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Abstract:

While many have noted the differences between the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts for Ezekiel, they have done so largely to rediscover an earlier Hebrew text, or to determine which variant preserves the better reading, frequently with the aim of establishing a ‘critical text’ for their commentaries. This often leaves the other variant(s) in a sense ‘incorrect’, often attributed to various forms of scribal error.

This thesis adopts a ‘textual-comparative’ methodology that accords each textual witness equal status as an interpretive trajectory, enabling each to be ‘heard’ in its own right. The aim of this thesis is to examine these different witnesses with a view to determine what they might tell us about the way Ezekiel 36-39 was interpreted by each particular community. This entails comparing the oldest extant Hebrew and Greek texts both intra-linguistically and trans-linguistically, noting any variants, and exploring possible interpretive reasons for them.

This study finds that the Greek translators were familiar with both languages, and that they often exegetically and interpretively interacted with the text before them. The Greek (LXX) is both translation and interpretation of the Hebrew. Other interpretations are found in ‘inserts’ or ‘plusses’, occurring in both the Hebrew and Greek texts.

Included is an examination of Papyrus 967 (G967), which exhibits a different chapter order (chapter 37 follows 38-39), and is minus 36:23c-38. Rather than finding that these differences result from error, or that G967 is a maverick text, we find that it is closest to what was probably the Hebrew Urtext. All other extant Hebrew and Greek texts then exhibit theological interaction; the change of chapter order exhibiting a ‘call to arms’, and the inserted pericope (36:23c-38) exhibiting a ‘call to purity’. Our research methodology thus elucidates the earliest Jewish interpretation of the Restoration of Israel in Ezekiel 36-39 (ca. 200-50 BCE).
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1.0. Chapter 1: Overall Introduction

1.1. Introduction

The desire to investigate the restoration of Israel in early Jewish interpretation incorporates a number of personal interests and experiences. I have been interested in Israel since 1967, and later experienced life on a kibbutz. My previous research also involved exploring early Jewish exegetical interpretation in translations and commentaries.¹

Ezekiel 36-39 incorporates a clear textual block dealing with Israel’s post-exilic restoration. Yet I have come to Ezekiel with mixed feelings, as it is not a book one turns to naturally. I was often subjected to many fiery sermons on Ezekiel’s apocalyptic wheels-in-wheels, the Valley of Dry Bones, or on Russia’s identification as Gog who is about to plunge us into WWIII (regularly heard in the 1980’s whilst living in the USA!).²

Ezekiel’s apparent choleric personality is very different from Jeremiah’s melancholic ‘weeping prophet’. Reflecting a degree of my own personality, Ezekiel’s bluntness did not offend me, yet at the same time did not endear him to me, as his writing often lacks love and compassion for the people (cf. Block, 1998, p.352).

The difficult content and style of Ezekiel may well be a reason for its lower historic popularity when compared to Isaiah and Jeremiah (and some of the 12 Minor Prophets). While there are many references in the New Testament to the other prophets, there are no undisputed quotations from Ezekiel. The early church and Jewish writers also did not often refer to Ezekiel’s writings. Even in modern times, whilst commentaries, books, and journal articles abound for the other prophetic writings, especially Isaiah and Jeremiah, there are fewer resource materials available on Ezekiel.

¹ “Does God Change His Mind? נח with Special Emphasis on Genesis 6:6 and Early Jewish Interpretation” (Bachelor Theology, Honours; Murdoch University, 1999 [Unpublished]).
² Many of these sermons were taken out of context with little or no regard as to how early Jewish communities may have interpreted them.
Block (1997a, p.45) notes that modern “conservative Christian interest in the book has tended to revolve around Ezekiel’s eschatological vision, particularly the participation of Gog and Magog in the final battles, and the role of the temple and its cult in the millennium”. This is the environment in which I teach, so despite initial hesitancies, it was important to grapple with early Jewish understanding of these issues, even as a corrective to their misuse.

Ezekiel 36-39 contains various events through which the prophet envisaged that post-exilic Israel would go, as part of her restoration to her fullness as in days of old. My original intent was to examine how words, themes and motifs found in Ezekiel 36-39 were used in the Septuagint (LXX), Targum, the Talmudic literature, and Medieval Jewish commentators (e.g., Rashi). However, my intended precursory examination of LXX soon filled my world; Targum, Talmud and Rashi are left awaiting future studies!

1.2. Traditional Textual Methodology

Whilst many commentators have noted the differences between the Hebrew and Greek text for Ezekiel, they have done so largely to rediscover an earlier Hebrew text, or to determine which variant preserves the better reading, frequently with the aim of establishing a ‘critical text’ for their commentaries. Yet this leaves the other variant(s) in a sense as ‘incorrect’, often attributed to various forms of scribal error.

Cornill (1886) was one of the first to give detailed reference to the Greek text, noting differences from the Hebrew. Subsequent commentators have built on his work. Cooke’s (1936, pp.xli-xlvii) extensive work in the ICC series, following the textual-critical methodologies of his day, evaluated Hebrew-Greek variants primarily to determine the ‘superiority’ of the Masoretic Text (MT) over the Septuagint (LXX), or

---

3 As well as many biblical studies subjects, I also lecture ‘Israel and the Middle East’ at Harvest West Bible College, that covers both past and contemporary events in Israel and the Middle East.
vice versa.\textsuperscript{4} This again was done to establish a critical text for the purpose of constructing his commentary. This practice can also be seen in Zimmerli’s (1979; 1983) commentaries. While he details LXX variants in his annotations, providing possible reasons, he rarely refers to them in his commentary section, since they are not part of his critical text. Allen (1990, 1994) is another modern commentator who follows this practice, yet with less detail than Zimmerli, and frequently attributes variants to ‘scribal error’. Block’s (1997, 1998) commentaries also consider the Hebrew-Greek variants but with less focus on the superiority of one text over the other, and he refers to variants in his commentary section when appropriate. Other modern commentators have written with little or no reference to Hebrew-Greek variants, presumably working from an existing eclectic text, either Hebrew, Greek, or a modern language.

1.3. The Goal of this Study and its Textual Methodology

Our purpose in what follows is not focused on examining variants in an attempt to discover any Hebrew original text (\textit{Urtext}), nor to establish which variant is ‘correct’, but rather to treat each text as an interpretive trajectory witness from the community in which it originated. This entails comparing the oldest extant Hebrew and Greek texts intra-linguistically, and then secondly, trans-linguistically, noting any variants and exploring possible interpretive reasons for these variants. This may be called a ‘textual-comparative’ methodology. This methodology gives 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).

\\textsuperscript{4} Cooke (1936, xli-xlvi) organised variants under three categories: “[1]. The superiority of LXX to MT in cases where they differ; [2]. The superiority of MT to LXX in cases where they differ; [3]. Characteristics of LXX that do not necessarily imply a different text”. Other commentators have often followed these categories with their treatment of variants.
1.4. A Proposed New Methodology

We propose a methodology that compares extant manuscripts, rather than relying on eclectic texts (e.g., *BHS*, Ziegler). Our ‘textual comparative’ methodology concedes that the Hebrew before the LXX translator may well be different from MT. Yet this earlier Hebrew text is also not given a ‘superior’ status to MT; it remains a witness to the viewpoints of that earlier community, just as MT does to a later community. This is also the case with intra-Greek variants, and with variants between MT and LXX. We often comment: MT says ‘this’ and LXX says ‘that’ (and similar comments between different LXX texts), yet without discussing which text is ‘correct’. Reference may be made to which was original, but only to assist establishing how the other variant came about, and possible exegetical and/or interpretive reasons for that variant. Our discussions frequently provide suggestions how a variant may have happened, yet without discounting the validity of the other variant(s).

This may initially disappoint a reader used to traditional ‘textual-criticism’ goals. Opinions formed under textual-criticism methodology may also be questioned, especially those that have traditionally explained variants away as scribal errors. We should note that at no point do we disagree with the goals and methodology of textual-critical methodology, as we also embrace its long held purposes and accomplishments. We seek only to suggest a complementary methodology when interacting with the ancient manuscripts, which hopefully can assist when researching or writing commentaries.

With our methodology, Hebrew and Greek variants are not textual anomalies that have to be explained away, or ascribed to some form of scribal error. Rather, variants are frequently celebrated as insights into early Jewish exegetical interpretation, often by the LXX community, yet also by the proto-MT. This does not mean that some variants are not the result of scribal error, as clearly some are. However, we will argue
that many variants are deliberate exegetical and interpretive interaction with the text before the scribe.

At times variants may be found to reflect a Hebrew text earlier than MT, yet this is not then used to correct MT, but to acknowledge and celebrate both as interpretive viewpoints. Likewise, we acknowledge and celebrate intra-linguistic variants, especially between the different Greek manuscripts, again often seeing them as interpretive viewpoints from their originating communities.

Our textual comparative methodology is not focused on trying to establish what came from the Prophet, what came from his ‘school’, or what was added by later redactors. We recognise these different sources only when it is clear, yet again only to acknowledge a possible interpretive exegetical trajectory.

Our methodology enables us and others following this style, to have insight into the earliest extant exegetical interpretations by the Jewish people. These texts can therefore partially take the place of non-extant commentaries from these various early Jewish communities. This methodology can also be applied to later texts, such as Targums, Vulgate and Peshitta, to determine how various Jewish and Christian communities interpreted the texts before them.

Another area covered by our textual comparative methodology is the varying paragraph structures in early texts. This is a developing methodology headed up by the Pericope Project (cf. www.pericope.net). Our methodology permits us to compare the various sense divisions within our texts, and note potentially different exegetical viewpoints, without having to establish which sense division is the ‘correct’ or ‘authentic’ one.

To date, we have found few scholars who regard both Hebrew and Greek variants as implicit insights to exegetical traditions. Hopefully this methodology can be utilised by scholars writing future commentaries.
1.5. Our Chapter Pathway

Our second chapter, ‘MT and LXX in Comparison’, identifies existing Hebrew and Greek textual witnesses that can be utilised for our methodology. This chapter will also discuss and expand on our methodology, laying the framework for gaining an understanding of how different communities in the time surrounding the Second Temple period viewed the restoration of Israel in Ezekiel 36-39. It establishes that these MT and LXX variants have their genesis in the early Jewish communities around the time period of the Second Temple. It also examines how the Hebrew text continued its dominance in Jewish life, and was not replaced by Greek text; and how the Greek text interpretively interacted with the Hebrew. This chapter also introduces the structure of sense divisions in the representative texts.

The following four chapters (chapters 3, 4, 5, 6) progressively examine one chapter from Ezekiel 36-39. Our methodology is applied to the representative Hebrew and Greek texts, suggesting possible exegetical interpretations for many of the variants. Of necessity these chapters are technical. We do not seek to write a commentary that considers whole passages, but discuss only verses with variants that we consider may contain exegetical and interpretive insights.\(^5\) We have two Excurses: the first in our discussions of 37:22, detailing how יְוָנִי, כְּנֶס, and ἀρχῷ are used in Ezekiel 37:22-25; the second is at the end of chapter 39, and covers unique plusses in the various manuscripts.

While variants in Papyrus 967 (\(\text{G}^{967}\)) are considered as they occur throughout our chapters 3-6, our chapter 7 covers \(\text{G}^{967}\)’s long pericope ‘minus’ of 36:23c-38 and unique chapter order. We examine previous discussions and proposals regarding these two textual anomalies, and find \(\text{G}^{967}\) is a viable text representing an earlier form of the Hebrew text. Our textual comparative methodology then permits us to examine each

\(^5\) It is presumed that the reader will have access to the many excellent commentaries on Ezekiel.
form of the text: the one that which we have traditionally received, and that in $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$. We then propose what possible theologies lay behind these two textual forms.

Finally, chapter 8 is our overall conclusion, and proposals for future studies.

1.6. Overall Summary: Chapter 1

This thesis seeks to interact with extant texts differently from traditional text critical approaches. We propose a ‘textual comparative’ methodology that treats each manuscript and language in its own right, with a comparison of intra-linguistic and trans-linguistic variants, in order to provide interpretive insights into the different textual communities. We will apply this methodology to the earliest extant Hebrew and Greek texts of Ezekiel 36-39, in an attempt to see how these various scribes, and perhaps their communities, exegetically interpreted the texts before them.
2.0. Chapter 2: The MT and LXX in Comparison

2.1. Introduction: Extant Resources

It is difficult to determine early Jewish interpretation of the text of Ezekiel owing to the scarcity of primary resources from the time of the Second Temple. There are no writings similar to the later (Medieval) Jewish commentaries, and citation of Ezekiel is rare. Our quest relies on extant Hebrew and Greek biblical manuscripts (MSS). We propose that a comparison of variants amongst these MSS, including intra- and trans-linguistic variants, should reveal theological and exegetical insights into the early Jewish communities which produced them, and into their interpretation of the restoration of Israel in Ezekiel 36-39. We call this a ‘textual comparative’ methodology.

2.1.1. Extant Hebrew MSS

Extant Hebrew MSS of Ezekiel from the time of the Second Temple are extremely few in number. The one major Ezekiel scroll from Qumran (11QEzekiel) remains completely fused awaiting some future technology which may open its record (Brownlee, 1963, p.11; Lust, 1986b, p.90; Herbert, 1998). The only relevant recognisable fragmentary witness from Qumran is perhaps from Ezekiel 37:23. The Masada Hebrew texts do contain fragments covering Ezek. 35:11-38:14 (MasEzek), and

---

6 Litwak (1998, pp.280-281) refers to studies done by Koch who “observes that Paul’s citations are limited to those books that Pharisaic-rabbinic Judaism, after 70 CE, recognised as definitively canonical. Paul’s preference for some books, such as Psalms, Genesis, Deuteronomy, Isaiah and the Twelve, and his ‘at the same time totally ignoring’ other books, such as Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Daniel, agrees with contemporary Jewish citation and exegetical technique (p.47)”. There are some allusions to Ezek 37:24-28 and 39:17 in the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch, but scarcely commentary.

7 Herbert (1998, p.21) describes various attempts to open and reconstruct 11QEzekiel, which is dated between “c.10 BCE–30 CE”. Brownlee (1963, p.28), who was responsible for detailed research on the actual scroll, says “the scribe was probably roughly contemporary with that of 1QIsa, but he may have been slightly earlier. It is therefore of the late pre-Herodian period or of the very early Herodian period, roughly in the period 55-25 before Christ”.

8 This is a fragmentary section of a Cave 4 Florilegium: ‘םינמאא לודג בדנהו ילל’ (‘They shall no longer defile themselves with their idols’) (Lust, 1986b, p.92). Speaking on the finds from Cave 4 and Ezekiel, Lust (1986d, p.11, n.30) claims that “to a large extent, the new finds are concordant with MT”. Brooke (1985, p.1) says “4QFlor is a fragmentary text containing quotations from the Hebrew scriptures: 2 Samuel, Exodus, Amos, Psalms, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel and Deuteronomy. These quotations are variously interlaced with commentary that attempts to show the interrelationship of the various texts and their significance”.

---
therefore are relevant for this study, particularly for comparison with the later Masoretic texts.\(^9\) Talmon (1999, p.60) says that MasEzek was “evidently penned by an expert scribe in an ‘early Herodian bookhand’ … and can be dated to the second half of the last century BCE”.\(^10\) MasEzek therefore provides us with the earliest readable Hebrew text for Ezekiel 36-39, albeit incomplete.

The oldest complete Hebrew texts remain the later Masoretic texts (MT).\(^11\) The earliest extant Masoretic MS is the Cairo Codex of the Prophets (MT\(^c\)); self-dated at 896 CE, supposedly copied by Moses ben Asher,\(^12\) and discovered in the Cairo Genizah (Lowinger, 1971). Next is the Aleppo Codex (MT\(^a\)), written around 930 CE, presumably by Aaron ben Asher\(^13\) (Goshen-Gottstein, 1976). The third oldest is the Leningrad Codex (MT\(^l\)), dated around 1008/9 CE (Freedman, 1998).

Whilst these later Masoretic texts are dated well after the Temple period, they nevertheless “may preserve the most ancient text” (Brewer, 1992, p.178). The link with an ancient text is actually more certain for Ezekiel due to the witness from Masada, which closely matches the later MT. This indicates that the Masoretes were not innovators or editors of their Ezekiel texts, but faithfully transmitted what they had

---

\(^9\) Yadin (1966, p.187) reports that the MasEzek scroll was found in a pit that was perhaps “a kind of geniza”, under the upper floor of what he believes was a synagogue, and states that “though the parchment was badly gnawed, we could immediately identify the writing as chapters from the Book of Ezekiel”.

\(^10\) Elsewhere Talmon (1997, p.318) points out that the discovery of MasEzek in a Genizah at Masada (cf. Yadin), would suggest “that because of its condition the scroll was stored there to take it out of circulation. This would imply that it had been in use for quite some time and would underpin its dating to the latter part of the first century B.C.E. or to early in the first century C.E.”

\(^11\) Tov (2001, p.22f) points out the inadequacy of the term Masoretic Text, as it “is limited to a mere segment of the representatives of the textual tradition of [MT], namely, that textual tradition which was given its final form by Aaron Ben Asher of the Tiberian group of the Masoretes. … [Also, MT] is not attested in any one single source. Rather [MT] is an abstract unit reflected in various sources which differ from each other in many details. Moreover, it is difficult to know whether there ever existed a single text which served as the archetype of [MT]”.

\(^12\) Lowinger (1971) briefly discusses the “dubious” dates and authorships surrounding such codices.

\(^13\) In his introduction for the facsimile edition of the Aleppo Codex, Goshen-Gottstein (1976, p.1) says that the Tiberian Masoretes laboured “to perfect the written record of the ancient tradition,” and that the “acme of perfection” is what we now call the Aleppo Codex. It is believed that Maimonides relied “exclusively” upon the Aleppo Codex, and considered it “halachically authoritative” (Goshen-Gottstein, 1976, p.2). Goshen-Gottstein, and others in the Hebrew University Bible Project (HUBP), still hold the Aleppo Codex as the authoritative text which every other text must be judged by, and is the text they use for their project.
received. Specifically, Ezekiel 36-39 contains a high level of agreement among the three earliest MT MSS and with MasEzek in the consonantal text, indicating they are from a similar textual tradition. Likewise these three MT MSS contain a high level of agreement in the placement of vowels and accents by the Masoretes. This strong agreement, which is not found amongst the Greek MSS, enables us to use MT as a starting point for our textual comparisons. However, this does not imply that MT is the Vorlage for the various Greek translations, or is the equivalent of a possible Urtext, or that any textual variants are ‘superior’ to those in the Greek texts.

**2.1.2. Extant Greek MSS**

The earliest complete extant texts of Ezekiel 36-39 are in the Greek tradition (LXX or Σ). We will focus on the three oldest: Papyrus 967 (P967, or Σ967), dated late 2nd to early 3rd century CE (Kenyon, 1937, p.x; Johnson et al., 1938, p.5); Codex Vaticanus (Σb), dated ca. 4th century CE (Bibliotheca-Vaticana, 1907), and the post-hexaplaric Codex Alexandrinus (Σa), dated ca. 5th century CE (Thompson, 1883).

There are a number of recensional variations among these three Greek texts, possibly evidencing different Vorlagen, just as there are many variants between these and MT. Σ967 witnesses two major variants in our textual block: firstly, a different chapter order than the other representative MSS (36-38-39-37); and secondly, the absence of 36:23c-38 (see our Chapter 7: Papyrus 967).

---

14 A decision was made not to include Codex Reuchlinianus with these other MT MSS as, whilst it has pre-Masoretic Tiberian pointing, it generally agrees with the consonantal text of the other MSS. However, it is dated ca.1105, which is another hundred years after MT (Sperber, 1969). Yeivin (1980, p.31) may have included Reuchlinianus when defining the parameters for his book, saying “Mss written after 1100 contain, as a rule little of interest to the study of the standard tradition and its development, and for this reason this book is not concerned with them. They do, however, contain much of value to the study of the development of the tradition up to the time of printing, and also for the study of the pronunciation of Hebrew in different periods and locations”.

15 Peters (1992, p.1100 states that “it is dangerous, dishonest, and wrong to assume that Leningradensis B 19A (MT) lay before the pre-Christian translators”).
Unfortunately, Ezekiel is not extant in Codex Sinaiticus and is believed to be part of the missing 56 leaves (Milne and Skeat, 1938, p.5). Identifiable material for Ezekiel 36-39 from the Greek translations of the three early Jewish exegetes, namely Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, is also minimal.\footnote{Ezekiel 38:4 is amongst the fragments of Theodotion (Fernández Marcos, 2000, p.140, n.20). It is disappointing that there is not more available, especially Aquila, as “the passages where Jerome mentions two editions of Aquila are all from Jeremiah, Ezekiel and a quotation from Daniel” (Fernández Marcos, 2000, pp.119-120). However, Tov (1997, p.45) points out that “Aquila was interested only in the linguistic identification of the Hebrew words, and did not introduce any exegetical elements into his translation”.

\footnote{Ziegler (1977, pp.260-281) also notes these fragmentary witnesses in his collation.}
\footnote{For further details on Hexapla and the three, see Fernández Marcos (2000, pp.113f, 127f, 206f).} Origen’s Hexapla does evidence a few surviving verses in our block, but often so fragmented that we are left with a partial witness, and often from just one exegete (Field, 1964, pp.867-873).\footnote{Ziegler (1977, pp.260-281) also notes these fragmentary witnesses in his collation.} As one may expect, extant variants from Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion typically follow MT, and as such offer limited insights for us.\footnote{For further details on Hexapla and the three, see Fernández Marcos (2000, pp.113f, 127f, 206f).} They will not be noted unless relevant to our discussion.

2.1.3. Summary of Extant Resources

In summary, there are no surviving commentaries or relevant citations of Ezekiel from the early Jewish communities of the Second Temple period. However, we do have several extant later Hebrew and Greek MSS, as well as a partial witness with MasEzek and minor fragments in the Hexapla. Variants among these MSS will be examined to determine if they are scribal errors, or show evidence of implicit theological and exegetical trajectories of thought. We chose MT as a starting point for textual comparison owing to its strong agreement amongst all Hebrew MSS.

2.2. LXX as Translation and Interpretation

It is generally accepted that one must make theological and interpretative decisions when choosing corresponding words in the receptor language. As such, LXX
is an implicit commentary on early Jewish interpretation as much as it is a translation. Whilst LXX is the first known translation of the Hebrew text, it also “provides insights into the art of translation of a sacred text and the subtle (and at times blatant) way in which it was re-interpreted in the process” [italics mine] (Peters, 1992, p.1102). Similarly, Jobes & Silva (2000, p.22) state that it is “precisely because the Septuagint reflects the theological, social, and political interests of the translator, [that] it provides valuable information about how the Hebrew Bible was understood and interpreted at the time the translators were working”. This is also supported by Müller (1996, p.23) who states “a translation will always reflect the translator’s grasp of the text, including the period and the cultural setting that the translator lived in; also, where biblical writings are concerned, the translator’s theology”.

In our case, we have three Greek texts presenting us with three different trajectories of theological and exegetical thought from the communities in which they originated. ’s chapter order and pericope minus (36:23c-38) reflect the theological views of a community earlier than other MSS. It is generally agreed that LXX grants insights into the world and early Jewish thought of both Alexandria, Egypt (where the first translation work of the Torah took place), and later Jewish communities, doing other translations and/or recensional activity. It is therefore likely that the translation of Ezekiel can provide insights into early Jewish interpretative thought.

19 Again, Peters (1992, p.1100) states that “the real value of the LXX resides not so much in its function as a corrective to some Hebrew text of which we have a copy, but rather as a record of the way in which a group of Jews in the 3rd century [BCE] and for some time thereafter understood their traditions”. Büchner (1997, 250) also points out that “in modern scholarship it has been shown again and again that the Septuagint is full of Jewish ideas”.

20 The complexity in using LXX for textual criticism is analysed in detail by Tov (1997).

21 Müller (1996, p.107) also stated that “more than anything the Septuagint testifies to the fact that at that time translation meant something more than simply finding Greek equivalents for the Hebrew words”.

22 However, we do not know the extent of any Greek cultural influence or impact upon the translators of LXX Ezekiel. Olofsson (1990b, pp.1-5) discusses the way that Alexandrian Jews partially integrated themselves into the Greek culture and religion, which had a bearing on their translation of the Torah. However, he concludes that the religious basis of Judaism “prevented them from any real assimilation or cultural syncretism” (Olofsson, 1990b, p.3).
2.2.1. Translation Location

Whilst scholarship is generally content to name Alexandria as the location of the original translation of Torah, the translation location of Ezekiel is largely uncertain. Alexandrian Jews may have translated LXX Ezekiel. Or it may have been translated in other Jewish communities such as Jerusalem or Babylon. However, we must also consider the possibility of Greek translations taking place simultaneously in different Jewish communities. Fernández Marcos (2000, p.250) points out that there are three Hebrew text families: one Palestinian of an expansionist nature; another Egyptian, generally but not always complete, closely related to the Palestinian in its oldest phase of the Pentateuch (but not in Jeremiah where there are appreciable differences); and another Babylonian with a preference for a shorter text where it is preserved (Pentateuch and Former Prophets).

Each community brought its own cultural and theological concerns to the translational and transmissional process, even if these translators were all using the same Vorlage. However, we cannot assume that they all had the same Vorlage, which also has an impact on variants. Textual variants intra-LXX, and between LXX and MT, may provide evidence of theological and exegetical trajectories from the various communities who undertook the tasks of translation, copying or revising.

2.2.2. The Genesis of LXX

It is uncertain if acceptance of LXX Torah was slow or rapid, both within Alexandria and universally. Whilst there are proponents on both sides of the debate, it may have taken time for overall universal acceptance. Modern scholarship does not strongly support the historical veracity of the Letter of Aristeas, with many instead believing that Alexandrian Jews translated the Torah in the 3rd century BCE for their

---

23 Muller (1996, p.39), speaking of the Prophetic Books, points out that “some of them may even have been translated more than once”.

24 The uncertainty over LXX Torah may have been the reason behind the Letter of Aristeas (Jobes and Silva, 2000, p.34). For an overview of the Letter of Aristeas see Jellicoe (1968, pp.29-58), Jobes and Silva (2000, pp.33-36), and Müller (1996, pp.46-67).
own use, and not because of a royal decree for the Alexandrian Library.\textsuperscript{25} Even if LXX Torah was written by royal decree, there is little indication that the Prophets were written by such decree, but rather for Jewish use.\textsuperscript{26} Their use covered areas of liturgy,\textsuperscript{27} education\textsuperscript{28} and even apologetics\textsuperscript{29}, as seen in their word choice when translating. These specific aspects are of primary interest to us, as they provide reason for the theological and exegetical variants. The debate continues as to the genesis of LXX, but this is largely outside the scope of this thesis. We do not seek to determine a definitive \textit{Urtext} or \textit{Vorlage} for Ezekiel 36-39, particularly as many today believe that such is now beyond establishing.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{25} Some recent writings have revisited this issue, and, whilst still finding the \textit{Letter of Aristeas} a pseudograph, nevertheless believe its point the Torah was translated in response to Ptolemy II’s decree. Collins (2000c) argues against the idea that the Jews voluntarily translated their texts, and sees them as reluctant translators who did not want to expose Judaism to the Hellenistic world. Perhaps Collins has overstated her point here as the Prologue to Sirach does not reflect such reluctance. On the other hand, the reluctance to translate may have been with relation to Torah. Yet following that event translation continued for all other books without any apparent royal decree. Even if Collins is correct, which is a discussion outside this thesis, we nevertheless have a record of how these early Jewish communities translated into the Greek, and continued their usage of the Greek. Therefore we can still see theological and exegetical interpretations transmitted. In fact, we could suggest that Collins’ argument helps support our proposal that the Greek text was never written to replace the Hebrew, but was to be used in conjunction with the Hebrew text.

\textsuperscript{26} We may suggest that whilst the original translation of Torah may have faced a reluctant acceptance (whether from opposition to the royal decree or by ‘purists’ who wanted to remain with just a Hebrew text), that the Prophets and Writings were also translated indicates that any initial reluctance was overcome.

\textsuperscript{27} Whilst finding areas wanting in Thackeray’s proposal of liturgical origins of LXX, Fernández Marcos (2000, p.60) says “nevertheless, it is the most ambitious hypothesis to try to incorporate in a coherent way the whole process of decanting the Bible from the Hebrew to the Greek in its different stages”.

\textsuperscript{28} Brock (1974, p.550) claims that “the combination of these two needs, then, the liturgical and the educational, were the real incentive behind the Greek translation of the Pentateuch. Once this momentous first step had been taken, it was only natural that the other religious writings of the Jews should follow suit – that is to say, the Prophets”.

\textsuperscript{29} When speaking about the possibility of the Torah being translated for the king’s library, Müller (1996, p.60) noted that “the fact that the translation project was given royal authorization might have been for apologetic purposes”.

\textsuperscript{30} Many have sought to reconstruct a \textit{Vorlage}, and/or conform LXX to extant Hebrew texts, but the methodology behind this is often incorrect. The most notable in antiquity was Origen with his massive Hexapla. Whilst Origen made a valiant attempt to emend the Greek text to match the Hebrew, he did not succeed. This was mainly due to his mistaken belief that the Hebrew text before him was the same as that before the LXX translators (Jobes and Silva, 2000, p.52). This has also been the quest of some recent commentators such as Cooke (1936, p.xl), who says “our problem is to recover a text which shall be free from alterations and corruptions, and so far nearer to the original. It becomes necessary, therefore, to examine the Versions, which were translated from an earlier form of the Hebrew text than that which we have in our Bible”.
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Instead of the two polarized positions of de Lagarde and Kahle,\textsuperscript{31} Tov (1997, p.11) proposed a four stage development for LXX:

1. The original translation.
2. A multitude of textual traditions resulting from the insertion of corrections (mainly towards the Hebrew) in all known individual scrolls in the pre-Christian period, and to a lesser extent in the first century CE.
3. Textual stabilization in the first and second CE, due to the perpetuation of some textual traditions and the discontinuation of others.
4. The creation of new textual groups and the contamination of existing ones through the influence of the text of the revisions of Origen and Lucian in the third and fourth centuries CE.

In general, we find Tov’s proposal realised in our studies, with $\mathcal{G}^{967}$ reflecting the original Old Greek translation (OG), and $\mathcal{G}^{BA}$ each typically witnessing the OG variants, but also reflecting recensional corrections towards the Hebrew as it ‘develops’ towards MT. That LXX was corrected towards the Hebrew suggests that later variants in LXX MSS are also likely to be Jewish; the exception being the minor plusses unique to $\mathcal{G}^{A}$ which nevertheless may still reflect a Hebrew text of that day. One issue, evidenced in this thesis, is that the three Greek texts witness a time when the Hebrew consonantal text was still in a state of flux, before it became a ‘fixed’ text. Dijkstra (1986, p.77) points out:

There are indications that the \textit{Vorlage} of the Septuagint of Ezekiel reflects a more archetypal text, although we have to be aware of the fact that the \textit{Vorlage} of the LXX was already in an advanced stage of harmonization. This process seems to have been continued within the textual transmission of the Septuagint itself. At the beginning of the above-mentioned process of harmonization we do not find identical texts, but two different though essentially related texts.

\textsuperscript{31} Tov (1997, p.10) simplifies the debate regarding the two dominant theories: “De Lagarde assumes an Urtext (the first translation or the hypothetical archetype of all extant manuscripts of the LXX), which subsequently divided into different text forms, while P. Kahle posited multiple translations which converged into one central tradition”.
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We do not have the Hebrew Urtext of Ezekiel, just as we do not have the Vorlage(n) used by the translator(s). It is evident that \( \text{G}^{967} \), \( \text{G}^B \) and \( \text{G}^A \) each represent recensions, but unfortunately, we do not have any of their parent texts available today to determine if they contained the exegetical variants. Regardless of other books, for Ezekiel 36-39 the uniqueness of \( \text{G}^{967} \) suggests the existence of two different texts in circulation at some point in time.

It is significant that these later scribes (e.g., \( \text{G}^{B,A} \)) did not correct a number of noteworthy exegetical and interpretive variants, and continued transmitting them. This suggests that the scribes, and their communities, accepted the variants as representative of their theological tradition. Their recensions towards a Hebrew text of their day suggest that variants unique to these MSS also reflect Jewish interpretation. Therefore, we should also accept them as such, acknowledging how each community saw their texts. This point does not include clear scribal error, only interpretive variants.

### 2.2.3. OG Translation Date

Whilst we do not know exactly who initially translated specific books of the Prophets such as Ezekiel, we know they were Jewish, as the translational work was completed before the Christian Era. Jobes and Silva (2000, p.45) confirm this:

> When and where the other books [than Torah] were translated, and by whom, has not been determined, but we have good reason to believe that by the middle of the first century B.C.E., the rest of the Hebrew Bible, with the possible exception of one or two books, had been translated into Greek.

Thackeray (1903b, p.578; 1921, p.39) proposed that the primary translator of Ezekiel was also a prominent translator of the Minor Prophets and involved with III Reigns, and

---

32 Swete (1989, p.24) also suggested that the whole Tanach was current in Greek by as early as 132 BCE, and the whole was included in the ‘Aristeas’ tradition. Thackeray (1921, p.10) believes all books in the Tanach were translated before the Christian Era saying, “we have first the original Alexandrian translations dating from the third to the first century B.C.; next the rival versions of the Asiatic school in the second century of our era”.
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that they were all completed at a similar time.\textsuperscript{33} Both Dorival (in Dorival et al., 1988, p.111) and Siegert (2001, p.42) also place the translation of Ezekiel in a similar timeframe to the other major prophets, \textit{ca.} 230-170 BCE. Recently Turner (2001, p.286) claimed that “it had proved possible to arrive at an absolute dating of the Greek \textit{qua} language to a period between 150 and 50 B.C.E.”.\textsuperscript{34} Yet, even Turner’s later dating still places the translation of the Old Greek Ezekiel within a pre-Christian timeframe. However, Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.10) points out that “there is no direct evidence of a Greek version of Ezekiel before the end of the first century … the earliest citation appears to be found in the letter addressed \textit{ca} A.D. 96 by the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth”.

Overall, we can suggest a broad translational timeframe for the original OG Ezekiel from as early as 230 BCE (cf. Thackeray, Dorival, and Siegert) through to 132 BCE (cf. Swete, Jobes and Silva), or even as late as 50 BCE (Turner). We do not seek to be more definite, beyond confirming the translational timeframe to be Jewish rather than Christian, thus determining that many of the variants between MT and LXX are clearly evidence of early Jewish interpretation. Our chapter 7, covering $\mathcal{G}^{967}$, also concludes that the major textual changes took place in the Hebrew text before 50 BCE as they are witnessed in MasEzek. We therefore prefer a date between 230 and 135 BCE for the OG Ezekiel. It is undeterminable when later LXX recension(s) towards the Hebrew were translated; we suggest a broad timeframe from around 50 BCE (based on MasEzek), through to sometime in the first century CE for an initial recension (most likely reflected in $\mathcal{G}^{B}$).

\textsuperscript{33} Thackeray (1903b, p.578) arrived at this conclusion following his examination of the vocabulary between these books finding “considerable affinity in their vocabulary, which renders it not improbable that they were all produced at about the same time, if not actually by the one and same hand”.

\textsuperscript{34} Turner (2001, p.293) also stated “the linguistic evidence is reasonably consistent with the completion of the Greek Bible by the late Second Century B.C.E.”.
2.2.4. Number of Translators

There are several theories as to how many scribes were involved in translating Ezekiel; Thackeray’s two translator proposal remaining the benchmark. Following his work on Jeremiah, and building on the work of others for Ezekiel, Thackeray (1921, p.38) determined three divisions in Ezekiel: “(1) chaps. i-xvii which I call Ez \( \alpha \), (2) chaps. xviii-xxxix Ez. \( \beta \), and (3) chaps. xl-xlvi Ez \( \alpha \) or \( \gamma \).” Thackeray (1903a, p.399) claims that [Ezekiel] appears, like Jeremiah, to have been divided, for the purposes of translation, into two nearly equal parts, but, instead of the second hand continuing to the end, as was the case in Jeremiah, the first translator resumed the task when the difficult concluding section, containing the account of the vision of the Temple, was reached.

Thackeray (1921, p.39) believed that translator \( \beta \) was not as proficient as the first translator (\( \alpha \) and \( \gamma \)), who, he claimed, was “a master who played a prominent part in the translation of the Nevi'im [sic]”. However, unlike his opinion of inferiority for the second translator of Jeremiah, Thackeray (1903a, p.410) did not believe Ezekiel’s translator \( \beta \) was “so markedly inferior to the first, [but] it is to be noticed that the first translator took to himself the hardest portions of the book”.

This leaves us with a degree of confidence that translator \( \beta \), covering chapters 36-39, knew his craft. Therefore variants between MT and LXX may not be due to scribal incompetence; rather they may be exegetical and interpretive viewpoints. This

---

35 Since Thackeray’s work others have usually agreed, some with modification of chapter divisions yet all ascribing 36-39 to the one translator. Some have argued for a single translator (Ziegler), or for three different translators (Herrmann, Turner), or single translator with later redactor(s) (Kase, Tov).

36 These divisions were based on detailed comparison of style and vocabulary.

37 In his earlier work Thackeray (1903a, p.399) provided the designation of \( \gamma \) to the third section, and most continue using this designation. However, Thackeray still saw the same translator for \( \gamma \) as \( \alpha \), and to avoid confusion over a two or three translator theory, he later adopted the designation of \( \alpha \) and \( \alpha' \).

38 Thackeray (1903a, p.410) also stated “whether the translators already found a break in the middle of the Hebrew texts, in other words, whether the Hebrew books where transcribed on two separate scrolls, must remain doubtful”.

39 This included the first half of Jeremiah, and the twelve Minor Prophets.

40 Thackeray (1903a, p.410) believed that the “two translators were set on to the work simultaneously”.
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immediately refers to the OG (\(\text{OG}^{967}\)), but it also applies to later LXX recensions towards the Hebrew (e.g., \(\text{OG}^{B,A}\)). It is to our advantage that all scholars ascribe the block of Ezekiel 36-39 to the one translator (Thackeray’s \(\beta\)), since it enables confidence in a consistency of theological interpretation found in the translation from Hebrew to Greek.\(^{41}\)

2.2.5. Early LXX Variants

It is apparent that LXX variants appeared very early, well before the Christian Era. Fernández Marcos (2000, p.21) observed that when Ben Sira’s grandson (\(ca.\ 135\) BCE) translated *The Wisdom of ben Sira* into Greek, he actually “apologises for the inadequacy of his translation”, stating in his Prologue:

> You are therefore asked to read this book with good will and attention and to show indulgence in those places where, notwithstanding our efforts at interpretation, we may seem to have failed to give an adequate rendering of this or that expression; the fact is that there is no equivalent for things originally written in Hebrew when it is a question of translating them into another language; what is more, the Law itself, the Prophets and the other books differ considerably in translation from what appears in the original text.

Of special significance to us, this apology includes reference to differences between the Hebrew and Greek for ‘the Prophets’, which may have included Ezekiel (based on our translation timeframes above). Thus we have a witness from 135 BCE that variations in wording existed between the Hebrew and Greek. Whilst the Prologue refers to translational difficulties in wording, our findings in the following chapters evidence deliberate exegetical choices in translating from the Hebrew to Greek. Translational difficulties may have permitted scribes to take exegetical liberties in their word choices. This again indicates such textual variations belong with the early Jewish communities, and not the later Christian transmitters.

\(^{41}\) For a recent detailed presentation and analysis of the different theories, and for the consenses that chapters 36-39 have a single translator, see McGregor (1985).
However, Jobes & Silva (2000, p.97) point out that almost all extant LXX MSS date from 4th century CE and following, and were transmitted by Christian scribes. Yet this does not mean they are now ‘Christian texts’, and that the variants are Christian. As Brewer (1992, p.180) states, “the [LXX] texts which have survived appear to be Jewish translations without much Christian influence”. Swete (1989, p.494) likewise claims that “early citations from the LXX suggest a diversity of readings and possibly the existence of two or more recensions in the first century, and lead us to believe that many of the variations in our MSS have come down from sources older than the Christian era”. Tov (1988, p.163) also found that “the NT influenced the transmission of the LXX but little. Allegedly several Christian changes were inserted at one time in LXX manuscripts, but few have survived to date”. Although LXX was transmitted to us by Christian hands, there is a high degree of certainty that variants originate from early Jewish interpretation.

Therefore, we have variants between MT and LXX that represent the OG (ca. 230-135), and are clearly Jewish and pre-Christian. These variants are continued in the later LXX MSS (e.g., ΣB,A). There are also a number of variants intra-LXX that, while these MSS are from Christian hands, also represent Jewish exegetical interpretation, as the major variants between Σ967 and ΣB,A reflect interaction with the Hebrew text (MT and MasEzek); and other later additional variants in ΣB,A typically reflect movement towards the Hebrew of their day. Additionally, while the ‘inserted’ pericope of 36:23c-38 is written in a later Theodotion style in the Greek texts, its witness in MasEzek indicates that this pericope also belongs to early Jewish interpretation. It is also difficult to see why Christian scribes would insert their own interpretive variants when their recensions sought to match the Hebrew text.
2.2.6. A Fixed Text

Some variants, such as plusses, may well be accurate representations of the Hebrew text available to the scribal editor, and “represent different stages in the history of the text” (Müller, 1996, p.42). Unfortunately, we do not have these Hebrew texts before us, so we cannot determine this with absolute certainty. It is apparent that the Ezekiel text before the original Greek translators was of a different Hebrew recension than MT. Sometimes these differences are only slight; other times they indicate wider variance, such as in $\Theta^{967}$ that evidences a Vorlage of a shorter text with a different chapter order. Jobes & Silva (2000, p.20f) state:

The issues surrounding this use of the [LXX] version are quite complex, but the fact remains that the Septuagint was translated from some Hebrew text that was not identical to the Hebrew text we use today. That original Greek translation, which was produced much earlier than any surviving copy of the Hebrew Bible, is an indirect witness to its Vorlage, that is, the Hebrew parent text from which it is translated.

It is this complexity that Peters (1992, p.1100) refers to when he claims that all extant LXX and MT MSS contain corruptions from the original Hebrew. Fernández Marcos (2000, p.117) agrees with this and, in direct reference to Aquila’s translation, states that, there are passages where the translation must suppose a different Vorlage from the Masoretic text as an indication that the standardization of the Hebrew text supposed by the Synod of Yammnia (c.100 CE) did not take effect immediately or in a radical way, but instead was more the expression of an ideal to be aimed for.

Most scholars today believe LXX represents a period in the textual and literary development of the Hebrew consonantal text before it was fixed (presumably some time

---

42 Later Müller (1996, p.113) said “the texts finds made after the Second World War reveal that the many more or less substantial discrepancies found in the Septuagint in relation to the later Masoretic text are not necessarily owing to the translator’s lack of conscientiousness … [but] they may in fact signify that the Hebrew text underlying the translation was different”. Of note, the text of Jeremiah is one-seventh shorter in the Greek than in the Hebrew and has a different chapter order.
surrounding the destruction of the Second Temple).\textsuperscript{43} Regardless of the exact time when the Hebrew text was fixed and accepted, this still means that extant LXX MSS may provide us with implicit insights into pre- or even proto-Masoretic Hebrew text(s); and therefore interpretation and theological exegesis from that time. Likewise, MT’s unique ‘plusses’, not evidenced in LXX, can also provide similar insights into the continued development of the Hebrew text. For this reason we should treat the variants found in each MSS with respect, and accord them equal value to what may have been original, as both provide us with interpretive insights to these early Jewish communities.

We must also consider that whilst the Hebrew text did at some point become ‘standardised’, this was never the case with the Greek text, as evidenced by the varying quality of each biblical book found in the various Codices. Metzger (1981, p.74) points out that different LXX MSS vary in the translational accuracy of each book, such as with Codex Vaticanus, which has “a good text in Ezekiel, and a bad one in Isaiah”.

Jobes & Silva (2000, p.31) agree:

\begin{quote}
The particular collection of Greek texts of the biblical books that comprise the earliest one volume Bibles, such as Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus, usually came to be by the historical happen-stance of whatever texts were at hand, irrespective of their origin or character. Therefore, whatever one may say about the history and characteristics of the Greek text of one biblical book may not be true of the others, even though they are bound together in one codex.
\end{quote}

2.2.7. Translation Quality and Glosses

Scholarship seems divided over the translational and textual quality of LXX Ezekiel. Following his evaluation of LXX translations, Blaiklock (1976, p.345) notes “Ezekiel is not well done”. However, Tov (1999d, p.397) counters this, stating “this is actually an overstatement as many of the differences between the MT and LXX were

\textsuperscript{43} Talmon (1999, p.25) argues that “the Masada biblical fragments give witness to the existence of a stabilized proto-masoretic textual tradition which had taken root in ‘normative Judaism’ of the time.” He (1999, p.25) also points out that the “textual fluidity, which can be observed in the Qumran scrolls and fragments of biblical books and bible-related works, which stem from the last centuries BCE, proves that these manuscripts were not subjected to such a stabilizing process”.
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created at the time of the literary growth of the book, and therefore should not be ascribed to textual factors”. Tov (1997, p.250) earlier comments that “the recensional rewriting is not extensive” and “the Greek translation of Ezekiel is relatively literal”. Metzger (1981, p.74) claims that $\text{B}$ Ezekiel enjoys a high level of agreement with MT. In his work examining the ‘consistency of lexical equivalents’, Marquis (1986a, p.417) concludes that “LXX-Ezekiel, in all three of its supposed translation units, is very literal” when dealing with nouns and verbs, and especially with verbs in unit β. Marquis’s finding holds special significance for us, as noun and verbal variants in 36-39 may therefore be more ‘intentional’ than in books that do not enjoy such a high degree of literalness. Perhaps one reason for the division of scholarship over the translational quality of Ezekiel is that scholars are each referring to the quality found within the actual LXX MSS/Codex available to them at the time they formulated their assessments (cf. Metzger, 1981, p.74).

It is significant that LXX Ezekiel is approximately 4-5 percent shorter than MT Ezekiel, and the percentage is even greater if we take $\text{B}^{967}$ into account. This has added to the debate over whether MT or LXX represents the Hebrew Urtext. The even shorter text of $\text{B}^{967}$ also raises debate as to which particular LXX MSS may more accurately represent the Urtext. Tov (1997, p.250) uses the literalness of LXX Ezekiel as the basis to argue for a shorter Hebrew parent text than that represented in MT. Often the plusses of MT have been explained away as later glosses or interpolations. Yet Tov (1997, p.250) argues that this description “is less appropriate because of the

\[44\] Marquis (1986a, p.417) furthermore claims “LXX-Ezekiel clearly stands closer to the literalness reflected in LXX-2 Kings and at a considerable distance from LXX-Isaiah”.

\[45\] Tov (1997, p.250) notes the plusses found in MT are also found in the Targum, Peshitta and Vulgate.

\[46\] Jobes and Silva (2000, p.176) suggest that “the evidence offered by the two Hebrew texts of Jeremiah increases the probability that other books were translated into Greek from a shorter, different Hebrew edition that is no longer extant”.

\[47\] For more on the glosses in Ezekiel see Dijkstra (1986, pp.55-77); also our Excursus on unique plusses at the end of our discussion on chapter 39.
large number of these elements and because of the occurrence of parallel elements and synonymous words among the pluses of MT and new material”.

Tov (1999d, p.410 n.19) does state that “such glosses or interpolations have been detected more in Ezekiel than in any other book of the Bible, and the model of Ezekiel negatively influenced the analysis of other books”. This point may have caused Cooke (1936, p.xl) to claim that “in the Hebrew Bible perhaps no book, except 1 and 2 Samuel, has suffered more injury to its text than Ezekiel”.48 In reference to glosses, Allen (1990a, p.408) says “the Massoretic Text of Ezekiel is notoriously beset with problems”.49 After researching the glosses in Ezekiel, Dijkstra (1986, p.76) found that “MT and in a lesser degree the LXX show a clear tendency to preserve as many readings and grammatical-exegetical clarifications as possible”. Tov (2001, p.283) suggests that “these additions should not be viewed as individual elements, but as components of a large-scale literary layer”.50 We may therefore examine MT pluses also as exegetical representatives from some early Jewish community.

Our studies reveal four groups of pluses in Ezekiel 36-39: firstly those unique to $\Theta^{\text{967}}$, secondly those found in both MT and $\Theta^{\text{A}}$, thirdly those unique to $\Theta^{\text{A}}$, and fourthly, those unique to MT (cf. Chapter 6: Excursus 6.6.0). These pluses have their genesis in the Jewish community, and were almost certainly added to the Greek texts to bring closer conformity to the Hebrew. $\Theta^{\text{A}}$’s pluses likely reflect Origen’s desire to match LXX to the Hebrew of his day.

---

48 Cooke (1936, p.xxvii) states, “everywhere uncertainty prevails about the text, due partly to the usual accidents of translation, but even more to the extraordinary nature of the events described .... We may blame the scribes; yet the very state of the text, with all its corruptions and inaccuracies, bears witness to the eager handling of those who studied it”.

49 Allen’s (1990a, p.408) comment that is in relation to the “apparent addition of a word or two” which he explains as ‘glosses’. It is interesting that Allen (1990a, p.408) concluded “the heavy annotation that underlies the texts in question [Ezek. 32:20, 21b; 33:31b; 34:26a; 35:6a; 39:16a] appears to reflect interest in their eschatological content”. Note: writers differ as to the spelling with single or double ‘s’ (Massoretes / Masoretes etc.).

50 Tov (2001, pp.333-334) supplies a list of such glosses, but these are all from Thackeray’s section α and thus do not include any from Ezek. 36-39.
It is difficult to imagine that the Jewish community would embrace any Christian plusses and insert these into their Hebrew texts, particularly when the efforts of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion sought to make LXX more reflective of the Hebrew text before them.\footnote{Swete (1989, p.31) claims that “the purpose of [Aquila’s] translation was to set aside the interpretation of the LXX, in so far as it appeared to support the view of the Christian Church” [italics mine].} We can therefore propose that the Christian community adjusted their Greek texts to match changes in the Hebrew, perhaps in an effort to alleviate criticism that their LXX did not accurately reflect the Hebrew. We may also suggest that the addition of MT’s later plusses by Christians into ‘their’ Greek texts is also an implicit example of theological choice by the Christian communities.

Finally, Lust (1986a, p.221) observed that “longer plusses in [LXX] Ezekiel are rare. Three of them are to be found in Ezek $\alpha$ [1-27] and six in Ezek $\gamma$ [40-48], whereas none of them occur in Ezek $\beta$ [28-39]. Their exegetical contents are not really relevant. They have not much bearing on the theology of the book”. It is significant here that no major plusses occur in LXX Ezek $\beta$, as this shows that although the translator interpretively interacted with the Hebrew before him, he did not seek to insert innovative material, and therefore revealing a degree of respect for the text.

\section*{2.2.8. Continued Dominance of the Hebrew}

It has become increasingly obvious that the early Jewish communities did not discard their Hebrew texts once they had been translated into Greek. Early disputes over variants and wording are “tangible proof of the increasing dominance of the Hebrew Bible text, also among Greek speaking Jews” (Müller, 1996, p.71f).\footnote{Gruen (1998, p.111) proposes that the various writings of that day, including LXX, “existed as accompaniments, commentaries, alternative versions, or provocative reinterpretations, inviting the reader to make comparisons or engage in reassessments of the tradition”. Furthermore, Gruen (1998, p.111) believes “the authors of these divergent treatments had no intention of challenging or replacing biblical narrative”.} As noted above, the Prologue for Sirach appears to appeal to the reader to continue comparisons with the Hebrew. Feldman (1988, p.455f) observed that the later Josephus quoted from both the...
Hebrew and Greek texts. We suggest that the Hebrew continued in use, even alongside the Greek translations, especially in synagogue liturgical and educational applications. The continued dominance of the Hebrew texts may also be seen with the later translations done by Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus, that set the Hebrew as the ‘master’ text, which the Greek must follow.

Swete (1989, p.299) importantly notes that “the manner of the LXX is not Greek, and does not even aim at being so. It is that of a book written by men of Semitic descent, who have carried their habits of thought into their adopted tongue”. This may also be seen in instances where LXX syntax follows the Hebrew rather than a Greek pattern. Lust (in LEH, 2003, p.xviii) brings this out, stating:

Although it may be based on it, Septuagint Greek cannot simply be characterized as Koine Greek. It is first of all translational Greek. This is most obvious on the level of syntax and style. The order of the words in the translation most often sticks to that of the Hebrew original. In fact, in many passages, the Hebrew and Greek can be put into parallel columns, word by word. The result is that the syntax of the Septuagint is Hebrew rather than Greek.

Lust (2001, p.395) defends this point, clarifying that the syntax of LXX “is largely affected by the syntax of the Hebrew source text due to the literal methods of translation employed” and is thus not strictly Koine Greek syntax. Significantly Ezekiel is one of the books “that are translated more literally [and] the influence of the source language on the syntax is more pronounced than in those [books] that are translated more freely” (Lust, 2001, p.397). Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.41) also states that “it is evident

53 Müller (1996, pp.46-67) discusses this issue in his third chapter outlining how Aristeas, Aristobulus, Philo, and Josephus all saw the Greek of the Pentateuch as equally inspired as the Hebrew.

54 Müller (1996, p.40) points out that Aquila “distinguished himself by rendering the text almost word for word, thus making it almost unintelligible to those who did not master the Hebrew language. But exactly this may have been the point with the enterprise, because it made the Hebrew text indispensable. Theodotion … wrote in a more elegant literary style than Aquila, but it is characteristic of him that he used Greek transcriptions of Hebrew words to a great extent”.

55 Lust (2001, p.395) further clarified that he does not mean “LXX syntax equals Hebrew syntax … the syntax of the Septuagint, and especially its word order, comes closer to Hebrew than to Greek, or in other words, ‘is Hebrew rather than Greek’. It leans more towards the syntax of the source language than to that of the target language”.
from the Hebraisms that the translators were familiar with the original tongue, but while they had a fairly extensive Greek vocabulary they were not at home in writing idiomatic Greek”. This suggests that the LXX Ezekiel translators, including Thackeray’s translator β, were perhaps more familiar with Hebrew than traditionally thought, and were not seeking to completely replace their Hebrew texts.\textsuperscript{56} Therefore, this indicates they did not misunderstand the Hebrew in every variant, but rather performed theological and exegetical interpretations in their translations.

2.2.9. Summary of LXX as Translation and Interpretation

We have presented support that LXX can be seen as an implicit commentary reflecting theological and exegetical ideas of the translators and their communities. Our representative MSS therefore provide us trajectories of interpretive thought. Significantly, many scholars believe the LXX MSS, especially the Prophets, were most likely written by early Jewish communities for their own liturgical, exegetical and educational use.

Extant MSS, especially the Greek, represent recensions to a Hebrew text in a state of flux. Our quest is not to recreate an \textit{Urtext}, but rather to observe textual variants that reflect theological and exegetical interpretations, giving each variant value as a witness to its community. We noted that scribes continued to transmit textual variants, indicating they accepted these as part of their tradition.

We suggested an overall timeframe for the Old Greek Ezekiel between 230 BCE (Dorival, Siegert) and 135 BCE (Swete, Jobes and Silva), thus placing the OG translation, and the resulting theological variants that are followed by later LXX MSS, firmly in Jewish hands.

\textsuperscript{56} Fernández Marcos (2000, p.10) also says “Bilingualism … is responsible both for the syntactic peculiarities of the Greek of the Old and New Testaments”.
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Whilst scholars may adapt and modify Thackeray’s two translator theory, we find they all ascribe Ezek. 36-39 to the same translator (Thackeray’s β). There is scholarly confidence in Thackeray’s claim that this translator was not ‘markedly’ inferior to the other. Therefore variants likely do not result from scribal incompetence. 

Greek and Hebrew variants began at an early date. Implicit evidence of this may be seen in the Prologue to Sirach (ca. 135 BCE). While extant LXX MSS come to us by Christian hands, the various LXX recensions show movement towards the Hebrew, supporting later variants as being Jewish. Some of these variants may be the result of a different Hebrew text before the translators, again indicating these variants as Jewish. Other variants, especially MT plusses, also evidence a Hebrew text in a state of flux until it became a fixed text.

The literalness of LXX Ezekiel, especially with nouns and verbs, permits us to have a high degree of confidence that variants are not always scribal errors, and therefore we can examine these for possible theological interpretations. Finally, that few long plusses are found in LXX Ezekiel also gives confidence that the translator was not seeking to make an innovative text, but rather, he sought to interact theologically with the Hebrew before him, whilst maintaining respect for the Hebrew.

The Hebrew text continued its dominance in use alongside the Greek, particularly in the Synagogue. The way translators often followed the Hebrew syntax shows they understood the Hebrew, and were not seeking to replace it. This again supports our proposal that not all variants are scribal errors, but often reflect interpretive interaction with the Hebrew.

### 2.3. Theological Interpretation in the MSS

In exploring early Jewish interpretation of the restoration of Israel in Ezekiel 36-39, we seek to provide possible interpretative reasons for variants in our representative
MSS. As stated above, our methodology is to take MT as a starting point, then compare the three earliest LXX texts with MT, while at the same time performing an intra-LXX comparison. Each MS will be given equal ‘value’, and variants will not be used to determine the superiority of one MS over another, or to determine which is ‘correct’. Instead, we will examine each variant to see if there is any evidence, implicit or explicit, of early Jewish theological interpretation.

In the following chapters, several features will be dismissed as not having any interpretative or theological intent. These include words where there is a clear scribal error, or where LXX smooths out the Hebrew by using two verbs for MT’s one,57 or where LXX uses a noun for an MT verb (and vice versa), with no substantive change in the meaning. We will not take the variations of the divine name into account, as, whilst evidencing theological intent, they are not directly related to just 36-39 and the restoration of Israel, but the entire book.58 Likely Hebrew glosses will be acknowledged where they evidence theological intent, but not where the gloss has permitted a smoother reading. We will not always note differences in word order or syntax, without any discernible theological or exegetical reason. Also, we will not comment on variant LXX spelling where there is no theological influence.59

Frequently scholars have explained away many of the translational variants between LXX and MT as scribal errors, often suggesting the LXX translator did not fully comprehend the Hebrew. While at the beginning of the current investigation this seemed likely, detailed observation of the data as a whole, rather than instance by instance, led to patterns that undermined the typical ‘scribal error’ explanations.

57 As Tov (1997, p.43) puts it “the identification of Greek words with Hebrew equivalents is based on a reconstruction of the translators’ intentions, so Greek-Hebrew equivalents need not be equal from a quantitative point of view”.
58 For a detailed examination of the divine name in Ezekiel see McGregor (1985).
59 For example, אֱלֹהִים frequently uses אֱלֹהִים for בָּשׂר קָדוֹשׁ וְשָׁלוֹם.
2.3.1. Trans-linguistic Wordplays

A few instances lead to the proposal that at times the LXX translator of Ezekiel 36-39 deliberately interprets the Hebrew, utilising trans-lingual ‘wordplays’, presuming the LXX reader (or hearer) would be familiar with the Hebrew, and so catch these wordplays and their theological and exegetical points. This scenario would find its fulfilment in the synagogue liturgy where the reading of the Hebrew is followed by the common language, permitting the bilingual hearer to appreciate the wordplay.

With a bi-lingual translator, operating within community theological framework for liturgical, educational and/or apologetic reasons, trans-lingual wordplays provide creative interpretation. This is often done by making a pun with the Hebrew spelling, often switching Hebrew letters within a word. Evidence of wordplay and other interpretive practices should not surprise us, as wordplay was one of their ‘habits of thought’ (cf. Swete above). Wordplay also occurs within the Hebrew text (and in later rabbinic literature).60

Wordplays should be considered where a Greek variant can be observed to exegete and interpret the Hebrew by reversing letters in the Hebrew, or making interpretive interaction on the ‘sound’. Such variants should not be automatically ascribed to scribal error, but rather considered as interpretation. Interestingly, commentators have largely ignored or overlooked these possible language wordplays, usually attributing such variants to ‘scribal error’ and/or the translator misunderstanding the Hebrew. We will demonstrate in our detailed study of these four chapters that this is not the case in a significant number of verses.

---

60 For an overall explanation of wordplay as a rabbinical exegesis see Brewer (1992) and for example of wordplay in the Hebrew text of Ezekiel 35:1-36:15 see Allen (1990b, pp.170-171).
2.3.2. Other Observed Exegetical Practices

Analysis in the following chapters shows some directions in implicit theological exegesis and interpretation: the LXX translator provides a reason for MT’s action or event; or outlines the result and/or consequence of actions stated in MT; or at other times provides an insight into the motivation or ‘heart’ behind such action. Often these interpretations can be seen to contemporise the text to their audience.

When confronted with metaphors in the Hebrew, the LXX translator typically exegeses them for the reader. This again is evidence that the LXX translator seeks to speak theologically to his community, or perhaps reflect community beliefs.

A comparative investigation between MT and LXX has revealed an implicit but consistent theological difference in the way MT and LXX view ‘the land’. For MT, the land is an active participant in the restorative plans of God, whereas in LXX the land is more passive, even the recipient of action. Included here are instances where MT records an action or event, but LXX uses the passive to translate as an action against Israel, the mountains, and/or the people. This may indicate that the LXX community felt victimised by events in both past and present, in that they felt they were harshly and unjustly treated by the nations around them.61 LXX often uses the passive voice in these instances.

There are times where it appears the translator sees himself and his community as ‘post’ the events of 36-39, or even that they were in the historic present. This also appears to have influenced their word choice.62

There are a number of significant plusses and minuses in both MT and LXX (also intra-LXX). Some of these are just one or two words, yet other times they cover

---

61 We do not use ‘victim’ or ‘victimized’ in any negative psychological sense; LXX’s use of the passive at these points suggests they felt these things had been done to them and they did not deserve it to that extent.

62 The aspect of a translator inserting “ideological changes” to make the texts fit the translator’s timeframe is covered by Tov (2001, p.94f). Whilst Tov is directly dealing with the Samaritan Pentateuch, there is no reason why this same timeframe adjustment would not have occurred with LXX translators.
whole phrases. A number of these plusses and minuses hold theological and exegetical insights for us and are therefore given due attention.

As noted above, that later LXX copiers or redactors did not correct these variations, and in fact continued transmitting them, may indicate that these later communities recognised and accepted them as representative of their theological traditions. Thus, we have both MT and LXX as two acceptable representations of theological trajectories of early Jewish communities for Ezekiel 36-39. Our textual-comparative methodology allows us to treat exegetical variants in each separate Hebrew and Greek MS with equal value as interpretive insights into their communities.

Commentators do not often mention many of the theological and exegetical aspects of variants covered in this thesis, perhaps because they require such detailed comparison intra-LXX and/or between LXX and MT. Some commentators note MT-to-LXX variants in their text critical notes, but frequently have no reference to these variants in the body of their commentary. This is likely due to the tradition of noting variants to establish a critical text, which then forms the basis for the commentary. These aspects we cover may be a phenomenon throughout Ezekiel, but our focus is on Ezekiel 36-39, and our findings remain; irrespective of whether similar features occur elsewhere in the book.63

2.3.3. Summary of Theological Interpretation

This section has outlined some parameters on what will, and will not, be examined. Our interest is interpretive significance. We will not cover verses without discernible theological interaction with the text by our representative MSS, while at

---

63 It is beyond the scope of this thesis to evaluate the whole book of Ezekiel. However, a cursory examination of Ezekiel chapters 6 and 16 has found similar theological and exegetical traits as experienced in 36-39. However, there was more evidence of variants in chapter 6 than in chapter 16. These two sample chapters were chosen, 1. Because they fall in the domain of translator α; 2. Because of the thematic similarity between chapter 6 and 36; and 3. Because of the dissimilarity between chapter 16 and 36-39.
other times we will comment on verses that are not often considered by many commentators.

Typically, variants have been attributed to scribal error, but we will examine possible trans-lingual interpretive wordplays, a common Jewish exegetical practice. We also propose various other exegetical practices employed by the LXX translator to contemporize the text for his community. These include: interpreting MT’s events and actions; exegeting MT’s metaphors; translating with a passive view of the land that may imply they felt harshly treated, even ‘victimized’; and then interpreting they way in which they viewed themselves post MT’s events. Theological plusses and minuses are also identified as possibly holding theological value.

Importantly, later LXX scribes did not amend all changes in their Greek texts, even when correcting to the Hebrew of their day. This indicates that they understood and accepted the original translator’s implicit interpretive interactions. This point is frequently overlooked. Our textual comparative methodology permits us to treat these variants as significant in their own right.

2.4. Sense Divisions

Whilst textual scholars in the past have not seen significance in sense divisions in extant texts, several today are beginning to re-examine these textual markers to determine the existence of implicit exegetical thought, in particular the international team in the Pericope Project.\(^64\) Olley (1998, p.111) highlighted the need to acknowledge the existence of paragraphs and other sense dividers in the text, and to consider variants of these divisions in extant MSS.\(^65\) The lack of significance attributed to MT sense divisions by modern scholars can be seen today where “many a Hebrew student does

\(^{64}\) For an online view of this project: [http://www.pericope.net](http://www.pericope.net) [accessed Dec, 2005]. There is also a Pericope series being published by Van Gorcum (2000 onwards).

\(^{65}\) Olley's initial (1993) work focused on Isaiah, and made special reference to the Hebrew University Bible Project (cf. Olley, 1998). But the same principles can be applied to the book of Ezekiel (cf. Olley, 2003) and for our purposes to the passage of particular focus (Ezek. 36-39).
not even know what a petuha or setuma is” (Korpel and de Moor, 1998, p.2). Today we may discuss sense definers of ‘chapters and numbered verses’, yet these are later additions to the Bible and may not reflect the chapter and verse structure of early Jewish or Greek scribes.66

Previously, emphasis in research was placed on individual words as the focus for an understanding of meaning. However, it is common in contemporary research to “include the significance of paragraphing (sense division) and even the form of the whole document” (Olley, 1998, p.113). To understand a text one must divide it into sense divisions, or pericopes, that will reflect the central thought of a text. Observing existing sense divisions in our representative manuscripts can highlight what was important in the text for these early scribes and their communities, revealing interpretive and exegetical insights. This can have a major impact on interpretation. As Korpel and de Moor (1998, p.1) say, “whether some verses do belong to a unit or not can make all the difference between a prophecy of doom and a prophecy of salvation”.

We agree with Tov (1998, p.142) that “the division of the text into sense units reflects the earliest visible component of context [sic] exegesis of the written texts”. This has increased significance for us as the Masoretes do not appear to be textual innovators, and therefore most likely transmitted the sense divisions they received, which may reflect some of the earliest extant Jewish exegesis. Therefore, it would be unwise for us to exegete a passage today without any regard to the sense divisions placed by these early scribes.

These early sense divisions should cause us to question why they were placed at that point in the text, and to investigate their history: were they part of previous texts or placed by later scribes who sought to put the text into interpretive sections for

---

66 Chapter and verse divisions numbering familiar to the modern reader were “introduced into the Latin Bible by Stephen Langton at the beginning of the thirteenth century …. [and] numbered verses were first worked out by Rabbi Isaac Nathan in about 1440” [Hebrew Bible only] (Metzger, 1981, p.41).
theological and/or liturgical use? On this, Tov (2003, p.473) says: “it remains difficult to know where and in which period the tradition of verse division developed, although it stands to reason that the division into small sense units originated in conjunction with the reading from Scripture in public meetings”. Sense divisions may have their genesis in the synagogue when structuring the Torah and haftarah reading, reflecting early Jewish interpretation.

However, we do not intend to suggest that all sense divisions (and thus exegesis) placed by the MT or LXX scribes are correct, or that we should embrace their interpretations and exegesis today. This is pointed out by Korpel and de Moor (1998, p.11) in their examination of sense divisions in Isaiah:

Of course we do not contend that the Masoretes were always right. On the contrary, we intend to prove that in many cases they were simply wrong. In some cases we are able to suggest that the Masoretic distinctive accents rest on rabbinic exegesis which cannot be followed by modern scholarship anymore.

Olley (1993, p.49) also concludes that the sense divisions in 1QIsa “are not definitive for modern exegesis and reading. Nevertheless there is value in taking them into account, along with the words of the text”. Having said this, we can also agree with Korpel and de Moor (1998, p.11) when they continue to say that “in the majority of cases the Masoretic delimitation of cola, verses and strophes rests on ancient, reliable tradition which should not be rejected without proper discussion”. Our textual comparative methodology allows us to compare where sense divisions occur in the various MSS, to determine any interpretive insights in how these various scribal communities paragraphed their texts.

2.4.1. Hebrew Sense Division Markers

In MT paragraph divisions, called pisqot or parashiyot, were marked typically with varying gaps signifying either a major division known as a
petuhah (open), or a minor division called a setumah (closed) sense division. All three representative MT MSS use these sense dividers. Yeivin (1980, p.41) describes these in the following diagrammatic form [xx’s mine]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense division location</th>
<th>Petuḥah (open)</th>
<th>Setumah (closed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Paragraph ends near the beginning of a line.</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>xxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Paragraph ends at, or near the end of, a line.</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
<td>xxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is believed that the sense division markers indicate interpretive breaks, whereby “in principle a closed section is ‘thematically related to what immediately precedes it’” (Siegel cited in Tov, 1998, p.124).67 A petuḥah is where a less relational theme is found. Tov (2001, p.51) says “the subdivision itself into open and closed sections reflects exegesis on the extent of the content units”, and explains that “the subjectivity of this exegesis created the extant differences between the various sources”.

Whilst acknowledging the subjectivity, we will typically follow the pericope divisions as found in MT in our attempt to hold to some form of continuity with early Jewish interpretation. This is not to suggest these ‘sense divisions’ occurred in the Urtext,68 but that MT is a starting point due to its general consistency among the three MSS. Variants do exist intra-MT, yet these are more often petuḥah and setumah

---

67 Tov (1998, p.124) does state “the vagueness of this definition leads to differences of opinion with regard to the interpretation of this relation”. However, whilst admittedly vague, this definition is still functional.

68 However, sense divisions can be dated very early. The call for a tradition of sense division is found in the Talmud of b. Shabb.103b “An open section may not be written closed, nor a closed section open (cf. b. Ber. 12b). Also Sof.1.15: “If an open section was written as closed or a closed section as open, the scroll must be stored away”” (Tov, 1998, p.130). There is also a Talmudic discussion regarding sense division in the writing of the Mezuzot, wherein Rabbi Ḥelbo wrote the two sections closed, whilst Rabbi Meir “wrote them as open sections” (Tov, 1998, p.129f). This provides evidence that sense divisions existed at the time of Rabbi Meir, and thus the Temple period. Metzger (1981, p.41) also notes that “verse divisions in the Hebrew Bible by נֵפָפָס is witnessed to as early as the Mishnah (Megillah iv.4)”. These markers do appear in MasEzek, therefore signifying they date to at least this timeframe.
variants at a particular sense division break rather than in the location of such divisions (although location variants do occasionally occur).

2.4.2. LXX Sense Division Markers

There is a wider variance with pericope division locations between LXX and MT, and even intra-LXX, which indicates that “the development of Greek paragraphing [is] independent of the Hebrew verse tradition [as] evidenced by the number of [LXX] divisions within [MT] verses” (Olley, 2003, p.4). Yet, significant for our study, Olley (2003, p.209) observed in Ezekiel “the closer matching amongst both Greek and Hebrew codices in chs 12-39 (at least 80%) suggests either some interaction in the development tradition, or similar criteria operating in both traditions”.69 Intra-LXX variances also indicate some independence among these various LXX communities, although Olley (2003, p.209) also found that in Ezekiel “the Greek codices show higher matching amongst themselves than that with the Hebrew, suggesting some Greek tradition”.70 Just as a wider variance exists intra-LXX with pericope division locations, there is also a wider variance with styles of division markers, requiring us to outline each LXX MSS’s style.

Paragraphing in Ω967 “is usually indicated by two short parallel lines sloping upwards to the right71 …. [and] the following line is usually slightly offset in the left margin, and the initial letter is often written in a larger script”72 (Johnson in Johnson et al., 1938, p.15). Olley (2002, p.204) also notes “the common scribal practice of a space, usually of one letter, [with] the script continuing on the same line”. Significantly, whilst

69 For a detailed examination of how Ω967, B, A compare with the sense division units intra-LXX and with MT see Olley (2002, pp.210f; and 2003).
70 Metzger (1981, p.70) says that “the two-stroke sign occurs in 24 of the 31 cases where the Masoretic text has petuha (77%), and in 38 of the 62 cases where setuma occurs (66%)”.
71 Olley (2003, p.206, n.7) has recently questioned the origins of these markers saying “it is unclear whether the original scribe was responsible for these marks …. These are probably later insertions”. Regardless of their origins, we find these marks do occur in Ezek. 36-39 in the same location as any ekthesis marker, and hence for us identify these paragraphs.
72 This scribal practice is called ekthesis.
\(\text{G}^{967}\) has fewer pericope divisions than our other two representative LXX MSS, it does enjoy approximately 90% agreement in Ezekiel with the MT tradition (Olley, 2002, p.209). This suggests that these sense divisions come from an earlier existing tradition than \(\text{G}^{967}\) and MT.

\(\text{G}^{\text{B}}\) shows evidence of both minor and major sense unit dividers; the minor division is marked often with only a one letter break, and often \textit{ekthesis} (e.g., 36:1, 4).\(^{73}\) \(\text{G}^{\text{B}}\)'s major sense division breaks are often marked with the text on one line finishing part way across a column, and the next line showing \textit{ekthesis} (e.g., 36:16; 37:1).\(^{74}\)

\(\text{G}^{\text{A}}\) contains more sense divisions in Ezekiel than any other representative MSS. These are typically marked as follows “the first letter of each paragraph, or, if the paragraph begins in the middle of a line, the first letter of the first complete line in it … is enlarged and projects into the left-hand margin” (Metzger, 1981, p.86).\(^{75}\) If the paragraph begins in the middle of the line there is typically a 2-3 letter break. \(\text{G}^{\text{A}}\) also exhibits major breaks in a similar manner to \(\text{G}^{\text{B}}\), but with the first letter of the next paragraph enlarged as well as protruding into the side column.

### 2.4.4. Summary of Sense Divisions

Sense divisions found in each of our representative texts provide important insights into how the early Jewish scribes exegeted and interpreted their texts. However, their sense divisions are not necessarily where the modern reader would place them, due to different exegesis. It is possible that sense divisions originated through liturgical use in the synagogue, and are therefore part of early Jewish interpretation.

---

\(^{73}\) Whilst a one letter break may not seem much to the modern mind, this does occur in a text that uses \textit{scripta continua}.

\(^{74}\) This ‘major’ division in \(\text{G}^{\text{B}}\) (also in \(\text{G}^{\text{A}}\)) may reflect MT’s \textit{petuah} sense division.

\(^{75}\) For more on the scribal practices of \(\text{G}^{\text{B,A}}\) see Milne and Skeat (1938, pp.87-93); also Swete (1989, p.125f).
We have also observed the differing styles of sense division markers, covering MT’s *petuḥah* and *setuma* markers, and LXX’s gaps and extended letters. Due to the consistency of sense division locations in the MT MSS, along with our use of MT as a starting point for textual comparison, we will use MT’s divisions to organise our discussions in the following chapters, while also considering the significance of other divisions.

### 2.5. Overall Summary: Chapter 2

There are limited primary resources available from the time of the Second Temple for determining how early Jewish communities interpreted the restoration of Israel in Ezekiel 36-39. However, we do have three Hebrew Masoretic texts that stand in unity: with each other, and with MasEzek, indicating MT’s Ezekiel tradition extends back to *ca.* 50 BCE. In addition we have three Greek texts that provide evidence of variants between themselves, and with the Hebrew text. Within the following chapters we explore ways in which these variants exhibit implicit and exegetical interpretations. Whilst these Greek texts are transmitted by Christian hands, they contain early Jewish variants. This is supported by the OG translation date of *ca.* 230-135 BCE, and how later LXX MSS are seen as recensions towards the Hebrew of their day. In addition, major variants between $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ and $\mathfrak{G}^{B,A}$ reflect interaction with the Hebrew of MT and MasEzek, again indicating these variants are early and Jewish. Extant plusses in the MT and $\mathfrak{G}^{A}$ also reveal early Jewish theology. Lust (1986a, p.201) says that when dealing with LXX variants we should “pay special attention to the differences with the Masoretic text. The study of these differences should reveal elements of the background and thinking of the translator, or of the final editors of the Hebrew text”. Such study is the focus of this thesis. Many of the variants that commentators typically ignore or attribute to scribal error are found to contain implicit interpretations (e.g., resulting from...
trans-lingual wordplays, LXX interpreting MT’s metaphors, and their variant sense divisions).

Both Hebrew and Greek texts, including their variants and sense divisions, should be seen as pointing to viable theological trajectories from their various early Jewish communities. We agree with Müller’s (1996, p.102) point that “the Greek translation may reasonably be seen as evidence of a process reflecting changing traditions” which only gradually came to a standstill once a particular Hebrew text became normative” [italics his].

Further, these early Jewish communities did not discard their Hebrew texts once translated into Greek. Rather, the Hebrew continued its dominance as the final authority; as indicated by the various Greek recensions. However, we agree with Lust (1986d, p.16) who said that “both the Septuagint and Massoretic text of Ezekiel may have preserved a <<final form>> of the Book”. Both Hebrew and Greek textual witnesses must be seen to have value in their own right. Whilst they can be compared for exegetical and theological insights, we should not seek to use one to determine the Vorlage of the other, nor “reduce or adjust one to the other” (Fernández Marcos, 2000, p.77).

This equal treatment of both traditions is the same acceptance the Greek had with the early Jewish communities, who viewed the Septuagint as a viable translation, and, at least in some quarters for the Pentateuch, as inspired as the Hebrew, and equally revered. For variants to continue to be transmitted in LXX, after so many recensions, indicates that later LXX scribes saw these variants as part of the LXX theological and exegetical tradition, and therefore as acceptable when read alongside the Hebrew. While the traditional textual-critical methodology determines the ‘original’ text, our textual

76 Müller (1996, p.103f) uses the book of Daniel as an example of the way variants may indicate flux in textual and theological traditions.
comparative methodology gives insight into how the various textual communities interpretively interacted with the texts before them.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{77} Our equal treatment of texts and variants may cause some readers to feel they are left without resolve as which is the ‘correct’ text. Our approach may result in a degree of ‘disjointedness’; it is recommended that the reader also refer to the various commentaries for the general issues surrounding a particular verse or passage.
3.0. Chapter 3: The Text of Ezekiel 36

3.1. Introduction: Ezek. 36

This, and the following three chapters, will contain a textual comparison to determine any variants that may indicate theological or exegetical activity. We will perform an intra-MT comparative study as well as an intra-LXX assessment. We will also compare MT with LXX trans-linguistically.

Overall, in our representative manuscripts, chapter 36 appears to be thematically divided. The first section (vv. 1-15) covers the restoration of the mountains and the accusations against the mountains and land as if it was a living entity, yet at the same time challenges the ‘enemy’ concerning their words and deeds against God’s land and people. The second section (vv. 16-21), explains the people’s sin as the reason for their dispersion. The third section (vv. 22-38) focuses on the restorative activity of God, announcing what he will do for Israel, and gives the reason for his actions: ‘for the sake of my name’ (v. 22).

3.2. Section 1: Ezek. 36:1-15

3.2.1. 36:1-4

We will treat 36:1-4 as one paragraph. All three MT texts studied have a petuhah division before 36:1. Each of the three LXX MSS also show a sense division break before 36:1: G\textsuperscript{967} has its standard pericope division marker, G\textsuperscript{39} its one letter break; and G\textsuperscript{A} starts 36:1 on a new line, perhaps reflecting MT’s petuhah divider. All representative texts signify that their communities saw the start of chapter 36 as separate from chapter 35, perhaps to distance the destruction of Edom\textsuperscript{79} from the restoration of

---

\textsuperscript{78} For more on the land see Galambush (1999), Habel (2001), and Stevenson (2001).

\textsuperscript{79} Included in Edom is Mount Seir, which the LORD is against, and its destruction (35:2, 3, 15), as compared with the ‘Mountains of Israel’ which the LORD is taking back from the ‘enemy’ and is restoring because he is ‘for you’ (36:1-9).
Israel. This is significant, as many scholars today tie these two chapters together, 80 and even see the speech in 36 as being said against Edom. Yet, for these earlier Jewish communities, the speech is against the ‘enemy’ (v. 2) and the ‘nations around’ (v. 3). This signifies a wider group than just Edom (v. 5). This break from chapter 35, dealing with ‘Edom’, enables chapter 36 to have a closer thematic link to chapter 6, which speaks of the judgement on the mountains of Israel.

Both MT C and MT L contain a setumah division break after 36:4. However, MT A and MasEzek do not witness any break. G 967 does not have a break after v. 4. Yet G B has its one-letter break after both v. 3 and v. 4. G A has a small break after v. 4 (also after vv. 2, 5, 6). This all indicates varying sense division views for these communities. For the communities of MT C,L and G B,A, vv. 1-4 with its own sense division theologically encloses: the boast of the enemy; the LORD’s response to that boast; and the address that goes out to the mountains (v. 1, 4) that the mountains should receive the prophetic proclamation, even of what is stated to the countryside (v. 4). These communities see the countryside (v. 4) as being within the proclamation to the mountains, whereas those who do not see a break here (MT A, MasEzek, G 967) have the countryside as the addressees for vv. 5, 6.

Through its interpretive translation of this pericope, we will observe that the LXX community sees itself surrounded by nations who despise and hate it, and who insult and trample them down, and they exhibit signs of feeling victimised. 81

80 For example, Zimmerli, Block and Allen all treat 35:1-36:15 as a theological block.
81 As noted in the previous chapter, we do not use ‘victim’ or ‘victimized’ in any negative psychological sense; LXX’s use of the passive at these points suggests they felt these things had been done to them and they did not deserve it to that extent.
36:2 τάδε λέγει κύριος κύριος ἄνθρωπος ἡ ὠν (σ967:A: ὠν; σB: οὐ) εἶπεν ὁ ἐχθρὸς ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς εὐγένεται (σA: εὐγένεται) ἐρήμια αἰώνια εἰς κατάσχεσιν ἡμῖν ἔγενήθη 

MT says νεκρὰ νεκρῶν ('ancient heights'), but LXX has ἐρήμια αἰώνια ('everlasting waste places'). Allen (1990b, p.168) states that “LXX presupposes θανάτωσιν or ἀπολοῦσιν for Heb. βλήματα θανάτωσιν ‘and ruins’ for Heb. βλήματα ‘and high places’, probably by assimilation to ἀπολοῦσιν πωλῶν ‘perpetual ruins’ in 35:9”. Block (1998, p.324) also says LXX “looks suspiciously harmonistic; cf. 35:9”. Scholars often ascribe this variant to scribal error. Cooke (1936, p.386) says LXX “suggests a more probable reading”. This may, however, be an example of a trans-linguistic wordplay, an implicit interpretation of how the LXX community saw the effects of idolatry on the high places82 (cf. vv. 17-18), which caused the desolation of these mountainous heights and the land of Israel, requiring restoration for the nation. Therefore, LXX exeges ‘waste places’ (the effect), from MT’s ‘high places’ (the event). σA’s additional εὐγένεται may be to emphasise the ‘snort’ of the enemy against the mountains of Israel.83

82 συνήμα in Ezekiel typically refers to the high places where idolatry took place (cf. 6:3, 5; 16:16; 20:29). Fisch (1985, p.238) says τὸ ἁρπάζω “in the mouth of a Hebrew prophet normally denotes idolatrous altars; but as used by the enemy it is a designation for the Holy Land in general”. Block (1998, p.328) also believes that in this context it is used “geographically” and “is therefore a poetic designation for the mountains of Israel”. Yet Cooper (1994, p.311, n.42) points out that “although it can have a less technical sense, the use of the term in 36:2 does allow the hearer to remember the misuse of those mountain shrines”. This concept appears to have been in the mind of the LXX translator, especially as these first verses of chapter 36 appear to be a reversal or a restoration from the judgement outlined in chapter 6.

83 σ967:B only have a single εὐγένεται which follows MT (cf. Gehman, 1938, p.124).
MT describes the action of the enemy as מְשֹׁרֵא אֲרָמַיָּהוּ (‘because [they] devastate and crush you’), yet LXX says ἀντί τοῦ ἀτιμασθῆναι ὑμᾶς καὶ μισηθῆναι ὑμᾶς (‘because you have been dishonoured and you have been hated’). There is difficulty in translating ἀοβ'), and Block (1998, p.325 n.11) provides examples of how some have emended the Hebrew; yet he concludes such are “ill advised given the frequency of the root שָׁם in the context”. Cooke (1936, p.386) says that LXX “may be nothing more than a guess”. While forms of שָׁם can mean ‘appalled’ or ‘astonished’ (Ezek. 27:35; 28:19; 32:10) its primary meaning is ‘devastate/desolate’ or ‘waste’, which suits its context here (Williams, 1997, p.168; also HALOT). In other places where MT uses שָׁם with this primary meaning, LXX embraces the sense with ἐρημῶν/ἐρημος (‘desolate/wasted’ 29:12; 30:7, 12; 32:15; 35:12, 15), ἀπόλλυμι (‘destroy/demolish’, 30:14), ἀπόλλεια (‘destruction’, 32:15), ἀφανίζω (‘destroy/ obliterate’, 36:4, 34, 35, 36). Whilst LXX uses ἀτιμάζω (‘dishonour’) here in 36:3 for שָׁם, LXX uses ἀτιμάζω elsewhere in Ezekiel (28:24, 26; 36:5) for παι (‘contempt/despise’). In 36:7 LXX also uses the noun form ἀτιμία (‘dishonour’) for MT’s מִלּוֹק (‘reproach/insult/ shame’) (cf. Ezek. 16:52, 54, 63; 39:26; 44:13). Perhaps LXX’s use of ‘dishonour/shame’ for these occurrences in 36:5, 7 influenced LXX’s use of ἀτιμάζω in 36:3 when translating שָׁם. LXX may have seen

84 Gehman (1938, p.124) states “syntactically Sch[eide] agrees with [MT]”.
85 Zimmerli (1983, p.228) also states “it is inadvisable to depart from the root שָׁם”.
86 Cooke’s (1936, p.394) ‘preferred’ suggestion ‘c’ has שָׁם as the pi’el of שָׁם with the meaning of “have malicious joy in Jewish Aram.”, and then says the LXX translation “suits” this suggestion. Yet Cooke’s suggestion here still does not match the meaning of ἀτιμάζω as ‘dishonoured’. Cooke’s suggestion ‘a’ has שָׁם as ‘devastated’, which is our preference above.
87 MT also uses מִלּוֹק in 36:6, 15 but in both places LXX translates with ὀνειδίσμος (‘reproach’), perhaps as a continuation of the ‘insult/reproach’ stated in v.3 (where MT used שָׁם). The use of מִלּוֹק/ἀτιμία is also found in Ezek. 16:52; 39:26; 44:13, where we find the concept of bearing shame/dishonour.
MT’s ‘contempt’ (v. 5) and/or ‘reproach/shame’ (v. 7) behind the action of the nations which LXX then interprets as ‘dishonouring’ here in v. 3 as the reason for MT’s ‘devastate’ (i.e., the surrounding nations devastated them because these nations dishonoured them). Overall, rather than finding an emendation here, or seeing the LXX translator as taking a guess, we can establish that the LXX translator was aware of ‘destroy/desolate’ as a primary meaning for תָּמָך, but made an exegetical choice here.

דַּעַץ does not occur elsewhere in Ezekiel, but it is found in Isaiah (42:14), Jeremiah (2:24; 14:6), and Psalms (119:131), where it has the contextual meaning of ‘to pant after’ (Fredericks, 1997, p.11). However, both the Psalmist (56:2, 3; 57:4) and Amos (2:7; 8:4) use דַּעַץ with the meaning of ‘be a nuisance, pester’ [HALOT], and LXX embraces this meaning, often translating with πατάξω (‘trample down’). The LXX translator(s) of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Psalms and Amos each capture the Hebrew meanings in the various contexts and translate them accordingly. Only in Ezek. 36:3 do we find LXX using μισέω ‘hate’. We therefore suggest that rather than LXX ‘guessing’ here (so Greenberg, 1997, p.717), LXX has theologically interpreted MT’s action (‘crush and trample’) by showing the heart of the enemy behind that action, exegeting that this happened to them because they were ‘dishonoured and hated’. Thus, MT provides an explanation for how they became the possession of the surrounding nations, whereas LXX gives the attitude of the enemy as the reason why they became a possession.

The later communities of גב, both implicitly emphasise this interpretive ‘dishonoured and hated’ by their יָּמְאָצ plus that is not witnessed in גס or MT. This

88 We may note that by ‘the LXX translator’ we are referring to Thackeray’s ‘Translator β’, as this person(s) is the accepted translator of Ezekiel 36-39 (see our previous chapter 2). This applies for all future references to ‘the LXX translator’, unless otherwise noted.

89 Fairbairn (1969, p.387) claims that דַּעַץ means “to snuff up, in the manner of a wild beast, which with a keen and ravenous appetite smells after its prey, in order to seize and devour it.” And in Psa. 56:2 “it is used by the Psalmist … of his cruel enemies: ‘Be gracious to me, O God, for there snuffs after me man [sic] etc.’
causes the phrase to read ‘you have been dishonoured and you have been hated’, emphasising the attitude of the enemy against them.

Further, MT has two qal infinitive construct verbs, yet LXX uses two passive verbs to make explicit that this action is clearly done to the people. LXX’s use of passive verbs, here and in other instances in vv. 1-15, may indicate that LXX sees the people of the land, and therefore themselves, as victims, with the action being done, or having been done, to them. In this way the LXX communities personalise the text to their situation and environment. We will find as we progress through the text that the LXX community appears to see themselves surrounded by nations who continue to oppose them (here, dishonour and hate them), especially with the later Ἐλλάδα, as shown by its various plusses.

For example, Ἐλλάδα’s plus of ἄπο τῶν ἐθνῶν (‘from the nations [around you]’) is not represented in either Ἑλλάδα, which both have ὑπὸ τῶν κύκλων ὑμῶν (‘by those around you’), nor in MT (לכבודם ‘from around’). Ἐλλάδα’s plus interprets the identity of ‘those around’ and the direction from where the hatred is coming (ἄπο): that the enemy is not just an individual, or individuals, but the nations surrounding them. Ἐλλάδα’s use of ἄπο here (cf. Ἑλλάδα, ὑπὸ) most likely occurs because of its plus (cf. ἄπο and ὑπὸ in 36:13).

At the end of this verse, MT just states that they were the objects of people’s talk (θέτεται τῷ ἄκω), yet Ἐλλάδα’s use of the dative produces a meaning that they were a ‘reproach/insult to the nations’, and Ἑλλάδα’s use of the genitive, that they were the ‘reproach/insult of the nations’. Thus, LXX implicitly interprets what kind of talk MT refers to, that it was reproachful and/or insulting talk. The ‘insulting/reproachful talk’ is taken up again in v. 6, and also in v. 15 where the ‘insult’ is identified

---

90 Eisemann (1994, p.549) says ἰῆμα “is generally used in a sense of defamation”.
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(miscarriage/bereavement). In vv. 6, 15 MT uses לֵּדַת (‘insult/reproach/shame’), which LXX translates with ὀνειδισμός. This may have influenced LXX’s use of ὀνειδισμός here in v. 3 rather than λόγος, as one would anticipate. It is possible that MT’s use of מִלְחָמָה is a reference to the רְשָׁפָה (‘evil report’) as part of the ancient charge against the land (cf. Num. 13:32; 14:36f), and as such LXX has interpreted רְשָׁפָה here as not just ‘evil report’ but as ‘insult/reproach’. This may well be the case when we consider the context of 36:12b-15, which also alludes to the ‘evil’ report of the spies. We also note that LXX uses ἐνέσσαν for MT’s בֶן, which interprets ‘nations’ instead of ‘people’. Often בֶן is used for the people of Israel, so LXX makes it clear that this talk is against them and coming from the nations. MT’s attention is on the action done by the ‘enemy’ to the mountains by the people – they were ‘a subject of talk’; yet LXX focuses on the result of that ‘talk’ – they were an insult/reproach to the nations. This comes from the view of those who have been spoken against (we have been reproached/insulted) and may again suggest they felt victimised. When we combine this point with the ‘dishonoured and hated’ attitude that the LXX communities indicated in their interpretation, we then have reason for the surrounding nations’ insulting talk against Israel. We may also note that LXX’s exegetical use of ὀνειδισμός does not give room for LXX to reflect MT’s intra-Hebrew word play with the following verse (רְשָׁפָה cf. v. 4).

Thus, in v. 3 MT has the action of the enemy, which is given as the reason for the word of the LORD to be spoken to the countryside in v. 4. Yet LXX has interpreted this action as the result of attitude of the nations around, who are insulting them. This is LXX’s reason for the word of the LORD in v. 4.
36:4 διὰ τοῦτο ὄρη (967: - ὄρη) Ἰσραήλ ἀκούσατε λόγον κυρίου τάδε λέγει κύριος τοῖς ὀρέσιν καὶ τοῖς βουνοῖς καὶ ταῖς φαραγγίαις καὶ τοῖς χειμάρροις καὶ τοῖς νάπαις τοῖς ἔξηρημομένοις καὶ ἤφαινημένοις καὶ ταῖς πόλεσιν ταῖς ἐγκαταλειμμέναις αἱ ἐγένοντο εἰς προοίμιον καὶ εἰς (967: - εἰς) καταπάτημα τοῖς καταλείφθεσιν θυσίαι (967: - θυσίαι) περικύκλῳ (967: + τοῖς περικύκλῳ)

967’s minus of ὄρη directs the prophecy to ‘Israel’ as a nation, rather than to the mountains as in the other MSS. In 36:1 967 is minus the genitive definite article before Ἰσραήλ, which also makes the speech appear to be directed to ‘Israel’ as a people rather than to the mountains of Israel. However, in v. 8 967 follows the other LXX MSS and has the speech directed to the mountains.

As one of the recipients of the LORD’s word MT has τὰ ἔρηματα (noun f.pl.) and τὰ ἔρηματα (qal ptc. f. pl.) (lit. ‘ruins of desolating’), whereas LXX has καὶ τοῖς ἐξηρημομένοις καὶ ἤφαινημένοις (both ptc. perf. pass. dat. neut. pl.) (‘and to those [places]91 which have been made desolate and destroyed’). The LXX translator has also added καὶ ἤφαινημένοις (‘and been destroyed’). Thus LXX emphasises the destruction, and its use of the passive emphasises that this action has been done to them, that they have been made desolate and have been destroyed. The action is done against the people in MT, but our suggestion is that LXX implicitly emphasises this by its use of the passive; MT uses the qal rather than the niphal. LXX’s use of the passive participle may suggest that the LXX community saw this as an ongoing action, and that they continued to suffer reproach from surrounding nations (v. 3), and continued in their desolation and destruction (v. 4). This again echoes a feeling of victimisation. We may suggest this

---

91 The context suggests these verbs are not referring to humans but their environment.
reflects the viewpoint of Diaspora Jews, or even those in the land during Greco-Roman rule.

Again in v. 4, MT has לְעֵינָיָא לְכַלּוֹנָיָא (‘the cities have become ‘a spoil and ridicule’), and LXX says εἰς τοὺς ποιμένες καὶ εἰς τοὺς καταπάτησαν (‘[the cities have become] ‘a spoil and trampled/trodden down, destroyed’ [LEH]). MT’s ‘ridicule’ is in reference to the ‘talk’ (v. 3b), and ‘insults’ (v. 13). Instead of repeating its use of ‘reproach/insult’ from v. 3, which would have fitted the context of ‘ridicule’, LXX here again appears to interpret MT’s action of being ridiculed, stating they are being ‘trodden underfoot’, perhaps again feeling victimised, by the surrounding nations. LXX’s plus of τοὺς reads ‘to those round about’, specifying the proximity of these nations. Overall, LXX catches and interprets MT’s concept in v. 3 of being crushed and spoken against, and here in v. 4 of being an object of ridicule. This may indicate that LXX saw their being trampled or trodden on as the result of the ‘nations round about’ dishonouring and ridiculing them (so MT). These surrounding nations are spoken against in v. 5.

3.2.2. 36:5-12

As stated above, some MSS do not have a break between vv. 4-5 (MTA, MasEzek, 967), whereas the others do, affecting the identity of the addressees for v. 5-6. It is significant that all MT MSS have a break after v. 12, with MT a petuḥah, and MTAL and MasEzek a setumah. LXX varies with its sense divisions, with 967 witnessing its division marker after v. 12, yet 9B exhibits no clear break after v. 12. This is possibly due to 9B finishing v. 12 at the end of a line, giving no opportunity for a single letter break. 9B does exhibit a paragraphos marker at the start of the following.

92 967, A's minus of εἰς here does not change the meaning as εἰς is mentioned earlier and carries over here.
93 967's minus of τοὺς leaves the text saying ‘those remaining round about’ leaving ‘nations’ as only implied. This may have been a later clarifying plus by the other MSS.
94 It should be noted that this part of MasEzek is a ‘reconstructed’ section and the break is proposed (Talmon, 1999, pp.64, 73).
line, but we are left unsure as to whether these markers were placed by the original scribe or a later one. It is therefore possible that $G^B$ does exhibit a break here. However, if not, then $G^B$ may have seen the ‘no more cause you to miscarry’ (vv. 13-15) as the ultimate overturning of the insults (vv. 5-7) and of the restoration and fruitfulness (vv. 8-12). $G^A$ has small breaks after vv. 5 and 6, and a larger one in v. 7b (see below), signifying vv. 5-7a and vv. 7b-12 as self-contained theological units. $G^A$ has a break after v. 12, with v. 13 having the first letter large and protruding into the column. As according to its practice, $G^A$ has numerous breaks not witnessed in any other representative text, and sees vv. 7b-12 as its own theological unit.

Overall, this pericope has the tone of Israel re-entering the land, where other nations are seen as illegal occupants of the land (v. 5). Yet these nations will be removed (vv. 6-7), and the LORD’s people ‘Israel’ will occupy his land (cf. ‘my people – my land’ vv. 8-9). They will multiply and be established as before, thus again inheriting the land (vv. 11-12). We will again find LXX interpreting and/or intensifying MT, and again reflecting a feeling of victimisation. LXX may indicate that these communities do not see the fulfilment of this text in their generation, and therefore interprets the text with their current situation in mind. MT appears to have a couple of theological plusses in this section (cf. vv. 7, 11), and $G^A$ has a rare minus (v. 9).

For the MSS that do not see a break between vv. 4 and 5 ($MT^A$, MasEzek, $G^{967}$), v. 5 completes the speech to the countryside begun in v. 4 and sees those locations as
the places of plunder. The focus here is the clash of attitudes between the LORD and the nations, including all of Edom. Firstly, we find the LORD’s attitude. Where MT says the LORD speaks against the nations and Edom יְהֹוָה יְהֹוָא (‘in the fire of my jealousy’), LXX says it is ἐν πυρὶ θυμῳ μου (‘in the fire of my wrath’). We must ask why LXX did not use ζῆλος (‘jealousy’) as in v. 6 (also 16:38). We find that earlier in 5:13 LXX also used ζῆλος for ἐν, and there are several times in Ezekiel when θυμός and ζῆλος are used together (e.g., 5:13; 16:38, 42; 23:25; 36:6; 38:19). These may all have influenced the usage of ζῆλος here, as may the use of ἐν in v. 6. Regardless, here MT gives us the basic action or attitude of God acting out of his jealousy regarding his land, whilst LXX appears to intensify this by giving the result of God being jealous, he is now angry/wrathful and this wrath appears to be directed against the nations and Edom.

In the same way, in v. 5 MT has ἢς (‘who/which’), that refers to “the actions of Edom and the nations involved staking claims on Yahweh’s land” (Block, 1998, p. 330). Yet LXX’s use of ὅτι (‘because’) highlights the reason for the LORD’s wrath. In so doing, LXX clarifies the reason for MT’s action that God is burning in wrath against the nations and Edom because they have taken his land away from his people. Thus LXX’s use of ὅτι here must be considered in conjunction with the interpretive ζῆλος, as they both show exegetical intent.

Secondly, we have the attitude of the nations. MT says it was πᾶν (‘with contempt of soul’ cf. 25:6, 15), but LXX has ἄτιμοσαντες ψυχας (‘having dishonoured the lives’). LXX has not treated πᾶν as a noun describing the soul/mind of the plunderers, but as the object of their plunder – the people of the land. This enables LXX

---

95 Some, like Cooke (1936, p.387), say that “some later hand has specified Edom in particular.” Yet the context of chapter 35, and the textual evidence that does not have a MSS without ‘Edom’, suggests its originality.
then to use ἀνυμάζω as an aorist participle, describing the action of ‘having dishonoured’ the land/people. LXX may have recognised the ‘contemptuous soul’ but interpreted the action of ‘contempt’ as ‘a disregard’ for their lives. This again echoes the heart of those who believe they have been plundered (v. 5c), downtrodden (v. 4), and hated (v. 3). This again may indicate the idea of victimisation. The use of the participle may suggest that LXX sees their surrounding nations continuing to ‘dishonour’ them. MT’s plus\textsuperscript{96} here of דְּגוֹ מָלַע also theologically expands the attitude of the plunderers regarding the ‘contempt of soul’ that it introduces.\textsuperscript{97}

Again, MT has לְאֵלֶּוהָ כַּפָּתָא לֵבָא (‘in order to plunder her pastureland’)\textsuperscript{98}, whilst LXX has τοῦ ἀφανίσας ἐν προνομῇ (‘to destroy by plunder’), which appears to interpret the result of being plundered; perhaps from the viewpoint of those who have been plundered.\textsuperscript{99} LXX has no mention of ‘pasture’, thus omitting the object that was plundered. The concept of לְאֵלֶּוהָ as the purpose for the action in MT is only implicitly referred to by LXX through its use of the infinitive. LXX appears to use the infinitive to interpret the result of MT action that ‘to plunder is to destroy’ [possessions]. Thus, the focus of LXX appears to be on the people being destroyed rather than the land. MT’s use of ‘pastureland’ fits with the context of ‘land/ground’. Even if LXX saw the

\textsuperscript{96} It is difficult to see why LXX would have omitted this, and so we are left with it being a later MT plus.

\textsuperscript{97} Interestingly, Greenberg (1997, p.718) says “wholehearted rejoicing, with wholesouled contempt. These are examples of Ezekiel’s play on the wording of his sources”. Thus Greenberg also finds ‘wordplay’ in the Hebrew text and Deuteronomic sources.

\textsuperscript{98} Or ‘because of its pasture, to plunder it’ (NRSV).

\textsuperscript{99} LXX may have seen מִנְסָה מַעְנָה as רְשׁ או ‘to drive out’ rather than open pastures, making ‘in order to drive out as spoil’ (Hulst, 1960, p.213). Allen (1990b, p.168) sees MT נָמָה as an early gloss. Cooke’s (1936, p.394) suggestion that “possibly מִנְסָה מַעְנָה is a miswritten form of מַעְנָה לָמְרָס in the line above” is speculative and without substance. The interpretation of מִנְסָה is complex and LXX could have simplified. Block (1998, p.326) points out that “In Leviticus and Numbers מִנְסָה denotes the territory adjoining the walls of a city given to the Levites as ‘pastureland,’ and this is how many understand it here. However, the sense of ‘pastureland’ derives from the contexts in which the expression occurs, not from the word itself”. We can suggest that LXX did understand the ‘pastureland’ meaning in Numbers and Leviticus, due to an evident awareness of those two books found in the way LXX interacts with them here in Ezekiel 36 (e.g., vv. 8, 13-15).
meaning of הֶלֶשָׁה כּ as ‘cast out’, its use of ‘destroy’ (ἀφανίσει) can be seen to interpret MT’s action of being cast out: the people are destroyed.

We note Symmachus says ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀδόκιμου ποιήσαι αὐτήν, καὶ τοῦ διαρπάσαι (‘so as to make it worthless, and to plunder’) (Field, 1964, p.867). Whilst Symmachus here could still be based on MT, yet treating the noun ‘pastures’ as a participle, we nevertheless find his understanding is similar to that of LXX, and that it provides an intent for the plunder – to make God’s land worthless.

Whilst we will not deal directly with v. 6, due to the absence of any apparent theological variants, we may note that it continues the running themes of ‘jealousy’, ‘wrath’, and ‘insults of the nations’. These themes appear to be the influencing factor in LXX’s theological interpretation in previous verses (e.g., ὀνείδομα ‘reproach’ v. 3).

LXX does not reflect MT’s declarative formula ἁκριβωτέρα περί εἶνας περικυκλῳ ἱμαν ὡτὸν τῇ ἐτιμίαιν ἀκτίων λήψονται, and only implies it by connection to the previous verse which also contains it. Zimmerli (1983, p.230) says “this textual lacuna is undoubtedly a result of a harmonizing of the text in Σ”. Cooke (1936, p.387) says that LXX omits this formula “perhaps rightly; the formula stands in its proper place in v. 4b; here it may have come in with the insertions vv. 5, 6”. Yet Cooke does not offer any other support for his suggestion. We also note that LXX does not reflect MT’s oath formula of ἀλήθεια (‘surely’). This needs to be considered together with its declarative formula minus, especially as LXX included the oath formula in v. 5 (cf. εἶ μὴν). Zimmerli (1983, p.230) suggests that LXX’s use of ἐπὶ (‘against’) for MT’s ἀλήθεια presupposes imizer, which indicates this oath formula may
have been in LXX’s *Vorlage*. Of note, MasEzek witnesses both the declarative and oath formulas. Ḡ’s plus of ἴδον may indicate awareness of the oath, but making ‘my hand against’ a stronger statement. On the other hand, LXX may not have understood the declarative and oath formulae used together here in MT. However, if LXX misunderstood the oath here, then why was it understood elsewhere? The declarative formula is followed by the oath formula in Ezek. 17:19; 33:27; 34:8; 35:6; 36:5, where LXX reflects the usage of both (with εἰ ἡμῖν). While none of these passages include the further oath of ἅγιοι, these passages do demonstrate LXX’s awareness of the declarative and oath formulas. Leaving out the declarative and oath formula here changes the flow of this verse, and allows LXX to have the LORD’s hand raised ‘against (ἐπὶ) the nations’. LXX’s minus here may well have been intentional in order to have the LORD lifting his hand against the nations in a punishing action, rather than lifting his hand just in an oath as in MT.

LXX turns MT’s *qal* perfect into future, from ‘I have’ to ‘I will’ [lift up my hand], suggesting LXX’s focus is on the future (or even their present). The focus is on what God’s hand will do, rather than on an oath that has been made but is not yet fully realized, as suggested by MT’s ‘I have’ and ‘they will’. This also could be a subtle interpretation of the Lord’s action of lifting his hand: it will be against the nations. It may indicate that the LXX communities either do not see these events as having yet occurred, or perhaps they are looking for it to happen again in their generation.100 The context of v. 7b, when compared to v. 6b, indicates that the ‘dishonour’ (*Ĥząμία* LXX) and/or ‘insults/reproach’ (*יִלְעֵל* MT) that Israel is experiencing will be turned back upon those nations who are currently uttering these insults (cf. Ḥνεἰλαομός ‘reproach/shame’ for *יִלְעֵל* in 36:6, 15; yet *Ĥẓumία* again in 39:26). LXX may also be

100 Even today, many interpret texts in light of current situations rather than examining where fulfilment(s) may have already occurred in the past. This is particularly true in the interpretation of eschatological texts.
seen interacting with MT’s ‘insults’ here by its use of ‘dishonour’, which appears to indicate that they saw these insults as bringing dishonour to them. We have already seen (as we will again) the feeling of ‘victimisation’ in the LXX community. Perhaps v. 6b is how they see their situation, and v. 7b is not their reality.

We may note that $G^A$ has a large gap in v. 7b, with οὕτωι beginning on a new line with an enlarged and bolded Ο that signifies a larger sense division break. This then attaches the last phrase of v. 7c to the beginning of v. 8, causing this section to start with the contrasting phrase ‘They shall bear their dishonour, but you, mountains of Israel…’. Perhaps $G^A$’s community saw the restoration of Israel, both land and population, as the way the nations would ‘bear their dishonour’. Their attempt to trample Israel would then be ultimately defeated.

现代的评论家经常把v. 8的‘But you’作为意义划分的标记，并将其v. 8-12作为一个思想单位。$G^A$是这些诗句的唯一古代证人，尽管是从v. 7b的前一句话开始的。

The instruction to the mountains of ‘your branches you will give, and your fruit you will carry to my people Israel’) in MT and MasEzek is not matched by LXX, which simply informs the mountains τὴν σταφυλὴν καὶ τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν (G$_{PB}$: ὑμῶν; G$_A$: -) καταφάγεται ο λαός μου οτι (G$_{967}$: ἐγγίζουσιν; G$_{BA}$: ἐλπίζουσιν) τού ἐλθείν

Modern commentators often see the ‘But you’ of v. 8 as a sense division marker, and place vv. 8-12 as its own thought unit. $G^A$ is the only ancient witness for these verses as its own division; although starting with the preceding phrase in v. 7b.

The instruction to the mountains of ‘your grapes and fruit, my people shall eat’. It could be that LXX “misreads ‘npkm’ [‘branches’] as ‘nbkm’” ['grapes'] (Block, 1998, p. 331, also Zimmerli, 1983, p. 230). Alternatively, this could be another implicit LXX wordplay, interpreting what fruit will be on the

101 Cooke (1936, p.395) says “the parallel 17$^\text{v}$ ἐλευθερίας … makes M’s text preferable”.

branches; especially as grapes are symbolic in Judaism for joy. This wordplay may be a deliberate reference to the grapes that the ‘spies’ brought back, carried between two men (Num. 13:23). If so, this reinforces the idea that the LXX translator (and perhaps his community) had the Numbers passage in mind when translating this section (cf. Ezek. 36:3, 13), and perhaps saw their return to the land as another re-entering and possessing the land as their forefathers did (cf. v. 11 ‘as in your beginning’). It is possible that MT also had the Numbers passage in mind, yet more implicitly than in LXX. If so, LXX exegetes, catching MT’s implicit echo, and providing the result of MT’s action. This may be seen in LXX’s καταφάγεται ὁ λαὸς μου (‘my people shall eat’), which interprets the need for the fruit: consumption by God’s people. It is interesting that the later Symmachus has τοὺς κλάδους ὑμῶν δώσετε, which matches MT perhaps as a correction to LXX (Field, 1964, p.868). Greenberg (1997, p.719) suggests that MT had Genesis 2 and the trees in the Garden of Eden in mind. This may also be correct as Ezekiel contains several mentions of Eden (Ezek. 27:23; 28:13; 31:9, 16, 18 [2x]; and 36:35). There is the possibility that both the Genesis and Numbers accounts were in the mind of MT, yet LXX only had the Numbers event in mind.

We also note that for MT, the producing of branches and fruit was a future action that would be done for the returnees. Yet for LXX, the branches already exist and are fruitful. In addition, MT has the mountains as an active participant providing for the returnees, informing the mountains that they shall ‘give branches and carry/bear fruit’. Yet LXX only informs the mountains what will happen to them passively when the Lord’s people will return (‘your grapes and fruit my people shall eat’).

102 As noted in the Introduction to the LXX chapter, the fragmentary nature of the Hexapla leaves only this one witness, and we are without evidence for Aquila or Theodotion. This will also be the case in following examples where we refer to the Hexapla.
\(G^A\) is minus \(\text{יְמֹנִי},\) just reading ‘the grapes and [the] fruits’, which emphasizes the passive participation of the mountains, avoiding any personal message to the mountains (cf. v. 10 where \(G^A\) adds \(\text{יְמֹנִי},\) to personalise it more).

MT has \(\text{לָאָרֶץ כְּחָלָיו},\) whilst LXX has only \(\text{λαός μου} (\text{cf. 37:12}).\) This may be an MT plus, especially as Targum follows LXX, being inserted by MT to emphasise the identity of the Lord’s people, perhaps to clear up any confusion in their community (or surrounding nations). However, MasEzek witnesses \(\text{לָאָרֶץ כְּחָלָיו},\) so if it was a Hebrew plus then it was quite early, and as such narrows the timeframe to the Greco-Roman period, even in the Maccabean time. It is surprising that the later \(G^A\) did not include this plus, as it often follows MT plusses. We do not know why Targum followed LXX here, but perhaps this was not in the Hebrew MSS used by Targum.\(^{103}\)

LXX does not reflect MT’s wordplay with \(\text{אָפְנִי},\) where different idioms are used:
you \(\text{אָפְנִי} \) the insults of the nations (v. 6); I \(\text{אָפְנִי} \) my hand (v. 7a); [the nations] shall \(\text{אָפְנִי} \) your fruit (v. 8). Similarly, the reversal where the enemy \(\text{אָפְנִי} \) themselves the land (v. 5), and then the mountains (i.e., land) \(\text{אָפְנִי} \) their fruit to the people (v. 8). These MT wordplays may be an implicit indication of how restoration would be realised, and the ruinous activity of the enemy reversed. It is curious that LXX did not capture and reflect these and other similar Hebrew wordplays.

We find a subtle yet important intra-LXX difference where \(G^{967}\) has \(\gamma 
\gamma \iota \zeta \omicron \omicron \iota \nu\) (‘they are drawing near’ [to return]) reflecting MT’s \(\lambda 
\lambda \pi 
\pi \iota \zeta \omicron \omicron \iota \nu\) (‘they hope to’ [return]). This ‘hope’ shows the heart, or attitude, of the returnees rather than just the event of ‘drawing near’, as in MT and \(G^{967}\). Gehman (in Johnson \textit{et al.}, 1938, p.125 [cf. p.19]) notes that \(G^{967}\) ‘is alone amongst all Greek MSS in preserving

\(^{103}\) The uniqueness and peculiarities of Targum are a separate discussion and outside the scope of this thesis. But this is one example where we see “the targums are dependent on the Septuagint, not the reverse” (Müller, 1996, p.43).
the correct rendering of the Hebrew אֶגְבְּזָז. He believes that this, and other similar
textual indicators,\textsuperscript{104} demonstrate that \textsc{g}967 was directly influenced by the Hebrew
original (\textit{Urtext}), and that “the Scheide version represents an early tradition which may
be closer to the original LXX than either B or the Syro-Hexaplar” (Gehman in Johnson
\textit{et al.}, 1938, p.76).

Cooke (1936, p.395) suggests “εὐπλησάοιν [is] a corruption of ἐγγῆζοσάοιν”.\textsuperscript{105} However, this suggestion may be questioned as ἐλπιζοσάοιν does not appear anywhere
else in Ezekiel (and only found in Psa. 30:20, 144:15, 146:11; Jer. 51:14), and, perhaps
more relevant, ἐλπίζω is not found in any form in Ezekiel. Whilst \textsc{g}967’s use is the only
occurrence of the form ἐγγῆζοσάοιν in Ezekiel, ἐγγῆζω is a common word in Ezekiel (7:4;
9:1, 6; 12:23; 22:4, 5; 23:5; 36:8; 40:46; 42:13; 43:19; 44:13; 45:4), and therefore a
word with which the later scribes of \textsc{g}B,A would have been familiar. Thus we may
suggest that, rather than a corruption, as suggested by Cooke, the later \textsc{g}B,A
communities deliberately used ἐλπιζοσάοιν perhaps to indicate that they were still
awaiting the fulfilment of the promised return. Whilst our suggestion appears to be in
conflict with other evidence indicating that the LXX community viewed the text from
the attitude of those within the land, it could be that they used ἐλπιζοσάοιν in the sense of
a hope not in the distant future, but rather, as an event about to occur. We also note that
the use of ἐλπιζοσάοιν was continued by all other Greek MSS, perhaps because they also
shared this ‘hope’ of return, leaving \textsc{g}967 as the sole Greek witness to the Hebrew.\textsuperscript{106}
We note Ziegler has ἐγγῆζοσαί in his text, following \textsc{g}967.

\textsuperscript{104} In fact, Gehman (in Johnson \textit{et al.}, 1938, p.74) states that “an examination of the readings with have
no counterpart in the other Greek MSS shows that Sch. has 43 cases which are an exact translation of
the Hebrew.” These include 36:8 already mentioned, but also 37:1; 38:8, 11, 16-17; 39:4. We must
note here that Scheide’s text finishes at 37:4 (which follows chapter 39 in this text).

\textsuperscript{105} Cooke’s suggestion of a ‘corruption’ also implicitly supports ἐγγῆζοσαί as original.

\textsuperscript{106} Johnson (in Johnson \textit{et al.}, 1938, p.19 [cf. p.125]) does note that “it is significant however that the Old
Latin follows the Scheide text in reading \textit{appropinqual’}. This again helps support \textsc{g}967’s use as the
original and correct one.
36:9 (G\textsuperscript{967,B}: ὅτι ἵδοι ἐγὼ ἐφ’ ἵμας καὶ; \textsc{A}: ἵδοι ἐγὼ) ἐπιβλέψω ἐφ’ ἵμας καὶ
κατεργασθήσεσθε (G\textsuperscript{967,B}: καὶ σπαρήσοσθε; \textsc{A}: -)

\textsc{G}\textsuperscript{967,B} both follow MT by saying the LORD is ‘for them’,\textsuperscript{107} which is most likely
a reference to Lev. 26:9. \textsc{A}’s minuses here are curious: firstly, it is minus ὅτι, which
gives the reason for the promise of v. 8; secondly, it is minus ἐφ’ ἵμας καὶ; thirdly, it is
minus καὶ σπαρήσοσθε. This leaves \textsc{A} saying ‘See, I will look upon you, and you shall
be tilled/prepared’. Block (2000, p.39 n.59) points out that “the formula ἀληθεύειν,
‘Behold, I am for you’ followed by ἀληθεύειν, ‘and I will turn towards you,’ in 36:9
deliberately reverses Yahweh’s disposition” (cf. 5:8; 35:3). By its minus, \textsc{A} does not
reflect this reversal, nor the inclusio of thought from v. 5, where the LORD was ‘against’
the nations, and now here is ‘for’ his people.\textsuperscript{108} This second minus in \textsc{A} may well be a
case of homeoarchon (ἐφ’ … ἐφ’). Yet this does not explain \textsc{A}’s ὅτι minus, nor the
inclusion of ἐπιβλέψω between the two ἐπί. Nor does it explain \textsc{A}’s third minus of καὶ
σπαρήσοσθε (see below). We are left with a measure of uncertainty as to the reason for
\textsc{A}’s minuses, especially since elsewhere \textsc{A}’s tendency is towards plusses. The first
two minuses may well be scribal errors, but \textsc{A}’s third minus may be the result of
theological choice.

For \textsc{A} the land is only tilled, but not sown, and does not have people birthed on
it (cf. v. 12) (cf. καὶ σπαρήσοσθε minus). The ‘sowing’ in the other MSS prepares the
reader for the population multiplication in vv. 10-11, and even for \textsc{G}\textsuperscript{967,B}’s ‘I will birth
people on you’, in v. 12. Either \textsc{A}’s Vorlage did not have καὶ σπαρήσοσθε, or there was
a choice to omit this, perhaps because \textsc{A}’s community did not feel the LORD was ‘for

\textsuperscript{107} Waltke and O’Connor (1990, p.194) note the differing senses of יָדָּע here, “I am concerned for you,
and will turn to you [with favor]” (italic theirs).

\textsuperscript{108} Perhaps \textsc{A} did not capture this as it has vv. 5-7a as a separate ‘sense division’ unit to vv. 7b-12 (or
7b-15).
them’ ($G^A$’s second minus), or had sown them ($G^A$’s third minus). The latter suggestion appears more likely. However, we should consider $G^A$’s minus here alongside its ‘δώσω’ variant in v. 12a (see below) that avoids $G^{967,B}$’s birth metaphor; together they suggest that $G^A$’s community was uncomfortable with the thought of the land being sown or ‘impregnated’, resulting in people being birthed on it (v. 12). Thus $G^A$’s minus here show evidence of theological choice. We may note that for MT and $G^{967,B}$, the land is sown, even pregnant (v. 9), and for $G^{967,B}$ the land has people born on it (v. 12). In MT, the land also carries the charge of it miscarrying the people, yet in LXX, it is (passively) made childless (vv. 12b-15).

It is possible that $G^{967}$’s ‘cattle’ plus comes from v. 11, as both verses start the same way, but this plus has no place here (Gehman in Johnson et al., 1938, p.126). $G^A$’s plus of ἱμῶν (your [cities]) makes this more personalised (cf. MT, $G^{967,B}$ ‘the cities’). This is a reversal of the previous few verses, where the ‘personalised’ aspect was not present in $G^A$ (cf. minus ἱμῶν in v. 8, and its other minuses in v. 9).

That both MT and LXX include ‘the whole house of Israel, all of it’, may be saying “the two Kingdoms will be restored to the land. The reunion is the theme of the latter part of the next chapter” (cf. 37:15-28) (Fisch, 1985, p.240). LXX may be seen

---

109 Whilst בְּּרָד means ‘seed’ and is generally used agriculturally, it is also used metaphorically as in Num. 5:28 where a woman is made pregnant (niphal); and in Lev. 12:2 ‘bore children’ (hiphal), for which Hamilton (1980, p.923) says this “denotes the Lord sowing Israel” into the land. We suggest that this is also the context here (vv. 8-12), particularly if we accept the metaphor of ‘miscarriage’ (vv. 12c-15).

110 Eisemann (1994, p.551) says “the phrase alludes to the return of the ten tribes”. Yet this may be too narrow a viewpoint. The context here, and in 37:16f, is the re-uniting of the Northern and Southern kingdom.
to intensify this with its use of εἰς τέλος for MT צְלָחֵה, reading ‘all’ the house of Israel to the end/completion/totality’ [LEH].\(^{111}\) Polak (1994, p.57) claims that typically in the Prophets, LXX uses συντέλεια for צְלָחֵה (cf. 11:15). Only here in 36:10, and in 20:40, which is also a promise of salvation, does LXX use εἰς τέλος.\(^{113}\) Polak (1994, p.69) states that “this solution was triggered by syntactic as well as exegetical considerations. In a promise of salvation the concept of συντέλεια would be inappropriate, so the translator could not apply the traditional rendering”. This LXX intensifying here may have been influenced by chapter 37, both in the regathering of the dry bones as the whole house of Israel (37:11), and the uniting of the two kingdoms (37:16f).

\[\text{36:11} \text{יהוה יְהֹוָה מִשְׁפָּטַיְךָ יִשְׂרָאֵלָהּ לִעְלָךְ שָׁלֹאָהּ וְהָיָה לְךָ נָפָלָהָ} \]

36:11 as 36:10, also has the phrase מִשְׁפָּטֵיךְ לִשְׁמַהְרָה צְלָחֵה.\(^{112}\) MT’s כְּלֵי בָ ipadֶה (‘and they will multiply and be fruitful’) is a reversal of the word order for the priestly blessing.\(^{114}\) The restored part of MasEzek includes this, but it is not witnessed in LXX, including \(\text{G}^\text{A},\)\(^{115}\) which frequently follows other later MT

\(^{111}\) Thackeray (1909, p.175, n.4) notes that “this use of πᾶν appears clearly to go back to the translator or an early scribe of ‘Ezekiel β’ (πᾶντα acc.sing. only in xxxvii.21, xxxix.20 in all uncials)”.\(^{112}\) Polak (1994, p.68 n.18) states that “the phrase εἰς τέλος may mean ‘forever’ … However, in Koine Greek this phrase regularly means ‘completely’”.\(^{113}\) Ezek. 20:40, as 36:10, also has the phrase מִשְׁפָּטֵיךְ לִשְׁמַהְרָה צְלָחֵה.\(^{114}\) Greenberg (1997, p.790) notes this “reversal exemplifies late Biblical Hebrew’s penchant for reversing traditional pairs.” Whilst Greenberg says this is a ‘late’ practice, this must be balanced with its inclusion in MasEzek. It may have been present early enough in MT’s Vorlage for the later LXX MSS to have witness to it. However, we do not know if it was in the Vorlage for any of our representative texts. Kutsko (2000a, p.131) says “I can offer no explanation for this inversion beyond the observation that the use of chiasm (or introversion) characterizes both P and H”.\(^{115}\) This MT ‘plus’ is witnessed in Aquila and Theodotion with καὶ εἰσέχθησαν καὶ πληθυσμήσατε (Field, 1964, p.868). Significantly this follows the normal order of the priestly blessing, which ‘corrects’ MT’s order here. However, this may assist with the general consensus of this phrase being a later MT plus. We also note here that this translation does not reflect the ‘perfect’ tense of MT, but rather uses the future passive, indicating they saw this ‘be increased and multiplied’ as something that will be done for or to them in the future.
plusses. This causes scholars like Allen (1990b, p.169) to believe this is a later MT plus, as it interrupts the direct address in the context. Probably it was a loose comparative annotation, which sought to compare the command be fruitful and multiply in Gen 1:22, 28; 9:1 with the occurrences of your fruit (v 8) and and I will increase (vv 10, 11).

Wevers (1982, p.190) says, “Its intrusive character is clear from the 3rd plural reference”. Block (1998, p.332) also states that it “interrupts the sequence of first person statements”, but he goes on to say “however, the third person also occurs in v. 12”, which answers Wever’s point. Zimmerli (1983, p.230) also says that MT is “probably … a secondary interpretive element”. Cooke (1936, p.388) claims “the two words are characteristic of Priestly authorship, e.g. Gen. 1:22-28”. This phrase is also found at the end of Jer. 23:3, but there MT has the words in the ‘normal’ Priestly order, and it is witnessed in LXX. Therefore, we may suggest that MT inserted this as a priestly blessing upon the restorative process, and may indicate that the later MT community saw a re-creative aspect taking place with the new possession of the land and the restoration of Israel (cf. Gen. 1:22; 8:17; 9:7; Lev. 26:9; Ezek. 36:8). MT’s use of here may also have invoked the remembrance of Genesis 1 for this later scribe who then inserted the priestly blessing. Kutsko (2000a, p.131) also finds this plus originated due to its connection to “creation motifs” in v. 11 and other passages in Ezekiel 36-37. MT therefore interprets with its expansive plus, perhaps because of the chain of thought from v. 8 to v. 12 of fruitfulness (v. 8), sowing/impregnating (v. 9),

116 In Jer. 23:3 LXX uses καὶ αὐξηθοῦσιν καὶ πληθυνθοῦσι which matches MT’s word order. Significantly, this is the same word order used by Aquila and Theodotion who witness this plus in Ezek. 36:11. This indicates that Aquila and Theodotion perhaps borrowed from Jer. 23:3 and placed these words here to match MT (howbeit with a ‘corrected’ word order). The word order for both MT and LXX in Jer. 23:3 follow that of Gen. 8:17. For more on the debate if Jeremiah is dependant on Ezekiel for plusses or vis versa see Leene (2000) as this discussion is outside our parameters for this verse.

117 The ‘later’ here nevertheless must have been early enough to be available for the MasEzek community.
multiplying people (vv. 10-11), and people walking on the land (v. 12). Interestingly, 37:26 also has an echo of this Priestly blessing (‘I will place and multiply’), which is not represented in LXX. We suggest both were added to MT at a similar time.

Ezekiel 36:12 is the end of this pericope, and serves the two-fold purpose of wrapping up what has been stated in the previous verses, about the LORD’s people returning and the land being fruitful with people, and then introducing the new concept of ‘childlessness/ miscarriage’ that will be taken up in the following pericope. This verse presents a number of complex issues.

In speaking of the restoration of the mountains, MT states (‘and I will cause people to walk on you’), whereas G\(^{967,B}\) say καὶ γεννήσω (‘and I will give birth to people on you’). Block (1998, p.332) says that in LXX this is “perhaps an inadvertent mistake or reflective of a different Vorlage”. The ‘different Vorlage’ suggestion is possible, considering the number of variants in 36:12-15, showing evidence of a text in a state of flux. However, Zimmerli (1983, p.231) dismisses this variant as a scribal error, stating that LXX “seems to presuppose (‘and I shall cause you to give birth’). He then states, “from the point of view of content, a reference to Yahweh’s ‘begetting’ would, in view of the context, be

---

118 For more on the phrase ‘I am the Lord’ (found in both MT and LXX), see (Zimmerli, 1982, pp.29-98).
119 Brenton has ‘I will increase people on you’ but in so doing Brenton interprets the basic meaning of γεννήσω – to beget, bring forth.
120 Greenberg (1997, p.721) also says “G’s bizarre ‘I will beget’ arose from an erroneous Vorlage (whildly).
121 Cooke (1936, p.395) says LXX “cannot be right”, but does not explain why he believes this.
extremely odd. Thus [MT] is to be preferred” (Zimmerli, 1983, p.231). On the other hand, rather than a different Vorlage or scribal error, LXX may well be reflecting on the ‘sowing’ (cf. v. 9) as ‘impregnating’, and then on the metaphor that continues regarding childlessness/miscarriage in this and the following pericope (vv. 12b-15). This would then enable G967,B to complete another word play here on הָוָלָהָה (ד for ה), causing an interpretive and exegetical shift to match the context, and their theology.

For G967,B, the mountains of Israel (cf. v.8) will give birth and will not miscarry, a charge that LXX appears to want to avoid (cf. vv. 12b-15 below).

We noted in v. 9 that GA was minus the land being ‘sown’, and suggested this was done by theological choice, and that this minus should be considered with GA’s variant here in v. 12, where it avoids G967,B’s birth metaphor by using δόσω (‘and I will give people on you’). The concept of ‘giving people’ may be an attempt to find middle ground between MT and other LXX MSS. This may indicate that the GA community was uncomfortable with the concept of the land being ‘sown’ (v. 9) and having people brought to birth on it (v. 12), and therefore made theological choices in both verses.122

We also note in 36:12 that where MT states ~l’K.v;l. dA[@siAt-al{w> (‘and you shall never again make them childless’ OR ‘miscarry them’),123 LXX states καὶ οὐ μὴ προστεθήτε ἐτεικνωθήσῃς ἀπ’ αὐτῶν (‘and you will no longer be made childless of them’). Here we see that MT has the mountains as an active agent (cf. v. 8) that will no longer ‘bereave/make childless’ the people (or nation/s; cf. גג vv. 13-15) of their children; or a more contextual preference, that the mountains will no longer ‘miscarry’

122 We have no suggestion for GA προστεθήτε η σκόθαι for G967,B προστεθήτε.
123 Duguid (1994, p.99) notes that דא … ל is “a characteristic idiom of the prophet’s contrast between the way things were in the past and the way they will be in the future” (cf. vv. 14, 15, 30; 37:22, 23; 39:7, 28).
their people.\textsuperscript{124} Hamilton (1980, p.923; 1997, p.106 [also HALOT]) outlines the overall use of \( \text{שֶׁלֶת} \) as ‘to become/make childless’, and even ‘to miscarriage’\textsuperscript{125}, stating here that “Judah\textsuperscript{126} is accused of ‘robbing her nation of its children’”. However, he (1980, p.923) curiously discusses whether the usage of \( \text{שֶׁלֶת} \) here is in reference “to the practice of infant sacrifice or cannibalism”.\textsuperscript{127} Whilst we may question this last usage here, Hamilton [also HALOT] has established that \( \text{שֶׁלֶת} \), whilst typically used for childlessness (being deprived of children), also has the meaning in the \textit{piel} of miscarriage, which fits the context of vv. 12-15. The charge of ‘miscarry’ for MT, and even ‘childless/bereaved’ for LXX, here and in the following pericope, may well be the insult spoken against the mountains back in 36:3, 6. This is most likely a reference to the ancient charge against the land that the spies brought back, ‘a land that devours (\( \text{שֶׁלֶת} \)) its inhabitants’ (Num. 13:32). Now their ‘enemies’ are restating this charge as an insult (cf. vv. 3, 6, 13). Cooke (1936, p.388) claims that “the mountains …. when ravaged by famine or wild beasts, they could be said to make the inhabitants childless”. Yet this does not appear to be what MT is stating here. Rather, the mountains are an active agent in this action. Greenberg (1997, p.721) points out that the use of the \textit{pi’el} here “signifies an active rather than a passive losing of one’s children, meaning to doing away with them or killing them off”. This again supports our proposed meaning of ‘miscarriage’ here, and in vv. 13-15. Eichrodt (1970, p.492) notes this phrase “directly
\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{124} Whilst directly addressing the mountains here (the subject since v. 8), this may nevertheless include all the land (cf. vv. 4, 6).
\textsuperscript{125} Hamilton (1980, p.923) states “Finally we note those passages in which the idea of "miscarriage" is prominent. The reference may be to the miscarriage of (1) animals: ewes and she-goats, Gen 31:38; sheep, Song 4:2; Song 6:6; calf, Job 21:10; (2) the land (non-productive): 2Kings 2:19, 21; Mal 3:11; (3) a woman: Exo 23:26; Hos 9:14, "give them a 'miscarrying' womb." Significant for us, is the \textit{piel} form in Gen. 31:38; Exod.23:26; Job 21:10; Mal.3:11, which gives us ground to hold the \textit{piel} here in Ezek. 36:12 also refers to ‘miscarriage’.
\textsuperscript{126} That Hamilton is exegeting may be seen in how he refers to ‘Judah’ and not to the ‘mountains’ of the text.
\textsuperscript{127} Hamilton brings his own interpretation to this passage in claiming that the land was bereaved or caused miscarriage, as there is nothing explicitly in the text to indicate infant sacrifice or cannibalism.
\end{footnotesize}
express[es] a very grim view of the land, regarding it as a sort of monster which devours its own inhabitants”. That the land will no longer miscarry appears to be a reversal for MT of Ezek. 5:17 and 14:15. Overall, for MT it is the mountains that have performed this action of miscarriage to the people, but they will never do so again.

However LXX, both in translation, and by use of the passive verb (ἀτεκνώνω), does not reflect ‘miscarriage’. Instead, LXX has the mountains as passive, with the action of ‘being made childless’ done to them, and stating the mountains will be no longer be made childless of their people. LXX’s use of the passive requires its ἀπό ‘plus’ (also in v. 13). In this, LXX appears to absolve the mountains, and therefore the people, of any wrong doing in the past, and passes the blame for barrenness onto the other nations, who are implicitly charged with removing the people. If LXX was written at a time when they saw their enemies surrounding them (Greco-Roman era), then one can understand their statement here that the land will not be made childless by their removal, as happened to their forefathers. The LXX community may well have seen this as something that was done to them, or their forefathers, again showing evidence they felt victimized. LXX’s use of the passive appears to offer a sense of ‘comfort’ to the people, saying that childlessness or expulsion from the land will not happen to them again. Theologically, this ancient charge may have been a primary concern for the potential returnees, who may have been saying, ‘what is the point of returning to a land that is only going to devour us?’. MT answers this with the LORD informing the mountains of his personal involvement, and stating that the mountains will not miscarry his people Israel again. LXX answers this concern by informing the mountains that ‘childlessness’ will not happen to them again, therefore requiring the passive.
3.2.3. 36:13-15

It is significant that all representative MSS have sense division breaks before and after this pericope. MT\textsuperscript{c} has a petuhah in both locations, MT\textsuperscript{A} a setumah before v. 13 and petuhah after v. 15, and MT\textsuperscript{L} a setumah in both locations. Likewise, both G\textsuperscript{967,A} exhibit breaks either side of this pericope. As discussed above, G\textsuperscript{B} does not have a clear break after v. 12 owing to this verse finishing at the end of a line, yet there is a paragraphos marker at the start of the following line which may be from the original scribe. We concluded that G\textsuperscript{B} shows evidence of a sense division after v. 12,\textsuperscript{128} and it exhibits a clear break after v. 15. All these MSS thus build on the childlessness/miscarriage statement at the end of v. 12, and now deal with the insults of their enemies (cf. v. 3, 6), which may be referring to the charge of miscarriage (MT) and/or childlessness (LXX).

This pericope is quite complex, and MT appears to struggle with the concept that the mountains/land ‘miscarried’ or devoured its inhabitants. We also find an interchange between the singular and plural forms in the ancient insult as the focus shifts from the mountains (masc. pl.) to the land (fem. sg.). This can cause confusion in our understanding of who is being addressed, and may be the reason behind MT’s ketiv and qere readings, and other variants. Overall, again there is evidence of a text in a state of flux.

\footnote{128 As also noted above, if G\textsuperscript{B} does not exhibit a break here, then this indicates they viewed vv. 13-15 as continuing the motif of ‘childlessness/miscarry’ from v. 12b.}
In the previous verses there has been a growing reference to the insult given to Israel by ‘the enemy’ (v. 2) and ‘people’ (vv. 3, 4, 6). In v. 12b we find the first indication as what this ‘insult’ was. In v. 13 it is clarified with the actual words of their ‘enemies’. We now find that “the hostile neighbours alleged that the Land of Israel destroyed its inhabitants” (Fisch, 1985, p.241). This again is likely a continuation of the ancient charge found in Num. 13:32 (cf. v. 12 above, and vv. 14-15).

In v. 13 we suggest that (as with v. 12b), LXX remains reluctant to portray the mountains as active, even as a charge from the surrounding nations. LXX again uses the passive so the mountains are being made childless. MT on the other hand continues the accusation that the mountains are an active participant, devouring their people and causing miscarriage. Cooke (1936, p.388) says, “the land is now addressed as if it were a beast of prey which devoured its people, by not producing the necessaries of life”. MT uses two verbal participles for the charge against the mountains: דעיה and טַלְכֶּה יָדַע, (‘devouring’ and ‘miscarrying’). LXX reflects MT’s first participle in the present participle (κατέσθονε) permitting the charge ‘you are devouring’. However, LXX then uses a passive participle ἡτεκνομένη (with ἐγένετο) to say, ‘you are being made bereaved/childless’, which continues the theological thought from v. 12b (cf. vv. 14-15). LXX therefore states, as in v. 12b, that the action of bereavement or being made childless is being done to the mountains. This again could be indicative they felt victimised: ‘we had this happen to us and we didn’t deserve it’.

---

129 Greenberg (1997, p.721) points out that Ezek. 19:3-6 accuses the kings of Judah of being like young lions ‘devouring people’ (cf. 34:10). However, the context of Ezek. 36:12b-15 has the land/mountains as the addressees and the accusation against the land by others (v. 13). However, Greenberg does mention the ancient charge against the land in Numbers 13; this is further discussed below in vv. 14-15.

130 Harland (1999, p.116) suggests that in Ezekiel the people were “so evil … that they may even have indulged in cannibalism (5:10; cf. 36:13).” Whilst a possible reference to cannibalism may be found in 5:10, the context in this pericope is the land devouring (so MT) or being made childless (so LXX).
MT starts the pericope using יָרֵאָם (ptc.)\(^{131}\), whereas LXX uses εἰπάν (aorist). MT appears to make this a present and continuous accusation, or perhaps referring to an event yet to happen. Yet LXX appears to be referring to a past event, or perhaps LXX sees the accusation as in the past. This may indicate LXX’s theological use of the passive to imply that ‘it won’t happen again’. The ‘speakers’ are not identified here, but are likely those uttering the insults in previous verses (cf. vv. 2, 3, 6, also 15). After these words, MT uses the plural בְּלִבָּם, whereas LXX uses a dative singular σοι, perhaps to match the singular used in the accusation in both MT and LXX. MT’s use of the plural continues the LORD’s speech to the mountains as a plurality (cf. vv. 1, 4, 8), and has the accusers’ charge been a statement to the mountains as a whole.

We may question whether MT’s ketiv יָנָע and qere יָנָא variant, and in vv. 14-15,\(^{132}\) refers directly to the two nations of Israel and Judah (cf. 37:11, 15-28). However, it may have been intended to include not just Israel, but the various nations that had sought to inhabit the land over the years, which the land had cast out.\(^{133}\)

Finally, the intra-LXX variant where 967 has ἀπό, which continues the ἀπ’ αὐτῶν from v. 12b. Yet the later 8,8 have ὑπό. This change for 8,8 from ἀπό to ὑπό appears to be deliberate. While ἀπεκδόω passive with ἀπό is also found in Gen 27:45, there is no instance in LXX of ἀπεκδόω passive with ὑπό other than here. 967 has ‘you’\(^{134}\) have been made childless from your nation, while 8,8 say ‘you have been made childless by your nation’ (cf. ὑπό as genitive with τοῦ ἔθνους σου). Both

---


\(^{132}\) MT’s other ketiv יָנָע and qere יָנָא variant here, both are 2nd person feminine singular pronouns. Block (1998, p.332) says the ketiv is “archaic” but the qere is “more conventional” (also see Yeivin, 1980, p.56f, #100). However, there is no difference in meaning between the ketiv and qere.

\(^{133}\) Cooke (1936, p.388) notes that “the word nation (gô) is rarely applied to Israel and Judah in exilic and post-exilic prophecy.” The insult is therefore directed at the land itself rather than the people. This also strengthens our previous point against Greenberg’s suggestion of the ‘young lions’ or leaders of Israel devouring the people.

\(^{134}\) As noted above, all the ‘you’ here in LXX are singular. In MT, only the reported speech uses the singular.
prepositions are related to the Greek use of the passive, but it appears that the idea of who ‘makes childless’ varies. The later ΒΑ communities may have been making a statement that the land was made childless by its nation (i.e., its people). Although ‘by’ matches Greenberg’s (1997, p.721) suggestion of Israel’s young lions devouring and causing the barrenness, and ‘by’ agrees with MT, it does not match LXX’s implicit feeling of being victimised that we have previously observed. However, ΒΑ may have included the land as one of their oppressors, feeling cast out and therefore victimised by the land.

There is a significant MT variance in v. 14 between the qere הָשָׁלַל (‘miscarry’), and ketiv הָשָׁלִיל (‘stumble’).135 Allen (1990b, p.169; similarly Block, 1998, p.332) says the “K[etiv] ‘you will cause to stumble’ appears to be an error by metathesis for Q[ere] ‘you will make childless’, the verb in vv. 12, 13”. Zimmerli (1983, p.231) claims the ketiv “is doubtless a scribal error” (also Greenberg, 1997, p.722). We suggest that later MT scribes, finding the error, but reluctant to adjust the written text, inserted a qere ‘correction’ in the side column to avoid confusion for both reader and hearer.136 If the ketiv was original, then one would expect LXX to have embraced ‘stumble’ over the qere ‘miscarriage’. That LXX follows the qere supports

135 See v. 13 for discussion on the first ketiv and qere variant here of ‘nation/s’.

136 It is acknowledged that there are various other explanations for the occurrence of ketiv/qere variants including that of a ‘textual variant’. But here we find support for Allen’s (and others) ‘metathesis’ proposal, which was then ‘corrected’ by the qere. For more on how the qere can correct the ketiv, even by the use of wordplay, see Tov (2001, pp.58-63). Note that Tov also provides other main explanations for ketiv/qere variants (also see Yeivin, 1980, pp.56-58).
the scribal error theory, particularly as Targum also follows the *qere*.\(^{137}\) However, whilst the *ketiv* was most likely a scribal error, it could also be a deliberate, yet subtle theological adjustment within MT (or an earlier Hebrew community). By means of wordplay they allow the text itself to say ‘stumble’ rather than ‘miscarry’, as it lessens the severity of the ancient charge against the land (Num. 13:32). Then, when publicly read, the text would allow the charge of ‘miscarriage’ to continue. Fairbairn (1969, p.388) also finds word play here, and claims that the repetition of לֶחֱטָה in the next verse is a proof that here a change of meaning is introduced,\(^ {138}\) and a change that also very suitably prepares the way for the truths to be declared in the next section (ver. 16, etc), which unfolds the moral cause of the past destructions, the sins and defections of the people. Canaan must not only cease to devour and swallow up its people, but even to prove an occasion of stumbling to them.

In this Fairbairn makes a good point, as it does allow a ‘double charge’ against the land of devouring and stumbling. This concept may have influenced an earlier editor, who adjusted the written text (*ketiv*) with wordplay, while a later editor corrected this in the margin (*qere*). This also may explain the *ketiv* (ךֵנֵנֵו) which is singular and as such may be referring to just the nation of Israel; that the land caused Israel to stumble. We may also suggest both these MT variants were put into the text by the same MT editor, and done later than LXX’s *Vorlage*.

This, along with LXX’s use of the passive in the surrounding verses, and גֶּ֨שֶׁר’s variant in v. 12 (ie, ‘give’ rather than ‘birth’), may all suggest that the various early

---

\(^{137}\) The reconstructed MasEzek text consistently follows the *ketiv*. However, the actual letters are not extant due to MSS damage, so we cannot be totally certain whether the reconstructed text is accurate here. There is no difference in letter number between the *ketiv* and *qere*, and we have no conclusive evidence from MasEzek. If the reconstruction is accurate, then we can still stand in agreement with Allen and Zimmerli’s proposal of scribal error, and the *qere* as a later inserted correction.

\(^{138}\) However, Fairbairn does not note that the לֶחֱטָה phrase is not extant in v. 15 in early LXX and some later MT MSS (cf. discussions v. 15). While this may appear to undermine his point, we may suggest here, as we do above, that these variants were put into the text by the same MT editor.
Jewish communities were uncomfortable with the ancient charge against the land. 139 If this was the case, then this attitude perhaps influenced the ketiv and qere variant here in v. 14 (also v. 15).

LXX makes a slight, and rather unexpected, shift by using two indicative future active verbs to say ‘you will no longer devour people, and you will no longer make childless your nation’. This is a reversal from LXX’s past pattern of using the passive to say ‘being made childless’ (cf. vv. 12, 13). LXX’s use of the future verbs indicates they see this as a promise that they will not be childless now, or in their future. They are not repeating the accusation of past events requiring the passive.

γινείτε κύριοι κύριοι

MT has three ‘never again’ actions, but LXX only represents the first two, making no reference to MT’s καὶ οὐκ ἀκουσθήσεται (B:A: οὐκέτι; B: ἐτί) ἐφ’ ἵμας ἀτυμία έθνων καὶ οὐ διενεσμούς (B: λαοῦν; A: έθνων) οὐ μή (B: άνενέγκητε; B: ένεγκηταί έτι) λέγει κύριος κύριος

139 We may also note LXX’s reluctance to allow the ancient charge in Lev. 18:25, 28, where MT states the land ὄρνη (vomits [out inhabitants]) yet LXX lessens this with προσοχῆσι (‘be offended/ aggravated/ angry’). Whilst this is largely outside of the scope of our discussion, which is focused on Ezekiel 36-39, it does indicate that LXX also theologically lessened this ancient charge in other books. Further studies by others may establish to what extent this occurs.

140 Block (1998, p.333) erroneously says this phrase is present in B. The later Hexaplaric texts include the wording from v. 14 (but as σὸν οὐκ ἀκουσθήσεται’ [future passive]), yet it is not extant in A (Ziegler, 1977, p.263).

141 Block (1998, p.333) suggests the same “metathetical error” occurs in v. 15 as in v. 14, but we do not find a qere variant for this occurrence in v. 15.
back to יד ‘any longer’ in v 14aa”. This phrase is also minus in some later MT MSS (Greenberg, 1997, p.722). However, we should also consider the possibility that a later MT scribe deliberately included this phrase as a plus to restate that Israel will not stumble again in their future. It may have been done perhaps at the same time as the ketiv/qere variants in v. 14. This is in keeping with MT’s theme of the mountains causing the childlessness/miscarriage, and thus causing the people to stumble. We should also consider that LXX may have deliberately dropped this phrase, as it once again accuses the mountains of causing the people to stumble, invoking the previous references to MT’s ‘miscarriage’ in the previous verses, which LXX has sought to avoid in vv. 12, 13. It is perhaps significant that Targum includes this phrase, as Targum often follows LXX. Yet Targum follows its qere reading of שבע from v. 14, bringing it also into v. 15. This may have been a Targumic adjustment towards MT (in both verses), or it may suggest that שבע was originally in both vv. 14, 15. Overall, we are left here with a slight puzzle, with MT having שבע (the ketiv in v.14), Targum with שבע (the qere in v. 14), and LXX minus both.

We also note that in v. 15 MT, the LORD as subject of the action towards the mountains (‘I will never cause you to hear’), is not represented in LXX, which simply has the passive (‘it will not be heard’). There is no reference to the LORD doing the action, or to the mountains. The only reference is to unidentified listeners (καὶ οὐκ ἀκούσθηται οὐκέτι ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ‘there shall no longer be heard against you’). Again, LXX uses the passive to denote the inactivity of the mountains, whereas MT continues

---

142 We note that in v. 15 is hiphil. It is unknown whether was hiphil or piel in v. 14 as the ketiv takes the pointing of the qere (the qere in v. 14 was pointed as piel) (for more on K/Q pointing see Yeivin, 1980, p.55 #97).

143 Again, MasEzek is not much help in v. 15 as the actual words are not extant. The reconstructed text finds room for this entire phrase, but without absolute certainty if MasEzek actually says לֹא וְתָהְדֹא or לֹא וַתִּמַּכָּל.
its use of active verbs. $\Theta^A$’s variant of $\dot{\epsilon}^\nu\nu^\omega$ does not follow MT’s $\dot{\lambda}^\alpha\omega\nu$ as does $\Theta^{67,B}$.

3.3. Section 2: Ezek. 36:16-21

3.3.1. 36:16-21

All representative MSS, both Hebrew and Greek, show evidence of a major sense division break between vv. 15 and 16, with v. 16 starting on a new line. MT$^{C,A}$ both have a petuhfah, with MT$^L$ having a ‘lesser’ setumah before 16.144

Each Hebrew MS has a division after v. 21: MasEzek and MT$^{C,A}$ each have a petuhfah after v. 21, and MT$^L$ again having a setumah. While each LXX MSS has a break before v. 16, they show a greater variance at the end of this pericope. The later $\Theta^A$ has a major division like MT$^{C,A}$, showing similar emphasis on this pericope. $\Theta^B$ has a 2 letter break after the first phrase in v. 22, which curiously places ‘οἱκὸς Ισραήλ’ as the closing statement for this pericope rather than as the opening statement for the following pericope. It is possible that $\Theta^B$ saw this phrase as an inclusio with the ‘οἱκὸς Ισραήλ’ in v. 17, and saw τάδε λέγει κύριος as the start of the next ‘verse’.145 The earlier $\Theta^{67}$ places its paragraph marker in the middle of v. 23 and then proceeds directly into chapter 38 on the same line.146 For $\Theta^{67}$ the ‘concern for my holy name’ (v. 21) is given more emphasis in this pericope, as the reason for both the scattering (vv. 16-20) and the regathering (vv. 21-23b) of ‘the house of Israel’.

Overall, these communities signify that they all witnessed a change of topic between vv. 15 and 16. In the previous pericopes of Section 1 the prophecy was addressed to the mountains and land regarding: the ‘insults’ against them, and their

144 Yet MT$^L$ shows evidence of a preference for setumah breaks, so there may be no ‘sense’ reason for its setumah break rather than MT$^{C,A}$’s petuhfah here.

145 See comments below under 36:22-32 for τάδε λέγει κύριος as a common sense division marker in LXX. Also see Olley (2003, p.214).

146 As stated previously, the uniqueness of $\Theta^{67}$ in terms of order and the ‘missing’ pericope of 36:23c-38 will be discussed in chapter 7.
destruction at the hands of the nations around them (vv. 1-12); the ancient charge against the land (vv. 12b-15); and how the LORD will restore the mountains, and bring the people back (vv. 8-12). In this pericope, the LORD is addressing the prophet, describing the sins of ‘the house of Israel’. Their sins are seen as the reason for their dispersing out of the land; because they defiled the land (vv. 17-18), and profaned the LORD’s name (vv. 20-21). This pericope gives a theological answer to the ‘charge’ of the land ‘miscarrying’ its people (so MT), or even that the land was made childless by nations around (so LXX). It shows that the LORD removed the people because of their apostasy that defiled the land (v. 19). Here, ‘the house of Israel’ is spoken of in the third person. We may have been curious in the first section (vv. 1-15) as to why the prophecy of restoration was addressed to the mountains, rather than to humans. In this second section (vv. 16-21) we are now given the explanation. The humans, as inhabitants of the land (both ‘my people’, vv. 8, 17, and ‘the nations’, v. 5), have defiled the LORD’s land (cf. vv. 5, 20) by their deeds (vv. 17-19). Ezekiel 36:8-15 speaks about the future of the ‘house of Israel’, but here we find the past being discussed (vv. 17, 21, 22, 32). A major theological shift appears to happen for LXX in this pericope, unlike in the previous section, now there is no hint that they felt victimised. We also find LXX tends to use the active voice here rather than, as previously, the passive. It appears that the LXX community readily acknowledged the sins of their ancestors, especially that of idolatry. This may be the consequence of a growing Torah-focused community, whether in Alexandria, Jerusalem, Babylon or elsewhere.

This pericope also shows evidence of a text in a state of flux. This is possibly due to the respective communities’ wrestling with the various theological issues in the text. We will find: a syntax change and an added line (v. 17); LXX communities wrestling with sensitive metaphors (v. 17); MT and \( \Phi^A \) with an exegetical plus (v. 18); the various LXX MSS interpretively interacting with the Hebrew text.
This layout aids in comparison between the three LXX MSS. The line breaks are as they appear in the codices, with abbreviations expanded, and spacing and accents added.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G 967</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>G A (layout as in the MSS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>υἱεν αὐθρῶσου</td>
<td>υἱεν αὐθρῶσου</td>
<td>υἱεν αὐθρῶσου οἰκὸς Ἰσραήλ κατάκτησεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>υἱεν αὐθρῶσου</td>
<td>οἰκὸς Ἰσραήλ κατάκτησεν</td>
<td>οἰκὸς Ἰσραήλ κατακτήσεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐμὶ</td>
<td>σεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐμὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>καὶ ἐμίαν αὐτὴν ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλισι αὐτῶν καὶ ταῖς ἀκαθαρσίαις αὐτῶν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀκαθαρσίαν τῆς ἀποκαθήμενης ἔγενσί</td>
<td>καὶ ἐμίαν αὐτὴν ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλισι αὐτῶν καὶ ταῖς ἀκαθαρσίαις αὐτῶν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀκαθαρσίαν τῆς ἀποκαθήμενης ἔγενσί</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>λοις αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῶν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τῆς ἀποκαθήμενης ἔγενσί</td>
<td>λοί τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλισι αὐτῶν καὶ ταῖς ἀκαθαρσίαις αὐτῶν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀκαθαρσίαν τῆς ἀποκαθήμενης ἔγενσί</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>αὐς αὐτῶν κατὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τῆς ἀποκαθήμενης ἔγενσί</td>
<td>αὐς αὐτῶν κατὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τῆς ἀποκαθήμενης ἔγενσί</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>υἱες ἐγενηθῆ ἢ ὁδὸς αὐτῶν</td>
<td>γένθη ἢ ὁδὸς αὐτῶν</td>
<td>υἱες ἐγενηθῆ ἢ ὁδὸς αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>πρὸ προσώπου μου</td>
<td>πρὸ προσώπου μου</td>
<td>πρὸ προσώπου μου</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This verse in LXX shows evidence of a verse in a state of flux, or suggesting different Vorlagen, or a flux influenced by theological and exegetical intent.

We find a unique repeated line in G A wherein all the words found in ‘line 6’ (their correct location), are inserted as a plus forming ‘line 3’ (καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀκαθαρσίαις αὐτῶν). This plus may be the result of homio teleuton with the scribe’s eyes skipping from καὶ ἐμίαναν ... καὶ ἐν ταῖς. On the other hand, the scribe may be theologically restating with a doublet, strengthening the charge ‘in their uncleanness’, as he did not start line 4 with καὶ (just stating ἐμίαναν αὐτὴν).147 Ziegler (1977, p.264) lists ‘line 3’ as a plus for G A.148

MT says that the house of Israel defiled their land θερασιαν της ἀποκαθήμενης ἔγενσι (‘in their way and deeds’).149 Whilst all LXX MSS have ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτῶν (‘in their way’), the

---

147 Rather than saying “the house of Israel dwelt in their land, and they defiled it”, G A says “the house of Israel dwelt in their land they defiled it”.

148 This is ascertained by the order in which Ziegler deals with variants in the verse.

149 There are six occurrences in Ezekiel where θερασιαν and ἀποκαθήμενη are found together (Ezek. 14:22, 23; 20:43; 24:14; 36:17, 19).
second phrase differs: καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις (G\(^{967}\)) / ἁκαθαρσίαις (G\(^{B.A}\)) αὕτων ('and in their sins / uncleanness'). LXX also has a plus ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὕτων ('in their idols') that is not found in MT or MasEzek. In this way, LXX gives two concepts for MT's ἁμαρτιάς/ἀκαθαρσίας and εἰδώλους, or, as Cooke (1936, p.395) says, “a double rend[ering]”. Zimmerli (1983, p.241) also says this is a “double translation of ἡμειῶν” and that it prepares “the way for v. 17b”. Thus, Cooke and Zimmerli have LXX theologically modifying the text with a double translation. Block (1998, p.343) suggests LXX translates the Hebrew with both these concepts, “probably reflecting either a different Vorlage or a misreading of [הַבָּניֵי לָלְלָהוֹת]¹⁵⁰ This ‘misreading’ proposal is possible, as בָּניֵי לָלְלָהוֹת (idols) is found in surrounding texts (vv. 18, 25; also 30:13; 33:25; 37:23 [as הבָּנִיֵי לָלְלָהוֹת]), and has a similar ‘shape’ to הנֵי לָלְלָהוֹת (idols).¹⁵¹ However, rather than a misreading, or even a different Vorlage, we may suggest that LXX has performed a deliberate ‘double translation’ (cf. Cooke, Zimmerli), and may be another example of LXX wordplay with the Hebrew text. LXX may have, by wordplay based on shape with הנֵי לָלְלָהוֹת and בָּנִיֵי לָלְלָהוֹת, theologically expanded MT’s generalized deeds of ‘sin/uncleanness’ to the specific deed of ‘idolatry’.

We also suggest LXX made a theological choice here, interpreting MT’s ‘deeds’: G\(^{967}\) with ἁμαρτία and G\(^{B.A}\) with ἁκαθαρσία. LXX Ezekiel translates לָלְלָהוֹת in various ways: ἐνθόμημα (‘thought, reasoning’ 14:22, 23; 24:14), ἐπιτήρησιμα (‘way of living’ 20:43, 44), ἁμαρτία (‘sins’ 21:29; 36:19 [36:17 G\(^{967}\)]). Only here do we find ἁκαθαρσία used (by G\(^{B.A}\)), which is normally used for MT’s מִנְאָה (see below). These two Hebrew words appear in the final phrase of this verse and may have influenced

¹⁵⁰ As noted elsewhere, the change from Block’s transliteration to Hebrew lettering is noted by the square brackets and done to assist the reader.
¹⁵¹ Whilst MT has לָלְלָהוֹת in v. 18, this is part of a later MT’s plus and is only found in G\(^A\), not G\(^{967.B}\).
LXX’s word choice(s) here, as well as the theological thought that included its εἰδωλολοίς plus.

There is a differing word order between the LXX MSS. $\text{G}^{967}$ places the εἰδωλολοίς plus before the following words (εἰδωλολοίς / ὁδὸς / ἀμαρτίαις), whereas $\text{G}^{\text{BA}}$ place this plus between these words (ὁδὸς / εἰδωλολοίς / ἀκαθαρσίαις). The latter interrupts MT’s syntax, yet at the same time emphasises the plus, which may be the reason for the move.

There are differences how ‘their way’ (ἡμῶν ἀδικήματα) of ‘uncleanness’ was seen:

MT (and MasEzek) says it was ἡμῶν ἀδικήματα $^{152}$ (‘as the uncleanness of a menstruous’ [woman]).$^{153}$ Cooke (1936, p.389) states ἀδικήματα is “a figure for idolatry”, which may have influenced LXX’s εἰδωλολοίς plus.$^{154}$ $\text{G}^{967,\text{B}}$ say it was τῆς ἀποκαθημένης (‘as a set apart woman’, cf. 22:10). $\text{G}^{\text{A}}$ plainly states it was τῆς ἁφεδροῦ (‘menstruation’, cf. 18:6). LXX uses both ἀποκαθημέναι$^{155}$ and ἁφεδροῖ$^{156}$ for ἡμῖν. Both words echo

---

$^{152}$ *HALOT* points out that ἀδικήματα is the ‘state of ceremonial uncleanness.’ Eichrodt (1970, p.494) also notes that ἀδικήματα means ‘to make unclean’, [and] is derived from sacral law. He thus takes a cultic term and applies it not only to cultic sins, as, for example, in 20:30f., but also in the more general sense of showing contempt for God’s holiness by breaking his commandments”. Thayer (1979, says “the Septuagint equivalent to ἀδικήματα is ἀκαθαρσία” and means “not cleansed, unclean; in a ceremonial sense, that which must be abstained from according to the Levitical law, lest impurity be contracted” (cf. Lev. 15: 26; 31; 25:22).

$^{153}$ Galambush (1992, 147) says “the behavior of the people was ‘like the pollution of a menstruant’”. Galambush (1992, p.146) also claims that “the ἐνδήλι of the book of Ezekiel is Jerusalem”. If the LXX communities also grasped this analogy, then this may have influenced their apparent wrestling with how to interpret the text here.

$^{154}$ Fisch (1985, p.241f) clarifies that “metaphorically Israel is compared with a wife and God to a husband. Therefore in the times of unfaithfulness to Him, Israel is spoken of as having the state of a woman in her impurity. She is temporarily avoided by her husband, becoming reunited with him after purification. Similarly, Israel’s banishment from the soil was due to moral impurity, but restoration to his homeland will follow upon purification”. Eisemann (1994, p.554) also speaks to this point but adds “such a woman is only in a transitional state, whereas a dead body remains contaminated. Included here is how a priest can enter a home of a menstrual woman but not where there is a dead body”. Galambush (1992, p.146) claims that Jerusalem is Yahweh’s wife who has defiled herself with bloodshed (especially from child sacrifices) and idolatry.

$^{155}$ Typically Numbers uses ἀποκαθήματα for ἡμῖν in a sense of ceremonial impurity, which is the context of Ezek. 36:17. The ceremonial impurity link with Numbers here is supported by the idea that the LXX translator had Numbers in mind, as seen above (cf. vv. 3, 13-15), and interacted accordingly with the Hebrew text. Ezekiel also uses ἡμῖν in 7:19; 18:6; 22:10.

$^{156}$ Leviticus often uses ἁφεδροῖ for ἡμῖν when directly referring to a menstrual woman. Cooke (1936, p.389) claims that “the connexion between the present passage and the Law of Holiness is noticeable”.

---
ceremonial impurity aspects in Numbers and/or Leviticus. We may suggest that the earlier communities of $G^{967,B}$ avoided the direct language of a menstruant woman, perhaps due to cultural sensitivity. This can also be seen through LXX’s ‘εἰδολολοίς’ for MT’s ‘הָּלָּלִים’ (cf. v. 18). The later $G^A$ community appears to have strengthened the wording with ἀφεδροῦ, perhaps to follow MT more closely, or to create a greater impact regarding the offence of the idolatrous sacrifices. If so, this, and its other ‘line doublet’ noted above, provides room for $G^A$ to follow MT’s plus in v. 18, which is not witnessed in the earlier $G^{967,B}$. Overall, the context of MT refers to the offence of blood sacrificed to idols, with the people defiling the land and themselves by their idolatrous sacrifices. LXX has taken this contextual point and theologically expanded it for their community.

\[36:18 \text{καὶ ἐξέχαε τὸν θημὸν μου ἑπ’ αὐτοῖς (} G^A: \text{+ peri τοῦ αἵματος οὗ ἐξέχεαν ἐν τῇ γῇ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ιδολολοίς αὐτῶν ἐμίαναν αὐτήν)} \]

MT and MasEzek have 'for the blood they had poured on the land, and with their dung pellets they had defiled it'. This sentence is minus in both $G^{967,B}$. However, it is represented in $G^A$; yet $G^A$

---

157 Block (1998, p.346f) says “cultic (idolatry) …. is identified appropriately by Ezekiel’s favorite term for idols, gillûlîm, pellets of dung, for that is what idols are in Yahweh’s sight”. In 38 of the 47 occurrences of נִיחֲלָק in Ezekiel, idolatry is identified with sexual immorality and prostitution (also see Block, 1997a, p.226f). Kutsko (2000b, p.121) covers the “basic meaning ‘heap of stones’”, but then says “it would be easy to emphasize the rhetorical force of a meaning associated with dung”. Elsewhere Kutsko (2000a, p.34) says Ezekiel “exploited the dual association of (idol-)stone and excrement in order to imply that pagan gods are … ‘Scheissgötter’”. Kutsko does point out that this word appears in literature held as exilic and post exilic (also Kutsko, 2000a, pp.32-35). This could signify how these communities viewed the idol worship of the pre-exilic communities. Tuell (2000a, p.112) says “Ezekiel vehemently rejects idolatry, referring to divine images pejoratively as נִיחֲלָק (‘dungballs’) and steadfastly refusing even to call them gods”. We may suggest that LXX’s εἰδολολοίς does not fully capture this meaning and as such can be seen as a theological interpretation of MT’s ‘metaphor’ perhaps due to cultural sensitivities.

158 The concept of blood defiling the land is found in 16:38; 22:4, 6, 9, 12, 27; 23:45; 33:25. Lasine (1993, p.178) notes that “Exile, bloodshed and idolatry are linked in Ezek. 36:18”, and indicates that this was a reference to times like those of Manasseh. Fisch (1985, p.242) also notes “that the sins of homicide and idolatry were among the chief causes of Israel’s banishment was stressed in xvi.36, xxiii.37”.

---
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translates ἄλλοι (dung pellets) with ἰδοὺλοις.\textsuperscript{159} Cooke (1936, p.xli) notes this as one example of “the superiority of \(G\) to \(M\) in cases where they differ … [as] \(G\) implies a Hebrew text free from words and phrases which appear to be additions or glosses in \(M\)”\textsuperscript{160} Most see this as a later MT plus that gives theological reason for God’s wrath referred to in the first part of the verse. It is hard to imagine that \(G\)\textsuperscript{967,B} would have deliberately omitted this sentence, due to the previous reference to idols and uncleanness in v. 17. Wevers (1982, p.192) suggests it “may be a late expansion explaining the impurity in terms typical of Ezekiel, viz. social violence and idolatry, cf. 22:4”. Eichrodt (1970, p.493) says “this short sentence, in a bad style … gives a brief and late characterization of the besetting sins of Israel”. Allen (1990b, p.176) agrees, stating that MT

reads awkwardly both in respect of the repetition of \(בָּאָה\) (‘upon/because of’) in different senses and in the change of construction in the last clause. It appears to have originated as two explanatory comments on v 17\(א\) and v 17\(ב\) respectively. The first appears to depend on Num 35:33, 34. LXX reflects in v 17\(א\) a similar need to define the vague terms: 'with their idols and their defilements.' Both sets of clarifications depend on v 25.

Kutsko (2000a, p.127, n.112) also believes this phrase was “added on the basis of v. 25”. If these ‘clarifications’ depend on v. 25 then one can understand why \(G\)\textsuperscript{967} doesn’t have this phrase as \(G\)\textsuperscript{967} is minus 36:23c-38.\textsuperscript{161} But this does not explain the minus here in \(G\)\textsuperscript{B}. It is possible that this phrase was added to MT after the Vorlage of \(G\)\textsuperscript{967,B}, but early enough for the later \(G\)\textsuperscript{A} (or its Vorlage) to include it. That MasEzek has this phrase suggests that it may have been added into the text, possibly around the same time

\textsuperscript{159} Interestingly, neither Block, Allen, Zimmerli, nor any of the other major commentators, note this is extant in \(G\)\textsuperscript{A}. It is also witnessed by both Aquila and Theodotion in the hexapla (Field, 1964, p.868).

\textsuperscript{160} Cooke also lists Ezek. 37:7, 12, 23; 38:16; 39:11, 14, 27 under this category.

\textsuperscript{161} Greenberg (1997, p.728) says the phrase ‘and by their idols they defiled it’ “is almost identical to that in Jer. 30:14f”. This may be another place where later redactors referred to the book of Jeremiah (see discussions below on 36:23c-38 being a later addition influenced by the book of Jeremiah).
as the Hebrew plus of ‘Israel’ in v. 8, except here \( \mathcal{G}^A \) included the ‘plus’. This may narrow down the possible timeframe of the plus. Overall, this can be seen as a theological and exegetical plus for MT and \( \mathcal{G}^A \).

This sentence refers back to the mention of ‘menstruation’ in v. 17b, which permits this plus that now speaks of blood being ‘poured on the ground’, indicating a wasted sacrifice.\(^{162}\) This plus, combined with v. 17, is a theological interpretation regarding the value that the LORD placed upon sacrifices offered to idols;\(^{163}\) it is just menstrual blood that defiles the land.\(^{164}\) \( \mathcal{G}^A \) also catches MT’s wordplay of ‘I poured out’ [because] ‘they poured out’, which gives theological reason for their being expelled from the land. We agree with Allen and Block’s suggestion that the first clause of this plus reflects back to Num. 35:33, 34. We propose this is another example of a later community reflecting back to Torah and interpreting the text for their generation (cf. the ‘evil report’ 36:3; ‘grapes’ 36:8).

\[^{162}\] Block (1998, 346) believes this is referring to murder (cf. Num. 35:33), but the context suggests the blood sacrifice to idols. Harland (1999, p.120) also believes the violence spoken of in Ezekiel is murder and says “What Ezekiel stresses is that murder was not just a social crime but that it separated people from God. Those who had shed blood could have no relationship with God because of their impurity”. Both murder and sacrifices could be included in this context if we consider the practice of child sacrifice (cf.20:26; 23:36). However, whilst murder may be implied here (blood on the land), child sacrifice is not explicitly stated.

\[^{163}\] On the other hand, Kutsko (2000b, p.138) suggests that here and elsewhere in Ezekiel the “frequent charge against Israel that its people shed much blood is based on the same imago Dei rationale as Gen. 9: the shedding of blood is prohibited because humans are the images of God”. He (2000b, p.138) does admit “this association with Ezekiel lacks direct proof”. Whilst there may be a case for Kutsko’s hypothesis, it is a study outside the scope of this work. We can say that there is no clear link with v. 18 (and this pericope), with the bloodshed resulting from murder mentioned in Gen. 9. The only possible, but unlikely link, is if we consider human (child) sacrifices as part of the sacrifices spoken of in v. 18.

\[^{164}\] Greenberg (1997, p728) observes this plus “answers to and motivates the foregoing ‘I poured out my fury on them,’ while interpreting (as an allusion to blood) the ndh element of the simile ktm’t hndh of vs.17”.
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Both Hebrew and Greek MSS have the LORD causing the dispersion of Israel from the land, yet again there are subtle differences. As Greenberg (1997, p.728) points out, MT’s “I scattered ... so that they were dispersed” [is a] typical sequence of actions (active verb)–achieved state (passive) …. obliterate[s] the distinction by tendering both verbs as active”. Unlike LXX in 36:1-15, LXX here turns from a passive view of the past and makes it an aorist active, even when MT has the second verb in the niphal. The reason for this may be that in vv. 1-15 the action was being done by the enemy to the mountains, whereas here in v. 19 (and surrounding verses) the LORD has done the action in response to the people’s ‘sin’. Thus, there is no theological room here for LXX’s prior feeling of being victimised, and its subsequent use of passive verbs.

A pluralises ‘ways’ (τὰς ὁδοὺς), whereas B follow MT’s singular with τὴν ὁδὸν. A pluralises again with τὰς ἁνομίας (‘lawlessnesses’, cf. 36:31, 33; 37:23), whereas B again have the singular τὴν ἁμαρτίαν (‘guilt/sin’) following MT’s τὸ ἔργον (‘deed’), as in v. 17. In this, we suggest that A subtly intensifies the text over the other MSS. This may indicate a text in a state of flux. However, it is possible that A’s community saw the idolatrous sins of their ancestors (and perhaps their own) in a plural sense, rather than a collective occurrence, and as an act of lawlessness against the LORD. This may be the case with A’s (and MT’s) plus in v. 18 that covers both blood sacrifices and idol worship.

165 Maybe both communities saw the dispersion as a fitting response by God to the sins of Israel, and that it reflects the warning of Leviticus that the land would vomit out those who defiled it (Lev. 18:25, 28; 20:22).

166 Greenberg (1997, 728) points out that this “levelling [is] facilitated by the fact that in all other (previous) occurrences of this verb pair both verbs are indeed in the active (12:15; 20:23; 22:15; 29:12; 30:23, 26). In this last occurrence the prophet makes a change, as it were a closure of the series”. Block (1998, p.344) sees this as LXX harmonising MT (as in 22:15; 29:12; 30:23, 26). Whilst it may well harmonise, we suggest theological intent behind any resulting harmonisation.

167 λπλη is used six times in conjunction with πτ in Ezekiel (14:22, 23; Ezek 20:43; Ezek 24:4; Ezek 36:17, 19).
36:20 καὶ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὰ ἑπτὰ οὐ εἰσῆλθον ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐβεβήλωσαν τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ ἁγιόν ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι αὐτοὺς λαὸς κυρίου οὗτοι καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς (G 967,B: αὐτοῦ ἐξεληλύθασιν; G A: αὐτῶν ἐξήλθοσαν)

This verse has a subtle difference intra-LXX. The earlier G 967,B use the perfect καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ ἐξεληλύθασιν (‘and they have come out of his land’), whereas G A uses the aorist καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν ἐξήλθοσαν (‘and they came out of their land’). The use of the aorist may permit G A to say ‘they came out’, perhaps seeing this as an event in their distant past.

More importantly, MT and G 967,B have ‘his land’ (αὐτοῦ), whereas G A has ‘their land’ (αὐτῶν). This may indicate a deliberate shift to make their claim on the land more personalised, and echoes back to v. 17a. G A may also be seeking to say that the defilement spoken of in the previous verses (vv. 17-19) caused personal defilement upon their own land. In other words, their sin defiled their land. Zimmerli (1983, p.247) believes that the translator may again have had Num. 14:16 in mind here. This does appear likely, and therefore G A appears to miss the reason for their departure from the land: that the land is the LORD’s, and he gifted it to them (cf. 28:25; 37:25), but they had polluted his land, and so they had to leave his land (vv. 17-19). The reason for the dispersion is therefore given as theological. It was not due to any mystical fault in the land, or capricious action of the land, or because God could not protect his people; these may have been the insults previously mentioned (vv. 1-15).


169 This may be similar to the modern English saying that “they messed in their own nest”, indicating their sin directly affected their own lives.

170 Zimmerli (1983, p.246-7) points out that the “The fact of the exile had now revealed to the nations the fact that Yahweh can no longer hold together the two entities, Israel and the land, on both which his name lay. What Moses, according to Nu 14:16, held up to Yahweh in prayer as a thing to be feared now became reality’’.
When speaking of the focus of the LORD’S action, MT and MasEzek say it was because of ‘and I had compassion/spared’ on account of my holy name’), whereas LXX has ‘and I spared them for the sake of my holy name’). The primary difference here is LXX’s plus. Zimmerli (1983, p.241) claims that LXX “finds the divine mercy for the people promised here already and thereby alleviates the sharpness of the statement that Yahweh is first concerned for his name”. Rather God is concerned for them. Both accounts claim that the action was done for of the sake of ‘my holy name’, which the people had profaned (cf. v. 20, 22). Greenberg (1997, p.729) says that LXX “obviates the peculiar use of the [MT] verb by interpretively supplying a personal object” (i.e., ‘avtōn’). Block (1998, p.348, n.62) notes for us to compare “the repeated pairing of hāmal with hūs (‘show/have pity’) in the judgement oracles to express Yahweh’s repression of any pity towards his people: 5:11; 7:4, 9; 8:18; 9:5, 10”. Schwartz (2000, p.51) states that unlike Jeremiah, “Ezekiel speaks of YHWH’s unilateral resolve to extend the existing covenant, unconditionally and indeterminately, even against their will, for his own satisfaction”. This appears to be the concept here in MT, but the LXX translator has softened this by the pronoun plus. Overall, we find that in MT God’s action of compassion was directed at his holy name. God was concerned


172 There are a number of parallels with 36:21-23 and chapter 20 regarding God’s concern for his name. Whilst these parallels are beyond the scope of this thesis, we will note that chapter 20 deals with Israel’s wilderness journey and draws reference to the Book of Numbers. This holds significance for us as we also have found references in chapter 36 to Numbers.

173 Wong (2003, p.226) suggests that “God’s holy name in contrast to God’s name is mentioned in contexts where God is said to exhibit his holiness among the nations (36.20-23; 39.7)”.

174 Whilst Schwartz may have some good points, we do not find such an overall ‘dim’ view of Israel’s restoration in Ezekiel. More importantly, the LXX pronoun plus is perhaps evidence that an early Jewish community interpreted this action was done for them and not just for the Lord’s name.
(so Block) for the reputation of his holy name. LXX’s pronoun plus interprets that the result of this compassion was ultimately for *them*: God had compassion / spared *them*. Thus, for LXX, God’s focus is on the mercy given to *them* rather than to his holy name. 

$B^*$’s unique sense division break after the first phrase in v. 22, placing this phrase in v. 21, brings added emphasis to this point.

This verse, and those following (vv. 22, 23), may well be echoing Moses’ intercession with God in the wilderness to spare the people who had sinned for the sake of his name, and to persevere with that generation (Num. 14:11-23) (Vawter and Hoppe, 1991, p.163). LXX appears to suggest that their generation saw themselves as the recipients of the LORD’s compassionate action for his name, in that they had returned to the land. However, they still looked for a greater fulfilment by the removal of their enemies (cf. 36:1-15).

### 3.4. Section 3: Ezek. 36:22-38

#### 3.4.1. 36:22-32

As mentioned previously, whilst there is agreement within MT (including MasEzek) for a division before v. 22, MT$^{CA}$ have a *petuḥah*, while MT$L$ has a *setumah*. LXX again exhibits varying breaks. $B^{967}$ has a division marker at v. 23b (after which it goes directly into chapter 38), presenting vv. 16-23b as the one pericope. While $A$ follows MT, $B$ has a 2 letter break after the first phrase in v. 22a, causing διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον τῷ ὦκῳ Ἰσραὴλ to be the concluding phrase for both the previous pericope and Section 2 (cf. comments under Section 2). This brings emphasis to the LORD sparing them because of his holy name. On the other hand, Olley (2003, p.215) points out that the following phrase, τάδε λέγει κύριος, in Ezekiel “is a significant traditional factor in the expanding number of sense divisions. The diversity in precise location of the division, however, points to scribal idiosyncrasy, often seeming to be mechanical”.
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may well be the reason for $G^B$’s break here. We must also consider that vv. 23c-38 is minus in $G^{967}$ and is likely an inserted text in other MSS, which may well have had a bearing on the varying sense division markers at this point.

Variants also exist for the completion of this pericope. Significantly, MasEzek, as the oldest extant text, does not exhibit a break again until after v. 38, treating vv. 22-38 as the one pericope. This may also give implicit support to vv. 23c-38 being an inserted text. All other MT MSS have a *setumah* break after v. 32. $G^B$ also has a break after v. 32. $G^A$ has breaks after vv. 29 and v. 32, forming vv. 30-32 as a kind of summary for the previous verses.

In the first section of this chapter the prophet was commanded to initially proclaim the LORD’s words to the mountains (vv. 1-15), and in the second section the prophet was the recipient of the LORD’s monologue regarding the iniquity of the house of Israel (vv. 16-21). Yet in this pericope, the prophet is now commanded to pass on the LORD’s words to the ‘house of Israel’ (vv. 22-32). This causes a thematic change, where the people themselves are finally addressed regarding their restoration, and how their restoration will take place.

This pericope focuses on the LORD’s acting on behalf of his ‘holy name’ as the motive for restoration (cf. vv. 20-21). It then describes what the LORD will do for his name, putting together a string of future ‘I-will’ actions. Now the ‘house of Israel’ is addressed in the second person (contrast vv. 16-21). They are the recipients of the promise of restoration, that includes a Jeremianic sounding ‘new heart and new spirit’ motif (v. 26; cf. Jer. 31). The ‘sanctification’ of the people is designed to remedy the problem, and the ancient charge, of the land casting out its inhabitants, even the LORD’s people. Again there is an echo here of their forefathers possessing the land (cf. v. 28).

---

175 See Cooper (1994, pp.316-318) for a breakdown of seven “elements of the restoration” in vv. 24-32.
176 Block (1998, p.353) also believes that “the influence of Deut. 30:1-10 is apparent” here.
This further supports the thought that both the Hebrew author and the LXX translator had the twelve spies narrative in mind (cf. 36:3, 8), as well as other related passages in Numbers, including the whole Exodus event and the original possessing of the land.\textsuperscript{177} The LORD will perform all these actions for the sake of his holy name (cf. Num. 14:11-23), as “by restoring Israel to its land, God could uphold God’s own dignity before the rest of the world” (Vawter and Hoppe, 1991, p.163).

In contrast to the surrounding texts, there is a surprising level of agreement amongst MT, LXX, and intra-\textsuperscript{B,A} in vv. 23b-38, again lending support to the idea that this is a later inserted text. As our goal is to observe variants as possible theological interpretations, we will not discuss verses where agreement is found. Therefore, we will not touch on a number of important verses (e.g., v. 26 ‘new heart/spirit’). Nor will we discuss the different Hebrew and Greek style used here in comparison with the rest of the book. Others have already examined these aspects (e.g., Thackeray, 1921, pp.125-126; Turner, 1956, pp.12-24; Lust, 1981a, pp.521-525) and we will cover linguistic issues in our Chapter 7: Papyrus 967. Our discussion of vv. 22-38 may therefore appear disjointed owing to the omission of the majority of verses.

One main comment, germane to this thesis, is that LXX typically translates verbs in the future active, rather than the passive as in vv. 1-15. Perhaps in this pericope the person or group who translated this section believed that they would not be victimized in their future, which they appeared to have felt they were in the past (cf. vv. 1-15). This may indicate a time of translating when there was a degree of hope for

\textsuperscript{177} Block (1998, p.353) notes that “the new exodus motif occurs ten times in Ezekiel, but it gains increasing prominence in the restoration oracles”, and in a footnote lists these as “11:17; 20:34-35; 20:41-42; 28:25; 29:13; 34:13; 36:24; 37:12; 37:21; 39:27”. We can agree that this new exodus motif is present in Ezekiel. Yet here it appears that the writer, and translator, has the imagery of the spies in Numbers. The implied challenge to those in this new exodus is, will they be like the ‘evil’ spies bringing a bad report of the land, or will they be like the two good spies who were the ones to take possession of the land. Here in Ezekiel 36 there is a strong motif of a new entering or possessing the land; a restored land that is fruitful and ready to receive its inhabitants. It is a land that will not cast its inhabitants out again, and will never have to bear the insults of the nations.
freedom from oppression in their future, and that their nation would again be established as of old (cf. 37:15-28).

This verse has a rare intra-Hebrew variance between MT and MasEzek. A MasEzek scribe has inserted בֵּית בֵּית (small, almost as superscript) into the text after בֵּית and before בֵּית. Talmon (1999, p.68) suggests the scribe was seeking to insert בֵּית “under the influence of … בֵּית בֵּית in the preceding verse (Ezek. 36:21), either due to a lapus calami (vertical dittography) or on the strength of his Vorlage which differed from MT”. It is interesting that the scribe did not finish the whole ‘insert’, suggesting that either the scribe did not find the required room, or decided against the insert. If the insert was completed it would have made the text read with a second vocative, making the rebuke harsher, but it stands in MasEzek now without sense.178 That LXX follows MT questions Talmon’s suggestion that בֵּית בֵּית was in MasEzek’s Vorlage.

As noted above, Β begins this verse with τάδε λέγει κύριος. Therefore, this verse in Β does not include the first phrase, which gives reason for the following restorative words (cf. διὰ τοῦτο). Β has this as the concluding statement to the previous pericope, which causes v. 22 (and this pericope) to lose some of the prophetic impact.

178 This ‘superscript’ style insertion also occurs in MasEzek in v. 25 with the ב in מַעְלָאָה מִי בֵּית, and in v. 30 with the ב in the middle of בֵּית.
36:23 καὶ ἀγιάσω τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ (Θ967.Β: μέγα; ΘΑ: ἄγιον) τὸ βεβηλωθὲν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὃ ἐβεβηλώσατε ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν καὶ γινώσκονται τὰ ἔθνη ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος (ΘΑ: + λέγει Αδωναί κύριος) ἐν τῷ ἀγιασθησάμεν τῇ ἑωρασθείν αὐτῶν καὶ δυνασθείν κατ’ ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν.

Our three representative MT texts and MasEzek all witness the declarative formula (יִהְיֶה אֱלֹהִים). However, Allen (1990b, p.176) says this is “lacking in two Heb Mss and LXXB”, following the note in BHS (cf. Block, 1998, p.349). Θ967 also does not witness this declarative formula, ending chapter 36 in the middle of this verse right after the recognition formula, and proceeding directly into chapter 38 on the same line. ΘΒ is also minus this declarative formula, yet has the subsequent verses and received chapter order. ΘΑ has this formula, the subsequent verses, and received chapter order, all which match MT (and MasEzek). Wevers (1969, p.273) says Θ967.Β “omit the declaration formula, which is peculiar after the recognition formula”, and then asks “but why would it be added by a traditionalist?”, proposing the possibility that “it was incorporated [later in MT] to make this key verse even more impressive”. We find significance in ΘΑ’s use of ‘Αδωναί in its declarative formula, as ‘Αδωναί is often attributed to the later linguistic style of Theodotion. Thus we may suggest that this declarative formula was a later plus for MT and ΘΑ, as part of additional later editorial work seeking to weave 36:23c-38 into the text (cf. see further in chapter 7, where we discuss distinctive features of style and language in both Hebrew and Greek).

This would have been added at a similar time to other later changes supporting the chapter reorder (e.g., the change from הָלַי to לָלִי in 37:10, and the change to הָלָה in 39:29).

179 Θ967 ends at this point and immediately proceeds into 38:1.
180 We will discuss with the uniqueness of Θ967 and these issues in our Chapter 7 (cf. 7.4.1).
181 This again may indicate a possible time frame for textual inclusion.
182 The use of single and/or double divine names in Ezekiel is outside the scope of this thesis. For a recent detailed discussion on this topic see McGregor (1985).
We also note that MT and G\textsuperscript{967,B} have ‘my great name’\textsuperscript{183} (‘יהוה / μέγα’), whereas G\textsuperscript{A} has ‘holy name’ (‘αγιόν’). This may be a theological adjustment by G\textsuperscript{A}, perhaps to match the previous verses (cf. vv. 20-22), or even a theological echo or duplication based on αγιάσω. Yet again we see evidence of a text in a state of flux.

The MT accents link ‘from all your uncleannesses and idols’ with ‘I will cleanse you’. For LXX, the addition of καί means that the cleansing from their uncleannesses and idols is linked back to the sprinkling of clean water at the beginning of the verse, with the last phrase being an independent clause (Block, 1998, p.349). Vawter and Hoppe (1991, p.164) point out that “what Ezekiel wanted to affirm was that without God’s initiative a genuine conversion on Israel’s part is impossible”. LXX’s independent clause emphasises this point, clearly showing that it is the LORD doing the ‘cleansing’ and that the people are the recipients of this cleansing. Greenberg (1997, p.730) notes that this verse is a “reversal of the personal impurity (‘like the impurity of a menstruous woman [hndh]’) incurred by the evils of vss. 17-18”. Eisemann (1994, p.556) brings out the interpretation with a comparison to the mikvah which a woman enters after her monthly menstrual cycle (also those defiled from the dead or defiled objects), and says “Just as a mikvah cleanses those who have become defiled, so God cleanses Israel (Yoma 85b)”. The LXX translator may have been reflecting on vv. 17-18 (cf. variants there), and now, perhaps with the concept of the

\textsuperscript{183} Wong (2003, p.229) suggests that “‘Holy name’ and ‘great name’ may be synonyms here. It is also possible that ‘great name’ is used to avoid an overloading of the שָׁם terminology and at the same time underlines the great power of God”.

mikvah and the haftarah reading of Num. 19:9-22 in his mind, exegetes to clarify it is the LORD who cleanses Israel.

Unlike \( \text{\textgreek{G}A} \), \( \text{\textgreek{G}B} \) does not attest MT’s \[\text{\textgreek{N}}\] (‘again’). This could be a later MT and \( \text{\textgreek{G}A} \) plus to emphasise the hope that they will not repeat their past tragedies in the land, and have to endure the resulting abusive insults from the nations.

In addition to this, MT and \( \text{\textgreek{G}B} \) have ‘the insult’ of famine among the nations’, but \( \text{\textgreek{G}A} \) has ‘the insult of people among the nations.’ Rather than scribal error, this may be an intra-Greek word play by \( \text{\textgreek{G}A} \)’s scribe, writing \( \text{\textgreek{G}A}: \lambda \alpha \omega \) (‘people’) for \( \text{\textgreek{G}B}: \lambda \dot{m} \omega \) (‘famine’). Both MT and \( \text{\textgreek{G}B} \) fit the context, and refer back to previous references to ‘insults’. However, the charge now appears to be ‘famine’ rather than childlessness. Famine may have been one of the events that caused the ‘childlessness’ (so LXX) or ‘miscarrying’ (so MT) from the land (cf. 36:6, 12b-15). This would fit our observation that the Hebrew author and LXX translator has the Exodus event, especially from Numbers in mind. Thus they would know that the reason for their ancestors’ original departure from the land was because of famine (Gen. 45:8-11).

\( \text{\textgreek{G}A} \)’s use of \( \lambda \dot{m} \omega \) instead of \( \lambda \alpha \omega \) (which is in the previous verse), may be because the context now refers to the insults Israel received from the surrounding

---

184 There is a strong link between this verse, and even the pericope, with Num. 19:9-22. It was one of the earliest haftarah readings in the Synagogue (Thackeray, 1921, p.126). Our suggestion here presumes the early date of the haftarah reading as proposed by Thackeray, and early use of the mikvah. See our chapter 7 on Papyrus 967 for more on the use of vv. 23c-38 in the Synagogue lectionary and haftarah readings. For more on the mikvah see Kotlar (1972, p.1542), who points out that in the “closing years” of the Second Temple, the mikvah was used by the “common people [who] were particular about the laws of cleanness”.

185 The Greek \( \dot{\nu} \epsilon \iota \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \) means ‘disgrace/insult/reproach’ [LEH]. The Hebrew \( \text{\textgreek{N}} \) means ‘disgrace/shame’ [HALOT]. The context here leans towards ‘insult’ due to the previous occurrences of them being insulted by the nations (cf. 36:3, 6, 15).
nations, invoking the memory of previous verses dealing with insults of childlessness (cf. vv. 1-15). \( \text{G}^\text{A} \) appears to change the reason for the insults (of famine) to focus on where the insults were coming from (the people among the nations), and inform their community that these insults will not happen again (cf. \( \text{v} \)). \( \text{G}^\text{A} \) may be referring back to the ‘childlessness’ of 36:15, and using wordplay to state that they will not experience a ‘famine’ (\( \text{limu}/\text{laou} \)) of ‘people’ (\( \text{laou}/\text{limu} \)).\(^{186}\) However, the context of this verse fits the former suggestion, as ‘famine’ was often the reason why the inhabitants had to leave the land, and the fertility of the land is restored before the people are said to return (vv. 8-9). \( \text{G}^\text{A} \) does not bring this aspect out as clearly as the other MSS.

\[ \text{36:31} \]

\[ \text{MT says they will } \chi\nu\theta\omicron\nu\omicron\nu \text{ ('loath') themselves for their sins. If we take } \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu \text{ as a reflexive pronoun, then LXX says 'they will } \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omicron\chi\omicron\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\tau\epsilon \text{ be angry/offended [LEH] or loathed}^{187} \text{ with themselves', and the later reading of Symmachus' } \kappa\alpha\iota \text{ } \sigma\mu\kappa\rho\upsilon\vartheta\sigma\omicron\varsigma\sigma\omicron\theta\epsilon\omicron\sigma\varepsilon\theta\omicron \text{ } \epsilon\nu\nu\omicron\tau\omicron\pi\omicron\nu \text{ } \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu \text{ would read 'and you will be diminished}^{188} \text{ before yourself'. However, } \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omicron\pi\omicron\nu \text{ } \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu \text{ is never used reflexively in LXX for non-3rd person subjects, and always has the meaning of 'their face'. Where the reflexive subject is the 2nd person, } \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omicron\pi\omicron\nu \text{ } \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu \text{ is used (cf. Deut. 8:20; Jer. 49:15; Ezek. 14:16; Dan. 1:10; Mal. 2:3). LXX twice uses } \upsilon\mu\omicron\nu \text{ in a reflexive sense in this verse, and if the translator intended} \]

\(^{186}\) In Ezek. 36:15 the phrase is in the plural, yet here in v. 30 it is in the singular. This indicates deliberate adjustment and thus signifies exegetical intent.

\(^{187}\) \( \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omicron\chi\omicron\theta\omicron\xi\omicron\omicron \) here means “to be angry, to be offended, to be provoked” [LEH]. Muraoka’s lexicon says ‘be weary of, dislike’. We find \( \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omicron\chi\omicron\theta\omicron\xi\omicron\omicron \) in Psa. 95:10 as ‘angry’, and as ‘loathed’ in Lev. 26:15, 30, 43, 44; Num. 21:5; Deut. 7:26; Psa. 35:5.

\(^{188}\) For \( \sigma\mu\kappa\rho\omicron\nu\omicron \) as ‘reduced / diminished’ see Jer. 29:6; Hos. 4:3; Sir. 17:25; 35:7; Bar. 2:34.
this sense here then he would have used ἵμων again. We also note the Hebrew clearly uses a niphal, yet the Greek uses an active verb rather than a passive.

If we apply a non-reflexive aspect of αὐτῶν here, and translate ‘their’, we must determine the referent. It is possibly the preceding ‘your evil ways and your practices’, so ‘in accordance with their presence [“face”]’, meaning in the presence of their evil ways and practices. Symmachus thus has Israel diminished in the sight of their deeds.

Alternatively, we may suggest LXX is reflecting back on the reproach by the nations mentioned in the previous verse, and elsewhere, saying that Israel’s deeds caused Israel to be loathed in the sight of the nations. This view permits Symmachus to read ‘you will be diminished before them’, reflecting a concern that the nations around would think less of Israel. LXX appears to have translated with a non-reflexive application for αὐτῶν to give reason for the reproachful words spoken against them by the surrounding nations. However, it is difficult to be sure whether the translator was referring to their deeds (v. 31a), or deeds of the nations (v. 30b).

Θ uses αὐτῶν in the final phrase of v. 31 as βδελύγμασιν αὐτῶν (‘their abominations’), whereas Θ has ἵμων (‘your’), following MT. This does appear to be a scribal error based upon the first occurrence in the verse.

3.4.2. 36:33-36

All representative MSS exhibit division breaks before v. 32 and after v. 36, except MasEzek, which treats vv. 22-38 as one pericope. We will discuss vv. 33-36 and vv. 37-38 under the same thematic division (our Section 3). While there are several minor textual differences in this block, Θ is of key interest, showing evidence of an eschatological slant in v. 33. There is also a variant in v. 35 regarding Eden.
There is one minor variant where MT and $\text{GB}$ both say ‘in the day’, whereas $\text{GA}$’s plus of the definite article and $\text{ek} \epsilon \epsilon \iota \iota$ reads ‘in that day’, which appears to emphasise a specific day or time. The phrase $\text{en} \ \text{t} \ \text{h} \ \text{m} \ \text{r} \ \text{r} \ \text{r} \ \text{e} \ \text{k} \ \epsilon \ \iota \iota$ is not very common in Ezekiel (24:26, 27; 29:21; 30:9; 38:14, 19; 39:11), but in other books, especially Isaiah, it appears to have a messianic concept. It cannot be known whether this concept was in the mind of $\text{GA}$’s scribe, or whether this time of cleaning was seen as a specific day in their future. Regardless, $\text{GA}$’s plus permits us to see an eschatological slant to this verse.

$\text{GB}$ acceptably has $\text{parodeu} \, \text{ontoj}$ ([those] ‘passing by’), a word not used elsewhere in Ezekiel. $\text{GA}$’s $\text{diodeu} \, \text{ontoj}$ ([those] ‘passing/travelling through’) captures MT’s wording ($\text{rbEA}$), and gives answer to the desolation found by those who are passing through in 5:14, and to the fear of travelling in 14:15 (both verses use $\text{diodeu} \, \text{w}$).

MT says that the ‘restored’ land has become $\text{w} \text{kh} \text{poj} \text{trufh} \text{j}$ (‘as [the] Garden of Eden’), which LXX reflects with $\text{w} \text{kh} \text{poj} \text{trufh} \text{j}$ (‘as a garden of delight’ [LEH]). Only here in LXX OT do we find ‘kēp̄os’ being used in the context of the garden [of...
Eden]. Elsewhere in Ezekiel (and other books) LXX translates ‘[יִשְׂרָאֵל]’ with παράδεισος (cf. Ezek. 28:13; 31:9; Gen. 2:23, 24).\(^{189}\)

The theology behind the use of Eden in this inserted pericope appears to reflect a view of what the ‘cleansed, rebuilt, and recreated’ Israel would be in its ideal state. Fishbane (1985, p.370) suggests that Ezekiel (or his redactor) juxtaposed the oracle of hope that the old Eden would be restored (36:25) with the parable of dry bones, whereby he envisions the recreation of the corporate body of Israel—much like a new Adam—with a new flesh and a new spirit (37:4-9). But with this coupling of Edenic and Adamic imagery, national nostalgia and primordial fantasies are blended.

Levenson (1986, p.33) also points out that Eden in Ezekiel’s theology, is “an ideal of pre-political existence, and [hence] redemption which ends in the Garden of Eden is deliverance from the tensions of political life”. The returnees will not have to endure the tumultuous politics that they suffered before the exile (cf. Ezek. 34). In both MT and LXX this verse, along with the surrounding verses, showcases a fully restored land abundant in produce (vv. 33-36) and people (vv. 37-38).

We must keep in mind that this verse is part of the pericope not found in \(^{967}\), and likely a later inserted text. The use here of κῆπος is another linguistic feature pointing to the later origin of this block in LXX. Its use may indicate that the allusion here to Eden as the nostalgic Garden of Eden for the people of God should not be confused with the earlier more mythological references to Tyre and Assyria in 28:19 and 31:9.\(^{190}\)

---

\(^{189}\) LXX Ezekiel, as with other books, translates ‘[יִשְׂרָאֵל]’ rather than transliterating, bringing out the meaning of ‘delight/luxury’ to its readers. LXX’s τρυπή can mean ‘a state of intense satisfaction, delight, luxury’ [BAGD].

\(^{190}\) Kutsko (2000a, p.130) notes that use of Garden of Eden here “reflects the creation tradition found in Gen. 2:15 ... [and] for the exilic community the language reverberates with images from the Israelite creation traditions.” Kutsko does not mention LXX’s use of κῆπος.
...know that I am the LORD [that] have built…”. It is interesting that Α had not repeat this εἰμι plus in the second occurrence of ἐγὼ κύριος in this verse, as it also has ὅτι as a plus as if copied from the first use, and a unique double divine name (see below). Α also repeats εἰμι in v. 38, but without any significant theological change other than to bring a greater emphasis (so it will not be covered separately). We may speculate that the εἰμι plus by Α’s Christian scribes may have been influenced by ἐγὼ εἰμι used by Jesus in John’s Gospel. If so, this may be an indication that the early Christian communities saw Jesus as the one who will bring about the restoration of his people. Alternatively, it may have been inserted by later Jewish scribes.

Α’s other plus of ὅτι refers back to the new-found knowledge of the nations, and gives reason for the LORD’s speaking and doing these restorative actions. However, ὅτι appears out of place here, as does Α’s double divine name (κύριος κύριος), that is

Thackeray (1909, p.55) says that “the use of ἐγὼ εἰμι followed by a finite verb” is a “flagrant violation of Greek syntax”, and lists the occurrence here in Α as a possible example. He (1909, p.55) explains that “it is due to a desire to discriminate in the Greek between … ἴν and ὅτι. The observation of the fact that ἴν is the form usually employed to express ‘I am’ led to the adoption of the rule”. Furthermore, he (1909, p.55) notes that this ‘rule’ “may be regarded as among the latest additions to the Greek Bible”, and suggests influence by Theodotion. While the Hebrew does not have ἴν in v. 36 (cf. v. 28), Β nevertheless has translated with theological intent in both cases of ἴν.
not found in the other MSS. These may have been added to emphasise the LORD’s action of ‘built’ and ‘planted’.192

LXX’s use of the future ποιήσω (‘I will do it’) may be seen as an interpretation of MT’s נָבַת (past + perfect), putting the action definitely into the future. This may indicate that the LXX community saw this building as both complete, yet with more to take place.

3.4.3. 36:37-38

All representative MSS have a break after v. 36, except MasEzek, which treats vv. 22-38 as one pericope. All the representative MSS have a major break between chapters 36 and 37. The exception is G967, which proceeds directly from 36:23b into what we know as chapter 38 on the same line.

As noted in the section above, vv. 37-38 will be discussed as part of the same thematic division (our Section 3). This pericope has only one minor intra-Greek variant.

Whilst MT and LXX agree here, there is a small variant in the Greek between LXX and the translations of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion (Field, 1964, p.868; Ziegler, 1977, p.266). GBA say ζητηθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ισραήλ (‘I will be sought by the house of Israel’). However, these three exegetes write ζητηθήσομαι as two separate words, ζητήσα as a noun and θήσομαι as a future middle rather than future passive. This changes the sentence to ‘So the LORD says: Yet for this inquiry, I will place the house of Israel, to establish them’. This may have been due to scribal error, or it may be

192 For more on God as builder see Brettler (1989, pp.116-118).
evidence of a different theology, whereby the later ‘three exegetes’ saw the ‘I will be sought’ as something that had happened in their past intercessions. Now they look for the reality of God placing and establishing Israel again, especially by their time they had again been dispersed, this time at the hands of the Romans in 70 CE.

3.5. Overall Summary: Chapter 3

Throughout chapter 36 we have found a number of differences between MT and LXX, and intra-LXX, that are often passed over by commentators as scribal errors. However, we have suggested numerous possible exegetical and theological interpretations that have influenced the varying shape of the text for both MT and LXX. LXX’s translator(s) often appear to exegete and interpret the text for their community. It is our suggestion that LXX did this at times through intra-lingual wordplays (cf. vv. 2, 8, 12, 17, 30).

Overall, we have found very few variants intra-MT, and likewise between MasEzek and MT, indicating that these all came from the same textual ‘family’. We have also found that the later hexaplaric $G^A$ typically, but not always, followed MT’s exegetical plusses, yet these are often minus in $G^{967,B}$. $G^A$ also has its own plusses not witnessed in any other representative MSS. We observed that the declarative formula is plus for MT and $G^A$ in 36:23b, but is minus in $G^{967,B}$, perhaps indicating a text in a state of flux towards its final shape.

Our study has found Ezekiel 36 can be broken up into three major thematic sections with different addressees: the first section addresses the mountains (vv. 1-15); the second section, the prophet (vv. 16-21); and the third section, the ‘house of Israel’ (vv. 22-38).

193 Talmon (1999, p.70, n.19) observes that “where preserved the Hexaplaric tradition is adjusted to MT”.
194 Tov (2001, p. 139) observes that “Codex A is greatly influenced by the Hexaplaric tradition and in several books represents it faithfully. The scribe of A often adapted the text to similar verses and added harmonizing details”. 
The first section, vv. 1-15, outlines the restorative work of the LORD towards the mountains/land of Israel, and at the same time covers the action of the enemy and the enemy’s insults towards Israel. In this section we found that LXX’s use of the passive verbs suggests that they felt victimised, and perhaps saw the ‘dishonour’ continuing from the enemy against their various communities. Their feeling victimised can also be observed in the way LXX at times interprets the attitude of the enemy towards them, whereas MT states the enemy’s action (vv. 2-5). LXX also clarifies the enemy’s action and ‘insult’ in MT as ‘dishonour’ (v. 3). This feeling of being victimised appears to indicate that these communities had the view that ‘it was done to us, and we didn’t deserve it to the extent that it happened. The land is not to blame: the enemy is’. LXX also displays a propensity towards clarifying MT, such as defining MT’s ‘דִּבְרֵיהֶם’ in v. 3 as ‘ונהכייה’, and identifying the ‘fruit’ as ‘grapes’ in v. 8.

This first section indicates that the LXX translator, and perhaps the original author, had the book of Numbers in mind, particularly the event of the 10 spies and their ‘evil report’ (vv. 3, 8, 13-15, cf. Num. 13:32; 14:36f). This suggests that these communities may have seen the restoration of Israel as a new exodus and re-possessing of the land. Other commentators have observed this motif elsewhere in Ezekiel.195

195 Patton (1996, p.73) also finds a clear reference to the exodus tradition in Ezek. 20 and 23, and says “these two chapters demonstrate that, although the exodus motif does not dominate the book of Ezekiel, the traditions were clearly known to the author”. Patton (1996, p.85) goes on to say that “if exodus motifs lie behind the restoration texts, they are latent and unexploited. For Ezekiel the restoration draws more clearly on royal motifs. The return is likened to the gathering of scattered Israelites by its ‘shepherd’, clearly a royal image. The restoration will be that of the United Monarchy, with full occupation of the land rule by a Davidide. Central to this restoration is the re-establishment of the temple”.

Some commentators suggest that Ezekiel saw himself as a new Moses;\(^{196}\) however, we are unable to find this motif in the variants of 36:1-15. We do find evidence of a ‘new creation’ motif, especially in MT’s unique plus of the priestly blessing in 36:11. This motif may also be seen in v. 8, which describes a fruitful place. One may even find it in the layout of the text: as in Genesis, first the land is prepared and vegetated (vv. 1-15), then people placed on the land with direction for living (vv. 16-23), and thirdly the people are cleansed from their sins for future living (vv. 24-38 [minus in \(\text{G}^{967}\)]).

We observed a degree of uneasiness within both MT and LXX communities regarding the ancient accusation against the land in vv. 12b-15. Yet MT appears to be more willing to permit the charge of ‘miscarriage’ against the land to be active, as if the land itself was the one miscarrying, whereas LXX’s use of the passive verb has the land being made childless.\(^{197}\) This again shows evidence of their feeling victimised. MT’s uneasiness with the ancient charge can be seen with the wordplay (\textit{ketiv/qere}) between ‘miscarry’ (\(l\text{\textael}\)) and ‘stumble’ (\(lvk\)) (v. 14). MT has the charge of ‘stumble’ appearing again in v. 15, which is not found in LXX. In v. 8 MT has the land active in preparing for the return of the people, whereas LXX has the mountains as passive.

\(^{196}\) McKeating (1994, p.99) argues along with Levenson (1986) that Ezek. 40f has a number of parallels with Moses, and says “Ezekiel might be seen as fulfilling the prophecy of Deuteronomy 19, that a ‘prophet like Moses’ would appear”. McKeating (1994, p.103f) also notes parallels between exodus and the return in Ezek. 20. He (1994, p.107) believes that “The Moses/Ezekiel parallelism must go back at least to this primary stage of the organisation of the book”, yet it is “not necessarily that he saw himself as a Moses figure, but that he believed he had a key role in the fulfilment of his own prophecies”. Kohn (1999, p.511) says “while never mentioning Moses of old, Ezekiel in fact portrays himself as a new Moses”. Kohn (1999, p.516) saw this happening as “Ezekiel modelled himself on the ancient lawgiver Moses, issuing laws in anticipation of the ‘Second Exodus’ and the resettlement of the land”. Greenberg (1984, p.183) points out that “Biblical tradition regards Moses as the mediator of Israel’s divine constitution, the Torah; it recognizes no other legislator—excepting Ezekiel …. As Moses spelled out the meaning of a ‘holy nation’ to an unformed people just liberated from Egypt, so Ezekiel specified the needful changes in the vessels and symbols of God’s presence in the future commonwealth of those near redemption from the Babylonian exile. Analogy of the situation produced similar prophetic roles”.

\(^{197}\) \(\text{G}^{A}\) appeared reluctant in this area, avoiding the land being ‘sown’ (v. 9) and avoiding the ‘birth’ metaphor (v. 12).
If we accept the proposal that $G^{967}$ represents the Urtext with this chapter finishing at v. 23b, then textually, vv. 12-15 is central in this chapter, forming a chiastic ‘answer’ to the people’s concerns. For $G^{967}$, 36:1-12a covers the action of the enemy and their insults (vv. 1-7), and the return of ‘my people Israel’ to the mountains (8-12a); vv. 12b-15 answers the ancient charge and perhaps the returnees’ current concern about the mountains/land; in vv. 16-19 the LORD deals directly with the people regarding their idolatry; and in vv. 20-23b the LORD outlines that the reason for his current action of restoration is for the sake of his holy name that had been profaned.

The second section, vv. 16-21, addresses the prophet regarding the sin of idolatry which it gives as the reason for the dispersion into the nations. On this, Kutsko (2000a, p.129) says, “it appears that Ezekiel 36 begins to describe the restoration of Israel as cleansing from sin, specifically, idolatry. Furthermore, Ezekiel portrays Israel in terminology associated with that very sin, namely idols: Israel has taken idols into its heart”. This second section gives the LORD’s reason for the restoration as ‘for the sake of my holy/great name’. In this section we do not find any indication the LXX community felt victimised as in the previous section, and LXX typically uses active verbs. This suggests that the LXX community accepted the LORD’s charge of idolatry, a point that may be found in its exegetical expansion of ‘idols’ in v. 17, especially with $G^A$. However, $G^{967,B}$ both show a reluctance to state clearly that their deeds were like a ‘menstruating woman’ (cf. MT, $G^A$), instead preferring to say a ‘set apart woman’, showing evidence of cultural sensitivity. Adjustment for the sake of cultural sensitivity may also be found where LXX uses ‘εἰδόλολοις’ for MT’s ‘נְטֵנִים’ (cf. vv. 17, 18).

MT and $G^A$ have an extended unique plus in v. 18, perhaps indicating addition by a later community. The first clause may indicate that these communities were also reflecting on the Book of Numbers (Num. 35:33).
The third section, vv. 22-38, addressing the house of Israel, covers what the LORD will do to restore Israel to her fullness. There are not as many differences as in the previous two sections. As with the first section, we can find the ‘new exodus’ motif in v. 30 (also v. 24), a finding observed by others (Block, 1998, p.353). We also found a possible link with Num. 19:17 in the ‘cleanse you’ passage in v. 25, especially in LXX, which treats this as an independent clause. The ‘new creation’ motif may be found again in v. 35 with the reference to Eden. As Batto (1987, p.189) says, “that Ezekiel patterned the restoration upon primeval motifs is confirmed by 36:35”. Whilst the absence of discernible variants caused us not to refer directly to 36:36, Kutsko (2000a, p.129) claims the concept of a new heart suggests “the language of (re)creation”.

Overall, in Ezekiel chapter 36, we can observe that LXX has consistently translated the Hebrew text for their community; likewise MT with its exegetical plusses.

---

198 See the discussions above in introduction to 36:22-32 for possible reason for the lack of differences, and our discussions in the chapter dealing specifically with ☞667.
4.0. Chapter 4: The Text of Ezekiel 37

4.1. Introduction: Ezek. 37

When seeking to determine early Jewish interpretation in Ezekiel 37, we must keep in mind the likelihood that this chapter originally came after chapter 39, as found in \( \mathbb{G}^{967} \). The placement of chapters (or a group of pericopes) in the text has definite theological and exegetical implications. While we refer to this aspect at various points below, its complexity will receive detailed consideration in a later chapter in this thesis (cf. our Chapter 7: Papyrus 967).

Chapter 37 has two discernible thematic sections: the first deals with the ‘resurrection’ of the dry bones (vv. 1-14), and the second with the reuniting of the two kingdoms under a Davidic king (vv. 15-28). This chapter can be seen as the ultimate fulfilment of the restoration of Israel, in which they are back in their land with a leader like David of old. Yet, in the received chapter order, the destruction of their enemies has yet to take place; in \( \mathbb{G}^{967} \)'s order the Gog epic has already occurred. Duguid (1994, p.104) points out “The re-creation and restoration of the bones serves as a guarantee of the promised ultimate restoration of Israel as a nation. Thus in a very real sense, the vision of chapter 37 provides the ultimate answer to the prophet’s question in 11:13”. Kutsko (2000a) finds also a creation motif in Ezek. 37:1-14.199 Fishbane (1985, p.452) finds a chiastic structure for this pericope with verse 11 as the central part, where he sees a “profound theological transformation” taking place.200 Curiously, Fox (1995, p.184) says that “Ezekiel’s role is not messenger but spectator” [italics his]. Yet

---

199 There are a number of good studies done on the structure and rhetorical aspects of Ezek. 37:1-14, including Fox (1995) and Allen (1993). Unfortunately these, along with the plethora of ‘preaching’ sources on this ‘dry bones’ pericope, rarely comment on variances between MT and LXX. Likewise few appear concerned about what the text may have meant to the original recipients or other early Jewish communities which remains our focus.

200 Fishbane (1985, p.452) also says “For if Ezekiel, an individual, was initially inspired and relocated in the exile, in the valley of dry bones, the entire unit closes with the divine assertion that YHWH will inspire the entire nation (i.e., revive them to a new life) and relocate them upon their land”.
we see Ezekiel’s active involvement in the delivery of the prophetic word in vv. 7, 10 just as he was involved in the previous chapter.\footnote{We may disagree when Fox (1995, p.184) argues that “it is true that he speaks the words that bring about the rising of the bones, but his part in the event is similar to that of a spectator invited up from the audience to ‘help’ a stage magician by waving a wand over the magician’s hat”.

\textsuperscript{201}}

As with chapter 36, we will examine intra- MT and LXX comparisons, and then compare MT and LXX trans-linguistically, to determine if any variants contain discernible theological or exegetical insights into these various communities. We will again follow MT’s main sense divisions.

\textbf{4.2. Section 1: Ezek. 37:1-14}

\textbf{4.2.1. 37:1-10}

Both $\text{MT}^{C,A}$ feature a \textit{petuḥah} break between chapters 36 and 37, whilst $\text{MT}^{L}$ has a \textit{setumah}. It is difficult to determine if MasEzek has a \textit{petuḥah} or a \textit{setumah}, as chapter 37 starts at the head of a column, but it does appear to be a \textit{petuḥah} (Talmon, 1999, pp.65, 73). Likewise, both $\text{GB}^{B,A}$ witness a major break between these two chapters. As its normal practice, $\text{GB}^{967}$ starts chapter 37 on the same line that 39:29 finishes on; but the space between 39:29 and 37:1 is unique since it is the only place in Scheide where a six letter break occurs (elsewhere just one letter).\footnote{$\text{GB}^{967}$ finishes in the Scheide collection at the very beginning of v. 4 (only $\text{καὶ ἔπειτα}$ witnessed). But the remainder of this verse, and chapter, for $\text{GB}^{967}$ is found in the Madrid collection, picking up exactly where Scheide left off, thus there is no sense division here at v. 4.}

With regard to the next sense division break, we find a wide degree of variance within the representative MSS. $\text{MT}^{C}$ and MasEzek do not witness another break until after v. 14, reflecting the two thematic sections. $\text{MT}^{A}$ has a \textit{setumah} in the middle of v. 9, and does not evidence another break until after v. 14. $\text{MT}^{L}$ has a \textit{setumah} after v. 10, which is also witnessed by $\text{GB}^{B,A}$. $\text{GB}^{967}$ exhibits its next sense division marker after v. 14, agreeing with the two earliest Hebrew MSS. $\text{GA}$ again exhibits more divisions than the other representative MSS, with breaks after vv. 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12a, 14. Such a
collage of sense divisions makes the text lose its sense of thematic order, and is not so helpful for our purposes of seeking to establish where the early Jewish communities saw the major themes in their texts. For the purposes of our examination, we will follow those MSS that treat vv. 1-10 as its own sense division unit within our section 1.

It is interesting that LXX starts this chapter with καὶ, signifying an on-going text, which is not witnessed in MT. This may be a legacy remaining from when the text of chapter 37 followed 39, but removed from MT with the chapter reorder.

For MT, the valley was filled with generic τάφρον ('bones'), which is also attested in Θ967. Yet ΘBA specify these as ὀστέων ἄνθρωπινῶν (‘human bones’). That Θ967 does not witness ἄνθρωπινῶν as other LXX MSS, suggests that this may have been an interpretive plus added to the later ΘBA (or ΘBA’s exemplar), as a clarifying point associated with the rearrangement of the chapter order. We suggest that ἄνθρωπινῶν is not necessary with Θ967’s chapter order, in which chapter 37 comes after the warfare with Gog, and the textual flow signifies that the bones are human, especially since 39:11-16 outlines the action of clearing human bones from the land. While the

\[203\] Lang (1986) suggests that the bones just lying on the ground was most likely influenced by the Zoroastrian practice of exposure rather than burial. Block (1992a, pp.137-138) initially says this “influence seems more likely”, but then says Lang’s “suggestion that Ezekiel may have been familiar with, and may even have visited Zoroastrian funeral grounds is speculative wishful thinking”. Block (1992a, p.138) also argues that “the reference to hahârigim, ‘the slain,’ in 37:9 rules out the possibility of Ezekiel’s valley of dry bones being a cemetery of any kind, Israelite, Babylonian, or Persian”. Furthermore, this theory may be questioned by the direct mention of graves in the ‘interpretive’ section (37:12) (For more, also see Block, 1998, pp.383-392). Overall Block rules out any such connection, and holds that if anything Ezekiel would speak against Zoroastrian ideas. Block (1992a, p.137 n.127) also says “There are no hints of Egyptian influence at all in Ezekiel 37”.

\[204\] Gehman (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.74) lists this as one of the occurrences of Scheide’s “43 cases which are an exact translation from the Hebrew” (so also 36:8; 38:8, 11, 16-17; 39:4, 8).
context of the received chapter arrangement implies these bones are human (cf. 37:11-14), $\text{GB,A}$‘s clarifying plus of ‘human bones’ assists the reader with this point.

With $\text{G}^\text{967}$‘s chapter order, the ‘slaughter’ (cf. מְרֵאשְׁת הָאֹרֶץ 37:9) in 38-39 included Israel, which required a physical, even eschatological\(^{205}\) resurrection of Israel’s people (37:1-14), to unite under Davidic leadership (37:15-28), and then build the new Temple (40-48). Yet, with the received chapter order, the ‘slaughter’ is of Israel’s enemies. This point, along with the motif of ‘spiritual renewal’ from the ‘inserted’ text of 36:23c-38, indicates more of a ‘moral’ or ‘spiritual’ resurrection for national Israel, rather than a physical bodily resurrection following warfare (cf. vv. 6c, 11).\(^{206}\) Thus, $\text{GB,A}$ have the interpretive or clarifying plus of ‘human’ bones, possibly pointing to a physical resurrection and not only a moral / spiritual one, although, it could still include the moral/spiritual resurrection motif.

However, we still must examine why MT does not witness this plus. This could be an implicit representation of MT’s theology that desired to have the resurrection as a national moral and spiritual one, as witnessed by the chapter reorder and plus of 36:23c-38. This leaves $\text{G}^\text{967}$ as a possible witness of the Urtext that originally saw a physical resurrection. Then, while accepting MT’s chapter order and plus, a later LXX scribe made a theological decision to insert ἀναπάντησιν to support their theological view that the dry bones are human, and that there will be a physical resurrection of Israel, 205 It is possible that Ezekiel was not aware of an eschatological resurrection, as even the text indicates (cf. v.3) (see Zimmerli, 1983, pp.260, 264-66). Yet others like Lang (1986, p.308) argue “there are reasons, however, for assuming that Ezekiel did in fact expect more – that Israelites would rise from the dead”. Block (1992a, p.141) also argues for a belief of resurrection in ‘ancient’ Israel, saying “Ezekiel offered his countrymen powerful declarations of hope. There is life after death, and there is hope beyond the grave. Yahweh remains the incontestable Lord, not only of the living, but also of the dead”. See Dimant (2000) regarding how Pseudo-Ezekiel reveals early knowledge of individual physical eschatological resurrection, that was based on the individual’s own purity. Ezek. 37:1-14 however, reveals national resurrection, without direct mention as the result of individual purity.

206 The issue of a ‘moral/spiritual’ verses a ‘physical’ resurrection is discussed in our Chapter 7: Papyrus 967. See Lust (1981a, pp.529-532) for his proposal regarding the moral/physical resurrection issues. Here, we only seek to raise possible answers for the variants intra-LXX and LXX to MT.
therefore still agreeing with the theology of the Urtext.\textsuperscript{207} This may indicate a timeframe where Israel had experienced some measure of a ‘slaughter’, perhaps during Greco-Roman times. MT could indicate a timeframe before such a ‘slaughter’, as they sought to ‘resurrect’ the hearts of their nation and unite them against a common enemy (cf. vv. 15-28), and so does not witness the plus found in $\text{B,A}$. This of course is speculative, but we are seeking to propose possible reasons for textual variants. It could be as simple as the later LXX scribes adding $\text{avnqrwπinων}$ just to clarify the meaning of bones in the context.

There is one other implicit indicator that $\text{G}^{967}$ follows the Hebrew, and perhaps even the Urtext, more closely than $\text{B,A}$. $\text{G}^{967}$ follows the syntax of $\text{̃ρωγον} \text{yov} \text{εκω} \text{̃πευματι κυρiou}$ (‘and he brought me out by the Spirit of the Lord’), whereas $\text{B,A}$ have $\text{καλεγον} \text{me en pneumatikurioj}$ (‘and the Lord brought me out by the Spirit’). $\text{B,A}$ follow the Hebrew word order, but interpret the syntax differently. On the other hand this is more likely an interpretation of the event, as Greenberg (1997, p742) points out that LXX

\begin{verbatim}
construe[s] the second clause of the verse thus: ‘The Lord brought me out by a wind’; but if this were meant, the placement of the subject (YHWH) after the adverb (brwh) is awkward. This forced reading may reflect an interpretation of the event as real rather than visionary.
\end{verbatim}

Therefore we propose that MT and $\text{G}^{967}$ saw this as a visionary event, but the intra-LXX variant for $\text{B,A}$ exegetes and interprets this as a real event. If so, then this theology may have influenced $\text{B,A}$’s $\text{avnqrwπinων}$ plus above.

Whilst $\text{pνευμα}$, like $\pi\nu\nu\nu$, may alternatively mean ‘wind’, ‘breath’ or ‘s/Spirit’, we suggest that the various LXX MSS alternate between these meanings as is evident by

\textsuperscript{207} We do not know if these later LXX scribes had access to $\text{G}^{967}$ or other MSS that witnessed its chapter order. Their plus, however, does match the theology of that original order even if they did not have access to these MSS (or ones similar to them).
their practice of abbreviating πνεῦμα as they do with κύριος and θεός. Fluctuation between abbreviating and not abbreviating may be stylistic, but v. 9, which has πνεῦμα abbreviated twice and once written in full in all representative LXX MSS, suggests theological intent. Sometimes there are variants in 37:1-15 of this practice intra-LXX, which may indicate their various attempts to translate and interpret the alternative nuances of רוח. As all representative LXX MSS abbreviate πνεῦμα in v. 1, we suggest that the copying communities interpreted רוח here as ‘the Spirit’ rather than ‘a wind’ (contra Greenberg above).

We need to be aware of the different ways in which רוח is used here, and in the rest of this pericope. Lemke (1984, p.179) outlines these ways saying,

रूह occurs no fewer than ten times in these fourteen verses, with varying nuances which embrace virtually the whole gamut of meanings which the term has in the Hebrew Bible. In verse 1, רूह refers to the spirit of the Lord as the source of visionary rapture and prophetic inspiration. The term רूह may also denote the life-giving breath or spirit coming from God, which creates living beings out of inanimate matter (cf. vs. 5, 6, 8, 9, 10 and cf. Gen.2:4b-7 or Ps.104:29-30). In verse 9, the term רूह occurs in the plural and refers to the four winds of heaven. Finally in verse 14 a suffixed form of רूह clearly refers to Yahweh’s spirit as the ultimate source of life in the full range of both its physical as well as its spiritual connotations.
‘doublet plus’ in MT as emphasis that the bones were everywhere, and then added to the later \( \text{\textit{S}}^{\text{B.A}} \) MSS. On the other hand, it is more likely to be a \( \text{\textit{S}}^{\text{967}} \) minus, seeking to smooth out MT’s ‘stylistic doublet’.\(^{209}\) Gehman (in Johnson \textit{et al.}, 1938, p.75) uses this \( \text{\textit{S}}^{\text{967}} \) ‘minus’ as one of the evidences (also 32:18), “that the text of Sch[eide] represents a translation which is based either on a faulty Hebrew text, or is due to error in reading the Hebrew … [and] the text of Sch[eide] apparently represents an attempt to restore order out of chaos of the LXX”. This doublet also occurs at 8:10 where the idols and abominations of the house of Israel are \( \text{\textit{bybis}} \text{\textit{bybis}} \) (\( \text{\textit{S}}^{\text{B,A}} \) just \( \text{kuk\lambda\varnothing} \) [NB: 8:10 is Thackeray’s translator a]). Now the writer may be implicitly stating this is the reason for the bones of Israel now being \( \text{\textit{bybis}} \text{\textit{bybis}} \) (cf. 37:11). After the occurrence here, \( \text{\textit{bybis}} \text{\textit{bybis}} \) is frequently used in chapters 40-43 (24 times)\(^{210}\) describing the Temple dimensions. In 40-43 \( \text{\textit{bybis}} \text{\textit{bybis}} \) is typically translated with \( \text{kuk\lambda\varnothing} \) and occasionally with \( \text{kuk\lambda\theta\varnothingv} \), but significantly never with both.\(^{211}\) Unfortunately, these other occurrences do not leave us with any clarity regarding this occurrence in 37:2. Overall, we find that \( \text{\textit{S}}^{\text{967}} \) follows normal LXX practice of simplifying MT doublets using a single \( \text{kuk\lambda\varnothing} \) here, and that \( \text{\textit{S}}^{\text{B.A}} \) have added a doublet to match MT, perhaps to emphasise the fact of the ‘human’ (cf. 37:1 \( \text{\textit{S}}^{\text{B,A}} \)) bones being all around.

We also note that MT has a second \( \text{\textit{hi\nu\varepsilon\eta}} \), perhaps as an emphasising gloss, which is only witnessed by \( \text{\textit{S}}^{\text{A}} \) (\( \text{k\alpha\iota\ i\delta\omega\upsilon} \)). This is another example of how the later \( \text{\textit{S}}^{\text{A}} \) follows MT glosses, as observed in chapter 36.

\(^{209}\) This may be more the case, as Block (1998, p.367) notes that duplication “is characteristically Ezekielian style, occurring frequently in chs. 40-41” and then says “That the duplication is stylistic rather than emphatic is confirmed by Targumic Aramaic” (Block gives a couple of examples to back his point).

\(^{210}\) Outside of Ezekiel \( \text{\textit{bybis}} \text{\textit{bybis}} \) occurs only in 2Chron. 4:3 where LXX has \( \text{kuk\lambda\varnothing} \text{\textit{kuk\lambda\theta\varnothingv}} \). It is undeterminable if this LXX doublet in 2Chron. 4:3 influenced Translator \( \beta \) here in Ezekiel 37:2.

\(^{211}\) Thackeray (1921, p.38) proposed both Ezek. 8:10 and chapters 40-43 were translated by the same person, but just because that translator only used a single word for the MT doublet in those locales does not mean ‘translator \( \beta \)’ used a single word in 37:2.
37:5 τάδε λέγει κύριος τοῖς óστέοις τούτοις ἵδον ἐγώ (G967: ἐπάγω ἐφ' ἐν; G83: φέρω εἰς) ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ζωῆς

LXX takes MT’s verb ‘and you shall live’ (הָיוֹתָהּ), as if it was a noun, ‘life’. Thus, it can be seen to interpret the kind of x;Wr: πνεῦμα ζωῆς (‘the Spirit/breath of life).

We also note the intra-LXX abbreviation variant here, where G967,B abbreviate πνεῦμα, perhaps indicating they see this as the Spirit of Life. Yet G83 writes πνεῦμα out in full, with the possible meaning of ‘wind/breath of life’. Regardless of ‘Spirit’ or ‘breath’, LXX syntax does not provide MT’s result of the Spirit entering them: ‘and you shall live’ (also witnessed in MasEzek). This is a little unusual for LXX, since in chapter 36 LXX often took MT’s action and interpreted the result, but here it appears to ignore a clear result (i.e., a practical application). Perhaps LXX was stating that they will live by the ‘Spirit of life’, and this was a sufficient ‘result’.212 The LXX translator may well have been reflecting on the previous occurrences of πνεῦμα ζωῆς (Ezek. 1:20, 21; 10:17: the πνεῦμα ζωῆς was in the wheels), and now sees the LORD’S activity fulfilled here in resurrecting the people to life.213 Both MT and LXX may also have been alluding to Gen. 2:7, and seeing this pericope as reflecting an act of recreation by God whereby the ‘human’ is standing but now requiring the ‘Spirit/breath of life’, and thus LXX exegetically clarifies this by reading ‘of life’. It may also be significant that Gen. 2:17

212 Greenberg (1997, p.743) says LXX “does not show this structure, since it reads the last two words of the verse as ‘breath of life’, reflecting a Hebrew text influenced by the language of Gen.6:17; 7:15”. This may well be the case, as Kutsko (2000b, p.135) points out the parallel with the Priestly Flood narrative (including the Noahide covenant) and Ezekiel. Kutsko (2000a, p.137) also finds a parallel here (and throughout Ezek. 36-37) with the creation event of Gen.1-2, and finds that “the recreation process must continue, as it did at creation, with God’s breathing life into them” (Kutsko says this in reference to 37:8). However, speaking against Ezekiel writing out of any ‘creation traditions’ Petersen (1999, p.498) claims “there do appear to be allusions to creation texts, e.g., the references to a vivifying breath/spirit though the vocabulary in Ezekiel 37:5 is different than that in Genesis 2. Nonetheless, apart from these allusions, the larger creation traditions, along with their attending theological implications, are absent from Ezekiel”. Fitzpatrick (2004, p.179) also finds a creational aspect here, stating “the point is that this national restoration will be nothing less than an act of creation”.

213 Block (1992a, 134) lists this as the third way Ezekiel perceives death and afterlife: “Third, the means whereby the corpses are revitalized is by being infused with Yahweh’s own life-giving spirit. This is how the first lump of clay became a living being; this is how these dry bones will come to life”.
gives death as the result of disobedience/sin (cf. 3:19), a concept which also fits here (cf. 37:23). MT’s context indicates that the Spirit will be upon them so they could have life and live in the land, to enable them to live holy lives, and LXX appears to capture this as an exegetical interpretation clarifying that this recreation is the activity of the Spirit of life. Duguid (1994, p.105) points out that here in Ezekiel “the result of Yahweh placing his rûah upon his people was to be life in the land, not prophecy (Ezek. 37:14)”.

There also seems to be an implicit theological choice of words intra-LXX regarding the Spirit/breath, with Σ967 stating ἐγὼ ἐπεγρώ ἐφ’ (‘I bring upon [you]’), yet ΣB,A state ἐγὼ πέρω εἰς (‘I bring into [you]’) [the Spirit/breath]. This may indicate a subtle shift in theology for how these LXX communities saw the interaction of the Spirit with humanity, as to whether they saw the Spirit’s interaction with humanity as internal leading or external directing (however, see below regarding ΣA in v. 6). We also ask if these communities were reflecting back on the Spirit’s being taken from Moses and placed upon the leaders of Israel (Num. 11:24-30).

---

214 This he contrasts with the usage in Joel 3:1f and Numbers 11 where the coming of the Spirit was for the purpose of everyone having the ability to prophesy, but here “the endowment with the rûah of Yahweh will not result in charismatic gifts but power for right living, which is itself the prerequisite for life in the land (Ezek. 36:27f)” (Duguid, 1994, p.105).
their abbreviation of πνεῦμα. Yet \( G^A \) again does not abbreviate, leaving the potential reading of ‘my breath/wind’. Block (1998, p.368) points out that both 36:27 and 37:14 may have influenced LXX’s \( \mu ν \) plus here. Even if this is the case, we see further evidence here of the LXX communities seeking to avoid theological confusion.

There may also be a slight theological difference with the variant between \( G^{967,A} \) saying the LORD’s πνεῦμα will be \( \dot{e} \pi \iota \) (on/upon) them, and \( G^B \), which follows MT (חנכון) saying \( eις \) (into) them (cf. v. 5). It is difficult to know if the earlier \( G^{967} \) and later \( G^A \) made a theological choice here, but it appears they did. Both \( G^{967} \) and \( G^B \) are consistent in their separate terminology in vv. 5 and 6 (\( \dot{e}πι/\epsilonις \) respectively), yet \( G^A \)’s use of \( \dot{e}πι \) here reverses its use of \( \epsilonις \) in v. 5, which suggests that it saw \( \epsilonις \) and \( \dot{e}πι \) as interchangeable. On the other hand, \( G^A \)’s scribe may have just mechanically followed the three occurrences of \( \dot{e}φ\prime \ ιμα\varsigma \) preceding this last occurrence.

37:7 ἀλήθειαν: 

37:7 καὶ ἐπροφήτευσα καθὼς ἐνετελάτο μοι καὶ ἐγένετο (\( G^A: + \phiωνη \)) ἐν τῷ ἐμὲ (\( G^{967,B}: \) προφητεύσα; \( G^A: \) προφητεύειν) καὶ ἰδοὺ σεισμός καὶ προσήγαγε τὰ ὀστά ἐκάτερον πρὸς τὴν ἄρμονίαν αὐτοῦ

\( G^A \)’s plus of \( \phiωνη \) reflects MT’s קָרִיל. Either \( G^{967,B} \) did not seek to reproduce קָרִיל, or it is a later MT and \( G^A \) plus as suggested by Allen (1990b, p.182), who says that it “probably originated as a [MT] comparative gloss inspired by 3:12,13 where the terms קָרִיל & רַעְשִׁן occur together”.215 If קָרִיל was a plus, then it was early, as it is attested in MasEzek. Block (1998, p.368) says that the whole Hebrew construction is “awkward but not unintelligible, nor is the construction unprecedented”.

---

215 As in 36:18, Cooke (1936, p.xlii) lists this MT as an occurrence where “\( G \) implies a Hebrew text free from words and phrases which appear to be additions or glosses in \( \aleph \)”. 
We also see LXX providing an interpretation of MT’s action of ותאכ‘ (‘and the bones came together, bone to its bone’), by indicating its result when it states καὶ προσήγαγε τὰ ὀστά ἐκατέρων πρὸς τὴν ἄρμονίαν αὐτοῦ (‘and the bones approached each to its joint’).²¹⁶ Therefore, LXX develops the result of the bones coming together; they will form joints.²¹⁷

There is a slight difference intra-LXX, with G\textsuperscript{967,B} saying προφητεύειν (aorist), and G\textsuperscript{A} saying προφητεύειν (present). G\textsuperscript{A}’s variant should be considered in conjunction with its φωνή plus, and may be seen as an emendation to align with MT seeing ב as emphasising continuous action.

²¹⁶ Block (1998, p.368), following BHS, notes that ותאכ‘ is minus in 2 Hebrew MSS, but these are later texts. It is present in all representative Hebrew texts, and so we will not treat it as a minus.

²¹⁷ Allen (1993, p.132) finds a wordplay between וברק here in v. 7 and וברק רבע in v. 12, 13 that he says “unites these parts” of the internal structure (specifically his ‘first and third parts’). LXX is unable to match this wordplay due to the words differences in Greek for ‘joined’ and ‘graves’ (cf. v. 9).

²¹⁸ Weissert (2002, p.138) argues that וברק‘ should not be changed from the qal to niphal as some would want, and concludes “that none of the ancient translations, each following the common ways of expression in their language, asks for one”.

37:8 καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἵδον ἐπὶ αὐτὰ νεῦρα καὶ οὐράκες ἐφύοντο καὶ ἀνέβαινεν ἐπὶ αὐτὰ
δέρμα ἐπάνω καὶ πνεῦμα οὐκ ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς

MT speaks of the action of the flesh coming on the bones (רָבָך וּכְלָּל ‘and flesh came up’), whereas LXX appears to translate the result to convey how the flesh came up on the bones (καὶ οὐράκες ἐφύοντο ‘and flesh grew up/germinated’).²¹⁸

All 3 LXX MSS abbreviate πνεῦμα here, suggesting they saw an absence of the Spirit and not just ‘breath’. This may have been influenced by their ‘Spirit of life’ variant in v. 5 (except there G\textsuperscript{A} did not abbreviate πνεῦμα as G\textsuperscript{967,B} did).
This verse exhibits a number of variants between MT and LXX, and intra-LXX, and more unusual, it exhibits an intra-MT sense division variant, all which indicates a text, and perhaps theology, in a state of flux.

MT\textsuperscript{A} stands alone amongst our representative MSS by having a *setumah* break in the middle of a verse, leaving the command to prophesy in v. 9, while placing the words of the prophecy for the *x;Wr* to come into MT\textsuperscript{A}'s v. 10, and thus in a separate division. This is one of five examples in Ezekiel where MT\textsuperscript{A} shows evidence of *setumah* break (‘a section division in the middle of a verse’). Here, this division occurs right before the phrase *hwIhy> yn”doa*; MT\textsuperscript{A} also does this in 27:3 (cf. Tov, 2001, p.53-55; Olley, 2003, pp.208, 211). This phenomenon most likely preserves another old tradition of verse division that appears to be independent of the paragraph tradition.\textsuperscript{220}

\textsuperscript{219} MT\textsuperscript{A} appears to evidence a break mid verse, with *x;Wrh’-la,* at the end of a line, and *rm;a’-hKo* starting with a two letter indent on the following line signifying a *setumah* break. We observe in Ezek. 36-39 that MT\textsuperscript{A} typically does not use a sof *pasuq* when a ‘verse’ finishes on the end of a line, but does have a *silluq.*

\textsuperscript{220} Olley (2003, pp.208, 211) notes that “as one might expect, instances of this independence are sparse. In [MT\textsuperscript{A}] … only one instance, in 3:16, also in [MT\textsuperscript{B,k,l}] (preceding ‘and the word of the Lord came to me saying’). [MT\textsuperscript{B,k,l}] have a further division in 43:27 (before ‘and it will be on the eighth day’), and [MT\textsuperscript{A}] a further three, in 20:31 (after ‘to this day’); 27:3 and 37:9 (both before ‘thus says the Lord’).
Perhaps MT$^A$ saw וְהָאָמְרָה as a sense division ‘phrase’ marker,\(^{221}\) or MT$^A$ theologically treated the first phrase in v. 9 as an *inclusio* to the previous verses, and set the divine speech as the beginning to the ‘interpretive’ section (which in MT$^A$ would be vv. 9b-14). However, MT$^A$ still continues the same reading tradition as found in MT$^{C,L}$, and as such can be seen to preserve two traditions, one of verse division and another of reading tradition.\(^{222}\) LXX faithfully follows MT until the end of this phrase (\(\text{G}^{967,B}\) also follow MT in syntax), but after this point LXX exhibits several variants, mostly which exhibit LXX’s wrestling with the various possible meanings of פְּנֵיהֶם.

\(\text{G}^{967}\) has a personal plus of σου to read ‘from your four winds/breaths come’. This plus may have been influenced by v. 6 and v. 14, and appears to clarify that this is the work of the Spirit, especially as \(\text{G}^{967}\) has twice abbreviated πνεῦμα. \(\text{G}^{967,B}\) do not abbreviate πνευμάτων, as they both did in the first two occurrences of πνεῦμα for this verse, suggesting they interpreted the action of the Spirit here as ‘wind’ or ‘breath’. This may be due to the ‘four’ directions from which the πνεῦμα was to come that led them to interpret ‘wind’ rather than ‘Spirit’.\(^{223}\) \(\text{G}^B\)’s manuscript evidences some ‘tampering’ here, that may suggest πνευμάτων was either corrected from an abbreviation,\(^{224}\) or more likely, that it was written over another word(s) now lost to us. The whole word is very spaced out in \(\text{G}^B\), especially the π.

---

\(^{221}\) Both Olley (1993, p.29) and Tov (2000, p.338) note that divine speech can begin new sense divisions in the Greek text.

\(^{222}\) Note that MT$^A$ has the same ‘geresh’ accentuation evident in MT$^L$ (cf. *BHS*) (Yeivin, 1980, p.167, #194; p.168, #195; and p.172, #201). This indicates that the reading tradition observed in MT$^A$ does not have a significant pause where the written paragraph exists.

\(^{223}\) Greenberg (1997, p.744) notes that “the concept ‘four winds/directions’ is found only in late books: e.g., Jer 49:36, ‘four winds, from the four extremes of heaven’; Zech 6:5 ‘the four winds of heaven’”. Cooke (1936, p.400) also mentions this point, but adds that the concept “goes back to an Akkadian idiom; this accounts for the use of the same word רֻעַח in two such different senses”.

\(^{224}\) The following word (ἐξέπλεξε) does not evidence any such textual correction, which may suggest that a later scribe just rewrote πνευμάτων, or even that the original scribe made an error that he immediately corrected. It is undeterminable as to what exactly happened here, and when it happened. Swete (1989, p.128) notes that “the MS. has been corrected more than once; besides the scribe or contemporary diorthotes (B$^1$), we may mention an early corrector to B$^5$, and a late, instaurator, who has gone over the whole text, spoiling its original beauty, and preserving oftentimes the corrections of B$^5$ rather than the original texts”. This may be one such case here!
$\mathcal{G}^A$ has a series of variants that must be considered together. $\mathcal{G}^A$ does not match $\mathcal{G}^{967, B}$’s abbreviation for the first use of $\pi\nu\epsilon\nu\mu\alpha$, yet it does match their abbreviating the second use of $\pi\nu\epsilon\nu\mu\alpha$. In the third occurrence (for MT’s τυπλα) $\mathcal{G}^A$ does not follow $\mathcal{G}^{967, B}$’s unabbreviated $\pi\nu\epsilon\nu\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron$, but instead $\mathcal{G}^A$ clearly interprets with $\acute{\alpha}v\nu\epsilon\omicron\mu\omicron\nu$ (‘winds’). This suggests $\mathcal{G}^A$ (or its exemplar) exhibits some confusion whether MT’s τυπλα is meaning ‘Spirit, breath, or wind’. Certainly $\mathcal{G}^A$’s use of $\acute{\alpha}v\nu\epsilon\omicron\mu\omicron\nu$ is an attempt to clear up any theological ambiguity, a practice we have previously seen with $\mathcal{G}^A$. But $\mathcal{G}^A$’s use of $\acute{\alpha}v\nu\epsilon\omicron\mu\omicron\nu$ must be considered in conjunction with its unique του ουνον plus, which is a common $\mathcal{G}^A$ abbreviation for ουφρανο(δ) (Ziegler, 1977, p.268).[225] This causes $\mathcal{G}^A$’s text to speak of the Spirit ($\pi\nu\epsilon\nu\mu\alpha$ abbreviated) coming from ‘the four winds of heaven’ or ‘the four heavenly winds’. $\mathcal{G}^A$ may see these as spiritual winds coming from heaven (and even commanded to come with its additional $\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon$ plus).[226] This may have been influenced by the contextual allusion to creation (see below). $\mathcal{G}^A$’s scribes may also have been reflecting upon v. 5 and $\pi\nu\epsilon\nu\mu\alpha\ \zeta\omega\eta\zeta$, along with reflection on v. 14 where the LORD will fill them with his Spirit (Eichrodt, 1970, p.508f). Interestingly, the Hexapla shows support for $\acute{\alpha}v\nu\epsilon\omicron\mu\omicron\nu$ from Aquila, yet he does not witness $\mathcal{G}^A$’s του ουφρανο(δ) plus (Field, 1964, p.869). This supports our point that this is a unique interpretative plus for $\mathcal{G}^A$. We may also suggest that Aquila was seeking to clarify that MT’s τυπλα here referred to ‘winds’ and not to ‘Spirit’.

Block (1998, p.369) says LXX “mistakenly” omits the vocative τυπλα, yet $\mathcal{G}^A$ does include it here, stating $\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon$ το $\pi\nu\epsilon\nu\mu\alpha$ ($\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon$ as an emphasising plus). As this

[225] For more on abbreviations in $\mathcal{G}^A$ see Thompson (1883, p.11; Swete, 1989, p.126).
[226] The primary usage for ουφρανο(δ) in Ezekiel is with the phrase τα πετεινα του ουφρανο(δ) (‘the birds of the sky/heaven’) [ουφρανος also abbreviated in $\mathcal{G}^A$] (cf. Ezek. 29:5; 31:6, 13; 32:4; 38:20). The only other occurrence (other than $\mathcal{G}^A$ here in 37:9) is in 8:3 where the Prophet is lifted up between ‘earth and sky/heaven’. For more on ουφρανος see Bietenhard (1976, pp.188-196).
vocative is found only in MT and $\mathcal{G}^A$, we may suggest this is a later plus, perhaps added at a similar time to the other unique MT/$\mathcal{G}^A$ plusses. The vocative makes this an imperative cry for the breath to come, and even contextually for the breath of the Spirit to come and create life in the raised but not resuscitated Israel (especially the case in MT). This emphasises the call for the Spirit to come back to Israel, even as a creative force.

LXX follows MT’s הַנֵּפֶר (חֲדוֹשׁוֹת) with its use of ἐμφυσάω. 227 These words were also used by MT and LXX in Gen. 2:7, and the matching use here suggests that the LXX community also caught this allusion for the Spirit to ‘blow’ as creation. 228 Greenberg (1997, p.744) also says the “the verb, from the root nph [breathe] is the very one used with God as subject in the creation of man [sic] in Gen 2:7. An allusion to that story is unmistakable”. 229 This suggests that these various communities saw the ‘dry bones’ event as a re-creation, or even a new-creation, of God’s people.

Fairbairn (1969, p.401) claims that MT’s יָשָׁר here and throughout the section, is not to be identified with the wind, for the thing wanted was to be called from the four winds. It is the life-breath, the spirit of life, immediate efflux of God, as the source of animated life in the creature”. This may be an oversimplification of the use of יָשָׁר here, yet his point of ‘the thing wanted was to be called from the four winds’ appears to be

---

227 As in v. 7, Allen (1993, p.132) also finds a wordplay that “bridges the second and third [structural] parts: יִשָּׁר ‘breathe’ (v. 9) and יִשהָר יָא ‘I will open’ together with יִשָּׁר יָא ‘when I open’ (vv. 12, 13)”. As noted in v. 7, LXX is unable to repeat this wordplay due to the different words used in Greek.

228 Kutsko (2000a, p.137) says “It appears that the vision in Ezekiel 37 halts (in v. 8) at a point that leaves Israel equal to its idols – and no better. Neither they nor the intermediate formation of bodies has יָשָׁר. Thus the re-creation process must continue, as it did at creation, with God’s breathing life into them. It seems certain, then, that Ezekiel 37 is consciously drawing this analogy with idols and thereby sharply signalling the distinction in the creation of the people of Israel”.

229 Seitz (1992, p.53) also finds that “the scene of humankind’s creation in the garden comes to mind. That scene is similarly graphic: Yahweh forms human creatures from the dust and then breathes the breath of life into the nostrils (Gen. 2:7-8). Without God’s spirit, there is no life. The biological reality is inherently a theological reality”.

how $\mathcal{G}^\Lambda$ interpreted it. We suggest these variances that emphasise the work of the Spirit here, and in the surrounding verses, may have even come from $\mathcal{G}^\Lambda$'s Christian scribes.

$\mathcal{G}^{967}$ also follows its previous use of $\varepsilon\pi\iota$ (‘upon’ cf. $\varepsilon\pi\iota$ vv. 5-6). In the same way $\mathcal{G}^B$ uses $\epsilon\zeta$ (‘into’ cf. vv. 5-6), and $\mathcal{G}^\Lambda$ also uses $\epsilon\zeta$, which agrees with its use in v. 5, but disagrees with v. 6 (cf. $\varepsilon\pi\iota$). Again, this may indicate a theological stance of the Spirit being ‘upon’ or ‘in’ humans, or it may just be a stylistic difference.

Also in v. 9, rather than using $\nu\tau\eta\varphi\alpha$ (‘dead’: 51x in Ezekiel), MT has $\nu\tau\delta\varphi\iota$ (‘these who have been slaughtered’, [HALOT]), whilst LXX has $\tau\omega\varsigma\nu\kappa\epsilon\rho\omicron\omicron\varsigma$ (‘these dead’). Whilst a slain person is dead, there seems a theological softening here away from ‘slaughtered’. 230

As in v. 9, we note that MT$^\Lambda$ retains another verse tradition separate from MT$^{C,L}$ that clearly links v. 9b with v. 10 in ‘sense division’ and thus theme, with the pericope ending at v. 14. This thematically places the command to the four winds as a lead into v. 10 that then gives the fulfilment of the command. This also causes vv. 9b-10 in MT$^\Lambda$ to be the part of the summary, or interpretive, pericope of vv. 11-14. For the other MSS v. 10 remains in the former pericope outlining the raising and resuscitating of the dry bones. However, as also noted above, MT$^\Lambda$ continues the reading tradition of MT$^{C,L}$

230 Block (1992a, 115 n.13) says note “also the abstract noun, hereg, ‘slaughter,’ in 26:15. Four of these associate the slaughter directly with the sword (23:10; 26:6, 8, 11)”.
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which allows MT to be heard as if there is no sense division in v. 9b, therefore preserving two traditions for us.

This verse (37:10) is pivotal as it concludes the pericope of the resurrection of the dry bones by having them standing ready for their future. Therefore, here we may have an implicit shift in how the various communities saw themselves before the surrounding hostile nations. MT says they are: נְתֵנָה לָהֶם מִבְּדֵי רֹאֶשׁ (‘an exceedingly great army/strength’). Yet LXX says συναγωγή (G^967^, Πολλή; Α: μεγάλη) ὁφόδρα (‘an exceedingly great assembly/congregation/multitude’). Cooke (1936, p.405) says that LXX “wrongly [uses] συναγωγή” here. In the other occurrences of לְרֵץ in Ezekiel (cf. 17:17 27:10 29:28, 19; 38:4, 15), LXX translates with δυνάμις, meaning ‘power/strength/army’ [LEH], and once with ἰσχύς ‘power/strength’ (32:31). Significantly, each of these occurrences refers to the armies of Israel’s enemies. Συναγωγή is used for לְרֵץ only here where it refers to Israel’s army, suggesting a theological choice of words.

In 38:4, 15, LXX uses both συναγωγή and δυνάμις to match MT’s לְרֵץ and לְרֵץ respectively, yet again in reference to the armies of Israel’s enemies. Significantly, the Hexapla records Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion all supporting MT stating δυνάμις μεγάλη (Field, 1964, p.869). This shows clear awareness of the meaning for לְרֵץ as δυνάμις, which raises the question why LXX uses συναγωγή in 37:10 now that the context refers to Israel’s ‘army’ (לְרֵץ). While συναγωγή also means ‘multitude’ [LEH], this still does not reflect the military image of MT’s לְרֵץ. Likewise, συναγωγή can be associated with ‘hostile intent’ (cf. Psa. 21:17; cf. BAGD # 5), yet this does not appear to be LXX’s meaning in 37:10. It is significant that LXX only uses συναγωγή elsewhere in Ezekiel in reference to the ‘gathering/multitude’ of the enemies against Israel, but

---

231 לְרֵץ has the meaning of ‘a company/assemblies’ or ‘a contingent for battle’ [HALOT]. LXX always translates this with συναγωγή (cf. 26:7; 27:27; 34; 32:22 (2x); 38:4, 7, 13, 15).
each occurrence is for לְגִיִּים not for לְגִיָּים (cf. 26:7; 27:27; 34; 32:22 (2x); 38:4, 7, 13, 15). There appears to be a deliberate lessening in LXX from MT’s ‘a great army’ when referring to Israel, to just a ‘great multitude/congregation’. Therefore, we suggest that whereas MT saw the ‘purpose’ for the resurrection of the dry bones was for a ‘great army’ as the whole house of Israel (v. 11), ready to be united into one kingdom (vv. 16-21), under a Davidic ‘king’ (vv. 22-25), able then to go into battle (ch. 38-39),232 LXX has seen this in a slightly different perspective.

We may suggest two possible scenarios: firstly, that LXX theologically translated συναγωγή for לְגִיָּים in 37:10 as a pointed statement against the συναγωγή of Israel’s enemies in 38-39. This was perhaps to show Israel is not insignificant amongst the ‘gatherings/multitudes’ of the surrounding nations. At the same time it lessens any interpretation by other nations that Israel would arise to be a military threat. Intra-LXX support may be found with how the earlier Θ967,Β have πολλά, yet ΘΑ strengthens this with μεγάλα. It is perhaps indeterminable if the use of the synagogue movement as a place of prayer and spiritual activity has any bearing on this translation, but we can propose this possibility.233

However, preference is to be given to our second suggestion: that LXX’s use of συναγωγή reflects the original chapter order witnessed in Θ967. In this chapter order the dry bones are raised to be a ‘congregation/multitude’ gathered for spiritual purposes to live out God’s Torah as one nation under a ‘peaceful shepherd Davidic ruler’, and not for military purposes (requiring δύναμις). This David comes with his harp, not his sword (see Excursus below). This also appears to be the explanation found in the following interpretive pericope (cf. ‘knowledge of the Lord’ and ‘my Spirit’, vv. 11-14). Thus,

232 However, it is significant that Ezekiel does not record this ‘army’ as entering any battle, not even in Ezek. 38-39. There we find God as the Divine Warrior, not his people, who fights for Israel (Greenspoon, 1981, pp.290-294).
233 For the uncertainty of the synagogue’s origins see ‘The Synagogue’ in Cohen (1987, pp.111-115).
rather than LXX ‘softening’ the text, MT instead has performed a ‘play’ on the Hebrew letters, strengthening from לָחְצִים ('assembly/congregation') to לֶחֶם ('army'). Therefore, we suggest that LXX’s use of σοφεργή in 37:10 reflects the original Hebrew, which was later changed from לָחְצִים to לֶחֶם, as further support for the change of chapter order, and the ‘call to arms’ motif (cf. Chapter 7: Papyrus 967). The later three exegetes’ use of δυνάμεις also supports our conclusion that this was an MT change done after the Vorlage for our three representative LXX MSS. This change from לָחְצִים to לֶחֶם would be likely to have been at a similar time to other such later editorial amendments (cf. MT’s declarative formula in 36:23b; the change from אֶ֥רֶץ to הֶלְחָנָן in 37:22-24; and from הַמֵּלֶךְ to הָנָּה in 39:29).

G's plus of ζωή continues the wording, and thus theology, from v. 5 (cf. 'breath of life'). Thus, this plus theologically interprets what kind of breath entered into the slain (cf. v. 5). G also has a theological plus by clarifying with a proper noun (κύριος) where MT and G have only a pronoun (also in v. 11).

4.2.2. 37:11-14

This pericope appears to be an interpretation, or an exegesis, of the previous pericope (cf. ‘these bones’ v. 11), yet it is not a clearly defined pericope in the various MSS. As noted above, MT starts a sense division in the middle of v. 9, but does evidence a petuḥah with the other MT MSS at the end of v. 14. We again note that MasEzek and MT have vv. 1-14 within the one sense division. MT differs, having a setumah after v. 10, and also after v. 12, finishing this pericope with a petuḥah after v. 14. This causes vv. 11-12 to stand alone in its own sense division in MT, emphasising the explanation that the dry bones in the previous verses are the ‘whole house of Israel’. This also indicates that MT's community saw the interpretive lament of hope being dried up in v. 11 as being answered by the prophecy of their graves being opened in v.
12. The result of knowledge of the LORD and indwelling of the Spirit is also given a greater emphasis. The change in metaphor from ‘bones’ to ‘graves’ in vv. 12-14 may also have influenced MT^L to mark this as a separate division.

\( \text{G}^{967} \) has vv. 1-14 as its own pericope, matching the two earliest MT MSS. \( \text{GB} \) has a two-letter break after v. 10, and a major break after v. 14, with v. 15 starting on a new line. \( \text{GA} \) again exhibits more sense divisions than any other representative MSS, with divisions after v. 9, 10, 11, 12a, 14. The MSS that have a division after v. 10 (MT^L, MT^A [break v. 9b], \( \text{GB}^{B,A} \)), appear to recognise that vv. 11-14 is a summary, or perhaps an interpretation, of the vision in vv. 1-10.

Only two verses contain discernible variants in this pericope (vv. 12, 13).\(^{234}\) These variants are only minor plusses, but they do carry theological weight regarding the dry bones as being the people of God.

\[ \text{37:12} \]

\[ \text{dia. tou/to profh,teuson kai. eivpo,n} \]

\[ \text{ta,de le,gei} \]

\[ \text{VAdwnai} \]

\[ \text{ku,rioj ivdou. evgw. avnoi,gw u`mw/n ta. mnh,mata kai. avna,xw u`ma/j evk tw/n mnhma,twn u`mw/n kai. eivsa,xw u`ma/j eivj th.n gh/n tou/ Israhl} \]

Both Zimmerli (1983, p.256) and Block (1998, p.369) state that LXX does not represent MT’s two plusses of 37:12, yet the later \( \text{GA} \) represents both (\( \text{pro} \)\( \text{ziz} \) and ʿAδωναί). This again may evidence a later MT plus inserted in time for the later \( \text{GA} \) to witness it (yet early enough for MasEzek to include both).

However, no representative LXX MS witnesses MT’s other plus (‘my people’). It is strange that \( \text{GA} \) did not follow its typical practice and include this plus, especially as it is included in MasEzek. Allen (1990b, p.183) sees this as “a comparative

---

\(^{234}\) Whilst we do not cover 37:11, Olyan (2003) has examined some nuances of לְעָלָּמָם. LXX uses ἡμῶν διασεκατεκάθωσεν here, which appears to capture MT’s meaning of being cut off and/or divided.
gloss on לְבֵית select ‘to a people’ in the verbal covenant formulation of v 27, citing יָמִי in the nominal clause of 34:30; it became attached to the wrong column. While Allen’s ‘scribal’ proposal has merit, there may be a deliberate theological reason for this MT plus. Zimmerli (1983, p.256) points out that MT’s יָמִי plus “introduces into the text the fully theological interpretation of covenant renewal and acceptance of the people of Yahweh”. We agree with Zimmerli’s point, and state that it is unlikely that LXX would have deliberately omitted such an important theological statement. Therefore, we can see this as an MT (and MasEzek) plus, theologically designed to give specific identity to those in the graves (cf. ‘bones’ vv. 1-11): they are ‘my people’. This avoids any thought of the surrounding nations being included in the restorative action, or the nations amongst whom God’s people live in exile. MT perhaps added this plus to provide a motive for the LORD’s restorative actions. This brings out the theology that if the people of God are slain, and in the grave (cf. ‘battlefield’ vv. 1-10), then it is God’s name and reputation that is at stake (cf. 36:22, 32). Block (1998, p.382) points out that any deletion of יָמִי “robs the promises in vv. 12-13 of a crucial theme. The exiles’ despondency arose from the conviction that with the fall of Jerusalem in 586 the deity-nation-land relationship had been ruined for ever”. Therefore, יָמִי helps restore this relationship of God’s people in his land (cf. 36:5; 38:16; 37:21).

235 When commenting on the presence of יָמִי in v. 13 Allen (1990b, p.183) proposes that it was assimilated into v. 12 from v. 13.

236 The pictures of ‘dry bones’ and ‘grave’ are most likely metaphors of exilic Israel (Eichrodt, 1970, p.510).
Allen (1990b, p.183) sees MT’s use of יָמִים as a “dittography from v. 12”. Yet both MasEzek and LXX represents יָמִים.237 There is an intra-LXX variance where \( \text{G}^{967}\) read ‘and I have brought up my people from the graves’,238 whereas \( \text{G}^{\text{A}} \)’s double plus of יְמָעֶז/יְמָעֶה again matches MT, (‘and I have brought you up from your graves, my people’). MT and \( \text{G}^{\text{A}} \) can be seen as emphasising that God is speaking to the people (יִשָּׁר), whereas \( \text{G}^{967}\) provide information of God’s intended action.

4.3. Section 2: Ezek. 37:15-28

As noted above, Ezekiel 37 can be divided thematically in half. The second half speaks of a United Kingdom (vv. 15-23), that will be governed by a Davidic ruler (vv. 24-28). Kutsko (2000a, p.139) says that 37:13-28 “expands the image of human recreation into the restoration of the kingdom of Israel … As section one promises recreation, section two promises reunification. Both are restorations of a previous reality”. Fox (1995, p.180 n.7) claims that “Ezek. 37:15-28 is probably a separate oracle joined editorially to vv. 1-14 because both speak of the future restoration of Israel”. However, we are without any textual evidence to support this proposal, and this last half can be seen as the ultimate fulfilment of the first.

Each representative MS evidences a major sense division before v. 15. All MT MSS have vv. 15-28 as one large sense division, as does \( \text{G}^{967} \). Yet \( \text{G}^{\text{B}, \text{A}} \) show a 2-3 letter break in the middle of v. 19, after the opening phrase of καὶ ἐρείς πρὸς αὐτούς; with no further break until after v. 28. The break mid v. 19 may have been inserted to provide an inclusio reply to v. 18 ‘they will say to you’, v. 19 starting with ‘but you will

237 Allen (1990b, p.183) previously stated that יָמִים in v. 12 is a “comparative gloss”, and then states here that יָמִים is a “dittography from v. 12”. This seems to be almost ‘double-dipping’ into his frequent ‘scribal-error’ explanation box.
238 Curiously LXX switches between using πᾶς μνήματα in v. 12 (2x) to τούς τέφοις here in v. 13 (2x), yet MT uses "רָב" in all four locations.
say to them’. This brings emphasis to the answer of ‘oneness/unity’ that follows in v. 19.

This whole pericope is intertwined with the themes of a scattered nation being formed again into a united kingdom, under one king/ruler, even a Davidic one, and a careful reading is required to grasp them all. We will find that LXX typically exeges MT’s metaphors that hold the various themes together (e.g., יֵעַ vv. 16-20). We will treat David as ‘king/ruler/leader’ in an excursus after v. 22, as this complex issue deals with more than one verse.

This verse has several plusses and minuses, and an LXX interaction with MT’s metaphors. Firstly, MT has יַחֲדָע that is not represented by LXX. MT Ezekiel’s יַחֲדָע is typically used as a theme change indicator, or even for special emphasis. Of the 23 verses in MT Ezekiel that begin with יַחֲדָע, LXX translated nearly all with קָאִי, so it is curious that LXX does not represent this.

Secondly, LXX omits the first יַחֲדָע ‘one’ [stick], yet in the next occurrence of יַחֲדָע uses דְּעֵהָרָאן, thus showing knowledge of the former and LXX’s choice to omit...
it. On the other hand, this is a good rendering of Hebrew idiom ‘one …. and one….’ as ‘a … and the second’.

Thirdly, some suggest that ‘Ephraim's stick’ may be an early addition to the text (cf. ‘Ephraim’ in v. 19). Allen (1990b, p.190, n.16e) claims this is something “MT and the ancient versions add … [and] is generally taken as an early gloss explaining the uncommon ‘Joseph’ as a designation of the northern tribes”.239 Zimmerli (1983, p.268) also says, “in comparison with the parallel of the first inscription, [Ephraim’s stick] is additional, [and] is to be judged as an explanatory interpretative element”. However, MasEzek also includes ‘Ephraim’s stick’, as do the three earliest LXX MSS. Therefore, this ‘early gloss’ must have been in the Vorlage of the earliest extant manuscripts, and we are without witness of a text that does not represent it. While ‘Ephraim’s stick’ does appear to explain the context, there is no reason why this could not have been in the Urtext. Hence, we find that this phrase fits the context, is found in all our representative texts, which must call into question any ‘gloss/plus’ proposal.

We suggest that there is a wordplay in MT between נַעַמְלוּת that had to come together (v. 1f), and פֶּשֶׁת that now also have to come together (v. 16, 19). However, this is not found in LXX.

We also note that MT says פֶּשֶׁת (‘wood/stick’), whereas LXX says ρόβδον (‘ruler’s rod, sceptre’).240 It is significant that in Ezekiel LXX only uses ρόβδον for MT’s פֶּשֶׁת here in 37:16, 17, 19 and 20, with ξύλων for all other occurrences in Ezekiel. The context here, as well as in the following verses (cf. vv. 17-20), indicates that MT’s פֶּשֶׁת appears to have the metaphoric concept of a ‘ruler’s rod’, and not just a plain ‘stick’,

---

239 Fisch (1985, p.250) points out that “the Northern Kingdom was named after Ephraim because its first king was Jeroboam, a descendant of that tribe”.

240 In its simple meaning ρόβδον may be translated as ‘rod/stick/staff’, however it is reasonably clear in this context that the LXX translator has the fuller meaning of ‘ruler’s rod, sceptre’ in mind [LEH]. This is all part of LXX catching MT’s metaphor and translating accordingly.
or even a ‘writing board’ (cf. v. 19 where the concept of sceptre is clearer). Fisch (1985, p.249) also captures MT’s metaphor and says the ‘stick’ here in MT is an “emblem of the royal sceptre”. Therefore, the LXX translator appears to have interacted theologically with MT’s metaphor of גבורה. It is quite possible that Ezekiel again had his mind on the book of Numbers as we found earlier (cf. Ezek. 36:14 and Num. 14), and is here echoing the 12 rods (יוחם) gathered by Moses (Num. 17:1-11), now stating that the northern and southern kingdoms should be united into the one ‘accepted’ rod, even as Aaron’s which budded showing God’s support for Aaron. Aaron’s rod was used to unite the 12 tribes of Israel and correct the rebellion that separated them (Num. 17:10). Even if this event in Numbers was not in Ezekiel’s mind, it seems to have been in the LXX translator’s mind, who may have either caught this ‘echo’, or made the link himself, as רֶפֶבּוֹנ is also used in Numbers 17, where it may well be referring to Aaron’s rod. Here it appears to carry the fuller meaning of a symbol of authority, as a ruler’s sceptre, (cf. Zimmerli, 1983, pp.273-274; Block, 1998, p.398). LXX may well

241 Block (1998, pp.397-406) and Wegner (1999, p.93) propose that these are just ‘writing boards’ used for ‘temporary messages’, which appears to miss MT’s metaphor. Even if Block and Wegner are correct, we can argue that LXX understood, or interpreted גבורה, as royal staffs, even as a ruler’s sceptre. Furthermore, Greenberg (1997, p.753) correctly notes that “while it is easier to write on a tablet or a diptych [i.e., a hinged writing board], the former does not associate with king or kingdom, and the latter in essence (di- “two”) contradicts the emphasis on oneness in this prophecy”. We can agree with Greenberg that both suggestions miss the metaphor.

242 Kutsko (2000a, p.140) argues that by using גבורה here, and in the following verses, “Ezekiel may be associating Israel with idols” and uses Hos. 4:12 to back his point. However, Kutsko appears to be guilty of fitting his thesis into the text instead of observing that the text itself explains the meaning of גבורה as the tribes of Israel, and not as idols (cf. vv. 18, 19). Furthermore, the text does not mention idolatry until v. 23, and then to say that the united kingdoms/tribes (גֵבָרָה) will not defile themselves with idols. Even if Kutsko is correct that this was Ezekiel’s intent, which is unlikely, this interpretation was certainly not given to the text by the LXX translator who correctly understands the גבורה metaphor (alternatively as a ‘ruler’s rod’, and as ‘tribes’) and now exegetes this for his community.

243 However, רֶפֶבּוֹנ is not used with this meaning in Ezekiel, except in chapter 19.

244 The context in Numbers declares this against the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram (Num. 16:1-40), and against the murmuring of the people (Num. 16:41-50), resulting in each tribe being required to present a representative leader with a ‘rod’ on which his name was written, and present them along with Aaron to the L ORD for his ‘selection’ (Num. 17:1-13). That the L ORD chose Aaron’s rod above the tribal representatives showed all Israel that their unity before the L ORD would be with Aaron, and thus the priestly tribe of Levi. Here in Ezek. 37:16-28 the context is that both Northern and Southern tribes will only find the L ORD’S acceptance and selection if they unite under the one Davidic leader. Their future was as a united kingdom, not a divided one.
have made this connection, as this pericope deals with the uniting of Israel’s divided nation, and it chose exegetically to use ῥάβδον to make the link clearer for the reader. Commentators suggest that LXX may also be reflecting back on Ezek. 19:11 “where the ῥῆμα ‘rod, stem’ that became a ruler’s sceptre is thrice rendered” (Allen, 1990b, p.193). With either thought, or even with both in mind, LXX looked into the fuller context of this pericope dealing with ‘king/kingdom’ (cf. vv. 22-25), and theologically expanded upon the metaphoric thought of יִשְׂרָאֵל now to state explicitly that a ruler’s staff or sceptre would be used to unite their nation (cf. v. 19). This is another case where LXX is happy to embrace metaphors and interpret them according to its community.

We also find that MT has שְׂרֵאֵל, which in this verse appears as a metaphor for the southern kingdom, and is translated by G967, with τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ. Yet GA has τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτῆς, thus avoiding the concept of Israel’s sons, making the context state ‘the sons of Judah’. This may be GA’s attempt to bring out MT’s Judah/Israel (southern/northern) metaphor in this pericope, again seeking to interpret a metaphor bringing clarity to the reader.

At the end of v. 16 MT has שְׂרֵאֵל, likely as a contextual metaphor for the northern kingdom. Yet LXX translates this again with τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ, instead of οἰκος Ἰσραήλ as in v. 11 (cf. v. 21 οἰκος for βίος). One the one hand, LXX may have

---

245 Allen (1990b, p.193) correctly points out “the factor of a different Greek translator [between Ezek. 19 and 37] must be borne in mind”.

246 Debate exists over the theological meanings and use of שָׂרֹאֵל, שִׂרְאֵל (83x in Ezekiel), and שִׂרְאֵל (11x in Ezekiel). It is generally agreed שָׂרֹאֵל refers to the covenant nation as a whole. Block (1998, p.402) suggests שָׂרֹאֵל has an ethnic focus, and is used in v. 16 to refer to the southern kingdom, whilst the use of שִׂרְאֵל is a reference to the tribes of the northern kingdom. Zimmerli (1983, p.565) does not believe that שָׂרֹאֵל is a general designation for the northern kingdom. The lack of consistency may have influenced Zimmerli’s disagreement, especially since this is the predominant phrase in Ezekiel referring to both northern and southern kingdoms. Regardless of how these terms are used elsewhere in Ezekiel, we can find support for Block’s suggestion of northern/southern designation here in v. 16.
translated with υἱοὺς here to harmonize with the beginning of the verse. However, whilst Ezekiel’s LXX translator(s) evidence some ambiguity when translating בִּי and בָּנָי (cf. 2:3; 35:5; 43:7), we may ask if there is a possible interpretative aspect, since υἱοὺς means not only ‘sons’ but also ‘descendants’ (cf. v. 21). This could be LXX’s way of including a reference to their present. The ‘house’ of Israel has been scattered into the Diaspora where the ‘descendants’ of Israel now largely exist. LXX may be attempting to capture the contextual motif of ‘oneness’ by using υἱοὺς for both designations. This may be the case, with the concern for continued unity and identification amongst the scattered tribes, and may be the genesis for LXX’s interpretation of the ‘tribal’ metaphors in v. 19.

There is an intra-LXX and MT ketiv/qere variant in this verse. With the intra-LXX variant, $\text{G}^{967,B}$ state προστεθέντας (‘those added to’), yet $\text{G}^{A}$ has προσκειμένους (‘those attached to’), which is a closer reflection of MT’s ketiv מָעַבֵּר (‘attached to him’; the qere מְעַבֵּר adjusts to the plural).248

37:17 καὶ συνάψεις αὐτῶς πρὸς ἀλλήλας σαυτῷ εἰς πάρθον μίαν τῷ δῆσαι αὐτῶς καὶ ἑσονται ἐν τῇ χειρί σου

MT has מָעַבֵּר (one [pl.])249, and LXX has τῷ δῆσαι αὐτῶς (‘to bind them’).250 Zimmerli (1983, p.268) proposes that MT’s מָעַבֵּר has been

247 We may also suggest that מָעַבֵּר has had a political concept attached to it, even as a royal house, and refers to the whole nation. Thus LXX’s use here of υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ may be an interpretative shift to focus on the people of Israel, and not a political entity (cf. v. 19 where LXX’s focus is on the corporate aspect of the people uniting as one).

248 Whilst מָעַבֵּר can have the meaning of ‘companions’ (KJV; NASB) or ‘associates’ (NIV; NRSV), in this context we find meaning of ‘joining’ as the reference is to the tribes of Israel joined to Judah and the tribes joined to Joseph.

249 Whilst rare, מָעַבֵּר is also found in Gen. 11:1; 27:44; 29:20; Dan. 11:20, where, as an adjective, it agrees in number with the noun.
misunderstood by [LXX] τοῦ δήσαι αὐτάς as a verbal form, and this has consequently brought about the independence of the conclusion in the form καὶ ἐσονταὶ ἐν τῇ χειρί σου”. We do note that the Greek is ambiguous. However, this may indicate exegetical thought rather than scribal error, as it may reflect the priestly view of being the spiritual caretakers for the people. This again shows the translator(s) of LXX speaking to their present times (cf. v. 16).

It is possible that MT’s use of בּרָק here was to echo the action of the bones in v. 7 as the same verb was used there. This same echo does not appear to be evident in LXX which uses συνάπτω here in v. 17 (‘tie/bind together’), yet προσάγω in v. 7 (‘bring forward’).

37:18 καὶ ἐσται ὅταν λέγωσιν πρὸς σέ οἱ νῦν τοῦ λαοῦ σου (Θ: οὐκ ἀναγγελεῖς; Α: λέγοντες οὐκ ἀπαγγελεῖς) ἢ μὲν τί ἔστιν ταῦτα σοι

Only Α follows MT רָקָל with λέγοντες. This may be another later MT plus followed by Α. The meaning of both ἀναγγελεῖς and ἀπαγγελεῖς is ‘report, declare’, but ἀπαγγελεῖς also has the concept of ‘explain, interpret’ [LEH]. This may have been the intended meaning by Α, as it fits the context of not just telling the story, but explaining and interpreting to their community. It is significant that in this context νῦν/νῦν means ‘descendants’, and is contextually referring to a united kingdom (cf. vv. 16, 21).

250 Brenton translates this verse from LXX as “And thou shalt joint [sic] them together for thyself, so as that they should bind themselves into one stick; and they shall be in thine hand”. Brenton is able to do this as his text has ἰναπατίς (reflexive) rather than αὐτάς. However, to date I have been unable to locate any LXX MSS that evidences ἰναπατίς in this location; neither Swete nor Ziegler lists any such variant. Brenton’s (1851) translation was based on the ‘Vatican text’, which probably means the Sixtine text (cf. Swete, 1989, pp.183-184; Jobes and Silva, 2000, p.71).

251 There are three possible ways to translate here: 1. ‘And you shall join them to one another, for yourself to bind them into one stick; and they shall be in your hand’ (taken as a unit); 2. ‘And you shall join them to one another for yourself, to bind them into one stick; and they shall be one in your hand’ (Dative of advantage); 3. ‘And you shall join them to one another for yourself into one rod to bind them; and they shall be in your hand’ (infinitive as epexegetically; or it could express purpose as in 2).
As above, we note that GBA have a small 2-3 letter break after the first phrase, thus placing this phrase with the preceding verse. This is possibly part of “scribal idiosyncrasy” wherein tāde légei kūrios was often treated as a divisional marker, almost in an “mechanical” way (Olley, 2003, p.212). Yet, in so doing, GBA highlight the speech that follows and at the same time place vv. 19-28 into its own pericope, emphasising the uniting of the kingdoms under the Davidic ruler.

Allen (1990b, p.190) claims MT and ancient versions add θν υφσφ as a ‘gloss’. Yet Block (1998, p.397) argues the MT “represents a natural explanation, given anachronistic reference to Joseph, probably added by the prophet himself”. This is found in MasEzek, and all representative LXX witnesses (χείρος Εφραίμ), therefore if a gloss it would have been very early, making Allen’s ‘gloss’ proposal unprovable (cf. v. 16, ‘Ephraim’s stick’).

Again in this verse, as in v. 16, LXX interacts with MT’s metaphors, exegeting and making them explicit for the reader. MT has @seAy #[e-ta, ('the stick of Joseph'), and later hd'Why> #[e-ta, ('the stick of Judah'). LXX has την υφσφ Ιωσφ ('the tribe of

252 Ephraim was a son of Joseph and received inheritance in the land, and as such ‘Ephraim’ is a reference to the Northern Kingdom, whilst Judah is a clear reference to the Southern. The importance of this plays out in the following verses where two kingdoms are united as one under a Davidic ruler.
Joseph’), and later τῆν φυλὴν Ἰουδα (‘the tribe of Judah’). With these two occurrences LXX deliberately interprets MT’s metaphors, twice using φυλὴν for γὰρ (not ἱάβδον as in v. 16, or ξύλον elsewhere in Ezekiel). Allen (1990b, p.190) points out that this is “due to the translator’s wish to replace metaphor with reality in this statement of Yahweh’s actions”. Block (1998, p.397) also notes that LXX is “interpreting the expression in accordance with ἱβεβετ, which also appears, rather than translating it”. This does not mean that the LXX translator is incorrect, but is capturing the concept that γὰρ in this pericope has the larger meaning of a ‘ruler’s sceptre’ (cf. v. 16). LXX views this rulership as corporate within the united northern (Joseph) and southern (Judah) tribes. MT appears to focus on the concept of the ‘ruler’ with reference to tribes (cf. v. 16), where LXX focuses primarily on the corporate aspect of ‘tribes/people’ and of their uniting. MT’s focus on the ‘ruler’ makes way for the one Davidic ruler in vv. 22, 24. At the same time, LXX’s focus on the oneness of the united tribes makes way for the one kingdom in v. 22. For the last MT wording of ἀναγεννήσει, LXX uses εἰς ἱάβδον μίαν (as in vv. 16, 17), perhaps because there is no direct tribal name attached with which to associate γὰρ, and the context speaks of one ‘rod/staff’. This metaphoric interpretation by LXX is a wider expansion from its existing use of ἱάβδον for γὰρ, which only emphasises this usage as interpretation (and again echoes v. 16 and the interaction with Num. 17). Overall, as in v. 16, LXX has captured MT’s metaphor of ‘ruler’s sceptre’, and exegeted it in the light of its community, seeing the tribes of Israel uniting together under one ruler (cf. vv. 22-25). As Greenberg (1997, p.755) puts it, the translators of LXX “reflect the views of the sticks as sceptres. They belong to the

253 In Ezekiel, ἱκέβεβετ can mean either ‘rod/staff’ but with the concept of a ‘sceptre’ and LXX follows this translating with ἱάβδος (19:11, 14; 20:37; 21:10), yet other times the meaning is ‘tribe’ wherein LXX uses φυλὴ (21:18; 37:19; 40-48 passim).
history of interpretation, anticipating in vs. 19 what is to be revealed only in vs. 22 – the restored monopoly on kingship of the Judahite Davidites”.

Also, in 37:19, MT states יד יבשทน בך 다ן יאדה יאדה מבר יאדה (‘and I will make them one stick and they will be one in my hand’), where LXX combines the first thought with the concluding phrase καὶ συνεται εἰς ἰσόδουν μίαν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ Ἰουδα (‘and they will be (ἡ 967: + μου `to me [as]’) one rod in the hand of Judah’). Allen (1990b, p.190) says “LXX renders βηρι Ἰουδα as if Ἰουδα which is an interesting evidence of the practice of abbreviation in Heb. MSS”. However, Block (1998, p.397) notes that LXX captures the intended sense of יד יבשTHON בך 다ן יאדה יאדה מבר יאדה, presumably reading Ἰουδα as Ἰουδα. BHS suggest deleting Ἰουδα, but this results in an unlikely reversal of roles for the respective tribes. MT is awkward but not ungrammatical if the pl. suffix on Ἰουδα is understood to refer to the tribes that the piece of wood represents, whereas the sg. suffix on Ἰουדα refers to the piece of wood that represents primarily Judah. Ἰουδα is then simply an appositional explanation for the suffix.255

Furthermore, Block (1998, p.397) claims that “LXX ἐν τῇ χειρὶ Ἰουδα reads the suffix on βηρ as an abbreviation for Ἰουδα”. Zimmerli (1983, p.269) also had observed this point, and stated that “אט appears of the unity of the nation of Yahweh, Ἐ accentuates Judean messianism”.256 This theological shift observed by Zimmerli suggests that the LXX translator was aware of the Hebrew, but doing another deliberate theological interpretation, as a trans-linguistic wordplay, to leave the balance of power in the hands of Judah. This may be the case with the later references in this chapter to Davidic

---

254 For ease of reading, I have put in the Hebrew letters rather than Block’s transliterations. This change applies for the other short quote from Block following this one.

255 We note that GKC (1910, §117m N) says ‘in 3719 read with Hitzig יאדה for יאדה’.

256 Cooke (1936, p.401) says that LXX’s “reading looks suspiciously like in the hand of Ephraim above, and may also be an explanatory addition”.

rulership (vv. 24-25). LXX has already shown theological exegesis in this verse and pericope, and we may be observing another example here. The focus on Judah and thus Jerusalem, and the centralising of the cultus, was a priority for the exilic and postexilic communities, as was their concern to eradicate idolatrous worship, which is also evident here in the text. Thus, instead of scribal error by LXX’s scribe, we suggest theological intent by wordplay to establish Judean priority. We further suggest that 967’s unique μοι plus strengthens this, indicating that this is the LORD’s view. The key word and concept in this pericope is ‘oneness’, and this is found, especially for LXX, in the restoration of the Davidic Kingdom and rulership (vv. 22-25). This also finds support from LXX’s interpretation of the Hebrew metaphors here, and in vv. 16-17. This is not to be seen as circular reasoning, but as further indication that LXX is interpreting and exegeting the Hebrew text.

We also ask why Ezekiel used ‘Joseph’ in the metaphor (vv. 16, 19), and it may be that this was a deliberate reference to the person in Patriarchal times that united his brothers together whilst in a foreign land, and brought unity and sustenance to the family. Joseph’s dry bones were those brought up out of the land of Egypt, which also fits the other primary metaphor of this chapter (Exod. 13:19; cf. Gen. 50:25). Thus Joseph was a participant in the Exodus, which again echoes the ‘new exodus motif’ found here and elsewhere in Ezekiel.257 Joseph is also representative of the 10 tribes of the so-called Northern Kingdom.

There is curious variant in 37:19, where Symmachus exegetes and expands on MT saying, καὶ δῶσω αὑτὰς μετὰ τοῦ συνιέναι τὴν φυλήν τὴν βασιλικὴν Ἰουδα (Field, 1964, p.870; Ziegler, 1977, p.270f).258 There are a number of difficulties in understanding Symmachus’ intent here, as well as translating the words into English.

257 Refer to my comments introducing Ezek. 36:22-32, and Block’s (1998, p.353).
258 It should be noted that the text of Symmachus here is Field’s retro-version from the Syriac into Greek (cf. Ziegler, 1977, p.271). Therefore the following discussion is based on Field’s speculation that this was in Symmachus’ Greek text.
Firstly, rather than using αὐτοῖς as other LXX MSS, he has αὐτάς (fem. pl.) which refers to the preceding ‘tribes’ (φυλήν), therefore focusing on the tribal identity. Secondly, he has his own unique plus of ‘μετὰ τοῦ συνιέναι’, which elsewhere in both Tanach and New Testament is translated as ‘with understanding/wise’ [LEH]. But here, with another accusative following, Symmachus appears to have intended the literal meaning of ἃν and thus ‘bring/set/join together’ [Thayer; LS]. Thirdly, Symmachus has unusually followed LXX’s exegesis of γῆ, writing φυλήν, breaking with his normal practice of strictly interpreting MT (Fernández Marcos, 2000, pp.128-133). Then fourthly, is his other plus of τὴν βασιλικήν (‘royal’), implying a king and/or a kingdom, something which LXX Ezekiel generally seeks to avoid when referring to Israel. We would expect Symmachus to avoid such terminology owing to the constant threat of Roman presence in his day, especially when there is no textual evidence for ‘royal’ in MT or LXX, indicating this is a theological plus. The accusative form of ‘τὴν φυλήν τὴν βασιλικήν Ἰούδα’, also makes it difficult to understand Symmachus. In addition δῶσω already has an object, and cannot refer to this. Perhaps the clearest sense is ‘I will put them [the tribes] together with the royal tribe of Judah’. With this phrase, Symmachus’ focus appears to be on the joining of all the tribes of Israel (cf. v. 16 for the parallel mention of the tribes of Israel associated with Judah). He then may be seen as promoting Judean priority by his use of ‘τὴν βασιλικήν’. Yet, we can offer no rational explanation at this point other than to say it is evidence of later theological expansion, perhaps resulting from internal tensions in the first centuries CE.

37:21 καὶ ἔρεις αὐτοῖς τάδε λέγει κύριος κύριος ἵνα ἐγώ λαμβάνω πάντα σῶμαν Ἰσραήλ ἐκ μέσου τῶν ἑνών οὗ ἐισήλθοσαν ἐκεῖ καὶ συνάξω αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ (ΘΑΒ: + πάντων) τῶν περικύκλῳ αὐτῶν καὶ εἰσάξω αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ
LXX interprets בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל with οἶκον Ισραήλ rather than υἱοὶς Ισραήλ, a reversal of v. 16. It also has πάντα as a plus. Most commentators correctly view vv. 20-22 as an interpretative section that exegetes the previous vv. 15-19 (cf. vv. 11-14). בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל in this context appears to be a reference to ‘all’ the descendants of their ancestor ‘Israel’, which includes both tribes (cf. Jacob, v. 25). On the one hand, LXX’s translation may be due to its inconsistency in translating בְּנֵי and בְּנֵי (cf. v. 16). However, it is possible that LXX may be interacting with this interpretative section, following the contextual flow of the uniting of tribes (cf. פְּעַלְמֵה v. 19), and of their descendants (v. 18), which now enables LXX to see ‘all’ of Diaspora Israel being gathered out of the nations, and so interpret them as ‘house’. LXX’s important πάντα plus lends weight to this, and may be an indication LXX is reflecting on v. 11 where both MT and LXX use the ‘whole house of Israel’ as an implicit reference to a united Israel (cf. GB, A’s other πάντα plus below). It may also be that the reversal of υἱοὶς and οἶκον between vv. 16 and 21 is an LXX theological inclusio within this pericope.

We also ask why LXX uses εἰσέλθοσαν (‘went into’) for MT’s הָלַךְ (‘walk/journey’), when LXX uses ἐπορεύθησαν (‘go, journey’) for all other occurrences in Ezekiel. This may be stylistic, but it may also be a contextual statement regarding the Diaspora, to include countries the Jewish people voluntarily entered, and not just referring to the exile.

Again in this verse, MT says בְּשֵּׁם אֲלֹהִים אֲלֵיהֶם (‘and I will gather them from all around’), where LXX says, καὶ συνάξω αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ (GB, A: + πάντων) τῶν περικύκλῳ αὐτῶν (‘and I will gather them from (all) that are around them’). Block (1998, p.406) believes that “LXX presupposes mikkol seḥibbōtām, ‘from all that surround them’”. Yet, LXX could be coming from the viewpoint of one translating in the land, and seeing the people gathered from all countries around them (cf. Allen v.
22). G\textsuperscript{B,A}'s plus of πάντων expands MT and G\textsuperscript{967} to emphasise the ‘united’ gathering will be from all the nations, covering the entire Diaspora and not just some of the tribes\textsuperscript{259}.

MT also says the LORD will bring them אְלֵ֑יָּהֵ֑י (‘into their own land/ground’), yet LXX interprets this clearly to state εἰς τὴν γῆν τοῦ Ισραήλ (‘into the land of Israel’). In so doing, LXX clarifies that ‘their own land’ is the land of Israel, which again may be seen as a view from one in the land, as it identifies the land. This supports the proposal that LXX is viewing a united and ‘whole house’ of Israel. However, we note that the entire phrase in both MT and LXX here in v. 21, and in Ezek. 36:24; 37:12, echoes the ‘new-exodus’ motif in Ezek. 36-37. That this phrase is found in Exod. 6:8 also supports the concept that Ezekiel saw the restoration of Israel from the exile as a ‘new-exodus’. Allen (1993, p.133) points out that

the restoration of the exiles to their own land is an important element in the interpretation. It grounds the metaphor of new life in Ezekiel’s general positive agenda of a new exodus. By implication it serves to identify the bringing up from the graves with the actual phase of exodus, which is then followed by the phrase of entry into the promised land.

\textsuperscript{259} For more on ‘gathering and return’ see Lust (1981b, p.139) who says, “most remarkable in Ezekiel is that the Gathering of the people and their Entry in the Land is pictured as an eschatological event as evidenced by ‘the clouds and the thick darkness’ accompanying it”. Lust (1981b, p.414) also concludes that “the formula of the Gathering and the Return does not occur in the early layers of the Book … In Ezekiel the formula does not strictly speaking mention a Return. It rather foretells the first real Entry into the Promised Land”.
Again this verse has a number of implicit theological variants that bear examining. MT starts with יָשַׁרְתִּי (‘I will make them’ [as one nation] in the land), whereas LXX states καὶ δῶσω αὐτοῖς (‘I will give/make them’ [into one nation in my land]). One of the uses of δίδωμι εἰς is ‘to make someone as’ (cf. 2Chr. 25:16, [LEHI]), 261 which is how Brenton translates here. Typically LXX uses δῶσω (δίδωμι) to translate יָשַׁרְתִּי (cf. vv. 6, 14, 19). Significantly, LXX translates every other occurrence of יָשַׁרְתִּי (in this form) in Ezekiel with ποιεῖ. 262 We suggest that δῶσω can still retain the primary meaning here of ‘to give’, and that LXX is reflecting back on 37:14 (δῶσω τῷ πνεύμα μου). 263 LXX may also have been reflecting on 36:5, and using δῶσω here as a reversal of the enemy’s gifting (δίδωμι) the LORD’s land to themselves (see μου below). Likewise, in 37:25, we find the LORD giving the land to Jacob (also δίδωμι). All these verses may well have influenced the translator to use δῶσω here rather than ποιεῖ. Whereas MT records that the LORD will make them as one nation, LXX appears to exegete this ‘making’ as the LORD giving or even gifting them ‘into a/one’ nation in his (LXX: μου) land. Thus, we may suggest that LXX sees ‘nationhood’ as a gift in the Lord’s land (cf. μου).

The concept of land ownership arises as the next point in 37:22, where MT says land, yet LXX says εν τῷ γῇ μου (in my land). Greenberg (1997, p.756)

260 We note the unique Ezekielian use of יָשַׁרְתִּי here for Israel; the other 86 occurrences of יָשַׁרְתִּי refer to other nations. That LXX uses εἰς εὖμα here indicates that יָשַׁרְתִּי was in its Vorlage and thus may well be original.

261 The context of 2Chr. 25:16 is in reference to an appointment, of a prophet being ‘made’ a royal counsellor.


263 We note that Ezek. 36:28 is not extant in $^\Theta^\text{67}$ and that 36:23c-38 is most likely an inserted pericope along with the chapter reordering. However, the wording τῆς γῆς ἡ δόξα ιύμων found in 36:28 is also found elsewhere which may well have also influenced the translator here (1Kgs. 9:7; 2Kgs. 21:8; 2Chron. 7:20; 33:8; Jer. 24:10; 25:5; 42:15).
says “‘the land’ unqualified is the land of Israel, as in 20:40, hence Θ ‘my land’ is not preferable.” Cooke (1936, p.402) likewise says that “on the mountains of I[srael], a phrase charged with sentiment, gives all the definition required” [italics his]. Allen (1990b, p.190) also says that not only is [μου] inappropriate here … but it is significant that in the context the LXX reflects assimilation to other passages: to v. 11 rendering ‘house’ for בַּנֶּי ‘sons’ in v. 21a; to 28:24 in translating ‘from all around them’ for מַעֲבֹד ‘around’ in v. 21b; and to v. 12 in its translation ‘the country of Israel’ for אֲרָמָה ‘their country.’ Correspondingly, here the influence of 36:5 is probable.\(^\text{264}\)

Commentators like Allen point out a number of the implicit theological exegeses that LXX is undertaking in this pericope. This plus of μου helps support the suggestion that LXX has not misunderstood this pericope, but is doing a deliberate theological exegesis, seeking to apply the text hermeneutically to their community. As such, we need to consider the above mentioned variant of δοσοῦ along with this μου plus, and suggest that LXX viewed this as God’s land gifted to his people. For the Hebrew text, these are all future projections and hope, but for the later LXX translators they appear to be present possibilities and even partial realities. Thus the use here of ἐν τῷ γὰρ μου’ may be an attempt to bring personal ownership and involvement of God in the land and people. After proposing various reasons why MT should not be emended here (cf. בָּאָרָא אֲדֹנָי בָּאָרָא, and with בָּאָרָא אֲדֹנָי בָּאָרָא v. 21),\(^\text{265}\) Zimmerli (1983, p.269) states “nevertheless, it might be wondered whether the whole complex, which is decidedly superfluous in the parallel structure of v 22a/b [nation-king & kingdoms-nations], is not a secondary theological interpretation”. But Zimmerli does not state here, nor in the body of his commentary, what that secondary theological interpretation might be! At least Zimmerli is willing to face the possibility of this being an interpretation rather than a scribal error.

\(^{264}\) In addition to 36:5, we may also include 38:16 as possible influence for LXX.

\(^{265}\) Block (1998, p.406) says that “LXX presupposes בָּאָרָא אֲדֹנָי בָּאָרָא.”
Again in 37:22, LXX has another subtle plus where the nation will be established: MT says ‘in the land on the mountains of Israel’, cf. chapters 6, 36, whereas LXX says ‘in my land and in the mountains of Israel’). LXX’s plus may serve as an exegetical clarifier to say ‘that is in’, or it may be that LXX seeks to mention both ‘land’ and ‘mountains’ as emphasis. Either way, LXX again interacts with the text.

There is a minor MT variant, where the qere appears to correct the ketiv to state “and (it ketiv) (they qere) shall no longer be two nations”). Greenberg (1997, p.756) suggests the ketiv “looks like a scribal error influenced by yhyh four words before”. Zimmerli (1983, p.270) notes that the ketiv “suggests a king for each nation”. We note that G’s unique plus of οὐκ strengthens the point that the kingdoms will never be divided again into two kingdoms.

LXX does not reflect MT’s last instance of θυτής, perhaps because it was “either recognizing its superfluity or reflecting of a different Vorlage” (Block, 1998, p.407). The number of variants in this verse may reflect a different Vorlage, but more likely these are theological variants. This verse, along with the following verse, and even the pericope, indicate a text in a state of theological flux.

We also find a subtle, yet very important, difference with the leadership of this nation. MT says ‘and one king shall be king for all of them’). LXX says ‘and one ruler/prince shall be for ( all) them’). LXX does not translate κυρίων with βασιλεύς, instead using αρχων. LXX also does not reflect MT’s double usage of ‘θυτής’ with either ‘βασιλεύς/αρχων’. G’s dative αύτων (cf: G: all) variant may reflect awareness of MT’s τοις, but it

266 See 36:14 for comments on how the qere can correct the ketiv. We may note that given the possibilities that the ketiv / qere variants may reflect diverse text traditions, it is a moot point for us as to which is earlier.
does still not witness לְמִלְתָּם לְמִלְתָּם. G\textsuperscript{A}\textsuperscript{s} πάντων reflects MT’s לְמִלְתָּם, but we question why G\textsuperscript{A} did not translate the second word, לְמִלְתָּם. Wevers (1982, p.197) suggests that LXX “rightly omit[s] the late gloss ‘king’ lmlk … [which] may be a copyist’s dittography of lklm, ‘for all of them’, in scramble”. A copy error may be the case here, and his ‘late gloss’ suggestion is also possible. Lust (1986a, p.218) says that “in 7:27 and once in 37:22 the Greek has no equivalent for Hebrew [מִלְתָּם]. Most likely [the translator] did not find [מִלְתָּם] in [his] Vorlage”. This also is a possibility, but these explanations do not answer why LXX consistently translates מִלְתָּם in this pericope with שְׁלֹשׁ. A ‘simple’ explanation may be that LXX deliberately made these changes with theological intent, including using שְׁלֹשׁ for מִלְתָּם, due to their views on the new Davidic leadership. LXX includes the concept of a united Israel but it does not reflect a king, but rather an שְׁלֹשׁ (‘leader/ruler’) for them. Yet this appears to be a complex issue, theologically motivated, and affecting more than one verse. Therefore we will treat this issue in its own Excursus.

4.3.1. Excursus on מִלְתָּם, שְׁלֹשׁ, and שְׁלֹשׁ in Ezek. 37:22-25.

Earlier in Ezekiel, the LORD is declared the one who will ‘be king’ over the people (cf. 20:33 מִלְתָּם בַּשָּׁלֹשָׁהוֹ). Joyce (1998, p.335) suggests that מִלְתָּם in 37:22 may still refer to “God as king”. This underlying theology appears to have influenced the wording when referring to the kings of Israel. Of the 37 occurrences of מִלְתָּם in Ezekiel, it is significant that 25 of these refer to kings outside Israel. מִלְתָּם is used for Israel’s kings in just five main places: 1:2 (as part of the date formula); 7:27 (כַּלָּמָה will

\footnote{For more on how God is King in Ezekiel, and the Hebrew Bible, see Brettler (1989).}

\footnote{Joyce (1998, p.335) does clarify “However, on balance, the most natural reading of 37.22 is probably as a reference to a human king”. The ‘humanness’ is clearly seen with the use of כַּלָּמָה.}
mourn); 17:12 (רְעַ֥ה into exile); and finally that which has specific interest to us, 37:22, 24 where it speaks of a future Davidic king. While Ezekiel does not avoid using לְלִּי for Israel’s leaders, he does show a significant preference for נְשָׁר ('prince/ruler'; Ezek. 7:27; 12:10, 12; 19:1; 21:12, 25; 22:6; 34:24; 37:25). Lemke (1984, p.174) suggests that לְלִּי “may have had misleading or even negative connotations” in Ezekiel’s day.

Ezekiel’s preferred title of נְשָׁר for Israel’s kings and leaders appears to bring out the vassal aspect of Israel’s kings in a world where Babylon dominated. It also describes how Ezekiel typically sees the future leaders (cf. נְשָׁר v. 25). Duguid (1994, p.32) points this out saying, “it is reasonable to suppose that Ezekiel intended by the term נָסי’ to convey a ruler with limited authority, genuinely representative of the people”. He also states that “the distinction between melek and נָסי’ is not hard and fast: the great emperors of Babylon and Egypt are always designated melek, but petty kings may go by either title” (Duguid, 1994, p.20). Joyce (1998, p.330) says that נְשָׁר is “used elsewhere mostly within what has commonly been called ‘Priestly’ material …. It is the technical term of the leader of a clan, and is always used of authorities in subordination to a greater authority (e.g. alongside Moses in Exod. 16:22)”. After examining its usage in other books, McKeating (1993, p.111) concludes that נְשָׁר as ‘leader’ “certainly does not imply royal status, but does not exclude it. That is to say, נָסי’ was not usually a king, but it was not felt inappropriate to apply the word to a king”. The title נְשָׁר rather than לְלִּי is used in 40-48, and without any clear Davidic-messianic nature. Yet this

---

269 Some of these occurrences appear to refer to ‘leaders’ rather than just ‘kings’ (e.g., 7:27 has both לְלִּי and נְשָׁר in the same verse, indicating נְשָׁר there refers to a leader under the king (cf. 32:29 of Edom). We also find in 22:6 that the לְלִּי are guilty of oppressing the people, which again appears to include more than just the king. This lends support for our point that נְשָׁר has a vassal concept to it in Ezekiel.

270 Cross (1975, 15) also notes that “the leader of the first return [from Babylon] was Sin-ab-asur, the heir to the house of David, son of Jehoiachin. He is given the title nāṣî, which Ezekiel and his circle in the Exile preferred to meleḵ, ‘king’, in designating the new David’s office” (cf. Ezra 5:14-16). This may have been part of the exilic Jewish terminology.
“does not imply a denial of its Davidic-messianic nature. The אֲדוֹנִי is a vassal of Yahweh, a shepherd who serves under the divine shepherd” (Raurell, 1986, p.85).271

Therefore, MT’s use of לֵלֶל in 37:22, 24 is theologically important, as Block (1998, p.414) points out: “the present choice of melek highlights the restoration of Israel to full nationhood. To the prophet’s audience, the use of nāṣî‘ would have signified less that complete restoration”. In an earlier work Block (1995, p.171) writes, “in several ancient texts the divine appointment of a human king represents … the climax of the normalization of the relationship between a deity and his land/people. Accordingly, Ezekiel’s anticipation of a new [messianic] king over his own people would have been understood by ancient Israelite and outsider alike”. The context in v. 22 deals with a ‘united kingdom’ which requires a ‘king’, and thus MT uses לֵלֶל. Greenberg (1997, p.756) says the contextual “parallelism of ‘one nation—one king’ / two nations—two kingdoms’ supports the authenticity of the term ‘king’ against G’s translation ‘chief’”. MT’s use of לֵלֶל implies that this לֵלֶל will be a real king, ruling over a sovereign united kingdom and maintaining cohesive unity. The identity of this new king is not given until v. 24, where we find he will be a king like David, indicating a renewed ‘Davidic Kingdom’. Adding to Block’s point above, the exiles would have seen this Davidic king and kingdom as the ultimate fulfilment of restoration. Unlike אֲדוֹנִי, the use of לֵלֶל identified with ‘David’ of old, suggests a military leader.

This raises the question as to which facet Ezekiel’s Davidic leader will exhibit: warrior or worshipper, or even both. The use of לֵלֶל shows that “Ezekiel does not discard the Judahite monarchy, he refashions it. The prophet had a place for a monarch but not for the monarchy, that is, the social, political, and economic system associated

271 Fisch (1985, p.251) simplifies this by saying “while king signifies a political ruler, shepherd denotes a spiritual leader”. Raurell (1986, p.89) says that for “the Greek translator … the ideal future king of 40-48 cannot be like the one of 1-39, in spite of the fact that MT always defines him as நேவிஞ்.
with the king” [italics mine] (Vawter and Hoppe, 1991, p.204).\textsuperscript{272} Sloan (1992, p.150) says, “the reunion of God, land and people can only occur at the same time as a new political order does”. However, Sloan (1992, p.150) notes that Ezekiel “does not offer a new political order as the means by which the people will return to the land”. Nowhere does it explicitly indicate that this Davidic leader will be a military conqueror, it is only implied by the pericope’s position before the Gog epic. Significantly, all four occurrences of ‘David’ in Ezekiel are prefaced with ‘my servant’ (cf. 34:23, 24; 37:24, 25). Furthermore, the context of v. 24 indicates the duties of this Davidic \( \text{נְוָלֵי} \) will be that of a \( \text{נָבַטֵ֔ן} \) (shepherd), who will enable the people to ‘walk in my judgements and observe my statutes and do them’.\textsuperscript{273} Then, in v. 25, we find a ‘softening’ in MT where \( \text{נְוָלֵי} \) is used in reference to David, perhaps to state implicitly that this future Davidic leader will be a vassal under God, even as the \( \text{נְוָלֵי} \) of the united kingdom (vv. 22-24). As such, this new Davidic king/ruler in v. 25 “will have a pastoral charge, to watch over the morals and religion of his people”, rather than being a military leader (Cooke, 1936, p.402). In the same way, this \( \text{נָבַטֵ֔ן} \) “is to devote himself entirely to the liturgy, just as Deuteronomy’s king is to devote himself entirely to the study of the Law (Deut. 17:18-20)” (Vawter and Hoppe, 1991, p.204).\textsuperscript{274} Speiser (1963, p.111) says that “in Ezekiel’s view, great temporal power does not appear conducive to spiritual excellence, hence the prophet’s personal preference for a modest principality as opposed to an

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{272} Levenson (1986, p.68f) also argues that in Ezekiel \( \text{נְוָלֵי} \) and \( \text{נָבַטֵ֔ן} \) can appear synonymously and that Ezekiel and his school have “not discarded kingship. They have reinterpreted it …. [as they] sought to bring the institution of monarchy under the governance of the Sinaitic covenant”. Lemke (1984, p.180) concludes that “Ezekiel and his disciples were not necessarily looking forward to the restoration of the Davidic monarchy. David in this passage is more an ideal symbol of Israelite unity than a specific past or future historical figure”.
\item \textsuperscript{273} Brettler (1989, p.36) points out that “shepherd is one of the oldest appellations for kings in the ancient Near East” and then says “it is likely that the metaphorical use of ‘shepherd’ of Israelite kings contributed to the literary depiction of David (and possibly Moses) as actual shepherds”.
\item \textsuperscript{274} Cooke (1936, p.403) also states this future Davidic leader “is overshadowed by the ministry of worship; his function amounts to little more than providing and attending the sacrifices on Sabbaths and festivals, 441-461-12:16-18”.
\end{itemize}
ambitious empire”. Therefore, we find in MT Ezekiel’s theology more the concept of David as ‘worshipper’, than David as ‘warrior’.275 Sloan (1992, p.150) also says Ezekiel “sees both political order and return to the land as simultaneous ends towards which spiritual practice is aimed”. This questions MT’s use of לַמְלִים in vv. 22-25. Overall, we find in MT one theology that has a resurrected and restored United Kingdom requiring a king, even a Davidic ‘military’ king, and then another theology where this Davidic מָלֵךְ would lead the people in spiritual pursuits, and not military activities. These two theologies represent that found in the two extant chapter orders of the received text, and that in G967.

LXX has captured the sense of מָלֵךְ with its use of ἀρχων, as it “reflects adequately enough the function, if not the etymology, of nāṣî’” (Speiser, 1963, p.111).276 Yet, our interest is why LXX has translated לַמְלִים with ἀρχων, rather than with βασιλεύς in 37:22, 24. LXX does not evidence any major hesitancy in using ‘king’ when referring to those outside Israel, consistently translating with βασιλεύς.

McGregor (1985) and Raurell (1986) discuss277 in detail the terminological preferences of the various LXX translators of Ezekiel. LXX uses βασιλεύς for Israel’s king only in 1:2 (cf. the date formula), and significantly in 20:33 discussing the LORD’s ‘kingship’ (βασιλεύς ὥσπερ ἐφ’ ὑμῖν), thus capturing Ezekiel’s theology of the LORD as

275 Significantly, and perhaps in support of this point, this Davidic leader is not directly mentioned in the battles against Gog and his hordes, but rather there God is the ‘warrior’ (cf. 38:4a, 16, 21-23; 39:1-4, 6-7, 11). However, if chapter 37 came after chapter 39 in the Urtext, then this could also explain the absence of David as warrior against Gog. Ezekiel, and the translators, retained the position of God as warrior.

276 Speiser (1963, p.114) later says “analogously, nāṣî’ goes back to nāšā’ ‘to raise’ …. the title, in short, stands for a duly elected chieftain”.

277 Raurell (1986, p.89) argued that the varied terminology used by LXX translators was due to their theological diversity. He proposed that ἀφηγομένος used in 40-48 is used in a positive sense “as the ideal future monarch, who never transgresses in either the ritual or social sphere” and as such “becomes the antithesis of the ἀρχων” used in 1-39. However both Lust (1986a, p. 219) and Duguid (1994, p.22) reject this proposal, largely because of how LXX uses ἀρχων in a positive sense for a future Davidic ruler here in 37:22, 24. This ruler is still not presented as a ‘king’, nor have any royal sense to this title.
Israel’s king. Lust (1986a, p.219) notes that ‘translator β’ consistently uses ἀρχων for either דָּלי or נְשִׁי. The exception noted by Duguid (1994, p. 23) is where “melek is found together with nāši’ or nāgīd … [then] LXX harmonized the two terms, understandably in the light of Ezekiel’s own usages, and translated both by archōn”. Thus, here in 37:22-24 LXX may have simply picked up on Ezekiel’s preference for נְשִׁי, and under influence from the use of נְשִׁי for a Davidic king in v. 25 and 34:24, translated with ἀρχων here. At the same time, LXX may well have grasped the implicit Ezekielian theology that the future Davidic ruler over the United Kingdom would be a spiritual vassal under God’s kingship, and so reflected this, using ἀρχων.

Block (1998, p.407) notes that some suggest MT should be emended in vv. 22-24 from דָּלי to נְשִׁי to follow LXX’s ἀρχων, but concludes supporting MT because “melek provides a better correlative with ἡγούμενος”. Block (1998, p.407) also notes that others, like Rofé, “attributes LXX to a theological revision in the Vorlage”. However, Zimmerli (1983, p.269) finds in favour of MT, stating that “the clear correspondence with the following τῶν βασιλείων, which is also attested without doubt by in βασιλείαις, is a much stronger argument for the retention of MT and for believing that has assimilated to 34:24”. Allen (1990b, p.190) also believes contextual assimilation with 34:24 occurs here. While we agree that it appears assimilation and even harmonization with 34:22-24 has taken place in 37:22, 24, we have to ask why LXX chose to do this.

The context of 34:24 supports the ‘vassal’ terminologies of נְשִׁי and ἀρχων, as it talks of Israel as a flock (34:22), over which God will set up a Davidic shepherd (רְעֵה), who will be a ‘ruler in their midst’. It is also significant that the context of Ezek. 34 is reflective, focused on the correct versus incorrect nurturing and leading of God’s people by their rulers. The earlier context (34:1-10) challenges the previous ‘shepherds’ (רְעֵה / ποιμήν) who had not cared for the ‘flock’ but only for themselves,
negatively implicating the kings in pre-exilic times. The latter context (34:22-24) corrects this by the appointment of a Davidic shepherd who will rightly care for the LORD’s flock.

But the context of 37:22-25 instead speaks of national Israel which once was dead but is now resurrected (vv. 1-14), gathered together again as a united kingdom (vv. 15-21), and requiring a significant ruler like David of old who will lead this united Israel into their future. The context of the surrounding chapters indicates restoration will be in the presence of the surrounding nations, who will witness the LORD doing this for his sake (36:22). In this context, and in the received chapter order, MT is correct in using יְלָד rather than יָשָׁר, because, as Block mentioned above, this will signify to all that Israel has reattained the status of full nationhood, and that full restoration has been reached because the new Israel is the equal to the high point of its past when it was united under David. This theology should have been discerned and embraced by LXX.

We have two proposals for LXX’s use of ἀρχων. Our first, is that LXX made a theological choice in vv. 22, 24 to overlook the original theological context of a ‘βασιλεία’ (cf. v. 22) requiring a ‘βασιλεὺς’. Instead, the translator theologically softened MT’s יְלָד, and has Israel in its restored state before the nations being led by a non-threatening ἀρχων. Even if this use is harmonizing, there is still the issue as to why harmonize. This may have been influenced by their socio-political situation, reflecting the ‘vassal’ leadership structure of Israel in Hellenistic and/or Roman times. Ezekiel’s ideal may have been a ‘king’ equal to the other kings around them, or as the military David in the past, but the reality in LXX’s timeframe was that Israel’s leader could only be a vassal ‘ruler’. The translator may also have been influenced by the theology that the future leader of Israel will only be a peer from among them (cf. Deut. 17:15), and, as noted above, this leader would be for spiritual purposes rather than military, and would be a vassal under God. This proposal also includes the possibility of LXX using ἀρχων
in this pericope as a political statement to their own ‘leaders’ who were seeking to promote themselves above the boundaries of their office. One such office may be that of the Maccabean high priests who were not widely accepted as the authentic high priests or as the correct [Davidic] king. Lust (1985, p.190) argues that in Ezek. 21:30-32 the LXX translator has adjusted the text and now the oracle reacts against the unification of the royal and the priestly functions. It condemns the high priests who prefer the royal powers over the priestly ones and announces the coming of a new high priest who will be worthy of the priestly turban. One would call this a priestly messianic expectation as opposed to a royal Davidic messianic expectation.

However, our second proposal considers the chapter reorder. In our Chapter 7 we discuss the different theologies behind the two different extant chapter orders; the received order, and that in $G^{967}$ where chapter 37 comes after 38-39, which likely reflects the original Urtext. In this original order, the theology reveals a peaceful shepherd Davidic figure focused on worship and Torah observance, from which the textual flow goes into the building of the Temple. $G^{967}$’s David does not need to be a military leader, as Israel’s enemies (Gog and his hordes) are already destroyed by God. However, the chapter change to the received order places the dry bones and uniting of the nation before the Gog epic. We propose in our discussions, that this chapter reorder was motivated by a ‘call to arms’, which required a military Davidic leader. As additional support for this change, and to encourage the ‘call to arms’, and to give greater status to current military leadership, we suggest the later Hebrew editor(s) also ‘strengthened’ the wording in 37:22-24 from אֲזוֹן to נְזֵן. Therefore, rather than LXX

---

278 Lust (1985, p.180) claims that “the LXX version of Ez. xxi 30-32 corresponds with, or prepares for, the messianic ideas en vogue at Qumran and in some of the intertestamental literature”. He does note that “however, other books of the LXX do not seem to follow this trend” (ibid).

279 Lust (1985, p.177) also said that “one cannot say that the LXX as a whole displays a messianic exegesis. Most often the translation is literal, without any messianic bias. In other cases it shows a shift in accentuation, thereby weakening the royal messianic character of the text”. 
‘softening’ the Hebrew, we propose that they found נַעַשׁ in their Vorlage, not מַעַל. This would explain why Σ₉⁶⁷, which likely represents the Old Greek, and perhaps the Urtext, also has ἄρξων, and the later LXX MSS continued this reading. Σᴮᴬ witness the chapter reorder, but these later minor editorial changes were not in their Vorlage.¹²⁸⁰

This would have been done at a similar time to other changes done after, and in support of, the chapter reorder (cf. 36:23b; ἡτ’ ἐπότις to ἴδησα in 37:10; ἤδη to ἐπώρεσεν to 39:29). MasEzek witnesses these changes, showing they are early (and Jewish), but yet still not witnessed in LXX’s Vorlage.

4.3.2. 37:23-28 (resumes)

LXX begins v. 23 with ἵνα μὴ, which continues the prophecy from v. 22. Thus v. 23 provides a theological reason for the combining of the kingdoms into one nation. Under a Davidic ruler, and even for the dry bones to be resurrected to life, they must no longer defile (μιαίνονται) themselves with idols. By this, LXX continues to interact interpretively with the text, reflecting back on the Davidic kingdom that worshipped God under David’s rulership and his tabernacle (vv. 24-28). MT simply gives a

¹²⁸⁰ Several points already discussed above in this Excursus also lend support to our proposal that the original Hebrew contained נַעַשׁ. We summarise these as: this reflects the underlying Ezekielian theology of God as King; ‘king’ is not used in Ezekiel with a military sense for Israel’s leaders; Ezekiel shows a preference for נַעַשׁ; the title of נַעַשׁ is exclusively used in the following block of 40-48; prophet had a place for a monarch but not for the monarchy; the immediate context vv. 2-24 has no military indication, only that of shepherding the people as a spiritual leader.
statement that they will not defile themselves, but this is not given as a reason for the restorative words in v. 22. LXX’s interpretation again echoes the postexilic concern to remove idolatry from the land.

We also find that MT, MasEzek and the later $\mathcal{G}^A$, include three areas of uncleanness, with the earlier $\mathcal{G}^{967,B}$ only one:

1. $\text{בַּעַל} \text{יִלָּשֵׁן}$ – in their idols ($\mathcal{G}^{967,B,A}: \text{εἴδωλον}$)
2. $\text{בַּעַל} \text{יִשֶׁרֶשֶׁת}$ – in their detestable things ($\mathcal{G}^{967,B}: \text{minus}; \mathcal{G}^A: \text{ὑμῶρτοσαν, commit wrong}$)
3. $\text{נַעַשְׁנָה}$ – rebellion ($\mathcal{G}^{967,B}: \text{minus}; \mathcal{G}^A: \text{προσοχθίσμασιν, offence, idol}$)

There are differing views regarding this section: Allen (1990b, p.190) says “it is difficult to decide whether parablepsis or secondary accretion in MT is the culprit”; Zimmerli (1983, p.270) believes MT is secondary; 282 Block (1998, p.407) finds support for MT from 14:11. Yet, these two extra words are likely to be another later Hebrew plus not present in $\mathcal{G}^{967,B}$’s Vorlage, but added prior to MasEzek, and in time to be reflected in the later $\mathcal{G}^A$. This MT/$\mathcal{G}^A$ plus theologically strengthens the simple statement of being defiled by idols ($\text{לְלָעַל}$), and may even be seen as an exegetical expansion. HALOT notes that the concept of ‘horror’ or even ‘monster’ should be considered with $\text{בַּעַל} \text{יִשֶׁרֶשֶׁת}$ ($\text{יוֹסֵד}$), as it is a reference to the statue itself and not just to the overall concept of idolatry. This aspect may be captured with $\mathcal{G}^A$’s use of προσοχθίσμασιν as “offence, provocation, idol” ([LEH], a neologism; cf. Deut. 7:36; 1Kgs. 11:33; 16:32). The use of these words in this context may refer to a particular

---

281 We may also suggest that $\mathcal{G}^A$ reversed the Hebrew word order (a not uncommon event), and προσοχθίσμασιν actually matches $\text{בַּעַל} \text{יִשֶׁרֶשֶׁת}$. In all of the other occurrences of $\text{בַּעַל} \text{יִשֶׁרֶשֶׁת}$ in Ezekiel (Ezek. 5:11; 7:20; 11:18, 21; 20:7, 8, 30) LXX translates with βδέλυγματα (abomination, idol) rather than $\mathcal{G}^A$’s προσοχθίσμασιν (offence, idol) here. Likewise, whilst $\mathcal{G}^B$ uses ήμαρτοσαν (commit wrong, miss mark) here, other occurrences of $\text{בַּעַל} \text{יִשֶׁרֶשֶׁת}$ are translated as παραπτώμασιν (transgression - 14:11; 18:22); ἄσβεσθων (ungodliness - 18:28, 30, 31; 20:28; 21:29; 33:12); πνεύμα (error - 33:10); ἁκοθροίς (uncleanness - 39: 24).
282 Zimmerli (1983, p.270) says “$\text{בַּעַל} \text{יִשֶׁרֶשֶׁת}$ is unattested in $\mathcal{G}$”, but he does not note that it is attested in $\mathcal{G}^A$. 
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event in Israel’s history such as the Seleucid polluting of the temple with the image of Zeus.

\(\mathcal{A}\)’s extensive plus, while initially following MT, also has its own additional plus: καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς βασιλείαις αὐτῶν (‘and in all their kingdoms’). It is unusual that \(\mathcal{A}\) uses ‘βασιλείαις’ here, and not ἐθνῶν or γῆν ὑμῶν, which indicates \(\mathcal{A}\) is reflecting on the δῶα βασιλείαις (v. 22), and referring to the separate northern and southern kingdoms discussed earlier (cf. vv. 16-22). Thus, \(\mathcal{A}\) is stating that the new United Kingdom will not defile itself with idolatry again. It may also refer to a broader spectrum to include the Diaspora, saying wherever they are in ‘all their kingdoms’.

The first part of this verse survives in part amongst the Qumran fragments (4Q Flor.) stating לֹּא תִּכְפַּרְנֵיהֶם אֶלָּא חֲמוֹרֵיהֶם בֶּן חֲלוֹקֵיהֶם (‘they shall no longer defile themselves with their idols’). We do not know if the Vorlage for this Florilegium had the additional MT and \(\mathcal{A}\) plus, as it is not represented in this fragment. Brooke (1985, pp.115-118) points out that this line in 4QFlor is part of a Midrash for Psa. 1:1, and is used theologically by the Qumran community to show how their two groups of ‘House of David’ and ‘Sons of Zadok’ will not defile themselves by any use of idols.²⁸³

MT says the LORD will save them מָכַל מַעֲבָדָתוֹתָם אֶלָּא חָפַר בָּהֶם (‘from all their dwellings where they sinned’), yet LXX says ἀπὸ πᾶσῶν τῶν ἀνωμοίων αὐτῶν δὲν ἡμάρτοσαν ἐν αὐταῖς (‘from all their transgressions whereby they have sinned’). Allen (1990, p.190) says that MT reflects the incorrect insertion of a vowel letter into מַעֲבָדָתוֹתָם = מַעֲבָדָתוֹתָם (cf. BHS) ‘their deviations,’ implied by LXX Σ. MT was influenced by the triple usage of ‘(and) they will dwell/dwell’ in v. 25 and perhaps by the association of מָכַל מַעֲבָדָתוֹתָם ‘in all their dwelling places’ in 6:14 with מָכַל מַעֲבָדָתוֹתָם ‘and all their idols’ in 6:13.

²⁸³ How the Qumran or any other such community used Ezekiel 36-39 is another study outside the scope of this thesis.
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Block (1998, p.407) agrees with Allen that "MT represents a metathetical error involving w and š ", and emends MT, along with Allen, so changing the meaning from ‘settlements’ to ‘turnings’, and states that “Ezekiel’s usage reflects Jeremianic influence” (also Greenberg, 1997, p.756). Block (1998, p.407) does note that “the masculine form of [משהתרותה] is attested in 34:13, … [yet] this sense is clearly out of place here”. Zimmerli (1983, p.270 [also p.275]) is another who believes that "belongs clearly to the language of Jeremiah”. LXX does seem to make more sense than MT. Yet the context speaks of God bringing the people back from the nations. The idolatrous sin of Israel also occurred in their homes, and thus MT’s ‘dwellings in which they sinned’ can also be appropriate. If so, this may be another place where LXX exhibits a trans-lingual wordplay: now rather than focusing as MT on the place where the sin was done (dwelling places), LXX focuses on the action of ἁνομία, the lawlessness that was done within their dwelling places.

Finally, the plus in ΘΒΑ of κύριος (καὶ ἐγὼ κύριος) is not found in Θ967 or MT, and clarifies the referent of ἐγὼ.

MT says ‘and David my servant will be king over them’, while LXX says καὶ ὁ δοῦλός μου Δαυὶδ ἀρχων ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν (‘and David my servant will be a ruler in the midst of them’). As in v. 22, LXX again uses ἀρχων as if the Hebrew had נַעֲשֵׂה (see Excursus above). We observe a theological movement in
MT: in v. 22 MT’s Davidic leader was a ‘king’ over the United Kingdom, yet now in v. 24 there is a shift to state that he will be a רועה ('shepherd') who will enable the people to follow the ways of God. MT’s use of רועה reflects the role of Israel’s leader in 34:23. Then, in v. 25, MT uses מֶשֶׁךְ to also define their Davidic ‘king’. MT’s use of רועה and מֶשֶׁךְ supports our suggestion that מֶשֶׁךְ was a later editorial emendation to the text, and that LXX translator found מֶשֶׁךְ in his Vorlage. Even if מֶשֶׁךְ was original, the presence of רועה here, and מֶשֶׁךְ in v. 25, may have influenced LXX’s use of εἰρχων here, and elsewhere in this pericope.

While MT’s מֶשֶׁךְ is מֶשֶׁךְ ('over them'), LXX’s εἰρχων is ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν ('in their midst'), as a passive, non-threatening ruler, reflecting the use of ‘shepherd’ (cf. רועה / ποιμήν). LXX may again have been influenced by Ezek. 34:24 where MT has the Davidic ruler בִּתְחֵיתָם (cf. 37:26, 28). Influence may also have come from Deut. 17:14-20, where Israel’s kings were to be from their brothers (לֹא), and were not to dominate the people, but rather spiritually lead them (Deut. 17:18f). LXX may also have been influenced by the post-exilic shift to ‘priestly rulers’, away from a leader who would rule over, or dominate, the people as in pre-exilic times. There is also the overall theology in Ezekiel where “Jhwh is the only king over Israel” (Lust, 1986a, p.217), and LXX embraces that concept having their Davidic leader as only ‘a ruler in their midst’. It could also be out of concern not to cause any ‘threat’ to an occupying force (Seleucids or Romans). Whatever the reason, LXX has theologically softened any ‘dominating’ role of the Davidic leader here.

LXX’s ὅτι plus reflects a theological purpose for the εἰρχων: ‘so that’ they would follow the ways of God. MT contextually implies this, but LXX clarifies that the

284 Whilst is a common ANE image for rulers, Jonker (1997, p.1141) correctly points out that “unlike the usage in other ANE contexts, the title shepherd is never used in the OT to denote a deified king or human leader”.
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Davidic leader will enable them to fulfil Torah. This captures the point that the new
Davidic leader will be one who unites Sinai with Zion (Levenson, 1986, pp.57-69).
Levenson (1986, p.75) believes the use of נְשָׁר in Ezekiel is “as an a-political Messiah”.
LXX’s use of ἀρχων may have also increased their Messianic expectation, especially as
the context is in reference to David and a united Israel.285 If so, then this helps explain
LXX’s ὅτι plus. Lust (1986a, p.217) appears to agree with this stating that in Ezekiel
often “Israel’s human messianic leader of the eschatological state does not receive the
title [נָשָׁר] but [נְשָׁר]”.286 However we agree with Lemke (1984, p.180), who, writing
on 37:16f, claimed

it should be noted that while a messianic motif is present in this passage, it is a
rather muted one. Ezekiel and his disciples were not necessarily looking forward to
the restoration of the Davidic monarchy. David in this passage is more an ideal
symbol of Israelite unity than a specific past or future historical figure. The final
goal of God’s future activity was his tabernacling presence among his restored
people.

37:25

καὶ κατοικήσουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν ἡμῖν (G967: εὕρωκα; GΒ,Α: ἐγὼ δέκοντα) τῷ
dοῦλῳ μου λαοῦ μου καὶ κατύκρισαν εἰς οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν καὶ κατοικήσουσιν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς
αὐτοῖ (GΒ: + καὶ οἱ νικότοι καὶ οἱ νικοὶ τῶν νικῶν αὐτών ἐως αἰώνος) καὶ (GΒ: + ἵδον)
Δαυὶδ ὁ δοῦλος μου ἀρχων (G967: + αὐτῶν; GΒ: αὐτῶν ἔσται) εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

MT says they will dwell (on the land), whereas LXX says ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
αὐτῶν (on their land). Both texts state this was the land given to Jacob (cf. 28:25), but
now LXX clarifies this as ‘their’ land, which theologically ties the land more directly to
the future generations.

---

285 In his examination of Ezek. 17:22-24, Lust (1995a, p.250) concluded that the Old Greek, most notably
G967, “is less open to an individual messianic interpretation than MT … the translator clearly has
plurality in mind”. He also suggested that the changes “in the majority of the [LXX] manuscripts is
probably due to a Christian reworking of the text”. Yet here in Ezek. 37, the context speaks of a
future individual Davidic-messianic leader.

286 Lust (1986a, pp.217-221) goes into detail regarding “Israel’s Kings in Ezekiel’s Vocabulary” finding
both theological reasons for the variants, as well as the translator’s “lexicographical choices”.
Following this, MT says אבותיכם ('your ancestors'), and LXX has οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν ('their fathers'). Block (1998, p.407) says that LXX “assimilates the [MT] word to the context” (cf. ל绗). Cooke (1936, p.403) also says LXX is “more in accordance with the context”. This appears to be another LXX clarifying adjustment to the text.

MT and א¹ both have a long plus: בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל נִבְרַא לְךָ // καὶ οἱ νεότεροι αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ νεότεροι τῶν νεότεροι ζῶσαν αἰώνος ('and their children and children’s children forever'). As in 36:18, Aquila and Theodotion also witness this plus (Field, 1964, p.870). However, this is minus in both א⁹⁶⁷. Zimmerli (1983, p.270) says it has ‘accidentally fallen out’ in the Greek. Yet, this plus, covering perpetual living in the land, could be another later MT plus inserted after א⁹⁶⁷’s Vorlage, but before א⁸ (cf. v. 23). As with other MT/א¹ plusses, it was added early enough for MasEzek to witness it. This plus may have its genesis from some later editor reflecting on the context of David and a united kingdom, and reflecting back to texts such as 2Sam. 7:13, 16, 24-26 and 1Chr. 28:8 (all with א⁹⁶⁷).

א¹’s additional following plus of ἱσόου, which is not represented in MT or א⁹⁶⁷, introduces and gives emphasis to David.

MT and MasEzek state that David will be their נְפֶשֶׁה (cf. דְּמוֹ לָךְ vv. 22, 24). LXX again uses ἄρχων. Zimmerli (1983, p.276) says that “the replacement of the פֶּלֶךְ ('king') of v. 24 (v. 22) by נְפֶשֶׁה ('prince') (v. 25) is due to conscious reflection” [italics mine]. This instance of נְפֶשֶׁה “defines David’s role spiritually as Yahweh’s servant and their ‘prince,’ rather than politically as ‘king over them’ (v. 24)” (Block, 1998, p.418). Duguid (1994, p.25) says that “the message Ezekiel is conveying here seems not to be that the future ruler will be a nāšiʾ (as opposed to a melek) but rather that the future nāšiʾ will not be like the [negative] rulers of the past”. Interestingly, Joyce (1998, p.331) points out that the use of נְפֶשֶׁה “represents a deliberate archaizing, and echo of the
leadership patterns of pre-monarchic Israel, as pictured in the book of Numbers”. 287 This is significant due to our previous observations concerning how Ezekiel, and definitely the LXX translator, had in mind various events relating to the exodus and possessing the land as found in Numbers. Therefore, אֶ֕חָ֖ד is likely to be original, and supports our proposal that אֶ֖חָד was also found in LXX’s Vorlage (rather than כֹּֽךַ). Further support can be found in the statement, ‘David my servant’, which emphasises the vassal nature of this new Davidic leader under the LORD’s ‘kingship’.

In the concluding phrase כֹּֽךַ reflects MT syntax by reading כֹּֽךַ דַּאֲוִיּ דֶּֽאֲוִיּ קָדְשֶׁ֖הוּ מְנַעְרֵ֥הוּ אֲבוֹתָ֖יו עָלֵֽהוּ מְנַעְרֵ֥הוּ (‘and David my servant, their prince forever’). 288 כֹּֽךַ א has אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה as a plus here, perhaps seeing an implied ‘יהוה’, or simply smoothing the reading. כֹּֽךַ ב is minus אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה, causing its phrase to read ‘and David my servant, a prince forever’. This may be due to scribal oversight.

In the concluding phrase כֹּֽךַ א has אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה as a plus here, perhaps seeing an implied ‘יהוה’, or simply smoothing the reading. כֹּֽךַ ב is minus אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה, causing its phrase to read ‘and David my servant, a prince forever’. This may be due to scribal oversight.
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In the concluding phrase כֹּֽךַ א has אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה as a plus here, perhaps seeing an implied ‘יהוה’, or simply smoothing the reading. כֹּֽךַ ב is minus אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה, causing its phrase to read ‘and David my servant, a prince forever’. This may be due to scribal oversight.

In the concluding phrase כֹּֽךַ א has אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה as a plus here, perhaps seeing an implied ‘יהוה’, or simply smoothing the reading. כֹּֽךַ ב is minus אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה, causing its phrase to read ‘and David my servant, a prince forever’. This may be due to scribal oversight.

In the concluding phrase כֹּֽךַ א has אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה as a plus here, perhaps seeing an implied ‘יהוה’, or simply smoothing the reading. כֹּֽךַ ב is minus אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה, causing its phrase to read ‘and David my servant, a prince forever’. This may be due to scribal oversight.

In the concluding phrase כֹּֽךַ א has אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה as a plus here, perhaps seeing an implied ‘יהוה’, or simply smoothing the reading. כֹּֽךַ ב is minus אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה, causing its phrase to read ‘and David my servant, a prince forever’. This may be due to scribal oversight.

In the concluding phrase כֹּֽךַ א has אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה as a plus here, perhaps seeing an implied ‘יהוה’, or simply smoothing the reading. כֹּֽךַ ב is minus אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה, causing its phrase to read ‘and David my servant, a prince forever’. This may be due to scribal oversight.

In the concluding phrase כֹּֽךַ א has אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה as a plus here, perhaps seeing an implied ‘יהוה’, or simply smoothing the reading. כֹּֽչַ ב is minus אֱֽשֶׁ֚ה, causing its phrase to read ‘and David my servant, a prince forever’. This may be due to scribal oversight.
Thus, $\text{GB,A}$. may have read $\text{אֲלִימָה}$ as $\text{אֲלִימָה}$. It may be that the Urtext once read $\text{ילוּלָם}$ but then $\text{ילוּלָם}$ dropped out of MT, perhaps by scribal error owing to the other occurrences of $\text{ילוּלָם}$ in this and the surrounding verses, leaving $\text{G}^{967}$ as the only witness to the Urtext. On the other hand, $\text{G}^{967}$'s scribe may have added this to emphasise the eternal quality of this ‘covenant of peace’.

MT and MasEzek’s plus of $\text{רְבִיתָה יְרוּשָׁלָיִם}$ (‘and I will set them, and multiply them’), is not represented by LXX, not even $\text{G}^A$. Allen (1990b, p.191) explains the minus in LXX by “parablepsis caused by homoeoteleuton” [sic], which may be the case as each $\text{אֲלִימָה}$ is followed by $\text{נְתִּיתָה}$. Block (1998, p.408) agrees, saying “the [LXX] scribe’s eye probably … skipped from one $\text{אֲלִימָה}$ to the other”.290 However, Zimmerli (1983, p.270) says that MT “cannot be correct, as is clear from the perplexity of the versions”.291 It seems unusual that LXX would have deliberately left out such a strong ‘priestly’ statement. We suggest that this was another later MT plus, added at the same time as the other MT ‘priestly blessing’ in 36:11, that is also without LXX witness. As with the occurrence in 36:11, this occurrence is also witnessed by the later three exegetes of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion (καὶ δῶσω αὐτοῖς, καὶ πληθυνῶ αὐτοὺς). Symmachus has his own unique and expansive plus of καὶ στηρίσω αὐτοὺς (‘and I will establish them’) (Field, 1964, p.870). Greenberg (1997, p.757) includes a two-step proposal for its inclusion by different MT scribes. Yet, it is difficult to prove these steps. Therefore, rather than the scribal error proposals given by others, we propose that here, as in 36:11, we have a deliberate MT plus that echoes the ‘re-creation’ aspect with which the later communities appear to have viewed the restoration

290 Block (1998, p.408) also suggests that “it may be preferable to interpret the final $\text{ב}$ on $\text{נְתִּיתָה}$ as a datival suffix … and to see here an abbreviation for the land grant formula [עָתַיִם לְכָּל אֲלִימָה] (cf. 11:17)”.

of Israel (cf. 36:11, 35; 37:1-14). As noted in 36:11, this recreation aspect could have had the original creation in mind (Gen. 1-2), or the flood event (Gen. 8:17; 9:1, 7), or even both. The scribe inserting this ‘priestly blessing’ may also have had the Levitical Holiness code in mind, as קַרְבָּנָה הָיְתָה לְאַלְדוּתָם לְהַיוֹרֵדָם לְכָלָם is found in the concluding part of this code (Lev. 26:9; cf. Eze. 36:10, 11, 29, 30; 37:26). Overall, this appears to be a later and deliberate MT plus, exegeting this text with a recreational view for the return of the exiles and the restoration of Israel.

LXX has a very subtle shift from MT’s קַרְבָּנָה הָיְתָה לְאַלְדוּתָם לְהַיוֹרֵדָם לְכָלָם (‘and my dwelling place will be over them’) to קַרְבָּנָה הָיְתָה לְאַלְדוּתָם לְהַיוֹרֵדָם לְכָלָם (‘and my habitation will be in their midst’). LXX may have been influenced by Lev. 26:11. B,A appear to have also been influenced by the surrounding verses (cf. μεσοω vv. 26, 28) and theologically view the ‘sanctuary’ and the Lord’s ‘habitation’ as usually ‘the one and same’. MT’s theology of the Lord’s habitation being ‘over’ them “may have been influenced by the קַבֹּד of Yahweh, which resided over … the tent of meeting (cf. Exod. 29:45-46)” (Block, 1998, p.421). Greenberg (1997, p.757) also observes that for MT, “the tent-sanctuary of the priestly writings was closely associated with the divine cloud that covered it by day, appearing as fire by night (Exod 40:34-38, abbreviated from Num 9:15-23)”. MT may also be referring to the temple being over them, as in height (cf. 40:2) (Cooke, 1936, p.403).

Either way, LXX appears to miss MT’s point of the LORD being a covering, and thus protective, presence ‘over’ them, but rather has his habiting/dwelling in their midst, or

292 So LEH, who also note that this is used mostly of the Lord in the temple’.
293 For more on the קַבֹּד of Yahweh in Ezekiel, see Tuell (2000a, pp.98f).
even in them. This may have been influenced by the earlier references to the πνεῦμα coming into them (cf. 37:8-10, 14). Cooke (1936, p.404) points out that “according to O.T. ideas of the blessed future, man [sic] is not translated to dwell with God, but God comes down to dwell with man [sic], and His Presence transforms the earth into heaven”. LXX has embraced this theology, but has done so by exegeting the Hebrew.

even in them. This may have been influenced by the earlier references to the πνεῦμα coming into them (cf. 37:8-10, 14). Cooke (1936, p.404) points out that “according to O.T. ideas of the blessed future, man [sic] is not translated to dwell with God, but God comes down to dwell with man [sic], and His Presence transforms the earth into heaven”. LXX has embraced this theology, but has done so by exegeting the Hebrew.

4.4. Overall Summary: Chapter 4.

We have found a number of the differences between MT and LXX observed in chapter 36 also occurring in chapter 37. In relation to discernible divisions, however, unlike chapter 36 which could be divided up into three sections by discernible variants, we find no such discernible division. Yet we can discern a thematic division of two
halves: vv. 1-14 (resurrection of the dry bones), and vv. 15-28 (the reestablishment of the United Kingdom under a Davidic ruler).

The first section dealing with the dry bones finds LXX inserting clarifiers, such as \textit{G}^{B,A}'s \(\hat{\alpha}v\theta\rho\omega\pi\iota\nu\omega\nu\) (v. 1), and \(\acute{\alpha}r\mu\omicron\nu\iota\alpha\nu\) (v. 7). We also found LXX interpreting the actions of MT, such as the flesh ‘germinating’ (v. 8). We observed differences regarding how these various communities interpreted and viewed the activity of the \(\pi\nu\epsilon\iota\mu\alpha\).

Yet, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to create a pneumatology for these communities based on the observable variants in chapter 37. The various LXX MSS at times abbreviate \(\pi\nu\epsilon\iota\mu\alpha\), suggesting they have interpreted as the Spirit of God, and other times they wrote out in full indicating an interpretation of ‘wind/breath’. Likewise there are other intra-LXX variants with the activity of the \(\pi\nu\epsilon\iota\mu\alpha\) towards humans, with the various MSS alternating the usage of \(\epsilon\zeta\iota\epsilon\iota\pi\iota\). However, we found more consistency between \(\textit{G}^{967,B}\) than of either with \(\textit{G}^{A}\) (cf. vv. 5-6). LXX also appears to have interpreted the role of the \(\pi\nu\epsilon\iota\mu\alpha\) in v. 5 by changing MT’s verb \(\~t,yy\pi\iota\) into a noun saying \(\pi\nu\epsilon\iota\mu\alpha\ \zeta\omicron\nu\eta\zeta\pi\iota\). This may be due to LXX interpreting this pericope as a re-creation, and reflecting on the parallels with Gen. 1-2. Ezekiel likely intended a ‘recreation’ motif, and LXX was observed as exegetically clarifying this (e.g., v. 5). This re-creation motif was also observed in v. 9 with the ‘breathing on the slain’ which echoes Gen. 2:7-8 through the use of the same Hebrew and Greek words.

We also found, as in chapter 36, that there may be an echo in 37:5 of the book of Numbers and of Moses with the ‘S/spirit’ coming on Israel’s leaders (Num. 11:24f). Some, such as McKeating (1994), have found parallels with Moses in the dry bones passage, but this is not clearly observed in any discernible differences between MT and LXX.\(^{294}\)

\(^{294}\) McKeating (1994, p.106) says “Just as Moses, through his prophesying, and above all through his law-giving, virtually creates a people, so Ezekiel, through his prophesying and law-giving (for law-giving
As in chapter 36, so in chapter 37 $\mathcal{G}^A$ has typically followed MT with various plusses/glosses (cf. v. 7 ‘sound’; v. 18 ‘saying’; v. 23 ‘wrong’ and ‘rebellion’; v. 25 ‘sons forever’). However, MT has its own unique theological plusses that were without witness in any representative LXX MSS (v. 12; v. 26). $\mathcal{G}^A$ also has one long unique plus in v. 23 to say that Israel would not defile itself again in any of its kingdoms. This theology of not being defiled by idols is also found in a Qumran fragment (4Q Flor.).

We suggested that LXX’s use of σωκωγη in 37:10 reflects the original Hebrew, and that a later Hebrew scribe changed לֶחֶם to לֶחֶנ, as support for the change of chapter order, and the ‘call to arms’ motif. LXX’s σωκωγη reflects a theology that their ‘resurrection’ was for spiritual and not military purposes.

The second thematic section covers vv. 15-28, which all MSS had as the one sense division. In this section we observed LXX interpreting MT’s metaphors, translating γυν with ραβδον (ruler’s sceptre). We saw the possibility that MT was again creating an echo with the book of Numbers (Num. 17:1-11), which LXX caught and interpreted accordingly. Likewise, we noted in v. 19 that LXX interpreted MT’s metaphor of γυν with φυλη, which again clarified the text for their generation. We also considered the possibility of these verses echoing a ‘new exodus’ theme as in chapter 36 (cf. the use of ‘Joseph’). We noted this theme was also evident in vv. 21, 25. Again, we noted in v. 19 that LXX appears to have offered a theological interpretation by its translation in a manner which gave priority to ‘Judean messianism’, or reflected Judean priority. This priority was also found to be evident in Symmachus’ later plus.

We examined the various uses of γυν in vv. 22-25 in an Excursus. Instead of finding LXX had theologically softened γυν with its use of ἀρχων, we

is what we largely have in chs. 40-48) re-creates the people after the death and dissolution of the gold.”
proposed that LXX did not find this in its *Vorlage*, instead finding "ayfin". A later Hebrew editor emended "ayfin" to "lml", as support for the chapter reorder from that found in G967 to the received order, and for the ‘call to arms’ that motivated this reorder. G967’s order does not require a ‘king’, only a peaceful shepherd ruler in their midst as God’s vassal. We proposed that this change would have happened at a similar time to other changes done after, and in support of, the chapter reorder (cf. 36:23b; "hmx to "hly in 37:10; "hmx to "hly to 39:29). We also noted that use of "ayfin"/"arxwn (37:25) indicated these communities saw Israel’s future Davidic leaders in more of a spiritual rather than a military sense.

Overall, we observe that chapters 36 and 37 in both MT and LXX appear to have expanded the *Urtext*, as evident in their plusses and variants. In this it appears that these scribes, especially LXX, have reflected on Israel’s past history and then transmitted the text for their contemporary communities based on their socio-political-theological worldview. The initial reflection on Israel’s history came from the *Urtext*, but was then often clarified by these later translator(s) and redactors. Our findings agree with Ellis (1988, p.686-697):

The OT displays a hermeneutical progression in which, on the one hand, sacred accounts of God’s acts in the past provided models for later accounts of his present and future activity and, on the other hand, the received sacred literature was from time to time conformed to its contemporary or future application and fulfilment. The first aspect of the process is evident in the way in which the prophets ‘placed the new historical acts of God … in exactly the same category as the old basic events of the canonical history’: a new creation (Ezek. 36:35), a new Exodus (Ezek. 36:8), a new covenant, a new Davidic kingdom (Ezek. 37:24), a new Zion or temple (Ezek. 40-48) [verse order adjusted for relevancy].

One matter that does arise here is the question as to what constitutes restoration. Speaking of the different approaches which Jews and Christians have towards the Bible,
Müller (1996, p.136) points that “Judaism in its various versions sees the perspective of the Law as the constituent factor, [whereas] Christian interpretation concentrates on ‘the fulfilment aspect’, that is, the opening towards a decisive new achievement either in or beyond history”. Thus, we find the fulfilment of restoration for Jewish communities here in Ezekiel 36, and following in chapter 37, as the people being returned to the land of Israel, living in peace under local spiritually orientated leadership (e.g., David in 37:22-25), and with the ability to obey Torah (36:27), and all this to bring honour to the LORD (36:23). They do not necessarily look away towards some eschatological future, but they see this as possible in their present, which is especially evident in the way in which LXX has exegeted the text as it translated. This can be found also with MT’s plusses and emendations.

We now turn to chapters 38-39 to examine these texts and determine what discernible exegetical patterns are evident, particularly given the order variation between $\Theta^{967}$ and the other manuscripts.
5.0. Chapter 5: The Text of Ezekiel 38

5.1. Introduction: Ezek. 38

Chapters 38-39 stand together as a sub-block dealing with the destruction of Israel’s enemies, yet they are still related to the textual context of the Restoration of Israel. Many scholars see this unit formed by redaction rather than by the original author. However, others have attributed the core of these two chapters to the prophet. Interestingly, most who see these two chapters as later do not enter into discussion of their placement in G967, which may remove many of their proposed reasons. Other commentators note the unity of these two chapters, including Block (1998, p.424), who says “this text provides one of the most impressive examples of typically Ezekielian literary ‘halving,’ the panels consisting of 38:1-23 and [39]:1-29”. While some commentators focus their energies on hypothetical textual reconstructions and the evolution of chapters 38-39, we will continue to concentrate on the text as we have received it in its Hebrew and Greek forms, especially as many of these theories are largely unprovable, and are the result of conjecture and speculation.

Both these chapters cover the LORD’s military conflict with Gog and his hordes, resulting in their destruction. The placement of these chapters in the block of 36-39 indicates that the destruction of Israel’s enemies is part of her restoration. Odell

295 De Vries (1995, p.175) is one example who sees the “succession of futuristic formulas in Ezekiel 38–39 as the work of individual redactors who used these as a device for expressing proto-apocalyptic ideals of various kinds”. De Vries (1995, pp.176-7) finds nine “secondary expansions” in these two chapters. However, these proposed ‘expansions’ appear to form most of these two chapters!

296 Block (1987, p.257) says that “in recent years interpreters have become more modest in their understanding of the text, generally acknowledging at least the core of the prophecy as from the prophet himself”. Recently Odell (2005, p.552) commented that “nothing in the oracle suggests that it was composed after the exile, and in fact, the configuration of Gog’s army makes good sense in the light of the political dynamics of the seventh and sixth centuries BCE”.

297 See discussions in Chapter 7: Papyrus 967.

298 Whilst Block has ‘29’ in the body of his text, this is a typographical error for ‘39’; his footnote has 39 (Block, 1998, p.424, n.1). This also occurs in his earlier work (Block, 1997c, p.91). See Block (1992b, p.157) for another example of his ‘two panel, four frame’ breakdown of these two chapters.

299 For some of these proposed reconstructions refer to Zimmerli (1983, pp.296-299), De Vries (1995, pp.175f), and Fitzpatrick (2004, pp.74-81). Also see Ahroni (1977), who argues for post-exilic interpolation.
(2005, p.552) says that “the defeat of Gog becomes the occasion for the full revelation of Yahweh’s glory to Israel and the nations. As for Israel, its time of shame and self-loathing comes to an end”. It is significant in the context of the book that this conflict takes place before the rebuilding of the Temple. Equally significant is that Israel itself is but a passive observer to the LORD’s destruction of Gog and his hordes: Israel does not take an active role in this part of her ultimate restoration, just as in chapters 36-37 all they had to do was ‘show up’ as the LORD restored them. This aspect is found more so in G’s chapter order than in the received order. The LORD intended to restore Israel for the sake of his holy name (36:21-23), so that his name would be known throughout the nations and no longer be defiled (37:28; 38:23; 39:7).

We again find a high degree of uniformity in MT’s sense divisions in chapter 38, with all three representative MT MSS agreeing at all points with setumah after vv. 9, 13, 16, 17, 23 (except that MT C has a petuḥah after v. 23). MasEzek agrees with the vv. 9 and 13 breaks, but the extant fragment ends after v. 14. MasEzek and MT C,A separate chapters 37 and 38 with a petuḥah, yet MT L uses a setumah, suggesting that the earlier communities saw a greater ‘distance’ between 37 and 38.

As in the previous chapters, the Greek MSS again offer a greater variance with their divisions. G continues 38:1 on the same line immediately after 36:23b, exhibiting its normal two stroke markers. The only other discernible divisions in G are after vv. 16 and 23, therefore dividing chapter 38 into two sections. G B has a long gap after 37:28 with 38:1 beginning on a new line marking a major division. It then has a minor 2 letter break after v. 9; then we find paragraphoi at the beginning of vv. 14 and 18 evidencing a break before these verses (vv. 14, 18 start on new lines, the preceding lines being full). However it is indeterminable if these are by the original

---

300 See Chapter 7: Papyrus 967 for discussions how the two extant chapter orders exhibit different viewpoints of Israel’s involvement.
hand. G also exhibits a major break before chapter 38:1 with v. 1 starting on a new line. There is only a minor break between chapters 38 and 39. As with other chapters, G exhibits more divisions than other representative MSS, with evidence of breaks after vv. 2, 9, 13, 14a (before τάδε λέγει κύριος), 16, 21a (after λέγει κύριος).

Overall, there is commonality between MT and LXX, with most MSS representing a major break between chapter 37 and 38 (MasEzek, MTCA, GB, A), and generally smaller divisions after vv. 9, 13, 16, 17. In chapter 38 we find that each MT sense division precedes the statement ‘thus says the LORD’, and each division contains a clear oracle from the LORD. These oracles, combined with the four in chapter 39, form a total of nine oracle divisions, indicating a clear theological thought in this early ‘exegesis’. Modern scholars either add or take from the number of these oracle divisions in chapters 38-39. We will follow these nine MT divisions in our examination of the text in chapters 38 and 39.


As noted above, all MSS exhibit a break before 38:1, and only G967 does not witness a break after v. 9. G has one of its frequent breaks after v. 3a, highlighting the actual speech, and placing the initial identification of Gog into its own division. This pericope establishes that the LORD is ‘against’ Gog (v. 3), and that Gog and his hordes will be drawn out for battle (v. 4f) against those dwelling securely (MT) or peacefully (LXX) in the land (v. 8), and this invading army will cover the land (v. 9). This oracle has Gog being drawn out, but not with any explicit statement that this will be for Gog’s

301 There is also a one letter space in v. 14, before τάδε λέγει κύριος.
302 The occurrence of ‘thus says the LORD’ as a common sense division marker in the Greek has already been noted in earlier chapters. Here we find this also occurring in the Hebrew text; for further information see Olley (2003, p.212f).
303 Block (1997c, p.99, n.58) has noted ‘seven’ and states this is a prominent number in the Gog oracle: “note the enemies’ seven weapons (39:9), the seven years’ worth of fuel these provide (39:9), the seven months needed for the burial of the enemies’ remains (39:12)”.
destruction; that tension is left for the final oracle in this chapter (vv. 18-23). The whole mystery surrounding Gog and those with him has captured the imagination of scholars for centuries resulting in a plethora of creative opinions regarding the text and identities of Gog and his hordes. Our focus remains on textual variants and not on the many issues surrounding Gog’s ‘identity’, especially as LXX transliterates Γωγ without any suggestion of his identity. These verses evidence a text in a state of flux (especially v. 8), with both MT and LXX exhibiting plusses, and with LXX interpreting the Hebrew for their community and based on their world view as in previous chapters.

304 The identity of Gog and Magog remains a mystery amidst the plethora of suggestions both ancient and modern, yet without any scholarly consensus, and these “may turn out to be artificial creations” (Block, 1998, p.434). For a good recent resource on Gog and Magog see Bøe (2001). Railton (2003) outlines a number of Christian, Jewish and Muslim interpretations of Gog and Magog through the centuries. Lust (1995b, pp.708f [Gog]; and 999f [Magog]) also covers a number of historical and modern suggestions for Gog and Magog’s identity. Attempts to align Gog with Russia in some modern eschatological fulfilment of these chapters is “an association that, given the changing political climate in the past few years, demands a careful re-evaluation” (Tanner, 1996, p.29). Odell (2005, p.554) suggests “the unit’s context and reworking of Israelite prophetic traditions allow for the possibility that the name is a cryptic allusion to Nebuchadnezzar”. However, there is nothing in either the Hebrew or Greek texts that explicitly support any of these suggestions, other than Gog comes from the north. Significantly, LXX retains ‘Gog’, and, unlike its treatment of the other names (cf. vv. 5, 13), does not seek to provide a contemporary equivalent. Alexander (1974, p.161) notes that it is “employed , perhaps, as a general name for any of God’s enemies at the time of the composition of the Septuagint”.

305 Cooke (1936, p.409) says this “should be read towards the land of Magog, if a direction was intended”. Block (1998, p.432) uses ‘of’ in his translation, as a place where Gog is from.

306 Eichrodt (1970, p.518) also says that it “separates the name Gog from the title appended to it, so this further description can hardly be original".
Magog as one and the same nation, or as a person symbolizing that nation”.

However, if this was an MT gloss, then it would have been very early as it is witnessed in MasEzek and in all three representative LXX MSS (καὶ τὴν γῆν τοῦ Μαγγόγ). 307

The primary difference between MT and LXX in this phrase is LXX’s plus of the καὶ copula, which appears to treat Μαγγόγ as another people group that Ezekiel is to prophesy about (Cooke, 1936, p.409; Block, 1998, p.432). MT appears to have לְמָמֵת הָא רֹעֵה as a place of origin for Gog, as Eichrodt (1970, p.518) points out, “Magog could possibly mean ‘land of Gog’” (also Block, 1998, p.433). 308 Yet this is a debated point amongst scholars, with some suggesting “the earlier form of the gloss [was] מָמֶט אָרוּעַ. ‘Magog in his land’” (Allen, 1990b, p.199). This suggestion treats מָמֶט as a people group rather than a locale, and thus follows LXX’s reading. This may be influenced by 39:6 which may treat מָמֶט as a people group (cf. discussions 39:6). Unpointed, אָרוּעַ could be a ה of locale, as in Cooke’s translation, which questions this suggestion. We note מָמֶט appears in Gen. 10:2 and 1Chron. 1:5 where Magog is listed as the second son of Japheth, which also may influence commentators in Ezek. 38:2. 309 Here it is sufficient to say that in MT’s context מָמֶט appears to indicate a land, perhaps Gog’s homeland, whereas LXX’s καὶ plus suggests Μαγγόγ is another people group. 310

307 Most commentators note that this phase is omitted in the later G62, but Block (1998, p.432) says that is “probably a case of homoioteleuton”.

308 Kline (1996, p.215) suggests that מָמֶט אָרוּעַ in Ezek. 38:15 (not discussed here due to absence of discernible variants) is “a substitute for the previous ‘land of Magog’ (Ezek. 38:2; cf. 39:6). Indeed, the term is probably an etymological play on Magog. Māqêm would interpret the mā- in Magog (explained either by the Akkadian māt, ‘land of,’ or as the Hebrew noun prefix signifying place)”.

309 Outside of MT Ezekiel, Gog is only found 1Chron. 5:4 where he is listed as a descendent of Reuben; in LXX, Gog also appears in Num. 24:7 (for MT’s Agag) and Amos 7:1 where LXX appears to interpret the identity of יֶעָן as one of MT’s locust/caterpillar. Bøe (2001, p.89f) says that “the fact that Magog is the name of a person in the genealogy of Gen 10 is no real objection against [Magog being a land/country], since several of the names in Genesis 10 are names of ancestors founding tribes developing into entire peoples”.

310 LXX’s treatment of ‘Magog’ as a separate people group would most likely have influenced the writer of Revelation to do likewise; for more on this see Bøe (2001), Kline (1996), and Tanner (1996).
There is a minor variant intra-LXX, wherein $\mathcal{G}^{A}$ have $\Gamma\omega\gamma$, yet $\mathcal{G}^{967}$ has $\Omega\gamma$. Gehman (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.128) says $\mathcal{G}^{967}$'s $\Omega\gamma$ “is probably due to lipography”. We may question if $\mathcal{G}^{967}$ was reflecting back in Israel’s history to the defeat of Og king of Bashan (Num. 21:33-35), but this is unlikely due to $\mathcal{G}^{967}$'s use of $\Gamma\omega\gamma$ from this point onwards.\textsuperscript{311}

We also note a rare intra-MT variant wherein MT\textsuperscript{A} has הָרֶשֶׁת [non-final ב] yet MT\textsuperscript{C-L} have זָרָה, yet this appears to be an error by MT\textsuperscript{A}’s scribe.\textsuperscript{312}

In vv. 2 and 3 there is a difficulty translating $\text{lb}^\text{t}u\text{w}> \%v_m, \text{varo} \text{ayfin}$. Block (1998, p.434) points out “the syntax … is problematic. The issue revolves around whether [זָרָה] is the name of an ethnic group or a common noun. Both LXX δρέων τῆς Πως and the construct pointing of the Masoretes argue for the former”. Cooke (1936, p.409 [cf. p.415]) states that MT “by its accents intends $\text{rō} \text{sh}$ to be taken as= $\text{head}$, and the phrase is to be rendered chief-head of M. and T.”. Interestingly Syriac, Targum, Vulgate, and Aquila (κεφαλής αὐτοῦ), all interpret זָרָה as ‘chief/head’. Yet Duguid (1994, p.20) says “$\text{rō}$’$\text{s}$ is not to be understood here as an adjective (‘chief prince’) but as a noun in its own right (‘prince of the chiefs’)”. After his discussions, Block (1998, p.435) concluded that,

if Rosh is to be read as the first in a series of names, the conjunction should precede ‘Meshech’. [זָרָה] therefore is best understood as a common noun, appositive to and offering a closer definition of [אִיָּף]. Accordingly, the prince, chief of Meshech and Tubal …. Ezekiel’s point is that Gog is not just one of many

---

\textsuperscript{311} Lust (1995b, p.710) mentions that “in the LXX\textsuperscript{B} version of Deut 3:1.13; 4:47, Gog stands for Hebrew Og (king of Bashan). Lust also mentions $\mathcal{G}^{967}$’s reading of ‘Og’ here, yet without comment.

\textsuperscript{312} הָרֶשֶׁת appears at the end of a line, followed by the first part of ב. It appears that the scribe anticipated room for the following word (ךָנֶפֶפ), but not finding sufficient room then wrote יִתְנַשֶּׁפ on the following line, yet did not delete the letters on the previous line. There are no vowels under the letters remaining on the previous line.

\textsuperscript{313} Discussions of זָרָה/Pως here in v. 2 also apply to v. 3, and to 39:1.
Anatolian princely figures, but the leader amongst princes and over several tribal/national groups.

In their translations, Block (1998, p.432), Allen (1990b, p.197), and Zimmerli (1983, p.284), all follow MT with Gog as the leader [םַאֲרֵךְ] of these other groups.

LXX, Symmachus and Theodotion all transliterate סַאְרֵךְ as Ρῶς; this can either be seen as the name of an ethnic group,314 or as a proper noun of a person called ‘Ros’, who is the prince/ruler (אֵרֹךְוֹנָא) of Mesoch and Thobel (cf. Brenton). Yet, most commentators see LXX interpreting סַאְרֵךְ as an ethnic group, especially as it also transliterated and interpreted ‘Magog’ in this way. Both transliterations should be considered together, as the same thought of another ethnic group as an enemy against them appears to be the influencing factor.

LXX also transliterates the other names with slightly alternate spelling as Μεσοχ/Μοσοχ καὶ Θοβὲλ. Yet, transliterating these particular places is a practice found elsewhere in LXX OT (Gen. 10:2, 23; 1Chron. 1:5; Isa. 66:19: Ezek. 32:26), which may indicate that LXX scribes did not know the contemporary identification of these countries.

MT’s נַפְלֵי is reflected in LXX (εἰπόν), with a dative pronoun plus: αὐτῷ, which appears to clarify that speech is directed to Gog as the overall leader of this gathering.

314 Fairbairn (1969, p.415) suggests that ‘Ros’ is the name of a people group, saying “traces have been found of a northern people anciently bearing such a name … and the great probability in the opinion, that the people referred to were the Russi, from whom the modern Russians derive their name”. However, it is unknown if Ezekiel knew of, or was referring to, this people group. Tanner (1996, p.30) points out that “if ‘Rosh’ is not a name place then the etymological connection with Russia is eliminated”. However, whilst this may be the concern of the modern eschatological exegete, we question if this was a concern to the LXX translator(s). Tanner (1996, p.31) says that Ezekiel would “probably not [be referring to] modern Russia” as the name ‘Rus’ is a Viking import in the Middle Ages.
MT’s נָבֵל is minus in both אָשְׁרֵי (B is also minus α’), yet is represented in א. This may be another later MT plus inserted early enough for א to witness it, and added to clarify who the speech is directed towards, as we suggested for LXX’s αὐτῷ plus. Without this plus it reads that the LORD is against ‘the chief prince’ (MT), or ‘Ῥώζ’ (א). א may witness the Urtext, which did not explicitly state ‘Gog’ as the object of the prophecy, but only implied as the ‘chief prince’ (cf. our discussions on v. 2). MT’s inclusion explicitly states Gog as the object of the speech. א’s α’ Γωγ καὶ gives two objects: Γωγ andῬώζ. א רוζ καὶ plus allows 3 objects: Ρώζ, and Μεσοχαι and Θυβέλ (See v. 2 above for discussions of ‘ᾲρα’/Ῥώζ’). The possible absence of ‘Gog’ in the Urtext may have influenced LXX’s treatment of ‘Ῥόζ’.

38:4 καὶ συνάξω σε καὶ πάσαν τὴν δύναμίν σου ἵππους καὶ ἵππεις ἐνδεδειγμένους θώρακας πάντας συναγωγῆς πολλῆς πέλτας καὶ περικεφαλαίαι καὶ μάχαιραι

MT’s שָׁבָבָב הַהוֹרִים בְּלִיתוֹ (‘and I will turn you back, and I will put hooks into your jaws’) is minus in LXX. Block (1998, p.437) suggests that “LXX condenses MT’s three verbs … into one”. We find שָׁבָבָב again in 39:2, but there LXX translates with καὶ συνάξω σε. MT also uses שָׁבָבָב in 39:27 and there LXX has ἀποστρέφω which captures the correct sense of ‘bring back’, indicating that LXX is well aware of this usage of שָׁבָבָב. Zimmerli (1983, p.284) also notes the occurrence of καὶ συνάξω σε for שָׁבָבָב in 39:2 and says “this raises the question whether א in 38:4 did not also have שָׁבָבָב before it, while in the original then the words תְּנָה תְּרֵיס (‘and I will turn you back, and I will put hooks into your jaws’) is minus in LXX. Block (1998, p.437) suggests that “LXX condenses MT’s three verbs … into one”. We find שָׁבָבָב again in 39:2, but there LXX translates with καὶ συνάξω σε. MT also uses שָׁבָבָב in 39:27 and there LXX has ἀποστρέφω which captures the correct sense of ‘bring back’, indicating that LXX is well aware of this usage of שָׁבָבָב. Zimmerli (1983, p.284) also notes the occurrence of καὶ συνάξω σε for שָׁבָבָב in 39:2 and says “this raises the question whether א in 38:4 did not also have שָׁבָבָב before it, while in the original then the words תְּנָה תְּרֵיס

315 Again, it is beyond the scope of this work to identify possible countries and/or people groups for these various nouns, either ancient or modern. For discussions on this refer to modern commentaries, also Bøe (2001) and Tanner (1996).
... might have been missing”. However, in 38:4 LXX’s use of συνάξω fits better with מְּכָרִים and not בִּרְכָּרִים, indicating that the former verb may have been the beginning of v. 4 in LXX’s Vorlage. The phrase ‘hooks in your jaws’ is also found in 29:4,316 and fully translated by LXX, again raising the question as to why LXX would not translate this phrase. Thus, either this phrase was minus in 38:4 in LXX’s Vorlage, or it was omitted on purpose or by accident. It is doubtful that LXX would purposefully leave out such a strong statement against Gog, leaving either accidental omission, or that it was minus in LXX’s Vorlage, with the latter as the most likely occurrence.

As such, this phrase appears to be a later MT gloss. Allen (1990b, p.200) says that it is “a gloss intended for 39:2 [but] was misplaced here because of the similarity of context”. Allen (1990b, p.200) also suggests that “at some stage in the LXX’s Vorlage a full text like that of MT had been revised against a shorter text but carelessly a wrong run of words was struck out”. This is possible, along with the other variants in vv. 2, 3. This phrase is witnessed by MasEzek, which indicates early inclusion into the Hebrew text, and raises the question as to why later LXX MSS such as G did not include it. This may be another MT plus added after G’s Vorlage. Theodotion includes this phrase, but with a different analogy than MT: καὶ περιστέψω σε, καὶ ἐγὼ δῶσω παγίδας εἰς τάς σιαγόνας σου (‘and I will wheel you around, and I will put a bridle in your jaws’) (Field, 1964, p.871). This analogy indicates the action of a rider of a horse, rather than the ‘fishing’ analogy in MT.317 Wevers (1982, p.202) claims MT’s analogy

---

316 The imagery of ‘hooks’ for captives is also found in Hab. 1:15 and Amos 4:2. Odell (2005, p.554) states that “Yahweh’s use of hooks has parallels in the Assyrian traditions for subjugating rebellious kings. Biblical references to hooks outside of Ezekiel have a similar connotation of control that stops short of destruction”.

317 Block (1998, p.442) notes the first phrase of בְּרָכָרִים (‘and I will turn you around’) “suggests the image of horsemen turning their steeds around (cf. v. 4b), a metaphor well chosen for peoples who come from a region renowned in antiquity for its horses”. However, the metaphor for the second phrase is that of a hook in the jaw of a fish, and it is our point that Theodotion’s wording only captures the first metaphor and not the second.
“is a late expansion based on the oracle against Pharaoh, 29.4”. Block (1998, p.437) appears to disagree saying this “introduce[s] a notion foreign to the present context”. MT may have been influenced by 29:4 and 39:2, combining both concepts here as a gloss to interpret how they saw Gog and his forces would be ‘brought out’ (רַבָּה אֱלֹהִים) they would be turned and drawn out like a fish on a hook, perhaps going in a direction Gog did not initially intend nor, keeping in mind the oracle’s context of destruction, to a place where Gog would want to go.

LXX translates MT’s אֶלֶךָ אֱלֹהִים (hih.: ‘I will lead you out’, or ‘I will cause you to go out’), with καὶ συναξίω σε (‘and I will gather you’). We question why LXX did not use καὶ ἐξάξω ὑμᾶς as in 11:9; 20:34 (also Exod. 6:6; 7:4, 5; Isa. 65:9). This may indicate LXX’s view that Gog will be ‘gathered/assembled’ for destruction, which interprets MT’s action of ‘leading out’. Equally curious is MT’s use of מְנַה (as the hiphil is typically used both in Ezekiel and in Exodus in relationship to God’s ‘bringing’ Israel out of Egypt. This may indicate that MT saw the bringing out of Israel’s enemies to their destruction as part of the ultimate restoration of Israel, a point which we find with the placement of chapters 38-39 in this block.318 Israel cannot be fully restored if they remain under the threat of their enemies.

MT has יַכְלָשׁי נֶפֶלֵד (‘perfectly clothed’ [BDB/HALOT], or ‘those clothed in perfection’ [DCH]), whereas LXX has ἐνδεδυμένοις θώρακας πάντας (‘all dressed in breastplates’). In the other occurrence in the LXX of יַכְלָשׁי נֶפֶלֵד (23:12), LXX has ἐνδεδυκότας εὐπάρυψα (‘clothed with purple’) which reflects MT. Yet here, LXX seems to interpret how an army would be perfectly clothed, that is, in breastplates. LXX may have been guessing regarding this ‘perfect clothing’, or more likely, they were reflecting on how the soldiers were equipped in their day.

318 This point stands regardless of the placement as in the received chapter order, or as in 967, as both have the context of the destruction of Israel’s enemies as part of their full restoration.
MT also has this army carrying גֶּיאֶשׁ הוֹיֵנִים (‘large [body shield] and small shields’), or as most EVV ‘buckler and shields’, whereas LXX has πέλται καὶ περικεφαλαίαι (‘shield and helmet’). Allen (1990b, p.200) notes that ‘body shield’ “is not suitable for cavalry” and says in general that “the words appear to be an explanatory gloss on מִכְלָה ‘all of them’ functioning as a cue word”. He (1990b, p.200) also says LXX’s translation “appears to presuppose μικρά ὑδότην ‘small shield and helmet’ as in 5b” (also in 27:10). While this is likely the case, we question if LXX is again adjusting the meaning to match how cavalry soldiers were equipped in their day. MT also says ~L'Ku tAbr'x yfep.To (‘all of them handling/wielding swords’) referring to action of the horsemen, yet LXX only says καὶ μάχαιραι (‘and swords’) as just part of the equipment list previously mentioned. Some commentators delete the entire line in MT saying it is “a gloss on gorgeous attire” (Cooke, 1936, p.410). If the ‘handling/wielding’ swords (~yfep.To) was a gloss, then we may suggest it was added perhaps to emphasise Gog’s strength that would soon be cut down. Yet it is represented in all LXX MSS, so if a gloss, then it must have been very early. However, we are left with explicit points regarding how LXX viewed Gog’s forces would be equipped.

38:5 Πέρσαι καὶ Αἰθιόπες καὶ Λίβυες πάντες περικεφαλαίας καὶ πέλταις

In this verse we find LXX uses equivalent Greek names of inhabitants, where MT lists the names of countries:

- פֶרֶס – Πέρσαι – Persians;
- אַיְתָיוֹפֶס – Αἰθιόπες (א"ב Αἰθιόπαες) – Ethiopians;

319 Speculation continues amongst scholars regarding the identity of these people groups, yet this is outside our sphere. For possible identities see Bøe (2001, pp.99-107).
320 A later corrector has written ε above the αι; thus one has B* with –αις and Bε –εις. In 30:4, 9 LXX lists the country (Αἰθιόπια).
Libyians;

LXX’s use of Greek names for the inhabitants of these countries is another example of the translator interpreting the text for his community.

LXX also reverses the order of ‘shield and helmet’ and makes them both plural (perhaps to match MT’s collective). Many delete the reference to ‘shield and helmet’ believing it is carried over from v. 4 with כָלָה as a “cue word” (Block, 1998, p.437). Yet it appears in all representative MSS. It does appear confusing at times when commentators say that v. 4 evidences glosses based on v. 5, and then state the glosses in v. 5 are based on v. 4! Cooke (1936, p.410) speculatively maintains that “the entire verse … has found its way into the text from the margin”. However, there is no textual evidence for Cooke’s suggestion.

Here, and in v. 22, MT has חֲלֹן אֲנֵפִי ('all his band/army' [BDB], or ‘troops’ [HALOT]), yet LXX in both occurrences says כָלִם אֵנוָן ('and all those around him’). Theodotion has “καὶ πάντα τὰ ὑποστηρίγματα αὐτοῦ ('and all his supporters’) (Ziegler, 1977, p.273). Block (1998, p.437) says that עֲנִפי נַחַל “is a genuinely Ezekielian word, occurring outside this context (cf. vv. 9, 22; 39:4) only in 12:14 and 17:21”. LXX translates the same way in each occurrence in chapters 38-39. The translator of 12:14 (Thackeray’s α) used καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀντιλαμβανομένους αὐτοῦ ('and all those helping him’). In 17:21 the translator took two Hebrew words (one with a ketiv/qere variant), and translated with one noun (παρατάξει) and a pronoun, without
giving a specific equivalence for רַחַלִּים. Overall, we may suggest that רַחַלִּים as ‘his band/army’ may have been unknown to the LXX translator(s) and even to Theodotion, and hence their use of οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν and τὸ υποστηρίγματα respectively. However, both these words do catch the basic meaning that all those tied to Gomer would be included.

38:7 ἔτοιμόσθη (G A: + καὶ) ἔτοιμασαν σεαυτον σὺ καὶ πᾶσα ἡ συνεχωγὴ σου οἱ (G967: ἐπισυνηγμένοι; G B,A: συνηγμένοι) μετὰ σοῦ καὶ ἔση μοι εἰς προφυλακῆν μὴν

"A's καὶ copula plus follows MT, and allows for a smoother reading. G967.8’s minus of the copula brings out the ‘sharpness’ of the imperative clearer than MT or GA. Zimmerli (1983, p.286) says “G makes it more concise here by omitting the copula”, yet he does not note that the copula is present in G A.

MT has ὑπὸ (‘to them’), while LXX has μοι (‘to/for me’). Block (1998, p.437) concludes that MT is preferable. However Zimmerli (1983, p.286) says “G, which refers the ῥαχάλεις to submission to Yahweh (הל), has probably preserved the original reading”. Zimmerli (1983, p.286) observes that “in M one will think rather of the function of care and protection which the commander exercises towards his troops” (cf. Block, 1998, 443). We must question why MT would adjust from Zimmerli’s proposed הל to ῥαχάλεις, which moves the theological focus from God as commander to Gog as leader and carer of his troops. Rather, we propose that LXX exhibits theological exegesis stating clearly that God is leading Gog and his hordes: God is the one in charge of the battle and Gog is an instrument in his hand. Wevers (1982, p.202) says that “God and his hordes are commanded to be in Yahweh’s service ready for the call to action” (cf. REB: ‘hold yourself at my disposal’). This theological shift from MT may have brought a sense of comfort to the LXX community, alleviating fears of an enemy about to
conquer them again, whereby God is commanding and leading Gog and his hordes to their destruction. Gog’s destruction is his service to God! 321

There is a small intra-LXX variance wherein ἐπιτευγμένοι, ὑπερθερμάνων, and ἑπισυνημένοι. While both mean ‘gather/bring together’, the prefix ἐπί- suggests a more hostile ‘against’ (cf. Micah 4:11; Zech. 12:3; 1Macc. 3:58; 40:12).

38:8 ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ πλῆθου μαθήματος μεθέλημεν ἀλλ’ ἑπισυνημένοι, μαθήματα μισοῦντες

38:8 ὑμεῖς οἱ πλείονες ἐκβάλλεσθε καὶ ἐπὶ σχάτου ἐτῶν (B,A: + ἐλεύθεροι καὶ) ἤξελε εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀπεστραμμένην ἀπὸ μακάριας συνημμένοιν ἀπὸ ἐθνῶν πολλῶν (B: ἐπὶ γῆν Ἰσραήλ; A: εἰς τὴν γῆν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ) ἕγενθη ἔρημος δύναμιν καὶ ὄλου καὶ (A: αὐτὸς; B: οὗτος) ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἐξελήλυθεν καὶ κατουκήσασον ἐπ’ εἰρήνης ἅπαντες

MT’s ῥυπὲρ nif. refers to being summoned militarily (cf. Jer. 15:3; 51:27; [HALOT]). The piel means ‘muster’ (cf. Isa. 13:4), which may permit the niphal as ‘mustered’ (cf. NRSV). However, LXX has ἐτοιμασθῆται (3ps) with the meaning ‘to cause to be ready, put/keep in readiness, prepare’ [BAGD]. This follows the double use of ἐτοιμάζω in v. 7, and may be used here to maintain an ongoing theme. Yet, LXX may be seen as interpreting the intent of MT’s ‘summoned’: he will be prepared (for destruction).

MT twice says ‘you’ [will be summoned/will come], whereas LXX twice says ‘he’ [will be prepared/will come]. Both refer to Gog, but MT is preferred as it still keeps

321 Zimmerli (1983, p.286) captures this in his translation: “and you will be at <my> service”. Odell (2005, p.555) also notes that this command “establishes Gog as Yahweh’s agent”. In his commentary section, Zimmerli (1983, p.306) said “if v. 7b is correctly reconstructed on the basis of B, it refers the command to be ready specifically to readiness for ‘obedience’ (רְשׁוֹפָה) to Yahweh”.

322 However, Odell (2005, p.470) argues against ‘mustered’ (NRSV), stating that the niphal and qal meanings cannot be interchanged; and says that this “verse thus suggests not that Gog is mustered to go up against the land of Israel, but that he has fallen away from his duty. His attack therefore constitutes a defiance of Yahweh’s plan to restore the land and people of Israel (cf. 34:11-13, 25-27; 36:6-10, 24, 32; 37:13, 21-22)”.
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the context of the oracle directly addressing Gog (cf. v. 4f). LXX appears clumsy as it shifts from the second person in v. 7, to the third person in v. 8, then back to the second in v. 9. The third person appears as a narration rather than God’s speech to Gog through the prophet, which continues from v. 4. Zimmerli (1983, p.286) believes LXX ‘misunderstands’ the Hebrew 2ms as being 3fs. It is true that the 3fs “assume the lands as the subject, but the following killām, ‘all of them,’ has the people in mind” (Block, 1998, p.438). LXX may have been influenced by the pronoun ἡ αὐτή (3fs ‘she/it’) in agreement with ἡ αὐτή later in the verse. Yet LXX has the masculine (GB οὐτος, G967,A αὐτός);323 possibly LXX initially reading a 2ms as 3fs, and then interpreting a 3fs pronoun as ms. LXX possibly uses its ms to refer to ‘Ἰσραήλ’, as it is odd saying that ‘a land’ is brought out as MT states (we note both MT and LXX finish with 3pl).

For MT בְּשָׁנָיִם ('in the latter years’) LXX has ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτων ἐτῶν ('in the last years’). Block (1997c, p.100) points out that “although LXX renders … with ἐσχάτων, it is not clear that the end of time is in mind. The reference may be simply to a later time, when the historical phase of the exile is over and the new period of settlement in the land has arrived”.

MT says ‘you will come to βῆθα (‘to a land’), whereas LXX says ‘he shall come εἰς τὴν γῆν (‘to the land’). LXX’s addition of the definite article may have theological significance by establishing which land – the land: for them there is only one ‘land’ and that being Israel. GB,A have καὶ ἔλευσθαι as a plus leading into this phrase, which creates a rather clumsy reading; G967 follows MT.

MT has βῆθα βασιλείας (‘the mountains of Israel’), yet LXX has γῆν Ἰσραήλ (‘[the] land of Israel’). It is difficult to determine which is the ‘correct’ reading, but as much of

323 The phrase following αὐτός in GA has the word order reversed. Normally we do not mention this practice unless it has possible theological meaning, but this is just another minor point regarding the textual anomalies in this verse.
chapters 36-39 relate to the ‘mountains’ of Israel, MT is preferred. This is the only occurrence of \( \text{גָּרֵשׁ שָׁלֹא} \) out of 15 in Ezekiel in which LXX uses \( \gamma \eta \) \( \text{לָאֹרֶף יְרֵה} \).\(^{324}\) It is unclear why LXX would use \( \gamma \eta \), especially when these two chapters makes it clear that Gog’s destruction will be upon the mountains of Israel (cf. 39:2, 4, 17). MT may have performed a later editorial work here at a similar time to 38:21 where LXX is also minus \( \partial \rho \eta \), and in both locales MT specifies ‘the mountains’ as the place of the conflict between God and Gog. Cooke (1936, p.411) notes that “the expression [upon the mountains] is inconsistent with the deliberate vagueness of the previous clause”.\(^{325}\)

Picking up on Cooke’s point, we suggest that the surrounding context refers to the entire land (cf. vv. 8, 11, 12, 16, 18), and only here specifically to the mountains of Israel, and so LXX interprets ‘mountains’ to refer to the whole land and translates accordingly. The use of \( \gamma \eta \) may reflect a different Vorlage.

While \( \text{G}^{967,B} \) have \( \epsilon \pi \) for MT’s \( \text{דָּלֶם} \). \( \text{G}^{A} \) has \( \epsilon i \zeta \), and adds \( \tau \omega \) before \( \text{לָאֹרֶף יְרֵה} \). which appears to have the enemy only coming ‘into’ and not ‘against’ the land. \( \text{G}^{967} \) also does not represent MT’s following \( \text{דָּלֶם} \) (\( \text{G}^{B, A}; \gamma \)).

LXX use of \( \partial \lambda \) for MT’s \( \text{דָּלֶם} \) is rather curious, as \( \partial \lambda \) is normally used for \( \text{כְּלַש} \). We again find \( \text{דָּלֶם} \) in 39:14 for the ‘continual’ employment of those who seek out the remains of the battle (LXX \( \text{διὰ παντὸς} \)). \( \text{דָּלֶם} \) is typically used in Torah and elsewhere in relation to sacrifices; this context is found in Ezek. 46:14, 15 (also \( \text{διὰ παντὸς} \)). Ezekiel may have been performing a pun stating that the desolation of the

\(^{324}\) \( \text{גָּרֵשׁ שָׁלֹא} \) is found in Ezek. 6:2, 3; 19:9; 33:28; 34:13, 14; 35:12; 36:1 (2x), 4, 8; 38:8; 39:2, 4, 17.

Block (1998, p.444) points out that “v. 8 may be interpreted as a shorthand version of Ezekiel’s salvation oracles, especially 36:1-15, addressed to the mountains of Israel and highlighting the restoration of its population”.

\(^{325}\) Zimmerli (1983, p.307) says “in mysterious secrecy the ‘mountains of Israel’ are not instantly named as the goal of Gog’s campaign, but these mountains are spoken of as a land whose population … has been brought back from having been slaughtered by the sword (37:1-14) and has been gathered together again from among the many nations (20:32ff)”.
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mountains was due to the unsanctioned sacrifices held there (cf. 6:2, 3). If so, this was missed by LXX’s translator(s).

We find MT saying Gog and his bands will come upon the land ḫאָשא, which has the basic meaning of ‘as a storm/destruction/desolation’, and also, as in the present context, ‘a storm that breaks out violently and suddenly’ [HALOT]. LXX translates this with υετός ‘heavy rain’ [LEH]. Yet this does not capture the full sense of ḫאָשא. As ḫאָשא is not found elsewhere in Ezekiel,326 we may suggest that LXX reflected on the ‘cloud’ to arrive with υετός. LXX may have been seeking to lessen the severity of Gog’s coming. However, Theodotion (Ziegler, 1977, p.273) later adjusts this towards MT by using the more appropriate καταϊγίς (‘a sudden blast of wind’ [LS] or ‘rushing storm’ [Thayer]). Symmachus goes in a different direction by using εξαιρήσεις (‘suddenly’ [LS]), indicating the speed in which he saw Gog coming against the land. Both these appear to go against any attempt of LXX to lessen the severity with its use of υετός.

LXX also appears to have difficulty dealing with MT’s ḫהט, perhaps viewing it as referring to the following words, and so inserts καί which Zimmerli (1983, p.287) says “is an inelegant secondary insertion which disrupts the syntactical context”. Whilst representing ḫהט, LXX’s καί plus causes ἐστι / ἐσι to refer to the following phrase, reading ‘and you will be, you and all with you’. The translator may be excused, as we may presume that the Hebrew before him did not have the attnach found in MT,

326 Zimmerli (1983, p.307) translates ḫאָשא as ‘thunderstorm’ here and says it “might have come from Is 10:3”.
supplied by the later Masoretes, which places הָיָה with the preceding phrase. On the other hand, if the Masoretes had put the atnach under יָדָיו the text could read ‘… the land, you will be [there], you and your bands …’, which would support LXX (not counting their καί plus). However, more perplexing is G^A which also has the καί plus, but distinct from G^967,B, says πέσῃ causing the text to read ‘and it will fall’, apparently referring back to either ὑετός or νυφέλη. G^A may have been influenced by 39:4 which has the same wording, but there in reference to Gog falling and being devoured on the mountains of Israel (cf. 39:1). Therefore, G^A may have been stating, as in 39:4, that Gog and ‘those with you’ will quickly fall as rain upon the land. This is different to the sense of both MT and G^967,B, which have Gog coming like rain and so numerous even as a cloud covering the land.\footnote{Block (1998, p.444) also says the two nouns in the Hebrew are “a metaphor for a sudden invasion by vast numbers of troops”.

5.3. 2nd Oracle: Ezek. 38:10-13.

As noted above, all MT MSS and G^B,A exhibit a sense division break after v. 9 (except G^967 which has vv. 1-16 in the one sense division). MT’s next break comes after v. 13, as does G^A. Yet, G^B does not evidence another break until the end of v. 17, which places three MT sense divisions into the one.

The previous section (vv. 1-9) describes what God will do. In this section the LORD speaks to Gog, revealing Gog’s personal thoughts to attack Israel. While we see in this pericope that Gog has his reasons for attacking Israel, God is nevertheless
presented as being in complete control. Gog’s reasons include the potential spoils of war (v. 12-13) from an easy target (v. 11). The people living in the land in v. 12 echoes the repopulation found in chapter 36:10, 33.

MT says they will come τῇ ἁλίᾳ ἑτέρῃ \(\text{ἐκ θήβαις τῆς Ἑβραίων} \) (‘to a land of un-walled towns’), where LXX has ἐπὶ γῆν ἀπερριμμένην (‘to a land being rejected/discarded’).\(^{328}\) Whilst the context indicates that the towns are without walls due to the people living safely and/or securely in the land (cf. vv. 11b, 12), LXX appears to interpret as a state of being devastated. LXX could also be giving a postexilic interpretation that the villages are unprotected and un-walled because God has rejected or discarded them. LXX’s passive perfect participle suggests they saw this ‘rejecting/discarding’ was still ongoing.

\(\text{G}^{B,A}\) have a unique plus of ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ (‘in stillness/quiet’), that is not witnessed in MT or \(\text{G}^{967}\). Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.8) says that this minus in \(\text{G}^{967}\) “may be due to ἡσυχαζοντας in the preceding line, but the phrase is not in our present Hebrew text”. Lust (2002a, p.386) states this is not a case of homoioteleuton in \(\text{G}^{967}\), noting it is also minus in the Vetus Latina Codex Wirceburgensis (\(W\)). Thus, \(\text{G}^{B,A}\) add to the description of those in the land living in rest and peace.

We also find an implicit LXX interpretation where MT says τῇ ἁλίᾳ ἑτέρῃ (‘those living in safety’, or ‘living securely’), and LXX says οἰκοῦντας ἐπὶ εἰρήνης (‘those

\(^{328}\) The literal meaning of ἀπορρίπτω is “to throw away, to put away; to reject; to abandon” [LEH]; also “to cast forth from one’s country” [LS].
living in peace’). LXX clarifies again that to live safely or securely is to live in peace. The concept of ‘peaceful living’ may be found in the Hebrew (השָׁלוֹם שֵׁבַיְם, ‘the peaceful ones who live securely’ [HALOT]), yet LXX makes this point explicit.

MT’s כלֵּם יְשָׁבֵים בֵּאָרָי יְהוָה (‘all of them dwelling without walls’), is witnessed by G\(^967\), which suggests this was original. However, the other two LXX MSS have their own unique plusses, clarifying the place where they are dwelling without walls: G\(^B\) κατοικοῦντας γῆν (‘inhabiting a land’), and G\(^A\) κατοικοῦντας πόλεις (‘inhabiting cities’). The change from G\(^B\)’s land to G\(^A\)’s cities may indicate that in G\(^A\)’s time ‘Israel’ is not just a land, but found in whatever city the people now inhabit. Yet, more likely, G\(^A\) interprets where in the land that the people are now dwelling: in cities.

At the end of this verse G\(^B,A\)’s πορευόμαι matches MT’s πτῶμα, ‘doors’. Yet G\(^967\) has an interesting variant of πορευόμαι, which means an “oblong shield (shaped like a door)” [LEH], or ‘a stone put against a door to keep it shut’ [LS].\(^{329}\) Gehman (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.129) says that “πορευόμαι is never used as a rendering for πτῶμα, while πορευά frequently represents πτῶμα.” It is difficult to know why G\(^967\) used πορευόμαι, other than as a word play to state they live without walls, bars or shields.

Overall, this verse exhibits an LXX text in a state of flux with a different understanding to MT, perhaps due to the various timeframes of living in the land.

329 Gehman (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.129) also says “in Classical Greek epic θυρεός is a door-stone, placed by Polyphemus at the mouth of his den”.
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MT has לָשׁוּב יָדֶךָ (‘to turn your hand’), yet LXX has τοῦ ἐπιστρέψας χειράμου (‘to turn my hand’).^330 Cooke (1936, p.412) says that LXX’s “my hand, [is] more consistent, but not necessarily right: the writer forgets for the moment that Gog is speaking”. However, it is difficult to know where Gog’s proposed speech from v. 11 finishes and where God resumes as the direct speaker (both MT and LXX have God as the direct speaker in v. 13). MT appears to finish Gog’s speech after וב in the opening phrase with its use of ‘your hand’. However, LXX’s ‘my hand’ appears to continue Gog’s monologue throughout v. 12. On the other hand it may be that LXX has the LORD as subject of the action against the desolate places. If so, this again could be LXX’s view that the desolate places were the result of God having rejected them.

LXX’s πολλῶν plus (‘many [nations]’) seems to expand the plurality of their scattering (cf. v. 16a). MT also includes וַיָּנָּהוּ מַעֲשֵׂה (‘cattle and possessions’, cf. v. 13), yet LXX has one embracing κτήσεις (‘property’). Zimmerli (1983, p.287) notes that the two Hebrew words “are not attested elsewhere in Ezekiel”.

Some scholars suggest a similarity between רָבָבָה (lit. ‘height’) and Mount Tabor (cf. Zimmerli, 1983, p.311; Cooper, 1994, p.338). However, if this connection was intended by Ezekiel, it is not represented in LXX’s όμφαλός (‘centre/navel’). Block (1997c, p.101, n.66) says that “the interpretation of רָבָבָה [sic] as ‘navel’ is as ancient as LXX but should be abandoned”; Block retains the meaning, ‘top of the world’. TWOT also understands רָבָבָה as ‘highest part, centre’, which is the meaning found in Jud. 9:37. However, the context there denotes the centre of Israel, and may even implicitly refer to Jerusalem. Fairbairn (1989, p.425) suggests it “may include the two points—of a prominent position, and of great fullness of blessing; on both accounts fitted to awaken the envy of others”. Surprisingly, HALOT gives only the meaning “navel” and as “the

---

^330 This is for G^67,B,A and Ziegler, yet Ralph has οοο along with later LXX (e.g., G^62).
centre of the land (or of the earth)”, although all its citations are late (except Jud. 9:37), and citing LXX and Vulgate in support. BDB has ‘highest part, centre’, covering both bases, yet in the explanation BDB also takes on LXX’s meaning of ‘navel’. LXX’s ὁμφαλὸς (‘navel’ [LEH]; or ‘anything central – like a navel’ [LS]), captures MT’s metaphor, and may be speaking out of the theology of early Judaism, that Israel and Jerusalem is the ‘centre’ or ‘navel’ of the world (Cooke, 1936, p.412f; Zimmerli, 1983, p.311).331

MT gives סַפַּרְרֵי תַּרְשִׁישׁ (‘the merchants/traders of Tarshish’) as one of Gog’s allies332, yet G967,B identify them as ēμποροὶ Καρχηδόνιοι (‘Carthaginian merchants’, cf. 27:12, 25), and G A as Χαλκηδόνος (‘Chalcedon merchants’). Only in LXX Isaiah (23:1, 6, 10, 14) do we find Καρχηδόνος used for סַפַּרְרֵי תַּרְשִׁישׁ; elsewhere תִּרְשִׁישׁ. These may have been the major traders of LXX’s era. Thus, LXX repeats its practice of translating with contemporary people group names as in v. 5.

331 Block (1998, p.447) says that the meaning of כַּלְמַע הָאָרֶץ “continues to engage scholars. The common rendering ‘navel of the earth,’ which derives from LXX ὁμφαλὸς, is perpetuated in the Vulg. umbilici terrae, as well as in pseudepigraphic and rabbinic writings, and is reflected in several renown medieval maps. But many modern interpreters have abandoned the literal ‘navel’ explanation, preferring to see here a figure of speech for ‘the centre of the earth’. By this understanding the land of Israel/Zion is viewed as a cosmic midpoint, which accords better with later Hebrew; moreover, our prophet himself declared earlier that Yahweh had placed Jerusalem in the middle of the nations (5:5)”. However Block (1998, p.448) then goes on to state “nevertheless, this interpretation suffers from several major weaknesses and should probably be abandoned”. He then discusses five key points to ‘abandon’ the above viewpoint. Block’s rejection does not explain why LXX adopted its ‘navel’ view.

332 It is unclear at this point in the text if these are military allies or bystanders. Regardless of which, it is clear they are awaiting the spoil.
MT has הֵרֵעָה (lit. ‘its young lions’ cf. 32:2), which is understood in many EVV and elsewhere as ‘its young warriors’. Yet LXX says καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ κώμαι αὐτῶν (‘and all their villages’ [cf. NIV]). Allen (1990b, p.200) believes “LXX Θ Syr interpreted [תִּפְרְחָה] as תִּפְרְחָה [sic] ‘its villages’ (= RSV). An emendation רֵיהָנִים ‘its traders’ … is plausible, assuming an insertion of ב for sense after corruption to הֵרֵעָה (רֵיהָנִים), but a simpler suggestion would be רֵיהָנִים ‘its traders’”. The context would point to either ‘young lions/warriors’ or ‘traders’, but LXX’s ‘villages’ seems out of place. Zimmerli (1983, p.287) also claims that LXX “misunderstood” the Hebrew, yet unlike Allen, he does not clarify how. As LXX was working from an unpointed Hebrew text, Allen’s first suggestion appears the more plausible. The Hebrew may have been ‘corrupted’, or, developing Allen’s second suggestion, it may have been a deliberate exegetical emendation by a later scribe (cf. לֵדוֹלָל below). Interestingly, Symmachus has καὶ πάντες διδρεθιοί λέωντες αὐτῆς (‘and all her destructive lions’), which whilst reading הֵרֵעָה as ‘lions’ inserts ‘destructive’ (Ziegler, 1977, p.274). It may be that ‘traders’ was original as suggested above, but an earlier Hebrew scribe changed this to read ‘lions’ as witnessed by Σ. This may have been to match the surrounding context of devouring plunder, and to clarify that the merchants were not coming as just bystanders to Gog for trade, but were allies with the intent of devouring Israel’s resources as lions do their prey. This change was misread by the earlier LXX translators as ‘villages’ (cf. Allen’s first suggestion above).

MT has לִשְׁלָלָל †דִּודי (‘to seize great spoil’), but LXX does not reflect †דִּודי either from an accidental omission or because it was not in its Vorlage. It is difficult to think that LXX deliberately omitted the opportunity to expand the size of the spoil.

333 Θ’s variant of χώμαι αὐτῆς appears to be a scribal error (χ for κ) as ‘and all her mounds/heaps’ (χώμαι [LS]) does not make sense.
This leaves us with the possibility of אדנ as a later MT plus, to emphasise the extent of the spoil that the community believes it has suffered. Eichrodt (1970, p.518) sees “dittography from the beginning of the verse”. However, Zimmerli (1983, p.288) maintains “the triple accentuation of the three parallel infinitive clauses suggests the originality of מ”. The later Symmachus and Theodotion have πολλά and μεγάλα respectively, thus both witnessing MT (Ziegler, 1977, p.274). It is possible that a later Hebrew editor added אדנ, at the same time ‘adjusting’ the Hebrew to form התים (cf. Zimmerli and Allen above).

5.4. 3rd Oracle: Ezek. 38:14-16

Again, we have a uniform sense division break before v. 14 with all MT MSS. However, $G^{967,B}$ do not witness this break, unlike $G^A$ which has breaks both before and within v. 14 (between $\Gamma\gamma\tau\omega$ and $\tau\delta\epsilon$).

This section now reverts back to the LORD speaking through the prophet to Gog, informing what will happen in his upcoming gathering for the intended plunder of Israel (as in the 1st Oracle). It provides the reason why the LORD will allow this to happen: for universal recognition of the LORD’s holiness (cf. v. 16b). While Gog may have his own plans (the spoil), the text shows that he (and his hordes) are instruments in the LORD’s hands, for the purpose of manifesting the LORD’s holiness and knowledge throughout all the earth. The LORD previously stated his actions will be done so Israel will know he is the LORD (36:11, 38; 37:6, 13), and even the surrounding nations would also know (36:23, 36; 37:28), but now the LORD’s defeat of this ‘superpower’ gathering will establish this ‘knowledge’ throughout the nations as a world impact statement.

This pericope again uses the terms ‘my people’ (cf. 36:8, 12, 36: 8, 12, 28; 37:12, 13, 27; 38:14, 16; 39:7), and ‘my land’ (cf. 36:5; 38:16). Concerning this, Block (1997c, p.102) states that “since the normal deity-nation-land relationships are now
operative, for Gog to attack this people and invade this land is to challenge their / its
divine patron”. Thus Gog’s defeat is certain.

38:14 

MT has ἵππηση (‘you will know’), yet LXX has ἕγερθη (‘you will be aroused’).

Allen (1990b, p.200) suggests an MT scribal “error and metathesis” of ר and ד and he 
emends MT to נוחל (‘you will be aroused’). Those who hold to an MT error use 
LXX as support. Yet De Vries (1995, p.177) says that “there is no good reason to follow 
the LXX here … because the rhetorical question [in MT] has the intent of synchronizing 
Gog’s earliest awareness that Israel is dwelling securely in his own land (cf. v 8) with 
his departure (bw’) prior to his attack (’lh) (v 16)”. Block (1998, p.449) points out that 
“it is equally possible the error was committed by the LXX translators”, which leaves 
MT as original. MasEzek also bears witness to MT. The theological difference is 
subtle, yet needs to be taken into consideration. Based on Block’s point, we suggest that 
LXX may have done a trans-lingual word play (cf. Allen: ר for ר), giving an interpretation 
of what will happen when Gog ‘knows’ about the people dwelling securely (or 
peacefully): Gog will be aroused and brought to the battle (v. 15). LXX uses the 
passive, perhaps continuing the implicit motif of God being in control, as the action is

334 Odell (2005, p.553) notes how “at the beginning of the oracle, the resettled people have no particular 
identity, at least in the eyes of the other nations. A quiet people living in a land restored from war 
and affiliated with neither clan nor king, they appear ripe for the plundering. It is only when Yahweh 
tells Ezekiel to prophesy against Gog that they are claimed as Yahweh’s people (38:14, 16) and the 
land is defended as Yahweh’s land”.

335 Allen further suggests that רלי (‘may have originated as a comparative gloss relating to the formula in 
39:5b, with 5:13; 17:21 (cf. 6:10) in view, which subsequently displaced the similar-looking רלי’).

336 This is the last extant word in the MasEzek fragment.
done to Gog. LXX changes the context from a question of knowledge as in MT, to a statement of action that will be done to Gog, yet still framed as a question. This is even clearer with $G^{967}$'s minus of $οὐκ$, and its $καί$ plus, which turns the context from a question into a statement ($G^{BA}$ are plus $οὐκ$ / $οὐχι$, but minus $καί$). For MT, including the interrogative Μολὼν, the context leads into the action of v. 15, making the interrogative into a question that presumes an answer: ‘will you not know it, and you will come’. From this theological context we suggest that MT’s reading is original, and LXX is an interpretive wordplay that takes Gog’s ‘knowledge’ (знать) into the action of ‘being raised up’ (созерцать).

LXX has a πάντα plus (‘all the nations will know’). This key plus emphasises that the knowledge of the LORD’s actions will not just be known by the nations in the immediate vicinity of Israel, but by all nations, even those afar off. This plus may also be related to the πολλῶν plus in v. 12, where Israel is gathered from many nations (also 37:21; 39:23). These plusses indicate that LXX was concerned that Israel was gathered out of ‘all’ the nations, and that ‘all’ nations would know this, and would know the LORD.

MT explicitly clarifies the subject by its placement of $G$ as a vocative at the end of this verse. Cooke (1936, p.414) notes that “at the end of the v. $G$ … omit O Gog, which comes awkwardly where it stands”. $G^{967}$ places $Γωγ$ as a vocative at the
beginning of v. 17. Yet $\mathfrak{G}^{B,A}$ both place $\Gamma\omega\gamma$ at the end of the introductory formula in v. 17, along with a dative article ($\tau\varphi$) to clarify Gog as the addressee of God’s speech. While some, like Zimmerli (1983, p.288), suspect the originality of MT, others like Block (1998, p.449) note “the Syr. omission of the vocative and LXX attachment of $[\Gamma\omega\gamma]$ to v. 17 are insufficient grounds for deleting the name”. The placement of Gog at the end of MT’s sentence structure “provides the first concrete indication since the opening challenge that the real antagonists in this oracle are not Yahweh and Israel, but Yahweh and Gog” (Block, 1998, p.451). MT’s placement causes ‘Gog’ to stand as an inclusio identifying the object in its sense division from vv. 14-16. These points are missed by $\mathfrak{G}^{B,A}$’s placement of $\Gamma\omega\gamma$ into v. 17, which just identifies $\Gamma\omega\gamma$ as the object of God’s speech. The ‘antagonism’ against Gog may still be found in $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$’s placement as a vocative at the beginning of v. 17. If $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ was the later LXX MSS, one could argue ‘Gog’ was a later MT placement at the end of the sentence. However, as the earliest LXX MSS supports the general locale of Gog, we suggest ‘Gog’ was original, and at the end of v. 16 (as in MT). It was initially placed in LXX as an opening vocative for v. 17 (as in $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$), but then later LXX editors moved it to clarify the addressee in v. 17 ($\mathfrak{G}^{B,A}$). This evidences LXX as a text in a state of flux.

God being honoured by the defeat of Gog echoes Exod. 14:4 where God says he will also be honoured by the demise of Pharaoh. The recognition is universal, especially with LXX (cf. πάντα plus above).

---

337 Curiously, Gehman (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.74 [cf. p.130]) attributes $\Gamma\omega\gamma$ to 38:16, and claims it is one of the “43 cases which are an exact translations of the Hebrew”. However, Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.177) has noted $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$’s normal paragraphoi marker ("=") in the text and attributes $\Gamma\omega\gamma$ as a vocative at the beginning of v. 17.
5.5. 4th Oracle: Ezek. 38:17

Block (1992b, p.172) argues against ascribing this verse and vv. 18-23 “to different editorial hands” as some suggest; then, based on the style and content, he says, “it must be concluded that v. 17 enjoys relative [sense] independence from the verses that follow”.338 This statement is supported by MT’s paragraphing: v. 17 stands alone as its own ‘sense division’ in all representative MT MSS. It begins ἐκ 967’s second sense division (vv. 17-23); v. 17 also begins Ἐκ 8’s next division (vv. 17-21a). Ἐκ 6 has v. 17 as the last verse of the previous sense division (vv. 10-17).339

This indicates that these communities behind these manuscripts, especially MT, saw this verse as a fulfilment of their prophetic history, and sought to establish the historical aspect of Gog’s animosity against God and his people. Block (1992b, p.157) puts a lot of stock in this verse when he says “for the interpretation of the Gog oracle Ezek. xxxviii 17 presents a crux”.

338 Block (1998, p.453) later says that “the new citation formula signals the commencement of the fourth literary frame. This frame consists of two unequal parts, clearly distinguished in style and purpose (v. 17, vv. 18-23).

339 Ἐκ 6 ends v. 16 at the end of a page and starts v. 17 at the top of the next, causing it to be very difficult, if not impossible, to determine if any division was intended.
MT (supported by Targum) asks an unexpected rhetorical question: ‘are you the one who?’\(^\text{340}\) LXX interprets this as an affirmative statement: σὺ εἶ περὶ οὗ (‘you are the one concerning whom’). Block (1998, p.452) notes that “many follow LXX, Syr., and Vulg. in reading an affirmative statement, assuming the ḫē on ḫaʻattâ is a dittography”\(^\text{341}\). Yet this change from an MT interrogative question to an LXX affirmative statement is in keeping with previous instances where LXX has interpreted the identity of Gog (v. 3), or MT’s action (v. 14). LXX may be seen making a theological statement that there is no doubt that it is Gog who has been spoken (prophesied) about by the prophets of Israel.\(^\text{342}\) This theology may also have influenced their placement of Gog in this verse. Fishbane (1985, p.510) says that “the earlier vague predictions [in other books] of an enemy from the north are reinterpreted by the author of Ezek. 38-39 into a vision of world significance”.\(^\text{343}\) Fairbairn (1989, p.425) also claims that the prophecy “appeared now only in a new form, but the thing itself had been many times described by God’s servants”, and (1985, p.477) “clearly the prophet saw the advancing devastation as the fulfilment of ancient prophecies …. Presumably, Ezekiel (or a pseudo-Ezekiel) believed the advent of Gog to be the true fulfilment of the ancient prediction”.

\(^\text{340}\) Block (1992b, p.157f) notes that “the prophet raises a question concerning Gog which not only catches the reader off guard after vv. 14-16; it seems to have little bearing on the furious attack upon Gog by Yahweh described in vv. 18-23”.

\(^\text{341}\) In an earlier work Block (1992b, p.170) said that LXX’s affirmative answer “may just as well be explained as a haplographic error on the part of the translators as a dittographic mistake by the Massoretes”. Zimmerli (1983, p.288) also “supposes” MT’s interrogative “хи” is a dittograph”.

\(^\text{342}\) Unfortunately, Ezekiel does not state who these prophets were, other than being ‘prophets of Israel’, nor what they said, which has opened up a plethora of speculative proposals. For a detailed discussion of various proposals regarding the identity of these ‘prophets’ see commentators such as Block (1992b). Whilst many scholars propose Jeremiah (Block, 1992b, p.166; Lust, 1995b, p.709), Cooke (1936, p.414) argues that “it is implied that a considerable time had passed meanwhile; Ezekiel himself would not have alluded to the prophecies of Jeremiah in this way”. Fitzpatrick (2004, p.91f) also finds in favour of Jeremiah, yet also of Isaiah.

\(^\text{343}\) Fishbane (1985, p.523) also says the “older prophetic promises are reappropriated in the proto-apocalyptic narratives of Ezek. 38-9”.
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Block (1992b, p.172) concludes that the answer to MT’s question regarding Gog being the fulfilment of previous prophecies should be “a firm ‘NO!’”, rather than the traditional affirmative answer as found in LXX. Block’s (1992b, p.172) reason is the absence of Gog as an enemy in any previous prophecies, and an affirmative answer would render the following verses as “nonsensical” saying “how could Yahweh announce in one breath that Gog is his agent, and in the next vent his wrath on him with such fury”. Block (1992b, p.171) maintains that “even if Gog would have answered this question positively, the correct answer is negative”. Fitzpatrick (2004, p.93) also says “the answer demanded by the rhetorical question was negative”, and says that “interpreting the verse with a negative answer, opens up the passage that follows to understand Gog in his fundamental purpose: to be an instrument which Yhwh could use in the future to unloose his anger against Israel again”. Fitzpatrick (2004, p.91) concludes “in the final analysis, against the recommendation of the BHS, there is no reason to depart from MT”. Odell (2005, p.558) covers both bases saying “the answer to the question of v. 17 is a resounding yes-and-no: yes, others have seen Gog as the fulfilment of prophecy; but no, Gog does not have an external license to wage war on Yahweh’s quiet people”.

We also find two other rhetorical questions addressed to Gog in the previous section wherein a positive answer is implied (cf. vv. 13, 14). In the previous pericope (vv. 14-16) the prophetic speech was addressed to Gog, and in the following pericope (vv. 18-23) the LORD is informing the prophet, not Gog, what will now take place. The LORD can therefore still use Gog as his ‘puppet’ (cf. Block) in the previous verses, as this ‘use’ will lead to Gog’s destruction; Israel’s prophets often spoke judgement to those who came against Israel. How one interprets v. 17 may depend upon whether one sees this as an actual question directed at Gog or a rhetorical question about Gog. After all, how would Gog know what has, or has not, been prophesied about him, or other
‘enemies’, from Israel’s prophets? Yet, if the question was directed at Gog with an expectant answer, surely Gog would answer ‘yes’ in an effort to bring fear and intimidation. If v. 17 is a rhetorical question about Gog as the beginning of God’s speech to the prophet (cf. G967, vv. 17f), then it also anticipates a ‘yes’ answer as it reflects on the prophetic oracles of judgement against Israel’s enemies.

However, regardless how modern commentators interpret MT’s question, LXX has exegetically interpreted with an affirmative answer, rather than leaving the question for their community to debate. LXX therefore must have seen Gog as the one whom the prophets generically spoke about as the ultimate enemy. One influence could be the interpretative tradition behind LXX’s use of Γωγ for γαγ in Num. 24:7 (also Aquila and Symmachus), and for ἤμω (Amos 7:1).

We also observe that LXX does not include a rendering of ὁσμολλί (‘who prophesied’), but the sense remains unchanged, as it is implied. Block (1992b, p.162) suggests that “this looks like an haplographic error”. On the other hand this could be another later MT plus not witnessed by LXX, clarifying the action of the prophets. This may be the case, as ὁσμολλί is witnessed in Theodotion as τῶν προφητευομένων (Field, 1964, p.871).

There is a minor intra-LXX variant where G967 follows the difficult Hebrew syntax with ἐν χειρὶ, which is ‘smoothed’ out by the later G8, using διὰ χειρός.

5.6. 5th Oracle: Ezek. 38:18-23

All MT MSS have 38:18-23 as the one sense division, as does G8. As noted above, G967 begin this pericope at v. 17, and concludes at the end of the chapter (v. 23). G8 also begins at v. 17, but starts another division mid v. 21, most likely again

---

344 Curiously, Zimmerli is the only major commentator who notes this point, yet without explanation.
influenced by λέγει κύριος (cf. Σ’s division v. 14b above); its next break is after v. 23.

This pericope, addressed to the prophet, focuses on what the LORD will do when Gog finally attacks, and on the three spheres of sea, air and earth that will be impacted (cf. v. 20). It also shows that the LORD will destroy Gog in his heated wrath (v. 19), an image that appears to echo epic battles of Israel’s past when their enemy turned against themselves (Jud. 7:22; 2Chron. 20:23). We may also find an echo of the LORD’s overthrow of Sodom (Gen. 19:24). Again, as at the end of the previous major pericope (v. 16), we find the LORD declaring that the purpose for his action against Gog is to establish his ‘greatness’ and ‘holiness’, and so that he will be ‘known’ before ‘many nations’ (v. 23).

Verses 18-19 need to be considered together due to the sentence division in LXX, as shown by its syntax. Most commentators propose that רָפָא at the end of v. 18 belongs better at the start of v. 19 (Zimmerli, 1983, p.289; Block, 1998, p.452). On one hand, רָפָא can fit in with v. 18 as it completes a Hebrew idiom for anger: יִתְמָר עַל הַפָּנִים (‘my heat/rage will go up in my nose/face’). On the other hand, רָפָא can also alone mean ‘anger’ [HALOT #3], and if placed in v. 19 as some suggest, then v. 19 would read (lit.) ‘in my anger and in my jealousy in the fire of my fury I have spoken’. Yet we note that each representative MT MS places רָפָא in v. 18, and so we maintain that
reading. Regardless of where \textit{בּאַסַּנְנָה} is placed in MT, it is not witnessed in LXX which reads, (v. 18) ‘my anger/rage will go up (v. 19) and my jealousy, in the fire of my wrath I have spoken’. Thus, LXX omits the idiom ‘nose/face’. It still reflects the intent of the Hebrew, but without the explicit point that God’s rage would be seen on his ‘face’.\footnote{Fitzpatrick (2004, p.95) says LXX’s minus here “is a loss. This visible rage harkens back to the rage of the holy war described by the Israelite narrators, Josh 8:14ff.; Judg 4:14ff.; 5:4; 20; 1 Sam 7:7ff.; 14:15ff.; 2 Sam 5:20ff. It dramatically heightens the sense of the profanation of the Creator’s covenant people living in right order and relationship, and the anger of their defender”}

This may be an example of a later community who no longer use a particular Hebrew idiom, and now put it into ‘plain language’. Alternatively, LXX may have sought avoiding using such an anthropomorphic term, as Cooke (1936, p.414) notes that Targum also paraphrases here “to avoid the anthropomorphism”.

We may question why Allen (1990, p.201) says that “sentence re-division seems necessary with LXX”, when LXX does not witness the ‘disputed’ word. Referring to \textit{ζηλός} in v. 19, Block (1998, p.452) says “LXX interprets ‘my passion’ as a second subject of \textit{ta’âleh} in v. 18”. For MT, \textit{נוכְךָאֶתַּנֵהּ} is able to stand alone and leads into the following statement. LXX may have been either smoothing out a Hebrew idiom, or avoiding anthropomorphism, but the result is that LXX sees both the Lord’s ‘anger’ (v. 18) and ‘jealousy’ (v. 19) as arising, rather than the Lord speaking out of his jealousy.

Eichrodt (1970, p. 518) claims “‘in the day when Gog comes upon the land of Israel’ [is] an explanatory gloss” (cf. v. 18). However, this phrase is witnessed in all representative MT and LXX MSS. 38:20 ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου οἱ ἰχθύες τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τὰ ἄγρια τοῦ πεδίου καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐρπετὰ τὰ ἔρποντα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

\footnote{Fitzpatrick (2004, p.95) says LXX’s minus here “is a loss. This visible rage harkens back to the rage of the holy war described by the Israelite narrators, Josh 8:14ff.; Judg 4:14ff.; 5:4; 20; 1 Sam 7:7ff.; 14:15ff.; 2 Sam 5:20ff. It dramatically heightens the sense of the profanation of the Creator’s covenant people living in right order and relationship, and the anger of their defender”}
καὶ πάντες οἱ άνθρωποι οἱ ἐπὶ προσώπου τῆς γῆς (G967: + πάσης) καὶ ῥαγήσεται τὰ ὄρη καὶ πεσοῦνται αἱ φάραγγες καὶ πάν τείχος ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν πεσεῖται (G967: + ἵνα γνῶσιν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐμὲ ἐν σοὶ ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν)

LXX’s κυρίου plus in the first phrase changes to the 3rd person, so making a statement rather than continued speech as in MT (‘ἐμε’ ‘from my face’).

MT says τάβάρναλμα (‘the terraces will fall’ [HALOT], or ‘steep place’ [BDB; TWOT]). BHS suggests emending to τάνταλον (‘the towers’) that will fall. LXX says it will be the φάραγγες (‘the valleys/ravines’; cf. 36:4, 6; 39:11). Alternatively, Symmachus says νάσαις (‘forests’; cf. 6:3; 36:6) will fall, and Theodotion φραγμοί (‘fences/ hedges/ barriers’ [LEH]). MT has used a relatively rare word that does not occur elsewhere in Ezekiel (cf. SoS. 2:14), and LXX appears to have referred back to Ezek. 36:4, 6 to find a possible interpretation.

G967’s plus of ἵνα γνῶσιν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐμὲ ἐν σοὶ ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν (‘so that all the nations will know me in you [that I am in you] in their eyes’), is not present in MT, GBA, or in any other text, and is “probably repeated from vs. 16” (Gehman in Johnson et al., 1938, p.131). This appears to be a theologically influenced ‘repeat’, to again emphasise the knowledge of the LORD amongst the nations. This may have support from G967’s other πάσης plus earlier in the verse, which again emphasises that ‘all’ on the earth (or land) will fall, demonstrating a ‘universal’ viewpoint of the LORD’s activity.

As noted above, G A exhibits a sense division in the middle of this verse after λέγει κύριος. As previously noted, these very words may well have influenced the
division. Yet, this places the second phrase of the verse in a following division, where it seems out of place.

MT also says פֶּרֶס יָדַע (lit. ‘and I will call against him to all my mountains a sword’); B^3 says καὶ καλέσω ἐπὶ αὐτὸν πᾶν φόβον (‘and I will call against him all fear’); G^967.A expand, … πᾶν φόβον μαχαίρας (‘… all fear of a sword’). Zimmerli (1983, p.289) believes “G … has preserved the original reading” of the Hebrew, yet he does not note his position only refers to B^3, [yet Cooke (1936, p.415) does note this refers only to B^3]. Allen (1990b, p.201) suggests “that out of the sequence בְּרַכְּר הָרָה some sense was wrested by understanding as בְּרַכְּר הָרָה הָרָה ‘frightened’ (cf. KB 876a)”. Yet it would be a major scribal oversight to ignore the הָרָה in between the other letters, especially when ‘mountains’ forms a key motif in these chapters.

Block (1998, p.458) also says, “it is difficult to see how [MT] scribes could have mistakenly reproduced הָרָה הָרָה. The LXX reading may itself reflect the translator’s uncertainty regarding the meaning of the word”. Yet, LXX was able to correctly translate בְּרַכְּר in other places in Ezekiel, including 38:4, 12. Allen’s (1990b, p.201) other suggestion may offer a better solution: “כֹּל הָרָה appears to be an adapted torso, whereby הָרָה was written for הָרָה under the influence of בְּרַכְּר הָרָה הָרָה in v 20, then abandoned and adapted to הָרָה for a modicum of sense”. However, neither Allen, Zimmerli, or Block note that both G^967.A include μαχαίρας as an object of the ‘fear’, reflecting two representative LXX understandings of בְּרַכְּר as ‘sword’ present in this location. G^967.A may have added this to conform to MT, yet this does not explain why B^3 did not include μαχαίρας, nor why all LXX MSS omit ‘my mountains’. This may

---

346 Block (1998, p.458) curiously claims that “the designation of the target as ‘my mountains’ is unprecedented in Ezekiel”. Yet we do find this same concept in 38:8.
indicate that ‘my mountains’ was a later MT plus to re-emphasise or clarify the battle’s locale, conforming to the context of the surrounding chapters. If so, then MT may have added this at the same time as the MT/LXX variant of הַר/γῆ in v. 8 where MT also clarifies the battle’s locale as being the ‘mountains’. However, this suggestion leaves us without answer for LXX’s use of φόβον, other than to suggest that LXX exhibits a theological exegesis of the enemy’s response to the sword, and that Δ omitted the mention of ‘sword’. Block (1997c, p.106) suggests that MT’s call for a sword is “reminiscent of Gideon’s war against the Midianites (Jdg. 7:22), when Yahweh calls for the sword, the troops in the armies of God and his allies will turn their weapons on each other”. If so, Δ did not appear to capture this echo; Σ may be seen to have caught it as they do have πᾶν φόβον μάχαιρας as a lead into the phrase ‘every person’s sword will be against his brother’.

38:22 nevmouai η θεός ἐκεῖνοι ἐστὶν ἡμῖν θύμα συμφύσις καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πάντων ἐστιν θάνατος Αλεξάντερ

MT says the LORD will judge ಕರ್ಣ ('with pestilence/plague'), whereas LXX says with θανάτῳ ('death'), which appears to interpret the result of plagues. Yet, LXX elsewhere uses θανάτῳ for ಮಹಾರ್ ('cf. Ezek. 5:12; 6:12; 33:27; also commonly used for מים).

As in v. 6, MT again has ಉಲ್ಲೆಹೃ ('and on his band/troops/army'), and LXX καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς μετ’ αὐτοῦ ('and on all those with him') (cf. discussions of v. 6).
38:23 καὶ μεγαλυνθήσομαι καὶ ἁγιασθήσομαι καὶ ἐνδοξασθήσομαι καὶ γνωσθήσομαι ἑναντίον ἑθνῶν πολλῶν καὶ γνώσονται ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος

MT uses 2 hithpael perfects with preceding י to reflexively state ‘I will magnify myself, and sanctify myself’. Yet LXX has 3 future passives, the first two reflecting MT, but adding ἐνδοξασθήσομαι (‘I will be glorified’). In MT the LORD is the reflexive subject of the actions, while in LXX the action is being done to the subject (passive). Perhaps the LXX community saw the result of the ‘battle’ with Gog (and Gog’s defeat), as the event that will enable the LORD to gain such standing and status amongst the nations, whereas MT saw the LORD’s self ‘magnifying and sanctifying’ as the reason for this battle. Wong (2003, p.225) points out that “if Yahweh allows Gog and his army to destroy Israel, then this will lead to a profanation of his holy name. By destroying Gog and therefore protecting Israel, Yahweh does not allow his name to be profaned … By protecting Israel and its land, Yahweh is safeguarding the sanctity of his name”. On the other hand, this may just be a case of ‘passive as circumlocution’ as in 39:7.

5.7. Overall Summary: Chapter 5

Unlike chapters 36 and 37, where we were able to observe different thematic sections, chapter 38 reveals the one consistent theme of Gog’s impending destruction. However, we can observe five oracle sections in this chapter, each following MT’s sense divisions, and each discernible as the object of the LORD’s speech:

1st Oracle: vv. 1-9: The LORD tells Ezekiel what to say to Gog; The gathering of Gog (by the LORD, v. 4)

2nd Oracle: vv. 10-13: The LORD speaks directly to Gog; Identifies Gog’s scheme to plunder

---

347 Block (1997c, p.106) points out that these ‘two involve the only occurrences of these roots in the hithpael stem in the book. These are examples par excellence of the estimative-declarative reflexive use of the hithpael stem’.
3rd Oracle: vv. 14-16: The LORD tells Ezekiel what to say to Gog; The gathering of Gog (by the LORD, v. 16)

4th Oracle: v. 17: The LORD speaks directly to Gog: Sets Gog’s identity and gives the challenge

5th Oracle: vv. 18-23: The LORD speaks to Ezekiel: Outlines the battle and destruction of Gog (so the nations will know the LORD).

While modern commentators exert their attention on Gog’s identity, this was not the case for MT or LXX: for both it is ‘Gog’ without any further clarifier as to his identity. Therefore the LXX simply transliterates ‘Gog’, without seeking to incorporate any contemporary name or people group (unlike v. 5). LXX also treats both ‘Magog’ and ‘Ros’ as a person or people group, rather than MT’s place and rank (respectively). This may have been done to increase the number of enemy groups facing the impending destruction. We observed in v. 5 that where MT list countries associated with Gog, LXX writes the people groups of those countries using contemporary names (e.g., v. 5 MT: Libya; LXX: Libyans). This practice was also found in v. 13 (MT: Tarshish; Ἐρυθρὰ: Carthaginian, Ῥως: Chalcedon).

We did not find many MT metaphors, unlike in the previous two chapters. One possible metaphor in v. 12 is MT’s ἔνατος (‘top of the world’), which LXX interprets with ὄμφαλος (‘navel’). While not a metaphor, LXX interpreted MT’s interrogative question in v. 17, clearly answering that Gog was the one the prophets spoke about. LXX also appears to have interpreted the battle clothing and equipment according to their day, speaking of breastplates and gear more suited to cavalry (v. 4). We also suggested in v. 4 that LXX may interpret MT’s ‘leading out’ with ‘gathered’, with the intent that they will be gathering for their destruction. While LXX does not exhibit any feelings of being victimized, which we observed in chapter 36, we do find an instance where they may reveal their view of the devastation as rejection (cf. vv. 11, 12). Ἐρυθρὰ, Ῥως
use of φόβον in v. 21 (GB is minus), may exhibit a theological exegesis of the enemy’s response to the sword.

Also, unlike the previous chapters, LXX does not perform as many wordplays in this chapter. In v. 11, G967 may have used θύρασσσι as a wordplay to state they live without walls, bars or shields. We find another possible wordplay in v. 14 where MT has ἔρις (‘you will know’), yet LXX has ἐγερθησάν (‘you will be aroused’).

There are a couple of examples where it appears LXX did not understand the Hebrew. In v. 6 MT’s ἰδόναξ (‘band/troop’) was translated with οἱ περὶ αὐτόν. This may also be seen in v. 13 where LXX read MT’s ὄρασις ἡμῶν (‘lions’) to mean ‘villages’; we agreed with Allen that the unpointed text likely influenced LXX. Likewise in v. 20 LXX has ‘rivers/ravines’ for MT’s ‘terraces/mountain paths’.

We found a couple of places where word placements cross over MT verse divisions. Rather than MT’s placement of ‘Gog’ as a vocative at the end of v. 16, G967 placed this as a vocative at the beginning of v. 17 (which was also the beginning of G967’s second pericope). GB,A did not place ‘Gog’ as a vocative, but rather at the end of the introductory formula in v. 17, which does not echo the ‘antagonistic challenge’ found in MT and G967. We also discussed vv. 18-19 together based on their word placement.

MT has a few minor plusses, one witnessed in GA (v. 3 ‘Gog’), yet others not (v. 4 ‘hooks’; v. 13 ‘great’; v. 17 ‘prophesied’; v. 18 ‘anger’; v. 21 ‘my mountains’). We also found G967 has a long unique plus in v. 20 (Ἰνα γνώσων πάντα τὰ θηνή ἐμὲ ἐν σοὶ ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν), which further emphasises the knowledge of the Lord to the nations.

Therefore, while we did not find the same degree of textual interaction as in the previous two chapters, we nevertheless did find practices that continued. As previously noted, many of the variants suggest a text in a state of flux.
6.0. Chapter 6: The Text of Ezekiel 39

6.1. Introduction: Ezek. 39

The focus in chapter 39,\(^{348}\) while initially on the battle against Gog (vv. 1-6), is primarily on the extensive aftermath, and the resulting clean up by the people (vv. 9-10, 12-15), and by the birds and wild animals as a ‘sacrifice’ (vv. 17-20). This is followed by an explanation why God exiled Israel (vv. 21-24), and Israel’s return from exile (vv. 25-29). The reasons for the defeat and slaughter of Gog and his hordes are woven throughout the chapter: that ‘my name will no longer be profaned’ (v. 7); so Israel will know the LORD’s name (vv. 7, 22); the nations will know the LORD and the reason for his past actions with Israel (vv. 7, 23-24); and the LORD’s glorification (vv. 13, 21, 27).

Again there is unity with MT’s sense divisions. All three representative MSS evidence a break between 38:23 and 39:1 (MT\(^C\) petuḥah; MT\(^A,L\) setumah). The other divisions occur after v. 10 (all setumah); v. 16 (MT\(^C,L\) setumah; MT\(^A\) petuḥah); v. 24 (all setumah); and after v. 29 (all petuḥah).\(^{349}\)

We find a high degree of agreement in chapter 39 between MT and LXX, with \(\mathcal{G}^{B,A}\) both matching MT’s sense divisions. \(\mathcal{G}^A\) has only one additional division break, a 2 letter break after v. 8; \(\mathcal{G}^A\) has a small break at v. 10, and then larger breaks at MT’s other division locales (vv. 16, 24, 29). \(\mathcal{G}^{967}\) has its sense division markers before 39:1, and another highly likely break after v. 16 where we find two ‘dots’ rather than \(\mathcal{G}^{967}\)’s usual ‘strokes’. But Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.15) points out that “sometimes one or both of these strokes degenerate into a dot or dots”. Although there is only enough room for two ‘dots’ between vv. 16 and 17, the lower ‘dot’ extends slightly to the right of the upper one, and the following line is slightly offset into the margin, and so follows the pattern of the original scribe (Johnson in Johnson et al., 1938, p.16). The

\(^{348}\) Issues already covered in our introduction to chapter 38 also apply to chapter 39.

\(^{349}\) MasEzek is not extant after 38:14, and so we are left without witness for chapter 39.
only other sense division break in $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ is at the end of the chapter, where there is an unusual 4 letter break after the sense division ‘strokes’ before moving into chapter 37.

As previously noted, these two chapters consist of nine oracles reflecting MT’s sense divisions: five oracles occur in chapter 38 and four in chapter 39. To date, I have not found any modern commentator or English bible that exactly follows these nine ancient divisions. We will continue the numbering for these oracles from chapter 38.

6.2. 6th Oracle: Ezek. 39:1-10

As noted above, vv. 1-10 are a pericope in all MT MSS and $\mathfrak{G}^{B,A}$ ($\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ being the exception having vv. 1-16 as one pericope; and $\mathfrak{G}^{A}$ does show a small break after v.8). This covers the LORD’s action against Gog, bringing Gog to his destruction as sacrificial food for birds and wild animals upon Israel’s mountains. This concept appears to be a reversal of creation order where humans were to have dominion over animals (Gen. 1:28; 9:1-3), and thus we may see here a ‘de-creation’ aspect for the enemies of God. Israel is passive in Gog’s destruction (vv. 1-6), and only plays a role in the clean up of weapons (vv. 9-10). The LORD clearly states that he will destroy Gog to make his ‘holy name’ known in Israel (v. 7a), and to stop the profaning of his name (v. 7b), and so the nations would know that he is the ‘Holy One in Israel’ (v. 7c). In this pericope Gog is addressed in the singular, and appears to be without his ‘hordes’ (cf. 38:4-7).

39:1 εἰσάχθη τῷ Κυρίῳ ἁγιόν τῆς Ελλάδος ἡ ἱεροθεία τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ τῆς Ἱεροσολύμων:
καὶ ἐλήφθη ἡ θύσις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡ ἀνθρώπου προφήτευσεν ἐπὶ Γωγ καὶ εἰπὼν τάδε λέγει κύριος ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐπὶ σὲ Γωγ ἄρχοντα Ρως Μοσοχ ($\mathfrak{G}^{B}$: Μοσοχ) καὶ Θοβέλ.

As in chapter 38:2-3, LXX transliterates ἄρχοντα with Ρως as a proper noun, either as an ethnic group, or as a person. The plain reading is ‘Gog, ruler of Ros, Mosoch and Thobel’. Brenton, perhaps influenced by 38:2, has Ρως as the prince/ruler (ἄρχοντα) of
Mosoch and Thobel. Either way, LXX does not follow MT’s Gog as the ‘chief prince’ of Meshech and Tubal (cf. discussions 38:2,3).

MT has \( \text{τιΑαβιω} \) (‘I will bring you’) is reflected by both \( \text{מ}967 \, \text{א}ח\text{ו} \) se (‘I will lead you’), and \( \text{מ}^\text{B} \, \text{א}נ\text{א}צ\text{ו} \) se (‘I will bring you up’), whereas \( \text{מ}^\text{A} \) again has \( \text{ס}נ\text{א}צ\text{ו} \) se (‘I will assemble/gather you’). Therefore \( \text{מ}^\text{A} \) interprets the intent behind ‘bringing’ Gog, it was to assemble Gog with a view to his destruction (cf. 38:4).

MT says \( \text{κι\
\text{ξιω} \) (‘I will strike [your bow]’), and LXX has \( \text{א}\text{פ}\text{ל}\text{ו} \) (‘I will destroy [your bow]’). LXX intensifies what MT says, and the force of the verb carries onto the arrows as well, whereas MT adds another verb saying God will cause their arrows to fall out of their hands. Symmachus has \( \text{א}\text{פ\text{ט}אצ\text{ו} \) (‘I will shake off’), which reflects MT closer than other LXX.\(^350\)

---

\(^350\) BAGD indicates this ‘shake off’ is a stronger word that at first appears, and explains it with: “shake off τι, of a snake which has bitten a hand \( \text{τηρον} \) ε\text{ις} τ\text{ο}ρ \text{που Ac 28:5}” or to “shake the dust fr. one’s feet Lk 9:5” and also “of St. Paul’s beheading”.
LXX inserts καὶ forming a new clause at the end of this verse, καὶ καταβάλω σε ('and I will cast you down’). The opening phrase in v. 4 MT (‘on the mountains of Israel’) is thus linked with v. 3 LXX. Perhaps this occurred because MT placed the verb לָשׁוּם at the end of the sentence, even though it refers to the preceding phrase, a phrase LXX treated as a further object of ἀπολῶ. This therefore left לָשׁוּם ‘hanging’, and so LXX attaches it to the first clause in v. 4 MT.

MT starts v. 4 with עלֵיהֶר הַשָּׁרָאֵל הַפָּול יִכְּרַשׁ נְאֵפָשָׁהוּ וְעָנָיו אַהֲרֶן לְעֵינֵי עֶשָּׁר כִּלֵּנָה (‘on the mountains of Israel, you shall fall’), yet, as noted above, LXX has MT’s opening phrase in v. 3 due to its inserted copula. LXX inserts another copula, saying ‘and you will fall’.

\( \text{G}^{967} \) has several variants to \( \text{G}^{B,A} \) and MT:

1. \( \text{G}^{967} \) begins with a unique plus: καὶ οὐ βεβηλώθησαι τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἅγιον (‘and the holy name will not be profaned’). This plus may have been inspired from v. 7, yet there as ‘my holy name’ (cf. Lev. 18:21). The use here of ‘the holy name’ appears to be a narrative plus, outside of the LORD’s speech, and gives added reason for Gog’s pending fall on the mountains of Israel.

2. \( \text{G}^{967} \) also has πολλα as a plus, reading ‘the many nations’ (minus in \( \text{G}^{B,A} \)).

Gehman (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.132) says this is “based on a Hebrew reading וְנָעָלִים רְבִים, which is found in a number of MSS … (cf. Ez. xxxviii.6)”. Zimmerli (1983, p.290) says Targum and Syriac also include ‘many’, stating this
“strongly suggest the addition of רָבָים”. As such, רָבָים may have been in the *Urtext*, but omitted very early, most likely by scribal error, and was not present in $G^{B,A}$’s *Vorlage*. However, it is difficult to see why following MT scribes did not reinsert this word back into the text.

3. $G^{967}$ is minus δοθήσονται, but “it should be noted that [MT] uses the root בַּנ only once” (Gehman in Johnson et al., 1938, p.132). $G^{967}$ therefore follows MT’s syntax, causing δοθήσονται to be a $G^{B,A}$ plus.

4. Rather than $G^{B,A}$’s δέδωκά σε καταβρωθήναι (pass.: ‘given to be devoured’), $G^{967}$ has δέδωκά σε εἰς καταβρωμα (‘given as food’) (cf. MT: יָצַה בָּלָה).

MT also says πτενών παντὶ πετεινῷ (‘birds of prey, bird of every wing’), yet LXX says πτενών παντὶ πετεινῷ (‘birds, all able to fly’). The Hebrew construct pair (נֵפָר Lý) is represented by one Greek word, causing LXX not to reflect fully MT’s ‘bird of prey’. Zimmerli (1983, p.290) proposes “the versions no longer understood” MT’s construct pair. In addition, ‘bird’ in MT is collective, represented by LXX’s plural.

351 JPS: ‘to carrion birds of every sort’.
(1983, p.315) concludes that “the aim of v 6 [MT] is to extend the proclamation of judgment to Gog’s hinterland”, which covers those under Gog’s rule. Block (1998, p.463) also sees MT as original, and says that Magog is the “home territories” for Gog’s armies, and is “Gog’s place of origin”. Yet, Cooke (1936, p.418) says “Magog here seems to be the name of a people, parallel to inhabitants of coasts-lands”. While Cooke does not have Magog as Gog’s ‘hinterland’, he still follows Magog as original. Lust (1995c, p.1001) claims that the “LXX rendering … [of] Gog for MT’s Magog … seems to confirm that the names Gog and Magog were interchangeable”. While this may be LXX’s mindset, it does not appear to be MT’s. Yet it is questionable if it was LXX’s mindset, as this is the only occurrence where Gog is used in place of Magog. Eichrodt (1970, p.518) claims that this “whole verse … looks suspiciously like an addition”. However he is without textual evidence, leaving him with his subjective reading based on how a modern mind can view the flow of text.

G[^A] has σε as plus, reading ἐπὶ Γωγ σε, emphasising the action is against Gog.

Block (1998, p.460) points out that “LXX transforms [MT’s] declaration of judgement to a promise of salvation for the coastal lands by reading ἑβλυγοῦσιν ὑμῖν as ἑβλυγούσιν ὑμᾶς (‘they will return’). LXX may have been influenced by ἑβλυγοῦσιν in v. 8 (also 37:25). Zimmerli (1983, p.290) says that LXX “produced a declaration of salvation for the (hitherto unmentioned) islands”. This may be another deliberate wordplay; in MT the context indicates the coast lands belong to Gog, and will suffer with Gog, yet in LXX the context implies the coastal areas of Israel, to be rescued from Gog and be ‘peacefully inhabited’. This shows a difference in LXX’s eschatological understanding for the ‘coast lands’ or ‘isles’ in the plan of God.

352 Zimmerli goes on to propose a possible location for Magog (concluding with the ‘trade list’ in 27:1f and those mentioned in 38:8, 11, 14), but that is outside our discussion. Block (1998, p.463) also concludes with these lands.
39:7 καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ ἄγιον γνωσθῆται ἐν μέσῳ λαοῦ μου Ἰσραήλ καὶ οὐ
βεβηλωθῆται τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ ἄγιον εὐκέτει καὶ γνώσωνται ( testimonia) τὰ ἔθνη
οτὶ ἐστὶ εἰμὶ κύριος ἄγιος ἐν Ἰσραήλ (*G 967 reverses the syntax).

In MT’s use of ἀναφέρω ('I will make known'), God causes the action. LXX does
not reflect this, instead having an impersonal passive γνωσθῆται ('it shall be [made]
known'). This is maybe due to the practice of locution that avoids the name of God (cf.
38:23). Likewise, MT says λείποι ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐστιν ἄγιον ('I will not let [them] profane'). LXX also does
not reflect this as an action done by God, but rather uses a passive verb to say that
God’s name “will not be profaned”. LXX again appears to avoid God being active.

G 967’s τὸ ὄνομά τὸ ἄγιον μου matches MT’s syntax (ὑπάρχειν).

G A’s unique πάντα plus states that the knowledge of the LORD as ‘Holy in
Israel’ will be ‘universal’ throughout ‘all nations’. This plus most likely stemmed from
the thought that the LORD’s name was defiled by Israel amongst all the nations they
entered (cf. 36:20-22). Block (1998, p.464) says that “this revelation was necessary
because it was precisely ‘in Israel’ that his reputation had been defiled, leading to the
nation’s exile and creating impressions in the foreigners’ minds concerning his
colorature”.

Finally, MT says ἰδώ πώς ἄγιος ἦν Ἰσραήλ ('that I the LORD am holy in
Israel’), which is matched by G B. However G 967,A both add the definite article ὁ to read
‘the Holy One in Israel’, which Cooke (1936, p.418)353 points out, is a “title so common
in Isaiah”. G 967,A subtly change from MT and G B declaring the LORD’s holy character
that will be known by the nations, to now state the LORD’s ‘title’ in Israel.

353 Whilst Cooke notes this plus, and even that it is in G A (G 967 was not extant to Cooke), he does not
comment on any theological shift. Contra Cooke, Zimmerli, who both correctly have ‘I am the
Yahweh, holy in Israel’ Block has ‘I am Yahweh, the Holy One in Israel’ (also Cooper); Allen is
similar ‘I am Yahweh, the one who is holy in Israel’. Curiously, Block (1998, p.464) sees MT has
stating the LORD’s title rather than being a reference to his character.
39:8 MT says *'Look! it is coming and it will be done',*\(^\text{354}\) cf. 21:12. \(\text{G}^{\text{B},\text{A}}\) expand MT saying, אָדֹן יָהָׁ֔נֶ֖י הָהֵנֶ֑ה (‘Look! it is come and you shall know that it will be’). \(\text{G}^{967}\) is minus γνώση ὅτι, matching MT, indicating this was a later LXX plus. But LXX does not make it clear who shall ‘know’ this coming event, as γνώση is singular and thus cannot refer back to τὰ ἔθνη (v. 7); it may therefore refer to the prophet himself (v. 1) or to ‘Israel’ (vv. 7, 9), yet likely to Gog who was previously addressed in the singular (vv. 1-5).

MT uses two verbs: καὶ θεῷ Ἰσραήλ ἐβρήσει ὑποτελέσας πάντα τὰ πόλεις Ἰσραήλ καὶ καύσουσιν ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις πέλταις καὶ κοντοῖς καὶ τόξοις καὶ τοξεύμασιν καὶ ράβδοις χειρῶν καὶ λόγχαις καὶ καύσουσιν ἐν αὐτοῖς πῦρ ἔπτα ἐτή.\(^\text{355}\)

Yet מֵהֶן conveys immediacy and imminence, thus this is not the distant future.

---

\(^{354}\) Yet מֵהֶן conveys immediacy and imminence, thus this is not the distant future.

\(^{355}\) Zimmerli (1983, p.291) suggests LXX “had the double expression in front of them and telescoped it” (also Block, 1998, p.464). Eichrodt (1970, p.518) claims that “as the LXX only reads one verb here, the first of the two expressions meaning ‘to kindle’ should be deleted”. Yet, Cooke (1936, p.418) says the second verb “need not be struck out; for the two are associated in Is. 44:15, and there is a play on the words for *burn* and *weapons*”. LXX apparently missed or ignored this wordplay. However the later Theodotion did capture this by including καὶ ἐκκαύσουσιν (‘and kindle’).
MT has נֵבֶן יִנְחָה ('small shield and body shield’), and LXX has πέλταις καὶ κοντοῖς ('small shield and spear’ [LEH]; or ‘and pole’ [LS; Thayer]). Allen (1990b, p.201) claims “the lack of preposition suggests that the phrase relating to defensive weapons is a gloss”. However, Block (1998, p.464) observes that “the pair is attested in the versions, though the LXX reads the second term as ‘lance’”. LXX may be translating according to the equipment worn by soldiers of their day (cf. 38:5). G967 also has καὶ δορασι ('and spears’) as plus before ‘lance’.

6.3. 7th Oracle: Ezek. 39:11-16

All MT MSS, and $\Theta^{B,A}$ exhibit a sense division break after v. 10 and then again after v. 16 ($\Theta^{967}$ only exhibits a break after v. 16). MT and $\Theta^{B,A}$ view these six verses as one pericope, likely because they deal with Gog’s burial and the communal search for bones that will ‘cleanse the land’ (vv. 12, 14, 16). In this pericope we will find LXX exegeting aspects of Gog’s burial place, and MT’s ‘the [ones] travelling’.

39:11 νῦν οὖν ὁ βρόχος τῆς Ἰσραήλ ἔχει τὸν κόπον τῆς ἱερής πλευρᾶς καὶ τῆς κοιλίας τῆς Μωσέου

39:11 καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ δῶσω τῷ Γώγ τόπον ὄνομαστὸν μνημείον ἐν Ἰσραήλ τῷ πολιονήδριον τῶν ἐπελθόντων πρὸς τῇ θαλάσσῃ καὶ περιοικοδομήσουσιν τὸ περιστόμιον τῆς φάραγγος καὶ καταρύζουσιν ἐκεῖ τὸν Γώγ καὶ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτοῦ καὶ κληθῆσαι τὸ ($\Theta^{967,A}: γαῖ; \Theta^{B}: τε$) τῷ πολιονήδριον τοῦ Γώγ

MT has κέφαλας πεσόμενος ([lit.] ‘a place there of a grave’); LXX says τόπον ὄνομαστὸν (‘a famous place’, or ‘a place of renown’). Allen (1990b, p.201) believes that LXX appears to misread פּוּשׁ as פּוּסּי, saying “MT is usually preferred, as a short relative clause: ‘a place where there is a grave in Israel’ (cf. GKC §130c, d)”. This is likely, as the text before the LXX translator was without vowels. This is one of Cooke’s
examples where “.openg, owing to the absence of vowel signs in the Hebrew text, confuses words written with the same consonants, but pronounced differently”. Cooke (1936, p.419) retains MT’s reading, saying “[LXX’s] change … does not suit the context so well”. Yet, this may be another deliberate word play by LXX to state that Gog’s burial place will be well known, which is suggested by its use of μνημεῖον (‘memorial’ [LEH]) rather than τάφος (‘grave/tomb’ [LEH]). This may have been influenced by an eschatological theme regarding the destruction of Gog, and the continued free movements of the people of the land. LXX’s reading here may also have been influenced by לְשָׁם in v. 13. On the other hand, the later Masoretes may have purposefully read the text as ‘there’, and placed the vowels accordingly, rather than having Gog having a ‘place of renown’ in Israel. However, due to the other LXX variances in this verse, we remain with our ‘wordplay’ interpretive suggestion.

MT says יֵרֵךְ, יֵרֵךְ (lit. ‘the valley of the passing-through-ones’ or ‘the Valley of the Travellers’ [cf. JPS]). Alternatively, Block (1997c, p.109) says, “the valley of those who have passed on”, which brings out the contextual aspect of death and/or burial. Allen (1990b, p.201) claims that יֵרֵךְ יֵרֵךְ “has probably suffered assimilation to the term in v 15 and was originally יֵרֵךְ יֵרֵךְ [sic] ‘Abarim,’ a mountainous district in Moab”. However, Block (1998, pp.466, 468) disagrees, and does not emend the text. Zimmerli (1983, pp.292, 317) sees this as the name of the valley, ‘Oberim Valley’.

---

355 Irwin (1995, p.110) suggests that יֵרֵךְ יֵרֵךְ recalls Molek worship practices, and says that “Ezekiel’s description of the forces of Gog as ‘the Ones Passing Through’ יֵרֵךְ יֵרֵךְ suggests a connection with the actions of parents who caused the children to ‘pass through/into’ the fire to Molek (Lev. 18:21; 2 Kgs. 23:10; Jer. 32:35)”. Cooke (1936, p.419) also has the location as east of the Dead Sea which is “outside the Holy Land strictly so called (4718), and in a district which belonged to Moab; but it was sometimes held by Israel in the former days … and had Israelite connexions”. Cooke also concludes the same mountain range suggested by Allen and says that the use of יֵרֵךְ יֵרֵךְ is a word play “on way-farers in the next sentence”. Also see Zimmerli (1983, p.317) and Irwin (1995, p98f) for discussions of possible locations, and for ‘the sea’. The potential location is not part of our interest, as LXX does not translate יֵרֵךְ יֵרֵךְ as a place. Irwin correctly observes that all MT MSS witness יֵרֵךְ יֵרֵךְ, and gives several reason why this is located in Israel (Jezreel), holding that ‘the sea’ spoken of is the Mediterranean and not the Dead Sea (contra Cooke, 1936, p.419).
which just transliterates the Hebrew rather than interpreting it. Eichrodt (1970, p.528) claims that “the proper reading cannot be established with any certainty, as the first name may contain some play on words referring to a legendary item in the Gog-tradition which is no longer preserved for us (its connection with the commission who ‘travel’ through the land is a word-play introduced at a secondary stage)”. Yet his suggestion holds a lot of conjecture. Irwin (1995, p.98) points out that “one of the reasons that this emendation has gained such wide acceptance is the presence of the modifying phrase *qidmat hayyām* – a combination that most scholars have translated as ‘east of the sea’”. Irwin (1995, p.99f) finds in favour of the MT, but notes “in its most basic sense *qidmat* means ‘opposite’ or ‘in front of’ with the direction indicated by the perspective of the writer … [and] the phrase in question could quite easily be rendered, ‘in front of/opposite the sea’, a translation supported by LXX”. Significantly, here LXX says τῶν ἐπελθόντων (‘the coming/arriving ones’), which does not interpret מָיְּדָה as a place, but translates according to its form in MT. But ἐπέρρχομαι can have the meaning of ‘in hostile sense, to go or come against, to attack, assault,’ [LS] (cf. 34:4). Therefore, LXX may have interpreted the ‘coming ones’ as Gog’s hostile forces, and the ones destined to be buried in that place.

LXX does not translate literally the preceding מ (“valley”), but rather exeges it with πολλὲς ὁμολογίας, which, whilst literally meaning ‘full of men’, is often translated as ‘burial place’. Bruce (1995, p.542) says “communal cemetery” (cf. vv. 11, 15, 16; Jer. 19:2, 6). Yet, this may be translated as ‘mass burial place’. LXX may have been influenced by their transliteration of מָיְּד to the burial place of Gog and his multitude (v. 11c).

LXX does not mention MT’s burial location of ‘east of the sea’, but gives the sea itself as the destination for MT’s ‘travellers’.
Based on the above observations, we suggest MT’s focus is on the location of Gog’s burial place in Israel: יִתְנָהָר הָרִים הָרִים נָבָיִם (‘the Valley of the Travellers east of the sea’). Yet LXX’s focus is on interpreting those who will be buried in Gog’s ‘place of renown in Israel’: τὸ πολυνάρθρον τῶν ἐπελθόντων πρὸς τῇ θαλάσσῃ (‘a mass burial place of those coming to the sea’). Thus we again find LXX exegeting and/or interpreting the Hebrew.

Following this, MT says, יִתְנָהָר הָרִים הָרִים נָבָיִם (‘and it will stop the travellers’ [or ‘the passing-through-ones’]). LXX says, καὶ περιοικώδησουσιν τὸ περιστόμιον τῆς φάραγγος ([lit.] ‘and they shall build up the edge of the valley’ or ‘dam up the valley’) (so Zimmerli, 1983, p.292). Eichrodt (1970, pp.517-518) also suggests “and they will stop the valley”, and says this is “a conjectural emendation of the impossible reading in the [MT] text”. Allen (1990b, p.201) says LXX is preferred and sees יִתְנָהָר הָרִים הָרִים נָבָיִם “as a gloss on בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל ‘community of Israel’ in v 12 …. MT may have been corrupted after the gloss entered the text”. His rationale is based on reconciling the two burial descriptions here and in v. 15. Bewer (1953, p.165) also follows LXX, and emends MT to read יִתְנָהָר הָרִים הָרִים נָבָיִם (‘and they will dam up the valley’). However, Block (1998, p.467) proposes that “LXX may also have misread the Hebrew”. Block (1998, p.469) also suggests that “given Ezekiel’s penchant for using words with more than one sense in a given context, the second occurrence of יִתְנָהָר הָרִים could also refer to travellers who would traverse the valley but are prevented by the huge mounds of corpses blocking the valley”. Following Block, we suggest that LXX, under the same interpretive thought as seen above, exegetes MT to state that the mass burial place of Gog, and ‘those coming to the sea’, will be to such an extent that it will ‘dam up the valley’, and therefore will be ‘a place of renown’.  

\[357\] So also BIHS. Bewer (1953, p.165) argues that “the valley does not muzzle or stop up or dam the passers-by but it is itself muzzled or dammed up”. Yet, MT may only be a figure of speech.
Finally, MT says גִּבְעַת הַמְּנִיָּה (‘and they will call [it], the valley of Hamon Gog’, or ‘the valley of the Multitude of Gog’), while LXX says καὶ κλήθησεται τὸ γαὶ τὸ πολυάνδριον τοῦ Γωγ (‘and it will be called ‘the gai, the mass burial place of Gog’). LXX transliterates גִּבְעַת הַמְּנִיָּה with a definite article, and therefore exeges it as the name of Gog’s burial place: ‘the Gai/Valley’. The LXX community may have just referred to this ‘place of renown’ as ‘The Valley’. Kline (1996, p.215) proposes that MT ‘recalls God’s wordplay interpretation of the new name, Abraham, he gave to Abram as a gift of grace: ‘אֱלֹהִי אוֹבֵר אֵלֶּה (Gen.17:4-5) … In quest of such name-fame Gog mustered his multitudes, but his הַמְּנִיָּה-name proclaimed his shame”.

Irwin (1995, p.96) also says “the prophet seems to be creating a word-play with this name and the name of the burial place of the [idolatrous] Judahites – גֹּהֶן (Jer. 7:32)”. Odell (1994, p.485) suggests that גִּבְעַת הַמְּנִיָּה “should be regarded as a pun on the Valley of the Son of Hinnom, the valley southwest of Jerusalem where child sacrifice and forbidden burial rites were conducted until the fall of Jerusalem” and “the Valley of the Oberim is a synonym of the Valley of Hinnom”. Irwin (1995, p.102f) also finds an MT allusion here to Hinnom, and to the worship of Molek that took place there. It is perhaps significant that LXX again uses πολυάνδριον (‘mass burial place’ [see above]) here rather than Εννομ (cf. Jer. 7:32; 19:6; 32:35). We suggest that LXX captured MT’s pun with the place of child sacrifices (cf. Odell, Irwin), interpreting the

358 Eichrodt (1970, p.518) puts the meaning of “pomp of Gog” here, but that does not appear to be correct, and it is not reflected by LXX.
359 ἐκ τοῦ is most likely a corruption of γαὶ (Cooke, 1936, p.424); Bruce (1995, p.543) curiously says it is “evidentially a corruption of γέ”. Yet γέ is not found elsewhere in LXX Ezekiel. Whilst γέ is found again in ὥθ in 39:15 (noted by Bruce), it is a corruption of γαὶ (not noted by Bruce). ὥθ appears to have been transliterating the Hebrew singular construct form of נָעְיָה (*ʔ).
360 Odell (1994, p.458) says that “Ezekiel employs this verb in its hiphil form to designate child sacrifice, one of the rites performed in the Valley of Hinnom”. Block (1997c, p.109) also notes that הַמְּנִיָּה appears to have been transliterating the Hebrew singular construct form of נָעְיָה (Nic).
361 Irwin (1995, p.101f) believes that Ezekiel is ultimately referring to the Jezreel Valley.
‘Valley of Hamon-Gog’ as the place for Gog’s mass burial place, known in their time simply as ‘The Gai/Valley’. LXX’s double use of πολυάνδριον suggests it saw both locations as the same site of Gog’s mass burial place. MT seems to change the name of this valley from יֵרוֹם (Yeroum) to גָּן הַמִּדְבָּר (Gan Hamidbar), but LXX stays with just πολυάνδριον. Symmachus (Ziegler, 1977, p.287f) has ἡ φάραγξ τῶν διαβάσεων ἐξ ἀνατολῆς τῆς θαλάσσης, ἡ ἐμφράσσουσα τὰς διαβάσεις (‘the valley of the crossers/travellers from east of the Sea, [it] shall stop the crossers/travellers’), which appears to be an adjustment towards MT.

There is a subtle syntax difference between MT and LXX, with MT having an athnach under land ((Job 39:12), and then following has שבעה (seven months) which is therefore linked back with the beginning verb (‘to bury’). LXX has the whole phrase linked with ἵνα making the purpose as to cleanse the land in 7 months, whereas the purpose for MT is to just cleanse the land (cf. v. 14). This verse appears to echo priestly concerns regarding corpses defiling the land, and ritual cleansing. It may be another example where Ezekiel, and the LXX translator, are reflecting on the Book of Numbers (cf. Num. 5:2; 19:16; 35:33) (Wong, 2001, p.136).  

---

362 Bruce (1995, p.533) points out that LXX also uses πολυάνδριος when translating ‘valley’ in Jer. 2:23f, and suggests that this was done because “the translator identified this ‘valley’ with the valley of the son(s) of Hinnom which, according to other oracles of Jeremiah, was to become a place for the disposal of corpses”. We may suggest this ‘identification’ by LXX’s translator also occurs here in Ezek. 39:11.

363 Block (1998, p.470) also finds a link here with Num. 19 and the concern to keep the land ceremonially clean, observing “that the process [in Ezek. 39:12] will take a full week of months, rather than the week of days prescribed in Num. 19, speaks not only of the magnitude of the task but also of the concern to render the land absolutely holy”. Wong (2001, p.136) points out that the concern here is ritual cleansing and “hence this case should not be confused with the sort of land pollution in 36:18 where moral impurity is concerned”.

---

Page 223
39:13 καὶ κατορύφωσοιν αὐτοῖς πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τῆς γῆς καὶ ἔσται αὐτοῖς εἰς ὄνομασθον ἡ ἡμέρα ἐδοξάσθην λέγει κύριος

LXX’s αὐτοῖς plus provides an object (bury them), which is only implied by MT’s context. MT says יְנֵּמָרַב (‘the day I am glorified’), or as Block (1998, p.467) says “on the day that I display my glory”. This suggests future action, although the Hebrew infinitive is indeterminate regarding time. LXX, however, uses an aorist passive, ἡ ἡμέρα ἐδοξάσθην (‘the day when I was glorified’), indicating they saw a past action. Block (1998, p.471) also suggests that whilst MT uses the niphal, which “may be interpreted as a simple passive … it is better interpreted reflexively: Yahweh effects his own glorification, and finally receives the recognition he deserves”. This is not reflected in LXX.

The second instance of נַעֲרֵי (‘travellers’) in MT is not witnessed by LXX. BHS and some EVV follow LXX. Block (1998, p.467) suggests that LXX “may have intentionally tried to smooth out an awkward reading, or omitted it by homoioteleuton. Targ.’s ‘with those who pass by’ changes the sense but does support MT”. Yet Zimmerli (1983, p.292) suggests that this second occurrence in MT “does not fit the context and … is to be regarded as an addition” (also Cooke, 1936, p.420). This may be a later MT plus, to emphasise that the burial will be done by ‘travellers’, and not by the people of Israel, lest they are defiled by touching the dead (cf. this ‘plus’ v. 15).

郅א has two unique plusses: 1. πάντα (‘all [the land]’); 2. ἀκριβῶς (‘[they shall search] precisely/diligently’ [LEH]). Both plusses reveal the theological thought that the
search will be performed intensely and extensively. This may stem from the belief that corpses and bones on the ground are a curse, and pollute the land.

As in v. 12, we again find a syntactical difference between MT and LXX: in the final clause MT indicates another search was to start ('at the end of' [HALOT]) the seven months spoken of in v. 12, which then makes way for the action in v. 15. However, LXX takes MT’s from the preceding clause and translates it into this statement of ‘after seven months’; this continues the previous purpose of ‘cleansing’ for seven months, rather than generating a new search. LXX then adds before the last word forming a new phrase (‘and they shall seek’). Again, as in v. 12, this may result from priestly concerns over ‘cleansing’, and the concept of ‘seven months’.

Whilst MT says (lit. ‘and they travel, the travelling, through the land’), LXX has kai. (‘and everyone passing through the land’), which “make[s] the text more concise by omitting ” (Zimmerli, 1983, p.293). However, contra Zimmerli, LXX use of may actually match , just as its use of in v. 14 for ; if so, this leaves as the ‘unmatched’ verb. Therefore, we suggest that is a later MT plus, just as in v. 14, added at the same time, and for the same reason.

MT and LXX repeat their wording from v. 11, (‘the valley of Hamon-Gog’ or ‘multitude of Gog’), and to (‘the Gai, the
mass burial place of Gog’). As in v. 11, LXX again transliterates Ναί to have the burial 
place as ‘the Gai’. ᾿O’s γε is a corruption of γαί (cf. discussions of v. 11).

᾿Ο’s two plusses: ἐσται and πᾶσαι, seems to emphasize the thoroughness of the 
search (cf. v. 14).

This verse completes the sentence begun in v. 15, with MT saying the name364 of 
the city will be Ἡμανα (‘Hamonah’ or ‘the multitude’), yet LXX says it will be
Πολυάνδριον (‘mass burial place’; cf. v. 11). Allen (1990a, p.413) sees the first clause in 
MT as a gloss that “interrupts the movement of thought from v. 15 to v. 16b”. Yet, if it 
is an inserted gloss, it was early enough to be witnessed in all representative LXX MSS.
Allen (1990a, p.413) also suggests that the occurrence of Ἡμανα here in v. 16 has been 
influenced by Χελονα (cf.) in v. 11; he suggests that annotations in the margin of some 
early Hebrew MS for v. 11 were later placed into the body of the text. But there is no 
textual evidence to support Allen’s suggestion. Odell (1994) suggests that Χελονα here, 
and in vv. 11, 15, is not a corruption or gloss but is a symbolic ‘new’ name for
Jerusalem where God again dwells in ‘divine presence’.365 Fitzpatrick (2004, p.98) also 
finds in agreement with Odell, claiming Jerusalem is called Χελονα elsewhere in 
Ezekiel (5:7; 7:12-14), and states “Hamonah is not only the resting place for Gog. It is 
also the resting place for the nation’s past infidelities”. Before chapter 39 LXX 
translates MT’s Χελονα (‘the multitude, abundance’ [HALOT]) interchangeably with

364 Fairbairn (1989, p.428) suggests the pointing should be τῷ rather than τῷ; yet LXX translates with 
ὄνομα recognizing MT’s pointing as received.
365 Odell (1994, p.488). translates v. 16 as “Indeed, the name of the city is Hamonah, yet they will purify 
the land” and then suggests the use of γαμ “may even require the reading of the first clause in a 
concessive sense: ‘even though the name of the city is Hamonah, they will purify the land’.”
ισχύς (‘strength/force’) or πληθος (‘multitude’), both of which reflect the Hebrew. In v. 11 LXX translated ἡμιβλάδην with πληθος ἀυτοῦ (‘his multitude’), and then ἡμιβλάδην with πολυάνδριον τοῦ Γωγ (vv. 11, 15). In the context of this pericope (vv. 11-16), the meaning for MT’s ‘Hamon Gog’ is ‘Gog’s multitude’, which could be seen as a mocking reference to the resting place for Gog’s forces; Hamonah is perhaps a Hebrew wordplay to say ‘multitude’ in reference to Gog’s place of burial: it will be as large as a city.366 LXX caught MT’s ‘pun’ and just exegeted it for their communities, to state clearly this was Gog’s ‘multitude’ (v. 11a) and Gog’s ‘mass burial place’ (vv. 11b, 15, 16). This concept may be reflected by the later Symmachus who used πληθος here in v. 16; however Theodotion transliterated the Hebrew with ἀμονάδε τοῦ Gwg (vv. 11, 15). Many scholars, and modern bible translators, transliterate the Hebrew into English, and so this mocking pun is often not captured by the modern reader.367

G967’s το plus suggests this was seen by them as a definite place (‘the mass burial place’; cf. ‘the Gai/Valley’ vv. 11, 15). LXX also interprets ἥρσ (‘also’), with γάρ (‘for’), giving this verse an explanation, rather than an addendum as in MT.

6.4. 8th Oracle: Ezek. 39:17-24

All representative MT and LXX MSS exhibit a break before v. 17. MT has a petuḥah, MT a setumah. G967 also exhibits a major break here, and G a minor. All MSS finish this sense division after v. 24, except G which continues from v. 17 until the end of the chapter (v. 29).

366 Contra Cooke (1936, p.421) who misses this pun and says “the burial-place of an immense number of bodies cannot be a city!”, and then goes on to state the text here is corrupt. See Block (1998, p.472) regarding how this is all part of a ‘riddle’ regarding Gog and his hordes.

367 Exceptions include EB: “Valley of Gog’s horde”; CEV: “the Valley of Gog’s Army” (vv. 11, 15), and “the town of Gog’s Army” (v. 16); The Message: “Gog’s Mob” (vv. 11, 15) and “Mobville” (v. 16); JPS: “Gog’s multitude”.
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This pericope deals with the sacrificial meal of Gog that the LORD sets up for the birds and wild animals, which is done for the purpose of God establishing his glory among the nations (v. 21). Interestingly, this meal comes after the information regarding Gog’s burial covered in the previous pericope (cf. vv. 11-16). Yet, there is a connection here with v. 4 that also informs how birds and wild animals will eat the flesh of Gog and his hordes. Irwin (1995, pp.107f) proposes that this pericope refers to “Molek cult imagery”, and this is a “non-Yahwistic pattern” even if “it is Yahweh himself who brings the victim”. Irwin (1995, p.109) also says that “The picture, then, is of a sacrifice orchestrated by Yahweh, but described in decidedly non-Yahwistic terms”. Yet, this is not explicitly stated in MT, and more importantly, LXX does not exegete the text in this way.

Verse 17 enjoys a large degree of agreement between MT and LXX, which is unusual for a longer detailed verse. LXX does have a plus of ‘eiπόν’ in the opening phrase (cf. 7:2). SizePolicy have συνάχθητε (‘be assembled’), witnessing MT’s ἤρχεσθε. This is minus in LXX, which perhaps saw the occurrence as a dittograph. LXX has πάντα (‘all [the mountains]’) as a plus, perhaps to emphasise that this sacrifice will be throughout the land.
39:18 κρέα γιγάντων φάγεσθε καὶ αἶμα ἄρχόντων τῆς γῆς πίεσθε κριούς καὶ μόσχους καὶ τράγους καὶ οἱ μόσχοι ἐστεατωμένοι πάντες

MT speaks of βασιλείς (‘mighty [ones]’), and LXX of γιγάντων: (lit. ‘giants’; but also ‘mighty one[s]’ [LEH]; cf. Ezek. 32:12, 21, 27). Typically LXX uses γιγάντων for γίγαντες, and δυνατός for δυνάμες. Cooke (1936, p.421) claims “these are not members of Gog’s army, who are described differently, 38:3-7 39:4”; he then suggests they are either other enemies of Israel, “Persian forces”, or those “under Antiochus III”. However, this is not apparent in LXX, beyond their use of γιγάντων (rather than δυνατός), which still contextually refers to Gog and his hordes.

There is a difference in the sacrificial animals, where MT appears to have a full contingent with ‘rams, lambs, goats, bulls’, yet LXX only has ‘rams, calves, goats’ (cf. 27:21 where these are listed as trade animals). Symmachus says ταύρων μοσχων συτιστῶν (‘bulls, fatted calves’). Likewise MT declares they are all like Ἰραίαν κῆπος (lit. ‘fatlings of Bashan’), yet LXX interprets this as οἱ μόσχοι ἐστεατωμένοι (‘the fatted calves’), and does not mention ‘Bashan’.368 Zimmerli (1983, pp.293-294) argues for the retention of MT. Block (1998, p.476) says that “these terms are obviously not used literally, but as animal designations for nobility”.

39:19 καὶ φάγεσθε στείρη εἰς πληθυνήν καὶ πίεσθε αἶμα εἰς μέθην ἀπὸ τῆς θυσίας μου (G$^{967}$: -) ής ἔθυσα ὑμῖν

G$^{967}$ is minus μου, thus it only reads ‘the sacrifice’, removing the personal aspect of God’s sacrifice.

368 LXX shows awareness of ‘Bashan’ in 27:6, translating with Βασανίτιδος (‘the land of Bashan’). If Thackeray is correct, then this was done via ‘Translator a’ rather than ‘Translator b’ who translated 36-39 (cf. MT and LXX in Comparison chapter).
39:21 and he gave over all the nations to him. He gave his glory among the nations, whereas LXX says it will be *ἐν ὑμῖν* (*in you*). Zimmerli (1983, p. 294) does not agree with any suggestion to emend *γαγβ* to *βανή*, preferring MT. Cooke (1936, p. 424) also says LXX’s *ἐν ὑμῖν* is ‘wrong[ly]’. Wong (2002, p. 133) proposes that “it is possible, though not very likely that the translator wrongly read *γαγβ* as *γκβ*. It is more likely that the translator found the Hebrew expression uncongenial and changed it …. to *ἐν ὑμῖν*, referring to God’s giving his glory to or among the Israelites”. While we agree with Wong about the translator changing deliberately, we suggest *ἐν ὑμῖν* does not refer to Israel, but rather to birds and animals as the addressees in the previous verses (cf. *ὑμῖν* vv. 17-20). Israel has not been directly addressed in this chapter, and so cannot be the referent of *ἐν ὑμῖν*.\(^\text{369}\) We agree with Wong (2002, p. 133) that “in the Hebrew, God’s giving of his glory to the nations is associated with his punishment inflicted on the nations (v. 21b)”. In LXX, God’s glory, established in the actions of the birds and animals at the sacrificial feast, is also associated with his punishment on the nations. God’s glory does not go out *for* the nations, neither in MT or LXX, but it is ‘given’ or ‘established’ in his sacrificial meal, as he punishes the nations along with Gog on the mountains of Israel (cf. vv. 17-20). These birds and animals are part of God’s creation, and are acting as his agents.

\(^\text{369}\) If Wong is correct, and *ἐν ὑμῖν* does refer to Israel, then we agree “the Greek rendering would also imply a change from a negative action of God with respect to the nations to a positive action of God with respect to Israel” (Wong, 2002, p. 133).
39:22 καὶ γνώσονται ὁ ὄνομα Ισραήλ ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶμι κύριος ὁ θεὸς αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης καὶ ἐπέκεινα

MT says άπο τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης (‘from that day’). LXX says ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης (‘from this day’). LXX changes MT’s eschatological ‘that day’, to view this as a present reality. LXX may have interpreted their current events (the Seleucids and/or Romans) as the fulfilment of the prophet’s words. After examining the occurrences of καὶ γνώσονται, and how LXX translated them, Wong observes the unique use of ταύτης here, rather than the expected ἐκείνης, and finds that the distance to this perceived event influenced LXX. Wong (2002, p.135) says that “at the time when LXX was made, the idea of Gog had become more common …. the translator saw the Gog-event as something near to his time, and it was not longer seen as belonging to the distant indefinite future”.

νῦν μὴ ἑρμῆνευτε ἡ μιᾶ τῆς ἐκείνης ἡμέρας, τῶν μετὰ ὑπέτατον τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης. 39:23

39:23 καὶ γνώσονται πάντα τὰ θέατα ἃ ἤλθαν ἐκαθαρίζειν ὃν ἦν ἡμέρας αὐτῶν ἥχωμι ἐκκαθαρίζειν ὁ ὄνομα Ισραήλ ἀνθεὶʹ ὃν ἤθετήσαν εἰς ἐμὲ καὶ ἀπέστρεψα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπ’ αὐτῶν καὶ παρέδωκα αὐτοῖς εἰς χείρας τῶν ἑχθρῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἔπεσαν πάντες μαχαίρᾳ.

LXX has another πάντα plus here, expanding on MT to state that ‘all’ the nations will know that Israel’s exile was because of her sin, and was not any weakness on God’s part. The LORD will restore Israel to establish his reputation (‘name’) in Israel, and in the nations (cf. v. 25-29; 36:21f). Wong (2002, p.136) notes the frequency of LXX’s πάντα plus in this block (38:12, 16; 39:7, 23), and explains these occurrences as “an intensification or ‘exaggeration’ of the situation … the translator wanted to provide a more impressive picture of the battle with Gog”.

MT here has ἔλυσιν (‘go into exile’; cf. v. 28), and LXX says ἡμικαλωτεύθησαν (‘they were led captive’). While αἰχμαλωτεύω is also used for ἔλυσιν elsewhere (cf. Ezek.
12:3; Mic. 1:16; Lam. 2:14), LXX’s use of the passive here has this as an action done to Israel.

MT also says ἔφαγον τῷ θρόνων μοι εἰς ἔμε (‘they acted unfaithfully/treacherously against me’ [BDB]), where LXX says ἀνθ’ ἠρήεται κατά με (‘because they rejected me’). TWOT notes that “in almost all the biblical references mā’al is used to designate the breaking or violation of religious law as a conscious act of treachery. The victim against whom the breach is perpetrated is God”.370 HALOT’s ‘to be untrue, violate one’s legal obligations’ also reflects this concept.371 We note that ἀδεετέω can mean ‘to reject (the law)’ [LEH; BAGD], and is contextually used in its other occurrence in Ezekiel (cf. 22:26, for MT’s מָלֵא ‘treat violently’).373 In Ezekiel, LXX typically uses παραπίπτω ‘to fall away, to commit apostasy’ [LEH] for MT’s מָלֵא (Ezek. 14:13; 15:8 (2x); 18:24 (2x); 20:27 (2x)). The typical context in these verses shows God speaking to Israel regarding their ‘falling away’ and/or ‘committing apostasy’. However, LXX uses ἀδικίᾳ for מָלֵא in 39:26. We suggest that LXX used ἀδεετέω here in 39:23 for מָלֵא, rather than its typical παραπίπτω, to highlight that all (cf. πάντα plus) the nations will know that Israel was exiled because they rejected God’s ways.374 Therefore, LXX use of ἀδεετέω

---

370 Block (1998, p.482) also gives the meaning “infidelity in covenant relationships, specifically treachery against Yahweh, the divine patron”.

371 That the context is speaking of covenantal obligations may also be found in v. 24 (not discussed here due to absence of variants), where the verb מֵתַה (‘rebellion’ [TWOT]) is used (LXX: ἀνόμως ‘lawless action’ [LS]), to which Wong (2001, p.74) says, “with Israel as the subject, it denotes a break, a completed separation from Yahweh the suzerain of Israel and therefore a breach of the covenant with Yahweh” (cf. 37:23).

372 Thayer says “‘to act toward anything as though it were annulled’; hence, to deprive a law of force by opinions or acts opposed to it, to transgress it, … Ezek. 22:26” [Thayer does not mention 39:23]; and LS has “to set aside: to deny one, refuse his request”, which does not reflect the ‘legal’ sense the other lexicons reflect.

373 Outside of Ezekiel, LXX uses ἀδεετέω for מָלֵא in only 1Chron. 2:7; 5:25; 2Chron. 36:14; Neh. 1:8.

374 Wong (2001, p.105) suggests a link here to Lev. 26:40 saying “the observation Lev 26:40-41 seems to imply a causal link between the act of מָלֵא (as an example of מָלֵא) and the exile, and this link is made explicitly in Ez 39:23. However, we point out that LXX uses ἀμαρτία ‘fault/error’ [LS] in Lev. 26:40 and so we question if the LXX translator caught this link here. Curiously, in his later work, Wong (2002, p.137) notes LXX Ezekiel’s unusual use of ἀδεετέω here, but does not offer any explanation, other than to propose מָלֵא is a later textual addition.
here to state ‘they rejected me’ is perhaps as an echo back to 22:26, to imply they also rejected God’s law/commandments. LXX may therefore be seen as interpreting MT’s use of מַעַל, in a similar way to previous chapters where we saw LXX interpreting the heart behind MT’s action.375

6.5. 9th Oracle: Ezek. 39:25-29

All MT MSS and G\textsuperscript{B,A} exhibit a sense division break before v. 25; yet G\textsuperscript{967} has vv. 17-29 in the one long pericope. The next break for all MSS is at the end of v. 29, which is the end of the chapter.

Whilst a number of scholars have suggested disassociating this final pericope in chapter 39, there is no textual evidence to suggest this was not also the work of the prophet.376 It focuses upon the final restoration of the nation of Israel from the exile after the defeat of Gog (vv. 25-28), and their restored favour with God whom they will know (v. 28), and who will no longer ‘hide his face’ (cf. vv. 23, 24, 29), but will pour out his Spirit (MT), or wrath (LXX), upon them (cf. v. 29). That such a strong statement of restoration comes at the end of the Gog account suggests that the defeat of her enemies is a major part in the overall restoration of Israel as a nation. In the received chapter order, they are now free to rebuild their temple and worship the LORD (chapters 40-48). However, in G\textsuperscript{967}’s chapter order the textual flow goes into the resurrection of the Dry Bones, the establishment of the united nation under a Davidic ruler, after which they build the temple. This final pericope helps the reader understand that the Gog epic

375 Cooke (1936, p.422) claims that the phrase ‘because they trespassed against me’ is in the wrong place and should be in v. 24. However all representative MSS have this in the same location in v. 23 and so Cooke’s claim is without textual witness.

376 For more on this issue see Block (1987, p.262) who says “in spite of the novel features in 21-9 caution is advised against haste in eliminating the text as non-Ezekielian or inauthentic or misplaced”. His following pages demonstrate the cohesiveness of this final pericope to the rest of the chapter.
was just part of the restoration of Israel, and that God’s focus was always on his people Israel, and not on her enemies who are just God’s agents.377

Unlike all the other occurrences of מִשְׁמָרָה יִשְׂרָאֵל in MT, LXX does not reflect מִשְׁמָרָה here.378 If מִשְׁמָרָה was in LXX’s Vorlage, the translator perhaps did not see that God’s mercy was on all the house of Israel, viewing their current events as judgement. This LXX minus is perhaps more noticeable here due to its willingness to insert πάντα as a plus, especially when referring to ‘all the nations’ (cf. 38:12, 16, 23; 39:7, 23). After examining this frequent Ezekielian phrase, Wong (2002, p.138) concludes that here “מִשְׁמָרָה was probably first not in the Hebrew but added later. The reason for the addition is that the restoration of Israel implies the union of all tribes”. LXX also does not witness MT’s מִשְׁמָרָה in the following verse (cf. ‘all their sins’ v. 26), and we suggest MT added both at a later date.

MT also says מִשְׁמָרָה יִשְׂרָאֵל (‘and I will be jealous for my holy name’), and LXX says καὶ ζηλωσάω διὰ τὸ ὄνομά τὸ ἐγιόν μου (‘and I will be jealous on account of (or, ‘for the sake of’) my holy name’). Zimmerli (1983, p.294) points out that MT’s “jealousy for the name is turned by διὰ into ‘on account of the jealousy’ (διὰ) of the name”. Wong (2002, p.139) proposes three possibilities: “διὰ with the accusative here either shows that the translator understands the phrase as what it means in 36,22, or that

377 As Block (1987, p.267) says, “with the expanded recognition formula taking up the last two verses, the text emphasizes that the covenant relationship among deity, people and land has been re instituted. Its restoration is full and permanent. Yahweh will never leave any of them, neither will he hide is face from them again”.

the translator wants to harmonise the readings, or that the translator attempts to emphasise the importance of the holy name of God in related to his action”. While Wong does not offer his preference, ours is with Wong’s last suggestion, seeing agreement with Zimmerli above. LXX’s motivating factor for the restoration of ‘Jacob’ is on account of the jealousy that God has for his name, where MT just has the jealousy directed at his holy name, or in other words, his reputation (cf. 36:21; 39:7).

The later Symmachus has ἡξήλωσα γὰρ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὄνοματος τοῦ ἀγίου μου, which reflects MT (Ziegler, 1977, p.280).

379 Wong (2002, 139) correctly notes “in 36,22 the preposition the ἐ does not indicate direct object, but means ‘because of, for the sake of, and hence διὰ with the accusative is a correct rendering. However, the preposition ἐ in 39,25 clearly indicates a direct object”.

380 As Wong (2003, p.225) observes, “if Yahweh allows Gog and his army to destroy Israel, then this will lead to a profanation of his holy name. By destroying God and therefore protecting Israel, Yahweh does not allow his name to be profaned … By protecting Israel and its land, Yahweh is safeguarding the sanctity of his name”.

381 Zimmerli (1983, p.320) also points out that “the thought of earlier sins being ‘forgotten’ is quite unheard of in the book of Ezekiel”, and he refers to the similar expression in 16:53 where Israel must ‘bear’ her disgrace.
‘and they will take/receive’) which witnesses רָכִּית as original (cf. 36:7). The later Symmachus’ use of καὶ ἐβάστασαν (‘and they will bear/carry’) also witnesses רָכִּית (Ziegler, 1977, p.281). Furthermore, LXX used the same words here, as in 36:7, to match MT (there the surrounding nations as subject). Overall, whilst some later MT MSS may have changed this to ‘a message of promise’ (cf. Lust), we find all our representative MSS reflect ‘and they will bear’, which we therefore hold to be original. Therefore it is curious that a number of EVV follow ἀφηγο, perhaps motivated by the same thought as those later Hebrew editors (e.g., NIV, NRSV, NAS).

Here, as in 36:7, LXX uses ἀτυμία (‘dishonour’) for MT’s ἀλῆθες (‘insult/reproach’). As noted there, LXX appears to imply that these ‘insults/reproaches’ bring dishonour to them. In 36:7 this ‘dishonour’ came from the surrounding nations; but here their own ‘treachery’ (cf. below) has brought them ‘dishonour’ (cf. 16:52, 63). Following this noun we note intra-LXX, ὁ and Symmachus have αὐτῶν, rather than ὁ’s reflexive ἑαυτῶν that appears to intensify the onus of the ‘dishonour’ onto the people.

There are a few minor differences in LXX for MT’s πᾶσας (‘all their treachery/unfaithfulness’, cf. v. 23). Firstly, unlike the later Symmachus (‘πάσας’), LXX does not reflect πᾶσας. MT possibly added πᾶσας at a later date to emphasise the forgiveness and restoration for Israel (as in v. 25). Secondly, as in v. 23, LXX does not use its normal παρατίπτει (‘fall away/commit apostasy’ [LEH]) for MT’s ἀπελθεῖ. But, whereas in v. 23 LXX has ἀπετέλεω (‘reject [me]’), here it has ἀδικία/ἀδικέω (‘do wrong; act unjustly’ [LEH]).384 As in v. 23, LXX may have been reflecting on the legal aspect

384 Lust (1997, p.544) ties the use of παρατίπτει in Ezekiel to its use in Lev. 5:15, 21; 26:40 for ἀπελθεῖ. Whilst he references Ezek. 39:26 he does not comment on the variant use of ἀδικία/ἀδικέω here for the double use of ἀπελθεῖ.
of מִנֵּל (TWOT: “the breaking or violation of religious law”), so here emphasising that their ‘unfaithfulness’ (as the basic meaning of מַעַל), was their acting ‘unjustly’ with regards to Torah and committing “covenantal treachery” (Block, 1998, p.486). This aspect may be emphasised with Symmachus’ ἀμελείας (‘and all their neglect’ [LEH]), (Ziegler, 1977, p.281). Symmachus could be further implying they neglected the Torah. Both LXX and Symmachus would thus be contextually reflecting Israel’s sin (cf. 36:16f; 39:23f). Finally, MT says יִבְּעַלְתֵּךְ (‘their treachery against me’), but LXX does not reflect ב as it did in v. 23. This may be an LXX theological softening of the charge, or a later plus by MT to match its use in v. 23.

Gehman (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.137) suggests that LXX’s ‘με’ minus “may be a copyist’s error, but on the other hand, קִבְּעַת מֹתֶה כּוֹנָה may have been read by haplography as קִבְּעַת מֹתֶה, the infinitive Piel, instead of the 1st sing. perfect”.

MT says אֲמַלְאַת אֲבֵרוֹת (‘from the lands of their enemies’), yet LXX אֲמַלְאַת אֲבֵרוֹת (‘from the countries of the nations’), which does not reflect MT’s ‘enemy’ (cf. 36:2 ἐκ θρόως for MT’s ἐκ θρόως). Wong (2002, p.141), Zimmerli (1983, p.295), and Ziegler (1977, p.281) all give LXX as ἐκ θρόως (‘enemy’) here. Ziegler gives ἐκ θρόως as reading in V (and other Lucianic codices), then notes LXX omits, while others have τῶν ἐθνῶν (yet without specifying LXX). This is not noted by Wong or Zimmerli. Rahlfs’ edition has ἐθνῶν here. Gehman (in Johnson et al.,
1938, p.137) does note $\text{GB,A}$'s use of $\epsilon\theta\nu\omega\nu$ here, but attributes it to a “mistranslation”. This is likely, yet $\text{GB,A}$ using $\epsilon\theta\nu\omega\nu$ instead of $\epsilon\chi\theta\rho\omega\nu$ may reflect a situation of living in the Diaspora, down playing possible negative terms about other nations.

Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.8 [cf. Gehman, p.137]) also suggests $\text{967}'$s minus of $\tau\omega\nu$ $\epsilon\theta\nu\omega\nu$ (or $\tau\omega\nu$ $\epsilon\chi\theta\rho\omega\nu$) is probably due to homoeoteleuton [sic] saying it “may be due to $\tau\omega\nu$ $\chi\omega\rho\omega\nu$ of proceeding [sic] line” (similarly Ziegler). Yet Lust (2002a, p.388) states “there is no homoioiteleuton”, and curiously says that “here Ziegler’s critical edition has $\epsilon\chi\theta\rho\omega\nu$ as a plus. It is in agreement with MT and probably implies a correction towards MT”. Lust acknowledges most Greek MSS read $\epsilon\theta\nu\omega\nu$ rather than $\epsilon\chi\theta\rho\omega\nu$. Yet Lust does not clarify why $\text{967}$ does not have either word. Therefore we stand with those seeing homoioiteleuton for $\text{967}'$s minus.

MT has רָבִים ($\text{many nations}$). Zimmerli (1983, p.295) believes רָבִים is a “secondary gloss” stating it “is not attested by $\text{G}$” (cf. Cooke, 1936, p.423). However, while $\text{GB}$ does not witness רָבִים, scholars typically overlook that both $\text{967,A}$ do witness רָבִים with מָלָלָא. This demonstrates that if רָבִים was an MT gloss, it was early enough for even $\text{967}$ to witness it, and thus should have been in $\text{GB}$. Therefore, it is curious that many, including Ziegler, omit מָלָלָא from their Greek texts.

MT says בֵּיתֵלְוָלָא (hiph. infin.; ‘when I led them into exile’; cf. v. 23), whereas LXX says εν τῷ ἐπισφανῆναι με αὐτοῖς $\epsilon\nu$ τοῖς $\epsilon\theta\nu\sigma\sigma\omega\nu$ $\epsilon\nu$ τοῖς $\epsilon\theta\nu\sigma\sigma\omega\nu$

MT says בֵּיתֵלְוָלָא (hiph. infin.; ‘when I led them into exile’; cf. v. 23), whereas LXX says εν τῷ ἐπισφανῆναι με (‘when I have been manifest’). Block (1998, p.478) suggests that “LXX treats the infinitive as a Niphal of הָלִין ‘to reveal’” (cf. בֵּיתֵלְוָלָא; Ezek. 21:29; 1Chr. 5:41). The context of the surrounding verses may give
support to MT’s understanding as original (cf. v. 27 ‘in my bringing them back from the
people’; v. 28 ‘in my exiling them to the nations’). On the other hand, these similarities
with v. 27 could have influenced LXX to have “omitted them as repetitions … [as] in
general, the translator does not hesitate to render ‘redundancies’” (Lust, 1986c, p.49).
Lust (2002b, p.152) points out that “the Greek gives the verse a hopeful connotation; a
similar effect is achieved by MT through the insert of a long plus” (see below).
Zimmerli (1983, p.295) also believes LXX’s use of ἐπιφαίνω “is connected” with MT’s
plus not being in LXX’s Vorlage. The LXX translator, working with an unpointed text,
and without MT’s plus, may have performed a wordplay giving a message of hope that
they knew the LORD when he manifested himself to them in the nations. LXX’s
‘manifest’ is not required with MT’s plus.

As stated above, MT exhibits a long plus from יָתָּ֣ס נֵי (“and I gathered them’)
to the end of the verse. This is not clearly noted by Allen or Zimmerli. This plus may be
a redundant repetition from v. 27. However, as Lust (1986c, p.48) states, “in general,
the translator does not hesitate to render redundancies”. Therefore, LXX should have
included this if it was in their Vorlage. Lust (1986c, p.51) covers this passage in detail
and concludes that this phrase “is a late [MT] composition which was not yet attested in
the Vorlage of the LXX”. Lust (1986c, p.53) proposes that all the issues in v. 28 need to
be considered together, and are part of editorial work whereby “the editor added a
section, taking position in the ongoing debate concerning the question whether everyone
would be allowed to participate in the Return from the Diaspora”.385 Lust (1986c, p.53)
concludes that “the Greek text was probably based on a Vorlage differing from MT”.386
Block (1998, p.487) does not agree with Lust, instead suggesting “it is preferable to
recognize the transitional significance of Ezekiel’s style”. Yet Block does not offer any

---

385 We note Lust’s (1986c, p.53) ‘disclaimer’ that “this attempt towards an interpretation is hypothetic.”
386 Wong (2002, p.142) also agrees concluding “that v. 28b is a late addition which did not exist in the
Vorlage of the LXX”.
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explanation for this being minus in LXX. Block (1998, p.487) also stands against Lust’s later redaction proposal, that “the LXX version of Zech. 10:10, ‘And none of them will be left behind’ [is] in place of MT, ‘Till there is no room for them’”. Wong (2002, p.142) states that “the idea that God will leave no one behind in the day of restoration cannot be found elsewhere in the Hebrew text”. Then, in reference to LXX Zech. 10:10, Wong (2002, p.142) says this may itself be a late composition, and that “this idea probably originated in the intertestamental period”, reflecting the same thought as a possible later Ezekiel redactor. Block (1998, p.487) acknowledges that this MT plus does “contain several stylistic surprises” (e.g., נֶפֶשׁ [both ‘gather’]; and הַשָּׁבֵעַ ['leftovers']). Yet both Lust (1986c, p.47f; 2002b, p.152) and Wong (2002, p.142) suggest that these very verbs indicate later, even intertestamental, usage, and use these to back their ‘later redactor’ theory. Lust (2002b, p.153) recently wrote, “most remarkable is the transforming formula ‘none will be left’, which elsewhere expresses total annihilation, into a formula expressing total salvation”. MT’s plus also includes their full regathering as part of how they will know the LORD is their God.

This verse, as the ones surrounding it, exhibit evidence of an LXX Vorlage differing from MT, and both MT and LXX exhibit editorial activity most likely in conjunction with, or resulting from, the re-ordering of the chapter divisions.

387 For more on late dating of the 12 minor prophets see Siegert (2001) and Harl et al. (1988).

388 This issue will be discussed in detail in a following chapter.
most probably an exegetical interpretation. It relates v 29b to the past experience of judgement in defeat and exile, in reminiscence of vv 23-24 and also 36:17-19 that in v 18 uses the phrase אֲשֵׁר הָעֵצָה, ‘and I poured out my wrath’. Block (1998, p.478f) also suggests that “LXX probably represents a harmonization with Ezekiel’s stereotypical phrase ēpēk hēmā, ‘to pour out wrath’”. Block (1998, p.488) sees MT’s יָרָה transforming “what had been for [Ezekiel] a stereotypical threat of judgment … into a glorious gospel message”, and says this MT phrase “signifies the ratification and sealing of the covenant relationship with his people”.389 Along with Allen and Block, Wong (2002) also proposes that LXX had יָרָה in their Vorlage but deliberately interpreted יָרָה as ‘anger’. Wong claims (2002, p.143) that יָרָה is not mechanically translated with πνεῦμα ‘spirit/breath’ even in Ezekiel, and is given the meaning of ‘anger’ in “Jdg 8,3; Eccl 10,4; Prov 16,32; Is 25,4; 33,11 … [and] elsewhere in LXX, יָרָה is translated as θυμός in Job 15,13; Prov 18,14; 29,11; Zech 6,8; Is 59,19”.390 Yet Wong does not mention that a translation of θυμός for יָרָה is not found elsewhere in Ezekiel, which undermines his point.391 Wong’s continued reasoning includes the witness of יָרָה in Targum, Vulgate, and Peshitta (however, we note these are late MSS); secondly, he refers to the contrasting themes in the preceding verses of a negative past when God refers to Israel’s sin (vv. 23-24), and a positive future when God considers

---

389 Lust (2002b, p.155) also states that “the Spirit poured out upon his people serves as a permanent witness of the eternal covenant of peace”.

390 We may note in these examples only one has the LORD as subject: humans are the subject in Job 15:13; Prov. 18:14, 29:11; and angelic in Zech. 6:8 (cf. v. 5); only in Isa. 59:19 do we find the LORD as subject. However, we may observe LXX having a number of exegetical interactions in this verse as evidenced by LXX’s use of two nouns the LORD’s יָרָה: ḥêrē and θυμός. Thus we may suggest that Wong’s examples may not necessary contextually apply here.

391 Lust (2002b, p.154) likewise observes that in the 52 occurrences of יָרָה, “the Greek equivalents are almost always either πνεῦμα or ἄνεμος; πνεῦμα is used e.g., in 3,14, even when there the context might allow a translation by θυμός” (n.b., Wong had used Ezek. 3:14 as an example supporting the use of θυμός).
Israel’s future (vv. 25-28). Wong (2002, p.144) proposes that both these perspectives are found in v. 29: the positive in v. 29a, and the negative in 29b, inspiring LXX’s use of θευμάς. Yet, the context of v. 29 MT may be ambiguous and influenced by how one interprets God’s pouring out (qal perfect) his ַָנְחָר as a past negative action, or a past (even present) positive action. This ambiguous contextual reading may have influenced LXX which appears to have taken the ‘negative past’ interpretation.

Wong’s third reasoning uses LXX’s Vorlage as evidenced in 6067, and correctly takes the chapter reorder, and resulting insertion of 36:23c-38 into consideration. Based on this observation, Wong (2002, p.144f) points out that “the promise of the giving of the spirit in 36,27 did not yet exist, and the promise of the spirit in 37,14 was yet to come after 39,29”. Wong (2002, p.145) then uses this observation to propose that אַנְחָר “has a causal meaning” (‘when’), and that ישׁמך needs to be interpreted “as a prophetic past” (n.b., ‘ἐξέκχεω’ is aorist). Wong (2002, p.145) also says “this interpretation would not be possible if he had read the text in the context of the original sequence of chapters … and interpreted the word as ‘spirit’ for the reason just mentioned. The possible solution was to interpret אַנְחָר as θευμάς”. While not agreeing with Wong’s conclusion, Lust (2002b, p.154) agrees that “the Septuagint supports the causal interpretation”. Yet, contra Wong, Lust (2002b, p.154) observes that “אַנְחָר with the Lord as subject is a hapax in Ezekiel .... however, the reference is always to the ‘spirit’ or πνεῦμα of the Lord: Joel 3,1, Zech 12,10, never to his ‘anger’”. We agree with Wong that the chapter reorder must be considered, yet we are not convinced אַנְחָר was in LXX’s Vorlage.

392 Also see Block (1997c, p.113f) for how 39:21-24 and vv. 25-29 parallel.
393 Wong reads rather awkwardly in this last phrase, and may be best read omitting the ‘yet’. Wong intends to say that in the original the promise of the Spirit as found in LXX’s came after 39:29, and thus did not give a past context for אַנְחָר in 39:29 to refer back to, as happens with the received chapter order.
Of significance, Symmachus says, καὶ ἐκχεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα μου ἐπὶ τὸ οἴκον Ἰσραήλ (‘and I will pour out my Spirit upon the house of Israel’), which reflects a ‘positive’ interpretation for MT, and witnesses the presence of חֵרֶם in his Vorlage (Ziegler, 1977, p.238). Also, rather than LXX’s aorist, Symmachus uses ἐκχεῖν the ‘indicative present’, which matches MT’s qal perfect here. In addition, Symmachus translates ḫăr with καί, making this an independent phrase.

The primary issue is whether the earlier LXX translator had חֵרֶם in his Vorlage, as apparently the later Symmachus did. Lust (2002b, p.153), speaking against the premise that חֵרֶם was in LXX’s Vorlage (cf. Allen, Block, Wong), states that “if in the Vorlage of the translator chapter 37 followed upon chapter 39, as indeed it does in p967, and given that the donation of the חֵרֶם, meaning ‘spirit, breath’, plays an important role in chapter 37, it is highly unlikely that he would have rendered חֵרֶם by θυμός”. Lust maintains חֵרֶם in 37 still had an overarching influence upon 39:29 in the original chapter order as witnessed by Θ967. As an alternative proposal, Lust believes LXX’s Vorlage had נֹא (‘anger/wrath’), and not חֵרֶם, and that early MT editors deliberately changed the text from נֹא to חֵרֶם when chapter 39 was still followed by 37. In his earlier work, Lust (1986c, p.53) proposed that “in verse 29 [the editor] replaced God’s ‘wrath’ by his ‘spirit’ as a prelude to ch. 37 where the role of the spirit was prominent”.394 Lust (2002b) still holds to this position in his later work, written in response to those interacting with his proposal (e.g., Block, Wong).

Overall, we are not convinced by the proposals that LXX used θυμός for חֵרֶם, nor are we convinced חֵרֶם was in LXX’s Vorlage, otherwise surely they would have caught

394 Lust (1986c, p.53) says the MT editor did this change from ‘anger’ to ‘spirit’ here, and the change from ‘shame’ to ‘forget’ (v. 26), and MT’s long plus (v. 28), was to bring “more hopeful connotations”.
this message of hope, especially with their use of ‘magnify’ in v. 28. Whilst accepting Lust’s proposal that MT emended from הָמוֹנָה to הָדוֹר, we question whether this took place before the chapter realignment. If before, we ask why LXX MSS witnessing MT’s chapter realignment, did not also adjust their wording here to ‘spirit’. We find two possibilities: firstly, LXX accepted the chapter order and just moved chapter 37 to before 38, also inserting 36:23c-38, yet without any individual word emendations made in MT, thus maintaining their traditional use of θυμός here (witnessing an early Hebrew בָּהּ). Alternatively, we propose the change in MT from הָמוֹנָה to הָדוֹר came after this chapter realignment, but before Symmachus. The chapter reorder caused 39:29 to be the final verse of the restoration block (36-39), and some later editor(s) may have decided this block should not end with the outpouring of God’s ‘wrath’, and so changed from הָמוֹנָה to הָדוֹר to now state the L ORD was pouring out his Spirit, a positive and fitting statement to end the previous chapters and begin the rebuilding of the Temple (40-48). We now have both G967 (pre–chapter realignment), and GB,A (post–chapter realignment), all witnessing θυμός which evidences הָמוֹנָה in their Vorlage, and then Symmachus witnessing the later editorial change to הָדוֹר with πνεῦμα. Therefore, we have different Greek witnesses to the textual flux in ‘proto-MT’. We also see Symmachus’ use of καὶ ἐκχέω (independent phrase; indicative present) as further implicit evidence of this word change in MT. The theology of ‘will pour out my Spirit’ is certainly found in the ‘inserted pericope’ of 36:23c-38, especially in v. 27 (cf. 37:14), and MT’s word change to ‘my Spirit’ here would act as a theological inclusio with the inserted text, and of their placement for chapter 37 before the Gog chapters. This change may have been done at the same time as other later MT changes (e.g., the declarative formula in 36:23b; the change from יָנַח to יָנַח, in 37:10; נָשִׁי to נָשִׁי 37:22-24, and the many other MT plusses not witnessed in LXX [see Excursus below]).
Therefore we have several variances in MT and LXX in the last pericope of chapter 39, just as we observed in the first verse of 37 in LXX (human bones), and in 36:23b, all which may be seen to be due to the change in chapter order.

This chapter finishes after v. 29, where all three MT MSS have a petuḥah break. G967 has its normal sense division ‘strokes’, but then has an unusual 4-5 letter gap before it starts chapter 37 on the same line. Both GBA begin chapter 40:1 on a new line; GB leaves a 4 letter break at the end of the previous line (a relatively extensive gap for GB); GA finishes 39:29 about two-thirds across the line. Therefore, all representative MSS witness a major break in their own styles between 39:29 and the following chapter.


There are a number of plusses through chapters 36-39, either single words or longer, which occur in only one (or two) of our representative manuscripts. We have discussed these unique plusses as they appeared in our examination of chapters 36-39, yet some bear further discussion here in an attempt to determine any underlying motif behind these plusses. There are four groups: firstly those unique to G967, secondly those found in both MT and GA, thirdly those unique to GA, and fourthly, those unique to MT. These may represent stages in the development of the text. A degree of complexity surrounds these plusses, warranting further study than the investigation here which is concerned only with interpretive aspects.

6.6.1. Plusses Unique to G967

G967 typically witnesses a text with very few plusses, and may well represent the Old Greek, and perhaps the Hebrew Urtext. Whilst G967 has a few minor plusses, often one or two words as noted through our study of chapters 36-39, here we will focus on its
two longer unique plusses. Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.14) claims these “are more or less stock phrases and may have been quoted from memory”.

The first is at the end of Ezek. 38:20, ἵνα γνώσων πάντα τὰ θυνη ἐμὲ ἐν σοί ἐνωπίον αὐτῶν (‘so that all the nations will know I am among you before them’). This appears to be a repeat of 38:16, but it lacks the important middle phrase (ἐν τῷ ἄγιασθηναί ‘when I am sanctified’), supporting Johnson’s ‘quote from memory’ proposal. This plus provides an immediate reason for God’s action against Gog in the first part of this verse.

G67’s second unique plus is in Ezek. 39:4, οὐ μὴ βεβηλωθήσετο τὸ ὄνομά τοῦ ἄγιαν (‘will not profane the holy name’). This appears to be another repeated phrase, this time from 39:7 (cf. 20:39; 36:20, 21, 22; 39:7, 25). It again evidences a ‘quote from memory’ as it is minus the important distinction of ‘my’ [holy name]. This phrase comes directly after Gog has been told he will be struck down on the mountains of Israel, and gives immediate reason for this action. However, it interrupts the sentence flow that includes what will then happen to Gog and those with him.

While these plusses may be ‘from memory’, rather than in the Vorlage, their insertion reveals a ‘holiness’ concern, firstly that the LORD will be known among the nations, and secondly, the protection of his name; both being common motifs in Ezekiel.

6.6.2. Plusses Unique to MT and $\mathcal{A}$

Pluses unique to MT and $\mathcal{A}$, that are not represented in G67B, were apparently added after G67B’s Vorlage, but in time to be included in $\mathcal{A}$’s Vorlage. MasEzek’s witness to these plusses indicates they had their genesis with early Jewish communities. Their inclusion in $\mathcal{A}$ is no doubt due to a later recension, and the hexaplaric tradition of conformity to the Hebrew.
Some of these MT/\(\text{G}^\text{A}\) plusses have a clarifying or intensifying purpose: ‘behold’ 37:4; ‘sound’ 37:7; ‘wind/breath’ (as vocative) 37:9; ‘in them’ and ‘‘\(\gamma\eta\)/
\(\alpha\delta\omega\mu\alpha\)’ in 37:12; ‘saying’ 37:18; ‘Gog’ 38:3; the declarative formula in 36:23b clarifies the LORD’s involvement; ‘again’ 36:30 emphasises their hope they will not repeat their past tragedies in the land; and ‘all’ 37:22 clarifies there will be one leader for ‘all’.

However, others have a discernible theological purpose. In 37:23 both have two plusses enlarging their sins: firstly, ‘in their detestable things (MT) / wrong’ (\(\text{G}^\text{A}\)), and secondly, ‘in their rebellion (MT) / offence’ (\(\text{G}^\text{A}\)). In 36:18 we find a longer plus that echoes priestly concerns, ‘for the blood they had poured on the land, and with their dung pellets (MT) idols’ (\(\text{G}^\text{A}\)). Then there is another longer plus in 37:25, ‘and their children and children’s children forever’, which expresses their concern for longevity in the land.

6.6.3. Plusses Unique to \(\text{G}^\text{A}\).

The few plusses unique to \(\text{G}^\text{A}\) (not represented in MT nor \(\text{G}^{967,\text{B}}\)), often expand the restorative work. \(\text{G}^\text{A}\) frequently adds ‘\(\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\)’: 37:21 Israel’s gathering will be from all the nations (also in \(\text{G}^\text{B}\)); 37:23 ‘in all their kingdoms’; 39:7 the knowledge of the LORD in ‘all nations’; 39:14, 15 they will search all the land. In 36:3, \(\text{G}^\text{A}\) adds ‘the nations’, giving identity to ‘those around’, and the source of the hatred against them. There are two plusses in \(\text{G}^\text{A}\) that show deeper theological thought, such as its ‘repeated’ line in 36:17, emphasising their uncleanness, and its \(\zeta\omega\nu\zeta\) plus in 37:10 (breath of life).

6.6.4. Plusses Unique to MT

We also find a few plusses in MT Ezek. 36-39 that are not witnessed in any representative LXX MSS. It is difficult to find any reason why LXX would omit these, especially as some have solid theological content. This suggests they were added after
the Vorlage for our representative LXX MSS. Significantly, where extant, we find witness for these later plusses with Aquila, Symmachus and/or Theodotion.

Some of the unique MT plusses expand, emphasise or clarify the text: in 36:5, יָלַעַל expands the attitude of the plunderers regarding their ‘contempt’; in 36:7 the declarative oath and oath formula (ינאָס) emphasises the LORD’s action;\(^{395}\) in 36:8 MT clarifies that God’s people are יְנִיאָה. This clarification is also seen in 37:12 where יָמַק gives specific identity to those whose graves are being opened; יָאָה in 37:16 clarifies Ezekiel as the object of God’s command; יָלַע in 37:22 emphasises one king for all; the phrase ‘and I will turn you back, and I will put hooks into your jaws’ in 38:4 clarifies how the LORD will move Gog; יָדַי in 38:13 emphasises the extent the community has suffered; יָהָנְכָאָה in 38:17 reinforces the action of the prophets; יָרְי in 38:21 clarifies the battle’s locale; יָלַע in 39:25, 26 emphasises ‘all’ their treachery; and ‘I will gather them to their own land, not leaving any behind’ in 39:28 answers concerns about being left behind in the exile.

A few unique MT plusses express priestly concerns: יָבַר in 36:11, and יָהָנְכָאָה יָרְי in 37:26, both echo the priestly blessing upon the restorative order; יָאָה in 36:15 may also echo a priestly concern that the land does not cause them to stumble again; and יָהָנְכָאָה יָרְי in 39:14, 15 may express priestly concern that those ‘travelling’ through the land perform the burial, and so the people of Israel are not defiled by touching the dead.

While not plusses, we also include a few places where MT most likely changed the text as a result of the chapter reorder. These include the later insertion of the

\(^{395}\) See our discussions for 36:7, and 37:22, where these ‘plusses’ may have been in the text but ignored by the translator.
declarative formula in 36:23b; the change from הָּלַּקְלָא to נִשְׂלָא in 37:10; from הָּלַּקְלָא to נִשְׂלָא in 37:22-24; and from הָּלַּקְלָא to נִשְׂלָא in 39:29. In these places, LXX may be found to reflect the original, leaving MT as the interpretive text.

6.6.5. Summary of Unique Plusses

These plusses may reveal different stages in the growth of the text. Both $\mathcal{G}^{967}$ and $\mathcal{G}^B$ witness a Vorlage without the later plusses, suggesting they reflect the original Greek more than $\mathcal{G}^A$; yet while $\mathcal{G}^B$ reflects the chapter order and inserted pericope (36:23c-38) redaction, $\mathcal{G}^{967}$ appears to reflect the Old Greek. The MT plusses witnessed by $\mathcal{G}^A$ show evidence of further textual editing, but early enough for $\mathcal{G}^A$ to include them. The plusses unique to $\mathcal{G}^A$, and plusses unique to MT, suggest that both the Hebrew and Greek texts had further separate textual development. The unique MT plusses are frequently represented in MasEzek, creating timeline difficulties, especially considering $\mathcal{G}^A$ as a post-Hexapla MS. This may suggest that all LXX MSS, including $\mathcal{G}^A$, drew on an earlier Hebrew parent text than MasEzek. We also noted a few places where MT may be found to have likely performed later interpretive word change as support for the chapter reorder. As noted above, all these issue require further examination covering the whole book and is outside the concern of the present investigation.

6.7. Overall Summary: Chapter 6

Ezekiel Chapter 39 continues the Gog epic, yet focuses upon the battle’s aftermath with the clean up by people and animals, and on Gog’s burial place. The last thematic section of chapter 39 declares Israel’s sin as the reason for the exile (vv. 21-24), and that the restoration of Israel will happen because the LORD has compassion for his people, and because he is jealous for his holy name (v. 25).
Chapter 39 contains four oracles that continue from the five oracles found in chapter 38, giving a total of nine oracles between chapters 39-39. These nine oracles follow MT’s sense divisions. In chapter 38 oracles are discerned by the object of the LORD’s speech, yet here in chapter 39 they are also discerned thematically as the addressee is at times difficult to determine. Two oracles (6th, and 8th) have a small ‘excursus’, where the LORD changes from the current addressees, to give a general declaration regarding his actions. We propose the following outline for chapter 39:

6th Oracle: vv. 1-10: The LORD tells Ezekiel what to say to Gog about his gathering and demise.

Excurses (vv. 6-10): The LORD declares what he will do, why, and the 7 year clean up.

7th Oracle: vv. 11-16: The LORD declares Gog’s burial place (Hamon Gog; Hamonah) and the resulting 7 month cleansing of the land.

8th Oracle: vv. 17-24: The LORD’s declaration, through Ezekiel, of his sacrifice to the birds and animals.

Excurses (vv. 21-24): The LORD declares Israel’s sin as the reason for the exile.

9th Oracle: vv. 25-29: The LORD declares his holy name as the reason for the restoration of Israel.

As in chapter 38, LXX maintains the transliteration of ‘Gog’, which also keeps the ambiguity of Gog’s identity; likewise LXX keeps ‘Rhos’ as a proper noun of an ethnic group. LXX’s use of ‘Gog’ for MT’s ‘Magog’ (v. 6) may suggest LXX used these names interchangeably.

Again, as in previous chapters, we found LXX interacting in chapter 39 with the Hebrew text. LXX smooths the Hebrew in a few places: v. 4 ‘birds’; v. 7 B,A adjust MT’s syntax; v. 9 LXX telescopes two Hebrew verbs into one. In v. 4 LXX ‘intensified’ the Hebrew (cf. ‘strike’ to ‘destroy’ bows).

We also found LXX exegeting or interpreting the Hebrew, such as in v. 4 where LXX appears to interpret the purpose for Gog’s assembly as destruction; in v. 11 LXX
uses ἐπέρχομαι, a word that can have a hostile meaning. In v. 21 LXX changed MT’s revealing of God’s glory ‘in the nations’ to ‘in you’ (i.e., in the birds and animals at the sacrificial feast). In v. 6 LXX transforms declaration of judgment into salvation message, which appears to reveal a difference in eschatological view for the coastlands. This shift in eschatology was also found in v. 22 where LXX changes MT’s ‘that day’ to ‘this day’, suggesting LXX interpreted events around them as fulfilment of the prophecy (i.e., with the Seleucids or Romans). In v. 23 LXX interprets MT’s ‘they acted unfaithfully’ to ‘they rejected me’ (and his laws), in a similar way to previous chapters where we saw LXX interpreting the heart behind MT’s action. Whilst some (e.g., Allen), see LXX interpreting MT’s ἔρρη αὐτοῖς as ‘wrath’ in v. 29, we suggested LXX’s Vorlage had διόμενον (‘wrath’), and not ἔρρη; MT changed to ἔρρη after the chapter reorder to give a message of hope, as the reordered chapter flow now goes from this verse into the construction of the Temple (40-48).396

We observed priestly concern in the 7th Oracle (vv. 11-16) regarding the burial of Gog, and the cleansing of the land. LXX interpretively interacts with Gog’s burial and cleansing of the land; in v. 11, MT’s focus is on the location of Gog’s burial place in Israel, yet LXX’s focus is interpreting those who will be buried in Gog’s ‘place of renown in Israel’. Again, in v. 11, LXX exegetes MT to state that the mass burial place of Gog and ‘those coming to the sea’ will be to the extent that it will ‘dam up the valley’, and as such will be ‘a place of renown’. LXX transliterates the burial place as τὸ γαί (‘the Gai’), rather than interpreting it, suggesting this place was known to the reader (v. 11, 15). LXX says the burial place will be called Πολύνορμιν (‘mass burial place’), for Ἑμονά (‘Hamonah’ or ‘multitude’) (vv. 11, 16). In v. 11 LXX uses μνημείον (‘memorial’) rather than τάφος (‘grave/tomb’), again suggesting Gog’s burial place as

396 We must remember that prior to the chapter reorder this verse led into the resurrection of the Dry Bones (cf. Chapter 7: Papyrus G).
known to the reader. MT’s twice plus of הַנִּשָּׁבָּיָה (vv. 14, 15) may indicate priestly concern that the burial will be done by those ‘travelling’ through the land, and not by the people of Israel, lest they be defiled by touching the dead.

We examined two possible LXX wordplays, perhaps resulting from working with an unpointed text. In v. 11, LXX either misread מָרָע as מָעַר, or performed a wordplay to change from ‘a place there’ to ‘a place of renown’. Then in v. 28, LXX may have performed a wordplay changing MT’s ‘exile’ to ‘manifest’ and giving a message of hope that the LORD will be manifest to them in the nations.

We observed where LXX used the passive: firstly in v. 7 where the passive avoided the first person singular used by MT, perhaps due to the practice of circumlocution that avoids the name of God; and secondly, in v. 23 LXX’s passive has the action of exile done to Israel.

There was one occurrence in 39:12 that echoes the ritual cleansing concerns of Numbers, a book that we suggested in discussing chapter 36 the writer and translator both were aware of. The other aspects of ritually cleansing the land may also evidence awareness of Numbers.

We also observed a number of plusses. LXX’s πάντα plus in this block (38:12, 16; 39:7, 14, 23) often intensifies the situation. MT twice has מִלְתָּה as plus, to indicate that the restoration of Israel implies the union of all tribes” (cf. vv. 25, 26). אָרוֹן 967 has a unique plus in v. 4 (cf. holy name); and MT also has a long plus in v. 28, that none would be left in the exile. We also observed a number of ‘adjustments’ by Symmachus towards MT (vv. 11, 16, 18, 25, 26, 29).

Finally, we briefly examined the plusses unique to אָרוֹן 967, אָרוֹן A, MT and אָרוֹן H and to MT alone in chapters 36-39. These evidence different development stages of the text, and reveals a text in a state of flux. MasEzek’s witness to unique plusses MT show that
the later Masoretes were not innovators with their texts but faithfully transmitted what they received.
7.0. Chapter 7: Papyrus 967

7.1. Introduction: Papyrus 967

One LXX manuscript worth discussing in detail, due to its uniqueness and antiquity, is Papyrus 967 (G967). This particular papyrus is dated from the late 2nd to early 3rd century CE, and therefore pre-hexaplaric (Johnson in Johnson et al., 1938, p.5). The main body of this papyrus was discovered in the early 1930s, and is considered Egyptian in origin; however, the origin of its parent text is uncertain. G967 originally contained (in order) Ezekiel, Daniel, Susanna and Bel, Esther (Johnson in Johnson et al., 1938, p.3).397

G967 is located today in several places. Significantly for us, most of chapters 19-39 (on 21 leaves, i.e., 42 pages) are located in the John H. Scheide collection at Princeton University. The Scheide collection finishes at the beginning of 37:4, which follows chapter 39 in an order different from all other LXX and MT MSS.398 The remainder of chapter 37 (37:4-28), along with other fragments, is located in Madrid, published by Fernández Galiano (1971). Most of chapters 11:25-17:21 (on 8 leaves or 16 pages) is in the Chester Beatty collection, Dublin, and published by F.G. Kenyon (1937). Other substantial fragments (none from chapters 36-39) are located in Cologne and were published by L.G. Jahn (1972). Kenyon (1937, p.viii) says that “the Ezekiel hand is large, square in build, with well-rounded curves … It is very clear, but heavy and by no means elegant, unevenly written and spaced, and plainly not the work of a trained professional scribe”. Yet Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.5) states that “the text was written by the same hand throughout in clear and carefully formed uncialis”. He

---

397 Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.2) notes that “the only other example of the order—Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther—is in Alexandrinus”. Lust (1981a, p.517) notes that “the text of the latter books was written by another hand”.

398 Ziegler’s critical edition of Ezekiel chapters 36-39 takes G967 into account. The first edition of the Göttingen LXX edited by Ziegler (1952) utilised the Chester Beatty and Scheide portions, while the 2nd ed (1977) now has an appendix by Fraenkel with details of the other portions.
(in Johnson et al., 1938, p.7) also claims that “actual mistakes in copying seem to be comparatively few”.\textsuperscript{399}

Our special interest in $G^{967}$ is due to its unique chapter order, where the material that is traditionally recognised as chapter 37 appears in this MS after chapter 39. In addition, $G^{967}$ is minus 36:23c-38. This chapter order and significant minus are not witnessed in any other extant Hebrew or Greek MSS. The only other textual witness for this chapter order and minus is the Vetus Latina Codex Wirceburgensis ($W$) (ca. 6\textsuperscript{th} century C.E.). Although Codex $W$ is later, it nevertheless “represents one of the two earliest and best preserved Vetus Latina manuscripts of Ezekiel” (Block, 1998, p.338). Lust (1981a, p.518) observes that $W$ “is not directly dependent upon the Greek papyrus” [of $G^{967}$] and [n.8] “does not follow Pap. 967 in its many omissions through \textit{parablepsis}”. Block (1998, p.338) agrees, commenting that because Codex $W$ “does not follow Papyrus 967 in many of its omissions [this] suggests it represents an independent textual witness” [to the chapter order and minus]. Kase (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.47), referring to $W$, claims that “the original translation of the Old Latin version was made from a text closely resembling that of the Scheide papyri and probably of Egyptian origin”. The significance for us is that we have two different trajectory witnesses to the unique chapter order and the minus of 36:23c-38. If we follow Kase, both trajectories have similar parentage, which may be the Hebrew \textit{Urtext}, yet certainly a parentage before the chapter reorder and insertion of 36:23c-38 found in other MSS.

Therefore, we suggest that $G^{967}$ is not an innovative or maverick text, but representative of an existing textual tradition. The extent of this tradition is a matter of debate and will be discussed throughout this chapter.

Codex Vaticanus ($G^{B}$), which is also pre-hexaplaric in text form, does contain the ‘omitted’ pericope, and has the received chapter order. While the Scheide portion of

\textsuperscript{399} Johnson goes on to discuss other ‘omissions’.
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G967 (chapters 19-39) shares many textual agreements with G^B, “there are some 660 variants [with G^B] in these 42 pages of text [which] shows that one or [the] other has diverged far from their common ancestor” (Johnson in Johnson et al., 1938, p.35). Most of these variants are minor. Interestingly, the Scheide portion has “550 variants not found in any other uncial MS …. [and] the new text is noteworthy for omissions, and there are ca. 55 examples of words or phrases found in other uncialswith have been omitted in Sch[eide]” (Johnson in Johnson et al., 1938, p.18). Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, pp.21-33) provides a list of “the readings of the Scheide text which are not found in any of the uncials” and concludes that G967 is closer to G^B than to Codex Alexandrinus (G^A). Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.33) notes that “Variants from A only 441; agreements with A only 95; Variants from B only 129; agreements with B only 168”. This suggests that the later G^A, which appears to have been influenced by Origen’s Hexapla, is further removed from the Old Greek (OG) and Hebrew Urtext than the earlier G967 and G^B. We also suggest that while G967 is more closely aligned with G^B than G^A, it nevertheless witnesses a textual trajectory and tradition different from G^B and G^A.

It appears that G967 represents a tradition closest to the Old Greek (OG). As Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.40) says, this MSS is “undoubtedly older than any other MS, [and] it probably represents the original LXX better than others”. Lust (1981c, p.45) agrees, saying G967 is the “earliest witness of the prehexaplaric Septuagint of Ezekiel”. Gehman (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.79) claims that

of all our Greek MSS, the Scheide text of Ezekiel appears to be closest to the original LXX … the original LXX must have been closer to the Hebrew than [G]B would imply. The authority of [G]B as our best source for the original Septuagint must yield to this new evidence.

---

400 See Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, pp.31-33) for a summary of the variants of chapters 36-39.
Gehman appears to imply that $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ represents the Hebrew Urtext closer than other extant LXX MSS. Following his discussion on the ‘Nomen Sacrum’ in $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$, Kase (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.51) concluded that “the earliest certain evidence for the revision of the Hebrew is furnished according to the Scheide papyri and the Old Latin”. Lust (1981a, p.525) also claims that $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ represents not only the earliest LXX Ezekiel, but also the Hebrew Vorlage, stating that 36:23c-38 “probably was not part of his Hebrew Vorlage”.

Tov (1999d, p.409) challenges Lust’s view that $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ reflects an accurate Hebrew Vorlage, stating, “This is a far reaching assumption”. While $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ may be the oldest Greek MS, and perhaps the best witness to the original LXX (OG), this does not necessarily equate to being a witness of the Hebrew Vorlage. Although $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ is the earliest known extant LXX witness of Ezekiel, we must ask whether ‘older’ and ‘shorter’ always equates to ‘better’ or ‘more accurate’, as it is often easier to explain why a longer text is later. Block (1998, p.342) comments that “a text’s antiquity is not necessarily a sign of either originality or superiority”. If $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ is an accurate representation of the original LXX, we would normally expect to find other witnesses in subsequent LXX MSS. Instead $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ stands alone amongst extant Greek texts. As Block (1998, p.340) comments, “if the absence of this section [36:23c-38] were original, it is remarkable that it is preserved in only one Greek manuscript and an obscure Latin text”. Likewise, if $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ is the best witness to the Hebrew Vorlage, we would expect a supporting Hebrew witness; yet MasEzek, the earliest extant Hebrew text, supports MT.

---

401 Gehman (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.77) states that because of the various ways $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ follows the Hebrew it “helps to confirm the authority of the Massoretic tradition”.

402 $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ typically uses only a single Divine Name, as does the Old Latin, whereas all other extant MSS typically use a double, occasionally a triple, Divine Name.

403 This remains the case even with the Latin witness of $\mathfrak{W}$ to the unique chapter order and pericope minus which evidences a different parent than $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$. 

This textual evidence and the resulting problems require a detailed investigation of \(\mathcal{G}^{967}\) and its relationship with other Hebrew and Greek MSS to determine possible reasons for its unique chapter order and the significant minus of 36:23c-38. We will begin with an investigation into various proposals for this minus. Then we will examine possible reasons for \(\mathcal{G}^{967}\)'s unique chapter order. Following this, we will look at other evidences that this pericope is a later insert, including its unique linguistic styles, and a possible liturgical genesis. We will also consider a possible eschatological proposal for the revised chapter order and insertion of this pericope. We then will consider other evidence external to Ezekiel supporting the view that \(\mathcal{G}^{967}\) reflects the Old Greek and perhaps the \textit{Urtext}, including Daniel, Revelation and Targum Num. 11:26. We will then consider the theological significance and timeframe for the chapter reorder and insertion of this pericope into other MSS.

7.2. \(\mathcal{G}^{967}\)'s ‘Missing’ Pericope of 36:23c-38

One of the issues often discussed regarding \(\mathcal{G}^{967}\) is the ‘missing’ pericope of 36:23c-38 that deals with the gift of the new heart and new spirit. The question is whether this pericope was omitted by some form of scribal error, or if \(\mathcal{G}^{967}\) actually represents a true picture of the Greek \textit{Vorlage}, and perhaps the Hebrew \textit{Urtext}. If the latter is the case, then this pericope is ‘plus’ in all other extant Greek and Hebrew MSS.

7.2.1. Omission by parablepsis

The occurrence of \textit{parablepsis} in \(\mathcal{G}^{967}\) is well established. Johnson (in Johnson \textit{et al.}, 1938, pp.7-8) found 17 instances of \textit{homoiooteleuton} or \textit{parablepsis} in the Scheide section covering chapters 19-39, including the minus of 36:23c-38.

Those proposing \textit{parablepsis} suggest that \(\mathcal{G}^{967}\)'s scribe, after finishing \(\kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\nu\\nu\sigma\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota\) in 36:23b then transferred his eyes to the closing words \(\kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\nu\\nu\sigma\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota\ \delta\tau\iota\)
evgw. κύριος in 36:38. The ‘catch words’ for the scribe would have been καὶ γνώσονται ......... κύριος in vv. 23 and 38. Therefore G^967 finishes this verse, and the chapter, with καὶ γνώσονται τὰ ἐν θνη ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος. The question is, how could this have happened?

Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.8) suggests that 36:23c-38 possibly filled its own leaf, and that the scribe “overlooked an entire leaf” by parablepsis. While Johnson suggests that this pericope existed on its own leaf in the scribe’s parent text, we propose that at some point the scribe would have realised this ‘theologically rich’ pericope was minus in his work and then corrected his oversight.404

Filson (1943) and Wevers (1969) also see parablepsis due to homoioteleuton. Like Johnson, Filson (1943, p.28) states “the scribe was frequently guilty of skipping phrases or larger groups of words”. However, he (1943, p.31) does admit that “it is obvious that so large an omission as fifteen verses is not an ordinary scribal error”. Filson (1943, p.31) proposes several possibilities, including G^967’s parent text being “in the form of a scroll, [and] the scribe may have omitted several columns”, but he admits this “is difficult to explain”. Alternatively, he (1943, p.31) suggests G^967’s parent text was a codex and “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”. Filson’s suggestion here reflects Johnson’s. We should also note Irwin’s (1943, p.63) argument against parablepsis: by his calculations, this pericope would have filled “the bulk of a page and three-quarters”. Irwin’s calculations are a bit smaller than Johnson’s ‘single leaf’ above; if correct, this pericope would therefore have formed fewer words than an entire leaf.405

404 Our proposal assumes the scribe had read ahead at some point and was familiar with the text of Ezekiel, and was not dealing with the text for the very first time.

405 Each leaf in this papyrus was written on both back and front, forming two pages of text. If Irwin’s 1¾ page calculation is correct, then the remaining ¼ page would have included text, and would therefore have also been omitted; yet there is no witness of more than this pericope being minus in any MS.
We may also wonder how a scribe’s eyes could ‘jump’ such a large section covering 1,451 letters. The size must be considered as an argument against *parablepsis*. Lust (1981a, p.520) points out that “a long omission such as 36:23c-38, amounting to 1451 letters, is very unusual. The longest omission through *parablepsis* in the papyrus appears to add up to 266 letters (12:26-28), and the average is ± 20 letters”. Block (1998, p.399), agrees, saying that “an omission of 1,451 letters is too long for an accidental skip of the scribe’s eye; an omission of this length is unprecedented in the papyrus”.

Although it can be demonstrated that $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ has a number of smaller minuses by *parablepsis*, Lust (1981a, p.520) concludes that “36:23c-38 was not omitted by accident and add that even the most absent-minded scribe would not have easily overlooked a passage with such theological richness”. Lust’s point has further merit when we take into account that 36:23c states €ν τῷ ἀγίῳ κατ᾽ ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτῶν. It is difficult to imagine a scribe accidentally omitting such a strong statement about Israel’s exultation before their enemies. In addition, v. 38 does not have τὰ ἔθνη ... εἰμι, which should have indicated to the scribe that he had skipped some verses.

Therefore we should be cautious in ascribing *parablepsis* to this extended pericope, especially by the accidental turning of a leaf, when we do not know the structure of the parent text. Zimmerli (1983, p.242) concludes that “the omission … as a simple copyist’s error due to homoioteleuton is not convincing either”. We agree that the *parablepsis* proposal is unconvincing, and therefore we turn to other proposals seeking to explain the absence of this pericope in $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$.

---

406 The letter count of 1,451 is based on this pericope as found in $\mathfrak{G}^9$. 
7.2.2. Omission in Vorlage

As the parablepsis proposal has been shown to be inadequate to explain such a large minus, this leads to another possibility that, rather than resulting from scribal error, this pericope was minus in 967’s parent text. Lust (1981a, p.521) firmly states that “the scribe of Pap. 967 did not overlook the section in question. He simply did not find it in the MS he was copying”. There are two possible explanations for this pericope to have been missing from 967’s parent text. Firstly, it was originally there, but was absent for some reason at the time of copying; or secondly, that this pericope was never in 967’s parent text, nor its textual history, giving us an accurate representation of LXX’s Vorlage, and perhaps of the Hebrew Urtext. We must therefore investigate both possibilities covering how a pericope of this size could be minus in 967’s parent text.

Although Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.8) includes 36:23c-39 in his parablepsis list (suggesting the scribe overlooked an entire leaf), he alternatively suggests that “the leaf was missing” in the parent text at the time of copying. Johnson came to this conclusion by a letter-size comparison of the other leaves in this MSS, and proposed that this missing pericope would have occupied its own leaf in the parent codex covering 3 columns each page. However, he (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.10) admits that this proposal is not without its problems, including “the fact that we possess no early Greek codex on papyrus with such narrow columns”. This seriously undermines his proposal. Secondly, we have already noted Irwin’s (1943, p.63) different calculation of 1½ pages for this pericope in the parent text. Thus it is unlikely that this pericope filled just the one leaf (i.e., two full pages). Therefore again this suggestion is left wanting. Yet, for the sake of a thorough investigation, we will still

---

407 Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.8) based this on his calculations that this pericope “would fill 6 columns of 24 lines with 10 letters to a line…. This leaf, if it existed, contained 3 columns on a page”. 
examine the possibility of a leaf containing this pericope being absent from $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$'s Vorlage.

7.2.2.1. **Omission in Vorlage by Lectionary Use.**

If a missing leaf in $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$'s parent text is a possible option, we must ask why. Referring to Thackeray’s (1903a, p.408) proposal that this pericope was a popular lectionary in the early church and synagogue,\(^{408}\) Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.9) suggests that “possibly because the passage was a favourite [in Egypt], the leaf containing these verses had been abstracted from the original codex and had never been replaced”. If this is correct, the leaf would have been absent from the parent text, and so not before the scribe at the time of copying, and therefore not transmitted into $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$.

Although this suggestion has some initial merit, it continues the presumption that this pericope existed on one leaf, a point we previously found unlikely. Furthermore, it does not take into account $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$'s unique chapter order, nor does it account for an inattentive scribe ‘forgetting’ that such a supposedly popular lectionary piece was missing from its original context. We conclude that this proposal is unlikely.

7.2.2.2. **Omission in Egyptian MSS**

It has long been noted that this pericope is written in a later proto-Theodotion style. Seeking to explain this, Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.9) suggests that “[$\mathfrak{G}^{967}$] or its archetype was current in Egypt in the second century, and in all these versions we may assume that chap. xxxvi. 24-38 was omitted”. He (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.9) then proposes that a later LXX reviser, noting the minus, “took the version of Theodotion and inserted it boldly into the text … all later texts of the LXX have

\(^{408}\) Note that Thackeray did not know this pericope was minus in $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$. His lectionary proposal sought to explain the Theodotion styled Greek in this pericope. See ‘Omission by Lectionary Use’ below for more of Thackeray’s proposal.
evidently been derived from this revised text”.

Significantly, he (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.10) later includes a suggestion by Kase that this passage was “lacking in the Hebrew text used by the translator, and that the earliest Greek texts circulating in Egypt did not have these verses”.

Yet, this appears to be a modification of Johnson’s above-mentioned ‘parablepsis’ proposal. Here, instead of occurring in \( G^{967} \) (or its parent text), the parablepsis occurred earlier, and was followed by Egyptian LXX MSS. It is also problematic how a ‘Theodotion’ style pericope, replacing a (‘parablepsis’) minus in an Egyptian MS, now exists in all other extant LXX MSS. While this proposal does provide a possible answer for the unique Greek in this pericope, it does not address the unique Hebrew vocabulary. It also does not address \( G^{967} \)’s unique chapter order, a factor that must be considered in conjunction with the minus.

Having said this, we note Kase’s proposal, as presented by Johnson, that this pericope was absent from the translator’s Hebrew text, as this supports the findings of others such as Lust. However, in agreement with Lust, we propose that this minus was not just confined to Egyptian MSS, but that it was never in the Hebrew Urtext, and therefore never in LXX’s Vorlage. Before we investigate this proposal, there is one more suggestion from a prominent scholar that should be examined.

### 7.2.3. Omission by Accident

Rather than accepting the above proposals of omission by parablepsis or Vorlage, Block (1998, p.340) proposes that “an accidental loss of a leaf or two seems more likely”. However, unlike Johnson or Irwin, Block does not state how he calculates

---

409 Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.9) does not believe the reviser was Origen as \( G^9 \) contains this passage. Furthermore, he notes that “Evidently Origen knew only this revised version, and never observed that the passage was borrowed from a source other than the original LXX” (Johnson, in Johnson et al., 1938, p.11).

410 See our ‘Linguistic Variances’ below.

411 Block says this in response to Lust’s proposal (see below).
that this pericope occupied ‘two leafs’ (or four pages). This leaves his proposal appearing rather vague, especially given Johnson’s calculation of one full leaf, and Irwin’s of 1¼ page (less than one leaf). Block (1998, p.340) also does not suggest how this ‘accidental’ loss took place, but with regard to the linguistic style he says that “those responsible for the transmission of the LXX recognized the gap and filled it with a reading that bears remarkable resemblance to Theodotion’s text-form”. Interestingly, he uses ‘gap/filled’ to avoid any concept of ‘inserted’. Block, perhaps unwittingly, places this proposed ‘Theodotion-filled’ LXX MS as the Vorlage to subsequent LXX MSS. Again this explanation does not provide an answer to the later-styled Hebrew in this pericope, a factor which must be considered together with the Theodotion-styled Greek. The different linguistic Hebrew style suggests this pericope was minus also in an earlier Hebrew text. Block’s ‘accidental loss’ proposal also does not provide any explanation for the unique chapter order of $G^{967}$, a factor that must be considered together with this pericope minus.

7.2.4. Summary for ‘Omission’

We have examined the main omission proposals for 36:23c-38 in $G^{967}$, including scribal error by parablepsis, or the absence of a leaf (or two) in $G^{967}$’s parent text by either lectionary or accident. However, we did not find any of the above proposals to be satisfactory. The ‘absent’ proposals presume that this pericope occupied one leaf, a doubtful size that is unmatched in antiquity. If Irwin’s (1943, p.63) 1¼ page calculation is correct, we must ask why we do not find the text on the remaining ¼ page also omitted from $G^{967}$. We also find little support for the idea that this pericope was missing from just Egyptian MSS, with the Theodotion replacement then found in all subsequent MSS. None of these suggestions indicate how long this pericope was supposedly ‘missing’ from the Egyptian Greek MSS, before some later transmitter reinstated the
pericope with a style resembling Theodotion; we do know it is minus in $G^{967}$ and most likely its parent text. In addition, none of the proposals discussed so far consider how these textual differences occurred in the separate Latin witness of $W$. One may be able to present these proposals for one MS, but the likelihood of these same textual differences occurring in a separate witness seriously questions any scribal error or accidental loss. We can agree with Lust (1981a, p.519) that “it can now be accepted as proven that the omission of 36:23c-38 was not purely a scribal error”. Finally, these proposals do not consider $G^{967}$’s unique chapter order. We now turn to examine this major textual difference, and seek to determine if this had any influence on the status of this pericope.

7.3. $G^{967}$’s Unique Chapter Order

Both the ‘missing’ pericope and the unique chapter order need to be considered together. When considered separately, one may arrive at two separate proposals. A better solution would be to search for a proposal providing a plausible answer to both textual issues.

Curiously, most scholars do not enter into detailed discussion of $G^{967}$’s unique chapter order. Some even ignore this major textual variant, focusing only on possible reasons for the ‘missing’ pericope, and therefore arriving at the various scribal error proposals previously discussed.412

Spottorno ([1981] cited in McGregor, 1985, p.19) claims “the arrangement and omission in 967 could be … easily explained on the grounds of accidental damage to

412 One would not know of $G^{967}$’s unique chapter order from Allen’s (1990) commentary. Block (1998, pp.338-442) briefly mentions the different order but offers no explanation, other than to say “the present arrangement of 36:23c-38 and ch. 37 follows a typical Ezekielian pattern of raising a subject, only to drop it immediately, and then returning to it for fuller development in a subsequent oracle”. Block defends the received order without clearly explaining the occurrence of $G^{967}$’s order. Likewise, Zimmerli (1983) does not give any clear explanation for $G^{967}$’s order, other than to mention its existence.
the text at some early stage”. However this proposal does not account for the Vetus Latina witness of \textit{W}.\footnote{Spottorno’s work was not available for us to examine whether he considers \textit{W}.} Johnson (in Johnson \textit{et al.}, 1938, p.13) spends little time explaining the chapter order, referring to it as a “dislocation”; significantly, he does suggest that this dislocation “may have been in the early Hebrew text itself”.\footnote{Johnson (in Johnson \textit{et al.}, 1938, p.13) also comments that “the displacement was corrected in B, and therefore the correction probably ante-dates Origen, who is said to have found dislocations of verses and chapters which he put into the proper position.”} 

Block (1998, p.339) says that “if this [pericope] were an accidental omission, v. 23b should be followed by 37:1, not by 38:1, with ch. 37 being inserted between chs. 39 and 40”.\footnote{It should be noted, that while the text in \textit{\$967} flows from 36:23c directly into chapter 38 without any spacing, there is a small space when it flows from chapter 39 into 37. This 4-5 letter gap is unprecedented in this MSS. Johnson (in Johnson \textit{et al.}, 1938, p.12) says that “whether this indicates that [the scribe] was aware of the dislocation, it is impossible to say”.} This is a major point, yet Block unfortunately does not provide us with a clear solution. This point demands that the ‘minus’ “has to be considered together with the transposition of chap. 37” (Lust, 1981a, p.520).

If we suggest, as above, that it would have taken a very ‘absentminded’ scribe to omit this pericope, then we must now suggest that it would have taken an extremely ‘incompetent’ scribe to place the words for chapter 37 after chapter 39. For both ‘errors’ to occur in the one MSS would be an example of scribal incompetency of the highest order. The alternative is that \textit{\$967}’s scribe accurately reflected the parent text before him. This appears to be a more plausible explanation, especially if we accept that \textit{\$967} reflects OG LXX, which shows evidence of a ‘pre-revised’ Hebrew text. Therefore, we can set aside scribal incompetency as a valid explanation for both of these unique textual variants in \textit{\$967}, and state that its scribe was diligent in transmitting the text before him. This text shows strong textual and theological continuity.

In the middle of last century, Cooke (1936, p.xxv) noted that the last two chapters in the received order (38-39) do not seem to flow smoothly with the passages that preceded them, stating that “the last two chapters appear to be a later insertion …
[as] they disturb the peace which has settled down upon the restored Israel”. Cooke’s suggestion has some validity, as one would expect that the restored nation of Israel united under a Davidic spiritual leader (37:16-24) would proceed into the rebuilding of the Temple (40-48). Instead Israel finds itself facing Gog and his hordes in battle (38-39). Yet Cooke was unaware of $g^{967}$, which was yet unpublished. $g^{967}$ gives us an alternative chapter order, and allows us to compare the implicit theologies behind the two variant chapter orders. Had Cooke known of $g^{967}$, it is possible he may have arrived at an alternative conclusion, one that saw $g^{967}$’s chapter order, and its ‘minus’ pericope, as a text holding a more logical thematic flow, rather than seeing chapters 38-39 as a later insertion.

We need to acknowledge that $g^{967}$’s chapter order makes logical, reasonable and acceptable theological sense. There is continuity with 35:1-36:23b and what follows. This order acceptably links the oracles against Edom, and other largely unspecified ‘enemies’, and the battle against Gog and his hordes (38-39). Lust (2002b, p.149) points out that both sections open with the same formula: ‘Son of man, set your face against …’ (35:2; 38:2). It is perhaps even more remarkable that, in both cases, Israel’s enemy is given more or less mythological features. They are not well defined historical nations, but typologically representations of ‘the enemy’ …. Moreover, at the end of both the Edom and the Gog sections the mythological enemy disappears from the scene, while the author focuses on the relationship between the Lord and his people (36,8-23a; 39,21-29).

Most overlook these connections as they are not clearly discernible in the received chapter order. Lust (2002b, p.149) further observes that “chapter 37, following upon 39, forms a good continuation of this scene: it draws attention to the dry bones of the Israelites, presumably fallen in the battle against Gog.\footnote{Lust is referring to the battle field covered with scattered bones in chapter 39.} They are revitalised by the
spirit [sic] of the Lord”. In addition, the end of chapter 37 establishes a clear path for the Temple in chapter 40 with its references to ‘my sanctuary’ (37:26) and ‘my dwelling place/tabernacle’ (v. 27). In $G^{967}$’s chapter order, Israel is restored on the mountains of Israel (36:1-23b), the wars are now over with the ‘enemy’ destroyed (38-39), Israel is resurrected into a united Davidic kingdom (37), the Temple is built and worship restored (40-48). The received chapter order does not offer this ‘flow’ of thought and, in many ways, is less logical.

Yet, Zimmerli (1983, p.245) states that “the section which ends with v 23b gives, on its own, a fragmentary impression. The real material exposition of Yahweh’s proving that his name is holy is missing from it”. Lust (1981a, p.525) summarises Zimmerli, saying that 36:16-23b “cries out for a continuation”. We propose that in $G^{967}$’s chapter order, chapter 38 is an acceptable ‘continuation’ from 36:23b, as it shows the way the Lord will vindicate his holiness: his judgement upon Gog (38-39), the raising up of his people (37:1-14), and their uniting as one nation under a Davidic shepherd-leader (37:15-28). Further evidence of continuation or fulfilment can be found in $G^{967}$’s order where 36:16-23b is followed by chapter 38 with its repeated references to God showing himself ‘holy’ (cf. בָּשְׂרוּ in 36:23b and 38:16, 23; 39:7, 27). Also, in $G^{967}$’s order, fulfilment of the nations knowing the Lord and his holiness (36:23b), can immediately be found in his judgment of Gog and his hordes in chapters 38-39. This idea of fulfilment is not seen in the received order, with the ‘dry bones’ in 37 following 36. It is also significant that 36:23c has the same phrase ‘sanctified in you before their eyes’,417 as 38:16. We propose that a later editor deliberately inserted this phrase into v. 23c as part of his ‘weaving’ vv. 23c-38 into the existing text. If $G^{967}$ reflects the OG and Urtext, then 36:23b originally came shortly before this phrase in 38:16. This may have

---

417 The only difference is that in 36:23c, ‘in you’ is plural, as it speaks of the house of Israel (cf. v. 22). In 38:16 it is the singular, as it refers to Gog.
‘inspired’ the editor to also include it in the beginning of his newly formed inserted pericope. We also suggest that 36:23b completes the oracle starting in 36:16, as it answers the concern of why and how God’s people were scattered. This was all part of a holy God’s response to his people’s idolatry (vv. 16-18), and their profaning his holy name (vv. 20-22). This shows that God was the one who scattered them (v. 19). Finally, 967’s context of ‘dry bones’ (in chapter 37), continues the context of the scattered (therefore ‘dry’) bones in chapter 39. In the received chapter order, there is no immediate clear reason for the existence of the dry bones in chapter 37.

Overall, we can see that 967 has theological and text continuity. Therefore, we should remove the various scribal error proposals for its chapter order and pericope minus. This then leaves us seeking a solution for both of these issues.

Lust (1981a, p.526f) believes 967’s pericope minus and chapter order witnesses the Hebrew Vorlage. He is not alone in his proposal; we noted above the suggestion of Kase and Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, pp.10, 13) that 967’s chapter order “may have been in the early Hebrew text itself”. Yet, unlike Kase and Johnson, Lust viewed both textual issues as one, proposing that the chapter reorder placing chapter 37 before 38-39, as found in other MSS, generated the need for the insertion of 36:23c-38 (Lust, 1981a, p.528). Lust (1981a, p.527) finds no theological place for the ‘missing’ pericope in 967’s chapter order. Furthermore, Lust (1981a, p.531f) believes that this chapter reorder and pericope insertion was theologically motivated by eschatological concerns (see further discussions below).

This suggestion holds more credibility than any other, as it answers both the differing chapter order, the disputed pericope, and how the former created the need for the latter. It also suggests a possible motive for both textual issues. Therefore, we agree that 967’s chapter order and pericope minus reflects the Hebrew text before the scribe.
7.3.1. **Summary to G\(^{967}\)'s Unique Chapter Order**

In this section we sought to establish that two important issues regarding G\(^{967}\), the ‘missing’ pericope, and its unique chapter order, should not be discussed in isolation from one another; any attempt to do so typically results in scribal error proposals. Furthermore, we have sought to show G\(^{967}\)’s chapter order is plausible and theologically integrated. We then examined Lust’s proposal that G\(^{967}\) reflects the Hebrew text, finding support from Kase and Johnson. We agree with Lust that the chapter reorder, placing the dry bones epic before chapters 38-39, generated the need for 36:23c-38 to be inserted. This likely occurred due to theological concerns, with G\(^{967}\) reflecting the OG, and the Hebrew *Urtext*. This means that the received text reflects a changed chapter order, and 36:23c-38 is a later generated and inserted pericope.

7.4. **Later Insertion (and Re-order), not Omission**

The proposal we now explore is that the pericope’s insertion was linked with the changed (received) chapter order, with G\(^{967}\) and the Old Latin *W* as the only extant witnesses to the original text. We will consider here other evidence that this pericope was a later innovation and inclusion, and then discuss the possible theological reasons for its inclusion, including lectionary and eschatological proposals.

7.4.1. **Linguistic Styles Suggesting Later Insertion**

Thackeray (1903a, p.407) was one of the first scholars to observe that the Greek style and vocabulary of 36:23c-38 was different from the surrounding text in extant LXX MSS. This was before the discovery of G\(^{967}\), which makes his observations and findings all the more significant. Thackeray (1921, p.124) says that although 36:23c-38 appears in the section of his designated ‘translator β’ “it has no kinship with his work”. Thackeray (1921, p.125) claims “the Greek of this passage stands out prominently from
its context; it is a patch of a different texture from the surrounding fabric. The limits can be exactly defined”. He suggests this pericope was the work of another hand, designated as ββ. Thackeray (1921) finds several Greek linguistic links to the styles of later Jewish exegetes such as Theodotion, Symmachus, and those of the ‘Asiatic’ Jewish exegetical school.418 Thackeray (1921, pp.125-126) provides a number of examples of words used in 36:23c-38 that do not occur elsewhere in LXX Ezekiel, yet are used by Theodotion in his version:

1. ἀθροίσω for  כּּבֶּץ (piel) in v. 24 LXX Ezekiel; elsewhere in β translated by συνάγειν (7 times).

2. The plural γαιῶν in v. 24, occurring “only here in Ez. LXX, [and] was preferred by the Asiatic school and is used by ‘the three’ in Ez. xxix. 12” (p.125).

3. In v. 31 προσοχθεῖτε κατὰ πρόσωπον (‘you will be angry / hateful in your own sight’) for וַיִּקְרֵא הָאָדָם (cf. κόψαι πρόσωπα 6:9; κόψε τὰ πρόσωπα 20:43).

4. The transliteration of ἀδωναῖ in vv. 33, 37 Θ before κύριος419. This “is the rendering of the Asiatic school” (p.125).420

418 Whilst Thackeray uses the phrase ‘Asiatic school’ in several locations, he appears to be one of the few who do so. Lust (1981a, p.521) uses this term when referring to Thackeray’s work. We will also use it only in the context of his work. It is difficult to determine exactly what he meant by this term, but we may suggest it broadly meant ‘non-Egyptian’, or even ‘Palestinian’. He does appear to include Theodotion in this ‘Asiatic school’ (Thackeray, 1921, p.125).

419 Θ has κύριος ὁ θεός in v. 33 and κύριος κύριος ὁ θεός in v. 37. Whilst Θ has a propensity towards the double divine name (κύριος κύριος or even κύριος ὁ θεός), the occurrence of ἀδωναί here suggests later amendment to the text. The use of the single and plural Divine name in Ezekiel is a complex issue and beyond the scope of our thesis. For more on this topic see Johnson (1938), Zimmerli (1983, pp.556-562), McGregor (1985), Spottorno y Díaz-Caro (1985), Lust (1996a), Olley (2004), and other major commentators.

420 Curiously Lust (1981a, p.521) says this occurs in “Pap. 967”. This is an obvious typographical error on his part, as he later correctly refers to Θ.
5. The use of ἀνθ’ ὁν ὅτι for רָא שָׁה (v. 34); “ordinarily rendered in Ez. by ἀνθ’ ὁν. Such combinations of particles are characteristic of the Asiatic school” (p.125).

6. The use of παραδείσουντος for רָשׁ; normally translator β uses διαπορευέσθηκαν.

7. ως κῆπος τρυφής in v. 35; normally παράδεισος in β (28:13; 31:8 [2x]; 31:9).

“Theodotion has κῆπος in those passages and in Genesis” (p.126).

8. The absence of εἰμι in ‘I am the Lord’ in vv. 36, 38 (cf. εἰμι in 36:23b; 37:6 and the many other occurrences of the recognition formula in Ezekiel).

From these examples, Thackeray (1903a, p.408) proposes that “in this section … we appear to have a clear case of the influence for some other version, resembling that of Theodotion”. Yet Turner (2001, p.281) considers that Thackeray’s “schema might be considered less than watertight”. However, others have accepted Thackeray’s proposal that this pericope is penned by another hand exhibiting Theodotion traits. Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.9) appears to accept this pericope as ‘Theodotion’, without further evidence beyond Thackeray. Lust (1981a, p.521) refers to a number of Thackeray’s linguistic examples, also concluding that the Greek is a later Theodotion styled insertion. McGregor (1985, p.190), referring to the way scholars observe that this pericope shows evidence of a “different type of text”, concludes that “there does not seem to be any indication that this view is incorrect”.

Yet linguistic peculiarities, indicating that this pericope is a later insert, are not just found in the Greek text. Lust (1981a, p.521) says that “the Hebrew text itself shows

---

421 Turner makes this statement regarding Thackeray’s overall ‘schema’ including that of this pericope. Turner (2001, p.281) also states that “very few examples, and most of these showing variants, are given by way of support”. Turner does not return to any direct discussion of this pericope, and these unique variants pointed out by Thackeray and others remain unexplained. Turner’s (2001, p.286) statement that “there was nothing in the language incompatible with an Egyptian origin” is a general statement covering chapters 30-39.
quite a few peculiarities and *hapax legomena*. Zimmerli (1983, p.245) discusses the “linguistically unusual [Hebrew] elements” contained in this pericope:422

such as the unique אֶנָּכי (‘I’) of v 28, the only occurrence in Ezekiel of מעֶל (‘deed’) in v 31, the אָשֶׁר (‘instead’) of v 34, the הלְזו (‘this’) of v 35, as well as the antithesis ‘build-plant,’ characteristic of the language of Jeremiah but attested in Ezekiel only in the later addition in 28:26.

Lust (1981a, p.522) claims that the Hebrew peculiarities in this pericope suggest “the redactor of Ezek 36:23c-38 leans heavily on Deutero-Jeremiah, more so than the redactors of the rest of the book”.423 Tov (1999, p.409) covers a number of these Hebrew elements, also stating that these “remind one of Jeremiah’s language and not that of Ezekiel’s”.424 This lends support to the proposal it was penned after the surrounding texts and inserted at a later date.

The ‘new heart, new spirit’ theme, often associated with Jeremiah, is also found in Ezek. 11:19. It is not, however, developed to the extent that it is in this pericope. We may suggest that the use in Ezek. 11:19 helped to inspire this pericope. Lust (1981a, p.525) defends his proposed link with Jeremiah stating that “Zimmerli’s objections against such a conclusion are not convincing”.425

Although these variances may not be overwhelming in number, they nevertheless show that most verses in this pericope show different linguistic style from the surrounding texts, the LXX showing evidence of the style of Theodotion, and the

422 Also see Allen (1990b, p.177) for a summarised list of “the non-Ezekielian nature of the Hebrew”.
423 Lust (1981a, pp.522-533) lists several examples to show how this pericope links with Jeremiah’s writings and thus theology, including v. 28 ‘the land I gave to your fathers’, v. 31 ‘evil conduct’, vv. 35, 38 ‘dry’, v. 33 ‘to cleanse’ with the object ‘iniquities’, v. 36 ‘build / plant’.
424 It was commonly thought that Ezekiel ‘borrowed’ from Jeremiah (Zimmerli, 1979, pp.44-46). However recent scholars have proposed a reversal of this schema. This discussion is beyond the scope of this thesis, as we seek only to examine possibilities that 36:23c-38 is a later insert into Ezekiel. However, for more on this see Turner (2001), and Leene (2000).
425 Whilst Zimmerli (1983, p.245) observed the linguistic connection with Jeremiah, he goes on to discuss how 36:22-32 may be an original but later unit, and then says “the possible absence of the passage from G967 and the peculiar character of the translation of it would then be a problem for the history only of Ψ, but not of Μ”. In this Zimmerli reveals his reluctance to have this pericope minus in the Hebrew Urtext. This reluctance may well come from Zimmerli’s uncertainty if future discoveries of other G967 fragments may contain this pericope.
Hebrew sharing similarities with Jeremiah, and/or Deutero-Jeremiah. Therefore, we can conclude that these linguistic styles for 36:23c-38, in both the Greek and Hebrew, signify a later insertion. Yet we need more evidence that this pericope was minus in the Urtext, and not just a ‘later insertion’ replacing a pericope left out of some texts.

The existence of some minor stylistic ‘stitches’ in the text may support the proposal that this pericope is a later insert for other MSS, and not in the Hebrew Urtext. Firstly, as observed in our ‘Chapter 3: The Text of Ezekiel 36’, we find the declarative formula as a ‘plus’ in v. 23b in both MT (אֳדַנְאָם יְהוִה נָי) and the later ΘA (λέγει Αδωναί κύριος).426 This declarative formula is minus in both Θ967 and ΘB (Θ967 finishes chapter 36 just before this formula MT (and ΘA)). This, plus ΘA’s use of Αδωναί here, a transliteration attributed to Theodotion’s style, suggests this declarative formula was a later editorial addition.427 That it is not found in ΘB, which does include 36:23c-38, shows evidence of a text in a state of flux, with even later editorial work occurring to weave this pericope into the text.

We also present the following ‘arguments from silence’. Firstly is the surprising level of intra textual agreement between MT and ΘB, ΘA in this pericope, in comparison to surrounding pericopes (cf. Chapter 3: The Text of Ezekiel 36). This may suggest that both languages for this pericope were written in a similar timeframe, perhaps by similar hands. Secondly, MasEzek, as the oldest extant text, has this entire pericope (vv. 22-38) in the one sense division. ΘB starts its sense division for this pericope after the opening phrase in v. 22 with τάδε λέγει κύριος. Although this phrase is a common and almost

426 Although it may be redundant, it is nevertheless important to note here that ΘA is a post hexaplaric MS and therefore often, yet not always, follows MT plusses. What is unique in this case is ΘA’s use of Αδωναί, again showing evidence of a later ‘Theodotion’ style. For more on the use of the Divine Name in Ezekiel see Olley (2004) and McGregor (1985).

427 Lust (1981a, p.525) also mentions that the “Coptic-Sahidic MS ... contains three complete oracles from Ezekiel, the last of which is precisely 36:16-23b”. To date we have not been able to obtain a copy of this MS to verify Lust. However, if Lust is correct, and we have no reason to doubt him, this is a very significant completion point for this oracle. This supports our suggestion that the Urtext finished at 23b with 23c-38 being an inserted text.
‘mechanical’ sense division marker in LXX (Olley, 2003, p.215), it is perhaps another implicit indicator of a text in a state of flux. Thirdly, we also propose that $G_{B,A}$’s use of ἀναφορά in 37:1 would have been unnecessary if chapter 37 followed 39 (as in $G_{967}^{a}$), as it would be apparent that the ‘dry bones’ were human. Although this is not found in MT or $G_{967}^{a}$, a later LXX copyist apparently thought that clarification was required. Fourthly, there is also a number of variants at the end of chapter 39 (e.g., vv. 28-29) that may have resulted from a change of chapter order.\footnote{These variants are too complex to discuss here but they are examined in detail in our ‘Chapter 6: The Text of Ezekiel 39’ chapter; especially v. 29 with MT’s move from ‘wrath’ to ‘Spirit’.} We find textual activity at all junction points of the chapter reorder, which supports the proposal that chapter 37 was originally after chapter 39 but then relocated to follow chapter 36; following this relocation, and to support it, 36:23c-38 was inserted into the text. Finally, as noted above, $G_{967}^{a}$’s unique chapter order and pericope ‘minus’ shows theological and textual flow.

Of interest to us, some scholars propose that the last two micro-sections in this pericope are the product of later redactors. Zimmerli (1983, p.244-5) claims that vv. 33-36 and vv. 37-38 “stand apart from the main body in vv. 22-32. It is clear from their introductions\footnote{Zimmerli (1983, p.245) notes they are introduced by “bipartite proof-saying” rather than “messenger formula”.} that both units are secondary additions”. Allen (1990, p.178) also proposes that these two passages are “a product of later redaction”. It is curious that Zimmerli and Allen are willing to ascribe these two micro-sections as ‘secondary additions’, and yet refrain from stating that the entire pericope was a later insert.\footnote{Zimmerli’s reluctance may be due to his uncertainty at the time of writing his commentary as to whether this pericope was present in a yet to be discovered fragment for $G_{967}^{a}$. The subsequent discovery of fragments has verified that this pericope is not extant in $G_{967}^{a}$. Zimmerli did mention these discoveries in his introduction but unfortunately did not use this information to clarify any new stance he may have taken.}

The different linguistic styles, and related issues, support the proposal that 36:23c-38 was not in $G_{967}^{a}$’s Vorlage, or in the Hebrew Urtext, but was a later insert for
both the Hebrew and Greek texts. The question at this point is whether this pericope found its way in by either the Hebrew or Greek text. Lust (1981a, p.528) proposes that this pericope was inserted initially into the Hebrew text to theologically support the changed chapter order. It was then later added into the Greek text by redactors seeking to align the Greek to the revised Hebrew. Following his discussion on Lust’s proposal, Tov (1999, pp.409-410) cautiously states,

this presumed late intrusion in the Hebrew book of Ezekiel was also added subsequently in the Greek textual tradition … If the evidence of P. Chester Beatty and La \[W\] can be trusted, the OG lacked a section which is secondary in the Hebrew text of Ezekiel and this information is essential for our understanding of the literary growth of the book.

Along with Lust, we suggest that the changing theological climate created the decision to rearrange the chapter order. This in turn created the need for the ‘new’ pericope, which may have been included in Hebrew and Greek texts at a similar time. This would explain the linguistic uniqueness of both the Hebrew and Greek, and the surprising lack of intra-textual variants. The theology of this pericope appears to match the theology behind the chapter reorder (see discussions below). A united effort among scribes would have resulted in the pericope’s inclusion and revised chapter reorder to be placed into all extant texts, with the only surviving exceptions being \[\Phi^{967}\] and the Vetus Latin \(W\). We will now turn to various proposals seeking to determine the theological reasons, pathways and possible source(s) for the insertion of this pericope and the chapter reorder.

---

431 It is rather curious that Joyce (1989) never considers this option in his quest to find answers for the theology and purpose of this pericope.

432 We stand in agreement with Lust’s statement above that the theology in \(\Phi^{967}\)’s chapter order does not ‘need’ this pericope, and as such it was produced to assist a smoother theological flow in the chapter reorder.
7.4.2. Insertion via lectionary.

Following his observations on the unique linguistic styles in both the Hebrew and Greek for 36:24-38, Thackeray (1921, p.118) provides several suggestions as to how this proto-Theodotion styled pericope came about in the Greek, and concludes that it “is an independent version made for lectionary purposes”. He (1921, p.126) asks two significant questions: “(1) Has this Greek lesson come to us from Church or Synagogue? (2) Is it earlier or later than its context?” In his earlier 1903 work, he does not appear to suggest that this pericope was secondary to the surrounding text, rather he explored possible lectionary explanations for the linguistic and stylistic differences. His questions appear to have broadened in his later Schweich Lectures. Thackeray (1921, p.129) struggles to understand how it was possible that “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”. As $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ was discovered after Thackeray, he was not aware of its pericope minus or chapter order. Unfortunately, we will never know whether Thackeray would have supported a liturgical genesis for this pericope in both Hebrew and Greek had he known of $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$’s textual uniqueness. We, however, are aware of $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$, and as such will use the basis of Thackeray’s proposal to examine the possibility of lectionary use creating this pericope, which then assisted acceptance of its insertion into the text of Ezekiel following the chapter reorder.

A secondary suggestion from Thackeray (1903a, p.408), which he himself did not find overly satisfactory, was that LXX 36:24-38 in “the version of Theodotion, or one resembling it, was used in the lessons of the Christian Church,” and that in some unexplained way the lesson for Pentecost has in this passage supplanted the older version of the translation”. We agree with Thackeray that this explanation is

---

433 Thackeray (1903a, p.408) arrives at this possible explanation based on an 11th Century lectionary found in the British Museum that gives Ezek. 36:24-28 (the promise of the Spirit) as the third of three readings on Pentecost. In his later work Thackeray (1921, p.126) said “in the scheme of O. T. lessons in use in the Greek Church, preserved in LXX lectionaries, the first five verses of our passage are assigned to the vigil (παραμονή) of Pentecost”. 

questionable. Although it may provide an answer for the Theodotion styled Greek found in this pericope, it does not provide a satisfactory explanation for the Hebrew text. It is unimaginable that an early Jewish community would have incorporated a Christian Pentecost lectionary passage into their Hebrew texts. Thackeray (1921, p.126) does question how a ‘later’ lectionary reading by the Christian church could “affect all known MSS. and to leave no trace of any earlier version.” This reasoning caused Thackeray to prefer a ‘Synagogue’ possibility.

Thackeray’s primary proposal was that the linguistic uniqueness of the Greek in this pericope found its origin through the Synagogue haftarah\textsuperscript{434} lectionary, even stating that 36:23c-38 “is an independent version made for lectionary purposes” (Thackeray, 1921, p.118). It is generally thought that, while the basic framework of the Torah portion readings may date back to Ezra, the accompanying haftarah reading list “is considered by critics to have been begun in the time of the Maccabees” (Thackeray, 1903a, p.408).\textsuperscript{435} Jacob (1972, p.1246) also says that “it may be assumed that the custom [of regular readings] dates from about the first half of the third century B.C.E., since the Septuagint was apparently compiled for the purpose of public reading in the Synagogue”.\textsuperscript{436} Rabinowitz (1972, p.1343) claims “the origin of the custom of reading a portion of the prophets after the Torah reading is unknown. The most plausible suggestion … is that the custom was instituted during the persecutions by Antiochus Epiphanes which preceded the Hasmonean revolt”. Cohen (1997, p.248), after a review of Philo’s use of the Latter Prophets that correspond with haftarot readings, concludes

\textsuperscript{434} The haftarah is the reading from the Prophets that followed the scheduled Torah readings.

\textsuperscript{435} Büchler (1893, p.423) mentions that “tradition assumes three stages in the development of the custom of reading the Law; the first is connected with Moses, the second with the Prophets, and the third with Ezra”.

\textsuperscript{436} We also find support for this from Acts 15:21 which states that Moses is read in the Synagogues each Sabbath, showing this was common practice at the time of writing. Acts 13:15 mentions both a Torah and haftarah readings. Luke 4:17 has Jesus reading from Isaiah, suggesting this was the haftarah reading in Nazareth at that time. This shows that haftarah readings were an established practice by the times of Jesus. However, we have no evidence in the New Testament that Ezekiel was used as a haftarah reading, nor do we have evidence if they kept the same cycle as later Jewish communities.
that “a strong case can be made that this reflects the existence, already in Philo’s day, of the traditional string of Haftaroth: Admonition, Consolation, Repentance”.

Turner (1956, p.20) also comments that the initial translation of the Prophetic books occurred for lectionary purposes and states “that may be why we have so many traces of earlier fragmentary versions”.

Turner (1956, p.20) also comments that the initial translation of the Prophetic books occurred for lectionary purposes and states “that may be why we have so many traces of earlier fragmentary versions”.

Thackeray (1903a, p.408) asks “is it too bold a conjecture 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?” In this earlier work, he (1903a, p.408) says that the entire passage of 36:16-38 “was read at a very early time as a lesson in the Jewish Synagogue”. He refines his ‘Synagogue haftarah’ proposal in his 1921 paper, pointing out that 36:16-38 was part of “the primitive Haphtarah for the Sabbath known as that of the ‘Red Cow’” (also known as the ‘Red Heifer’, cf. Num. 19) (Thackeray, 1921, p.126). Numbers 19:1-22 deals with the use of purifying waters, and Thackeray (1921, p.126) claims the primary haftarah verse was 36:25 מַיִם עֲלֵיכֶם וְזָרַקְתִּי הֹטְּ טְהַרְתֶּםוּרִים ('I will sprinkle clean water on you, and you will be clean').

Thackeray (1921, p.127) states that this ‘Red Cow’ Sabbath was the Parah Sabbath, “one of the four ‘extraordinary’ sabbaths, which in Talmudic times fell in the last month of the ecclesiastical year”. These special readings were outside the normal Torah reading schedule and “the choice of the haftarot for the Four Special

---

437 Cohen (1997, p.225) starts her discussion by clarifying that “although our knowledge of the history of Jewish liturgical practices has advanced significantly, far more remains buried in the seemingly impenetrable mists of antiquity”.

438 While Turner did not directly refer to §967 with this statement, we nevertheless have another scholar who proposes that some textual variants generated from various lectionary readings.

439 Lust (1981a, p.523) also notes the link between Ezek. 36 and Num. 19, without mentioning its liturgical use.

440 The four original special Sabbaths are Shekalim, Zakor (“Remember” Amalek), Parah, Hahodesh (the month) (Thackeray, 1921, p.127). See Büchler (1893, p.448-453) for more on the four special Sabbaths.
Sabbaths depends on the special additional portion read on these days, and not on the ordinary Sabbath portion” (Rabinowitz, 1972, p.1343).\textsuperscript{441}

Thackeray (1921, p.127) claims that these four special lectionary readings predated and may have even begun the normal ‘Sabbath readings’. This may be the case, as Rabinowitz (1972, p.1343) points out that while the Talmud lists the haftarot readings for the four special Sabbaths, “nowhere in the Talmud are the haftarot given for ordinary Sabbaths, which were not fixed until after the talmudic period”. Thackeray (1921, p.128) also proposes that these four special Sabbaths and their accompanying readings\textsuperscript{442} came about over ritual disputes,\textsuperscript{443} and that this pericope “was a call to purification on the opening sabbath of the new year”.\textsuperscript{444} The link for 36:23c-38 to the Red Cow Sabbath can also be seen in the Targum of 36:25, “and I will forgive your sins, as though you had been purified by the waters of sprinkling and by the ashes of the heifer sin-offering”\textsuperscript{445} (Levey, 1987, p.101).\textsuperscript{446} This Parah Sabbath is also tied into the Passover festival, as seen in the Targum of Ezek. 36:38: “Like the holy people, like the people who are cleansed and come to Jerusalem at the time of the Passover festivals, so the cities of the land of Israel which were ruined, will be filled with people, the people of the House of Israel, and they shall know that I am the Lord” (Levey, 1987, p.102). Targum here may have been a later emotive call for the Diaspora Jews to attend Passover in Jerusalem, as neither MT nor LXX mention any

\textsuperscript{441} Significantly, Ezek. 36:16-38 continues to this day as the corresponding haftarah reading for Num. 19 on the special Parah Sabbath (Hertz, 1960, p.999).

\textsuperscript{442} It is interesting to note that three of these four extraordinary Sabbath haftarot readings come from Ezekiel.

\textsuperscript{443} Rabinowitz (1972, p.1343) mentions, without comment, Buechler’s proposal that the haftarot readings originated against the Samaritans, and then later against the Sadducees (cf. Büchler, 1893, pp.424-425).

\textsuperscript{444} In support of this, Thackeray (1921, p.128) points out that both the passage of “the Temple half shekel [and] the red cow … are the subjects of special treatises in the Talmud”.

\textsuperscript{445} Levey uses the italics to indicate where Targum Jonathan expanded the text (also for 36:38).

\textsuperscript{446} Levey (1987, p.101 n.14) also said that “R. Akiba cites this v. in what I consider to be an assertion against Christian baptism. God Himself purifies Israel, m.Yoma 8:9. Cf. S.S R. 1:19, where Torah is the purifying element”.
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particular festival in Ezek. 36:25, 38. The Targum may also have included these expansions in defence of this pericope’s inclusion into the text of Ezekiel.

Thackeray (1921) claims this early Synagogue haftarah liturgical use influenced the unique Greek in this pericope. His reasoning appears to be that, according to synagogue tradition, the scheduled haftarah is first read in the Synagogue in Hebrew, and it is then verbalised into the common language (in this case, Greek). This Greek verbal translation for 36:23c-38 was then written down in a contemporary (i.e., Theodotion-like) style which then found its way into all LXX MSS. Yet, he does express perplexity as to how the Greek idiosyncrasies in 36:23-38 replaced the existing text in all known MSS, concluding that this happened “in some unexplained way” (Thackeray, 1921, p.129).447

Thackeray’s proposal may give an answer as to how the Greek obtained its Theodotion style in this pericope, but it does not fully explain the unique Hebrew style. We may question whether the Synagogue haftarah liturgical use then covered all of vv. 16-38 as it does now. If it did, then why do not we find similar later linguistic styles in vv. 16-23b as we find in vv. 23c-38? Finally, Thackeray’s Synagogue liturgical proposal does not address the important chapter reorder issue.

Thackeray may have found different and more plausible answers had he known of 6967. We can propose that 36:23c-38 had its genesis as part of the development of these four special Sabbath haftarot readings, and was initially used for this liturgical purpose. We also propose that the haftarah portion may have originally been 36:16-23b, and the use of ἁρώ in 36:17 and the corresponding Num. 19:1-22 Torah passage may have evoked thoughts of the mikvah, where the woman is ‘washed clean’. This may have formed the theological basis for the liturgical formation of vv. 23c-38, as a greater

447 Earlier, Thackeray (1903b, p.585) states “the rendering given of the lessons read on the great festivals, such as Pentecost, in the synagogues in Alexandria, formed the basis on which a complete translation was afterwards engrafted”.
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call to purity (especially v. 25). Alternatively, this pericope may have had a separate liturgical life, and now was included into Ezekiel due to the call to purity. The ‘pouring’ of God’s wrath (36:18) may have inspired the response of the ‘pouring of cleansing water’ in this restorative new pericope (v. 25). We suggest that the text forming vv. 23c-38 was then inserted into the text of Ezekiel following the existing haftarah reading (36:16-23b), even as support for the chapter reorder, as it is based on a similar theology that influenced the chapter reorder. This then expanded the haftarah reading to its current length of 36:16-38. This would have been written first in the Hebrew, and then in Greek, both styled according to their timeframe. This proposal does provide a plausible answer for the unique Hebrew and Greek style, and for the large degree of trans-linguistic unity. We do admit this proposal is very speculative, and only presented as a possible genesis for this pericope.

However, our proposal here is still insufficient. While it may provide a possible explanation for the genesis and subsequent inclusion of 36:23c-38, even as support for the chapter reorder, it does not provide any reason for that chapter reorder occurring. We therefore need to find a proposal that gives plausible explanation for both issues, and especially any theology that may have generated the chapter reorder.

7.4.3. Lust’s Theological / Eschatological Proposal.

In a paper given at the 16th Congress of the International Organisation for the Septuagint and Cognate Studies in 2001 (published 2003), Lust sought to give reason for three significant longer ‘minuses’ in G967 Ezekiel, including 36:23c-38, that have often been explained as parablepsis. He proposed a central ‘eschatological’ theme,

\[\text{Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.8) points out that his list of omissions in G967, including the three listed by Lust (minus chapter 7 which is not extant in Scheide), all “have one significant factor in common …. these omissions resolve themselves into units of 10 letters …. [thus] the most obvious explanation is that this MS or one of its ancestors was copied from a text which has 10 letters to a line, and that the omission was due to parablepsis”. However, Lust (2002c, p.22) counters that no extant “ancient papyri seem to have such short lines” and says Johnson’s counting “appears to be rather arbitrary”.}\]
suggesting that they have actually been ‘inserted’ into all other LXX and MT MSS. His conclusion is that they are not ‘minus’ in $\text{G}^{967}$ or the Hebrew Urtext, but rather, they are ‘plus’ in all other extant MSS. Lust proposes that these were deliberately added into the Hebrew, and subsequently into LXX, because of changing eschatological and canonical concerns. These three ‘minuses’ in $\text{G}^{967}$ are: 12:26-28; 32:24b-26; 36:23c-38. There is a fourth minus and verse reordering in chapter 7 in $\text{G}^{BA}$ and other major LXX MSS; but this section is not extant in $\text{G}^{967}$, so it is unknown if this ‘minus’ is present in $\text{G}^{967}$. Lust suggests that all four should be viewed as ‘plusses’ by MT, and later LXX MSS. It does appear strange that the translator would omit these significant passages that all carry a similar theme, especially as the translator of Ezekiel is considered so literal.⁴⁴⁹ This suggests that we again have evidence here in Ezekiel of a text still in a state of flux, which must be understood in the light of literary criticism. Lust (2002c, p.25) states that “in cases like the present one [i.e., ‘minuses’], text-critical and literary critical issues are very much entangled”. This also raises the possibility that there were two Ezekielian texts circulating, as with Jeremiah and Proverbs; one with these plusses and one without.

Lust (2003, p.86) claims that “the authorities responsible for the Hebrew ‘canon’ appear to have been suspicious in matters of ‘apocalyptics’”, and they seem reluctant to include apocalyptic literature into the canon. Therefore, these ‘plusses’ “may have been inserted in order to answer objections against the admission of the Book of Ezekiel, with its apocalyptic-coloured visions” (Lust, 2003, p.86). These plusses appear to lessen a futuristic apocalyptic aspect to Ezekiel, and bring these events into a present context. This causes the book of Ezekiel to have a contemporary application, which Lust believes facilitated a smoother inclusion into the canon. This raises the question of what

⁴⁴⁹ Tov (1999d, p.400) says “Since we rule out the possibility that the otherwise literal translator of Ezekiel was involved in shortening, MT should be considered expanded”.
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evidence exists that this was of concern to those determining the Hebrew canon, especially as Lust holds to such a position as ‘fact’. We examine Lust’s argument in detail, beginning with the three significant ‘minuses’ in $\pi\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$967.

The first is Ezek. 12:26-28, a passage that deals with true and false prophecy (cf. 12:21-25). Filson (1943, p.28) believes this ‘minus’ in $\pi\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$967 is another example of *parablepsis* as 12:26 and 13:1 contain the same words. Yet Lust (2003, p.85) claims this pericope is actually a later insertion that “interrupts this connection between chapters 12 and 13. Indeed, its theme is that of Ezekiel’s vision on the final days, and not that of true and false prophecy in general”. The context of v. 27 is the accusation of the people: they see Ezekiel’s vision(s) as having future eschatological fulfilment. They are seeking present completion, as the lack of fulfilment causes the prophecy to appear false. Lust (2002c, p.25) clarifies the people’s complaint, that the visions spoken of in v. 27 “are for remote future times and cannot be tested”. Block (1997a, p.392) also claims that “the address appears to be directed at the exiles who have become disillusioned with Ezekiel”. Lust (2002c, p.26) believes that the $\pi\pi\pi\pi\pi$ (“vision”) in v.27 “is no longer a simply synonym of prophecy or prophetic experience. Here it stands rather for ‘apocalyptic vision’. This vision is for ‘many years ahead, for distant times’”. Lust (2003, p.86) says that v. 28 ‘historicizes’ the surrounding textual content regarding God’s actions, and bring the events spoken of into the ‘present’ or ‘immediate future’, rather than in some ‘eschatological future’. These inserted verses therefore give answer to the attacks against Ezekiel’s prophecies, a point which may be emphasised with $\pi\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$B,A’s additional plus of $\pi\rho\pi\nu\kappa\rho\pi\iota\nu\omega\nu$ (“provoking”). It cannot be proven, despite Lust’s claims, whether the motive was to ease the ‘apocalyptic’ concerns of those

450 Curiously, Block does not mention this as minus in $\pi\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$967, or the ‘provoking’ plus in other LXX MSS.
451 Whilst the Dead Sea Scrolls are outside the scope of our thesis, Wright (2000, p.465) mentions the 4Q385 3 fragment wherein Ezekiel appeals to God that the days be hastened or shortened, and he proposes this may be based on 12:21-28. This may support Lust’s proposal that this insert called for the vision to be ‘historicised’ and apply to the present rather than an eschatological future.
deciding the Hebrew canon. However, this pericope does stand as its own unit, with a clear message of ‘present’ rather than ‘later eschatological’ fulfilment’, and is likely a later insertion.

Lust’s second proposed later MT - LXX ‘plus’ is Ezekiel 32:24b-26, again minus in $\text{G}^{967}$, commencing the last phrase in v. 24 (after $\zeta\omega\zeta\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\nu$) (241 letters). Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.7) includes these verses in his $\text{G}^{967}$ parablepsis list, saying the ‘skip’ was “from $\epsilon\pi\tau\tau\\zeta\omega\zeta$ to $\epsilon\pi\tau\tau\tau\zeta\omega\zeta$”. However, it appears that v. 26 should read $\gamma\zeta\zeta\zeta$, which may question his parablepsis theory. Greenberg (1997, p.659) also sees parablepsis here, claiming that “the eye of the copyist of G or its Vorlage skipped from $\texttt{bwr} ‘\text{Pit}’ at the end of vs. 24 to $\texttt{bwr} at the end of vs. 25”. Lust (2002c, p.27) notes that “the critical text of LXX is shorter than MT but longer than $\text{G}^{967}$. It is probably an adaptation towards MT, introducing Meshech and Tubal but not Edom”. Much of v. 25 is also ‘minus’ in LXX, which has only the last phrase (‘in the midst of the slain’). However, this does support the idea that this also is a pericope in a state of flux, where the first part of v. 25 was a later MT addition not found in LXX MSS. In reference to this, and $\text{G}^{967}$’s greater minus, Lust (2002c, p.28) states “they are no simple omissions but are part of a different text with its own structure”.

This pericope occurs in the section dealing with Assyria (v. 22) and Elam (v. 24), two Gentile nations already in Sheol awaiting Egypt’s arrival. The ‘inserted’ verses add Meshech and Tubal into Sheol’s list, and list them with the ‘uncircumcised’.

---

452 Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.8) proposes that the parent text had 10 letters to a line, resulting in this pericope occupying 24 lines, yet he admits “it is unlikely that a copyist would have overlooked 24 lines, but if two succeeding columns of narrow width began with the words $\epsilon\pi\tau\tau\zeta\omega\zeta$ it would not be impossible for the scribe to overlook the entire column”. However, we have noted previously that there is no textual evidence supporting papyri with 10 words to a line. This undermines Johnson’s proposal.

453 We should note that $\text{G}^{967}$ and $\text{G}^{A}$ have $\tau\zeta\zeta$ (in vv. 23-24), yet $\text{G}^{B}$ has $\gamma\zeta$ (witnessing MT’s $\gamma\zeta\zeta$). Ziegler has $\gamma\zeta\zeta$. Johnson (in Johnson et al., 1938, p.119) also points out “the final $\omicron\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\omega$ of Sch. is not found in $\text{M}$ either in vs. 24 or in vs. 26”.

454 Further evidence of this pericope being in a state of flux may be found with the MT orthographic variants for ‘graves’: $\tau\omicron\rho\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\nu$ (v. 23); $\tau\omicron\rho\omicron\nu\om\nu$ (v. 25); $\tau\omicron\rho\omicron\nu\om\nu$ (v. 26) (Tov, 2001, p.226).
However, Lust (2003, p.88) notes they are not listed with the ‘gibborim’. Lust (2003, p.89) proposes that the editors of MT sought to lessen the eschatological and apocalyptic content of chapter 32, and they,

inserted a section on the mythological kingdoms of Meshech and Tubal, aligning them with the historical enemies Assur and Elam, and with Edom which symbolizes Israel’s major enemy in their times. In doing so the editors of MT may have tried to suggest that nations, such as Meshech and Tubal, mentioned in the final battle of chs 38-39, are no mysterious apocalyptic entities, but historical agents.

This does appear to be a later editorial attempt to bring Ezekiel’s prophetic words into the present, and therefore not the distant future. This was part of their “attempt to bring Ezekiel’s visions down to earth” (Lust, 2003, p.89). That MT has additional material in v. 25 may suggest that they had to again revisit this insert to further historicise it and weave it into the text. While $\Theta^{967}$ is minus the entire insert, other LXX MSS witness the initial insert, but not MT’s further revision. The additional wording of v. 25 appears to reflect aspects of the battle with Gog in chapter 38.

Of most significance to us, Lust’s view of the third major passage, 36:23c-38, echoes his previous 1981 discussion on this pericope. He repeats his claim that the insertion of this pericope must be considered in conjunction with the change in chapter order as found in $\Theta^{967}$. Overall, Lust sees that the received chapter order removes the eschatological and apocalyptic sense of a horrific future battle with Gog, where Israel’s slain requires physical resurrection. The received chapter order now allows the dead mentioned in chapter 39 to be Israel’s enemies, and not Israel herself. With the received chapter order, and the resulting ‘insertion’ of this pericope that now ‘introduces’ chapter 37, Israel is only “morally dead, not physically” (Lust, 2003, p.90). In the received order, Israel’s ‘dry bones’ resurrection in 37 is a moral and/or spiritual awakening.

---

455 Lust (2003, p.89) claims that “the dissociation of the נבוריים from the mythological giants in Gen 6:4 seems to confirm” that the MT editors were attempting to historicise Ezekiel’s prophecies.
which is further emphasised by the theology of the ‘inserted’ pericope. A further result is that the uniting of Israel’s divided kingdom and the establishment of a Davidic leader in the second half of chapter 37, now enables the united nation to face Gog, just as they did in times past. Thus, Israel’s ‘restoration’ (36) is now part of her ‘resurrection’ (37). This again lessens the eschatological and apocalyptical impact found with Ḡ967’s chapter order and ‘minus’.

Lust’s fourth proposed eschatological section covers Ezekiel 7:5b; 6b-7a; 10b; 11c. These are ‘minus’ in all major LXX MSS; it is currently unknown whether these are also minus in Ḡ967, as this section remains undiscovered. This chapter also has a transposition of verses with vv. 3-6 in LXX located at vv. 6-9 in MT, and vv. 7-9 in LXX are located at vv. 3-5 in MT (Tov, 1999d, pp.397-399). Lust (2003, p.91) points out that “all these plusses specify the evil that is coming at the end of the days … whereas LXX emphasizes the punishing role of the Lord and the day of the Lord, MT draws attention to the ḥṣl, the instrument of the Lord’s fury. The day of the Lord is not mentioned explicitly in MT”. Lust finds parallels between these verses and Daniel 8 (also ‘great evil’ in Dan. 9:12-14), and identifies Antiochus IV as the ḥṣl. Lust believes that these plusses and verse rearrangements also place the eschatological aspect of Ezekiel chapter 7 into the present historical setting.456

Lust (2003, p.84) states that “obviously the [Greek] translator did not ‘correct’ or ‘change’ the Hebrew text. Where major differences occur, these must be due to the Hebrew Vorlage, and to the scribes transmitting and reworking the text”. We agree that it is unlikely that the Greek translator, seeking to accurately transmit the text before him, would have overlooked such long passages, unless he was extremely incompetent. Lust has demonstrated plausible evidence that it is unlikely that Ḡ967 omitted these three pericopes (including 36:23c-38); rather, MT and later LXX MSS contain them as

456 For more on this see Lust (1986d).
insertions. It would appear that these three pericopes are part of the literary development of the text, born out of early Jewish theological and interpretive reasons. This can be seen clearly with 32:24b-26. As \( \text{G}^{967} \) reflects the Old Greek, which was written before any other extant text (with the exception of MasEzek), it is significant that it does not have the plusses of MT and other LXX MSS.

The main significance for us is that Lust’s changing eschatological proposal provides a plausible theological reason for the chapter reorder, resulting in the creation and insertion of 36:23c-38 in later MSS. Although his suggestion of concerns over canonical inclusion may be difficult to prove, we can nevertheless still conclude with Lust that these pericopes were later additions birthed out of shifting eschatological theologies.

We may combine Lust’s proposal of changing eschatological concerns that caused the change of chapter order, resulting in the inclusion of this pericope, with our hypothetical proposal above that this pericope found its genesis in the liturgical life of the Synagogue. Then we have an answer for the genesis, and then inclusion for this pericope. Yet, we do not know who, or which religious party, adjusted the text of Ezekiel in this way. We will now investigate an early proposal by Lust regarding a sector of the early Jewish community that may have felt so strongly about their theology to have interacted with the text, changing the text to reflect their sifting theology.

7.4.3.1. Lust’s Pharisees Proposal

Already in his earlier examination of the chapter reorder and 36:23c-38 as an inserted pericope, Lust proposed that theological concerns over a shift in eschatological and apocalyptic views in early Jewish communities created the environment for the changes. Lust’s (1981a, p.531) theory was that the original chapter order and events in the text as found in \( \text{G}^{967} \) “probably did not arouse much interest … [and] these chapters were not read as a continuous story … [but] the situation changed when apocalyptic
tendencies grew stronger”. He then proposes that this greater interest in apocalyptic theology, with its varying eschatological sequences, created a polarised environment with one group (the apocalypticists) embracing the events as portrayed in G967’s chapter order, and another group (the Pharisees) embracing a different order of eschatological events, one that was focused more on their present.

Lust proposes that the Pharisees stood against these rising apocalyptic viewpoints as they were more ‘realistic’ in their eschatological views. Lust (1981a, p.532) claims:

The Pharisees may be responsible for the restoration of the Book of Ezekiel. 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 this 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.

Lust also examines the idea that the Pharisees were responding to Christian resurrection theology, but he quickly dismisses this as unlikely, with evidence that the addition of 36:23c-38 was pre-Christian.457 He settles instead with the theory that these textual changes came about because of Pharisee reaction against apocalyptic views of their day.

Yet Lust’s Pharisee proposal is not without its critics. Block (1998, p.339) claims that the Pharisee involvement proposal by Lust is “his own creative interpretation”. Significantly, following criticism from Block, Lust (2002c, p.30) concedes “it must be admitted that my reference to the Pharisees as the party responsible for the restructuring of Ezekiel is highly hypothetical”. Yet more significantly, Block questions Lusts’ entire proposal that G967 reflects the Hebrew Vorlage, and that the chapter reorder from G967 to the received text resulted in the need for vv. 23c-38, a detailed matter to which we now turn.

457 The discovery of MasEzek (ca. 100-50 BCE) undermines any idea that this pericope came about either through Christians, or by any early Jewish reaction against Christian theology.
7.4.3.2. Block’s Objections to Lust

In his 1998 commentary, Block raised seven points of concern over Lust’s 1981 article. We will summarise them, and interact in the light of Lust’s responses:


Although this is correct, Lust (2002c, p.29) responds that his point “was not that it [the recognition formula] never occurs in the middle of an oracle, but that ‘the recognition formula followed by ne’um Yhwh in v. 23b makes a good conclusion’”. Even though the declarative formula (יהוההו’) appears commonly at the end of a verse, it also appears in the beginning or middle. The same is true of the recognition formula. However, 36:23b is the only place in Ezekiel where the recognition and declarative formulae appear together as ‘a string’ in the middle of a verse. Having these two formulae together suggests that the recognition formula in v. 23b marked the end of the original chapter, and the declarative formula in v. 23c was part of the editorial weaving of this pericope into the fabric of the text. This can explain why all our representative MSS have the recognition formula, and why the declaration formula is minus in both $^9$, but present in MT, MasEzek and $^A$. This declaration formula being a later insert also explains $^A$’s use of the later Theodotion styled $\lambda\omega\nu\omega\alpha\iota$ κύριος here (instead of κύριος κύριος). This proposal is again strengthened if we see the declaration formula in v. 32 as an *inclusio* to v. 23c. The ‘citation’ formula also marks the start of the following two oracles: vv. 33-36 and vv. 37-38.

---

458 36:38 also ends with the recognition formula of [הו’יימו-יהוה], which is seen as the concluding marker to this oracle and the entire chapter.


460 Occurrences of the declaration formula at the beginning (often following הוהי), or in the middle of a verse in Ezekiel: 14:16, 18, 20; 16:8, 30, 43, 48; 17:16; 18:3, 23, 30, 32; 20:31, 33, 40; 26:5; 32:11; 34:8; 35:6, 11; 36:23, 32; 38:18, 21; 39:8; 43:19; 44:12:

461 Lust (1981, p.525) compares this string here to the ending of 25:12-14, and uses this as a comparison for an acceptable conclusion to a prophecy.
(cf. Block, 1998, pp.362, 364). The recognition formula is also found at the end of v. 38, as a deliberate overall inclusio to the original recognition formula in v. 23b. Ezek. 36:36 has an expanded form of the recognition formula, and concludes with אֱלֹהִים יְהֹוָה יְבָרָכָה, which is another Ezekielian phrase used at times to mark the end of oracles (cf. 5:17; 17:21, 21:22, 37; 30:12; 37:14). It appears that this ‘inserted’ pericope begins with a ‘citation / declaration’ formula,462 as do the intra-oracles (vv. 33, 37), and that the existing recognition formula in v. 23b finds an overall inclusio conclusion in v. 38. We propose that these formulae may have been used deliberately by the scribal editor in order to ‘weave’ his inserted text into v. 23c, making it blend into the Ezekielian standard. As such, נָשָׁה אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה in v. 23c can be seen as an additional ‘pause’, linking what follows with what precedes.463 Whilst this is not ‘proof’, it does support Lust’s proposal.

2. The distinctive style in this section may be attributed to the special content and need not argue against Ezekielian authorship … [although borrowed], the special characteristics … may reflect authorial awareness of its significance (Block, 1998, p.340).

Block is correct in stating that the linguistic and stylistic differences need not argue against Ezekielian authorship. However, these differences cause him to defend that it is Ezekielian. It would be extremely unusual for an editorial scribe to insert a text and not attempt to blend it into the surrounding text utilising existing formulae. We previously discussed the arguments of Thackeray, Johnson and Lust that the hapax legomena and stylistic uniqueness in the Hebrew of this pericope suggest later insertion (cf. 7.4.1). Interestingly, Block does not explain or attempt to give significant reason for the Hebrew textual uniqueness, yet he (1998, p.340) admits that the “diction borrows

462 We propose that this pericope ‘begins’ with this declaration formula as it is minus also in א, and may therefore be another later ‘stitch’ to weave this pericope into the text.

463 This appears to be the clause referred to by Zimmerman (1983, p.248) when he says “the additional clause in v 23bβ … in which we probably have a later expansion”. 
heavily from previous oracles and from Jeremiah” [italics mine]. Likewise, Block does not offer a clear explanation for the ‘Theodotion’ style in the Greek.464 His explanation for unique linguistics is not that this pericope is an editorial insertion, but that the uniqueness “may reflect authorial awareness of its significance. A lofty subject deserves an exalted literary style” (Block, 1998, p.340). This is a curious explanation for the sudden change of literary styles in both the Hebrew and Greek. While ‘lofty’, this pericope is no more so than other Ezekielian oracles (e.g., 11:17-19; 20:39-44). Yet these other oracles do not evidence this oracle’s literary style. Lust (1981a, p.519) says that this pericope can either been seen as “a culmination of the prophet’s theological thinking … [or] a mere summary, borrowing from the surrounding chapters … [and] the gift of a new heart and a new spirit, is almost a literal repetition of Ezek 11:19”. These very differences are given by Lust as evidence for \( \text{G}^{967} \) representing the Hebrew Vorlage (Lust, 1981c, p.45). Block’s argument that the linguistic uniqueness of this pericope is due to the ‘lofty’ subject matter remains weak.

3. The LXX evidence is not conclusive. In the first instance, the reliability of Papyrus 967 for reconstruction of the Hebrew Vorlage to the Greek translation is not without question …. An accidental loss of a leaf or two seems more likely (Block, 1998, 340).

Block appears to bring up two separate issues in this one point. Firstly, Block addresses the issue of scribal practices and the problem of parablepsis and/or homoioiteleuton, and concludes that the omission of 36:23b-38 in this papyrus is due to the ‘accidental loss of a leaf or two’. We dismissed this proposal above.

The second issue Block raises here is the ability to reconstruct the Hebrew Vorlage based on \( \text{G}^{967} \). However, \( \text{G}^{967} \) is the oldest extant Greek MSS and therefore the closest in age to a Vorlage, and likely witnesses the OG. Its uniqueness is also not

464 Block does not mention or provide explanation for \( \text{G}^{81} \)’s use of \( \Lambda\delta\omega\nu\alpha\varepsilon \) in vv. 33 and 37, avoiding the unique Greek linguistic characteristics of this pericope.
without a witness, albeit in the Old Latin.\footnote{As mentioned previously, Block (1998, p.340) says that “it is remarkable that it is preserved in only one Greek manuscript and an obscure Latin text”. Yet, if the MSS following $G^{967}$ were corrected, and the ‘gap’ filled as Block claims, then we have only a couple of witnesses to what was prior to the correction. We must also question the wording of $W$ being an ‘obscure’ text, as it witnesses the Old Latin.} We do not see Lust saying we should ‘abandon MT’ in favour of $G^{967}$, but just that $G^{967}$ reflects an earlier Hebrew Vorlage. Lust (2002c, p.30) answers this point, saying that Block

is right when he holds that a text’s antiquity is not necessarily a sign of superiority. He is also right when he does not see the need to abandon MT in favour of a hypothetical ‘original’ based on $P^{967}$. It is true that MT represents a standardised form making perfect sense. I never defended the view that MT is inferior to LXX as represented by $P^{967}$. I simply suggested that they represent two different stages in the development of the text.

While both of Block’s points here are worth examining, we do not find anything that undermines Lust. Both Lust and Block find a ‘gap’ in the text, but see it from two different stages of the text development: Lust sees that this pericope was originally not in the text and is a later insertion; Block believes it was there, ‘accidentally’ lost, and a later ‘transmitter’ added a Theodotion styled text to fill the ‘gap’. But Lust’s proposal gives answer to the unique linguistic style in both Hebrew and the Greek. Block only gives answer to the Greek. While we stand with Lust regarding this pericope being a later insertion, and even reflective of the Hebrew Vorlage, our textual comparative methodology is focused on the fact we have two different textual trajectories, and not which is the ‘correct’ text.

4. Lust’s proposal flies in the face of recent form-critical scholarship; he eliminates evidence that runs counter to his theory. V. 23c, ‘when through you I vindicate my holiness before their eyes,’ is discounted as a secondary correction of 38:16 …. Further, deleting ‘It is not for your sakes’ in v. 32 neutralizes an effective inclusio with the same expression in v. 22 (Block, 1998, pp.340-341).
Block seems to misunderstand Lust here. Nowhere does Lust ‘discount’ v. 23c; he states that v. 23b “makes a good conclusion … [and] the continuation in v. 23c ff … is unusual” (Lust, 1981a, p.525). This clarification can be seen in Lust’s (2002c, p.29) response, “it was not my intention to discard v. 23c. Together with F. Hossfeld, I merely defended the view that 23b presents the conclusion of the section and that its expansion with 23c is secondary”. Block (1998, p.341, n.20) supplies a long list of examples to show that the recognition formula followed by an infinitive construct introduced by a prefixed ב is Ezekielian. The only instances of the declaration formula followed by an infinitive construct introduced by a prefixed ב are 16:30; 32:14-15. Therefore 36:23 is unique with its use of a recognition formula followed by the declaration formula followed by an infinitive construct introduced by a prefixed ב (Lust, 2002c, p.29). We agree with Lust that v. 23c is unusual. We have been unable to establish where Lust claims that v. 23c is a “secondary correction of 38:16” (so Block, 1998, p.341). While Block (1996, p.341) uses this argument to say that v. 23c is “an expansion of the recognition formula”. We respond with the proposal that it is an appropriate editorial expansion (see #1 above).

Block also appears to misunderstand Lust, when he claims Lust deletes ‘it is not for your sakes’ in v. 32. Lust (2002c, p.30) responds, saying “in fact I do not delete anything, but simply suggest that the expression in v. 32 belongs to a later insert”. Lust (1981a, p.525) also points out that “the fact that v. 32 forms an inclusio with v. 22 does not argue in favor of the original unity of vv. 16-32. It rather suggests that the redactor wished to connect his composition (v. 23c ff.) with the foregoing section”. We again point out that it would be a very poor redactor who did not seek to weave his insertion into the text, making inclusio and employing Ezekielian stylistic features, in particular Ezekiel’s typical literary formula markers.

466 Interestingly, Lust does not directly address this point.
5. By itself the section in vv. 16-23bβ appears fragmentary. On the one hand, in contrast to the rest of Ezekiel’s restoration oracles, which average twenty-seven verses, deleting 36:23c-38 reduces the present oracle to less than eight verses (Block, 1998, p.341).

It is true that vv. 16-23bβ forms a short oracle, yet Ezekiel is not without short oracles; 36:13-15 is one such short oracle. That one section may appear fragmented on its own to the modern reader, is not evidence that another section is not an insertion. These are two different issues. Block (1998, p.341) is correct when he says “removing vv. 23c-38 reduces this text [16-23b] to a bland and truncated two-part pronouncement, lacking any explanation of how Yahweh intends to vindicate his holiness”. Yet vv. 16-23b, while short, has continuity, fully explaining the dispersion (vv. 16-21), and giving reason for God’s future action (vv. 22-23b). In addition, this very blandness may have helped justify the inclusion of vv. 23c-38 into the text.

Block (1998, p.341) also claims that “since vv. 33-36 and 37-38 each have their own introductory citation and concluding recognition formulae, these look more like separate oracular fragments than vv. 23c-38 as a unit” [italics mine]. Curiously, Block admits here that shorter oracle fragments do exist, which appears to undermine his argument. Furthermore, Block (1998, p.362) asks whether vv. 33-36 is “a fragment of another oracle secondarily added here to fill what the editor considered a gap in the presentation of the restoration”. In this Block has admitted the possibility that an oracle was later inserted, even if ‘fragmented’, for the purposes of filling a ‘gap’. This also appears to undermine his argument against Lust regarding short oracles and insertions. It may be that these two fragmentary oracles (vv. 33-36; 37-38) were combined together and inserted as they provide an overall purpose for God’s restorative action for Israel (vv. 23c-32). Block does not mention or provide explanation for $\Theta^B$’s use of ’$\Lambda\delta\omega\nu\alpha\iota$ in vv. 33 and 37, avoiding the unique Greek linguistic characteristics of

---

467 Block (1998, p.362) is quick to add that “there is no reason to deny the content to the prophet himself”, avoiding any thought that a later editor inserted these oracles from other sources.
this pericope. Again, we find that Block’s objection does not disprove or seriously undermine Lust.

6. Lust’s reconstruction of the history of the LXX is speculative, lacking any objective evidential basis for a Pharisaic reaction to the sequence of events suggested by the arrangement of Papyrus 967 [italics mine] (Block, 1998, p.341).

Of all Block’s points, this one holds the most serious challenge to Lust’s proposal. It is apparent that there is a lack of ‘objective evidence’ for Lust’s Pharisee involvement. Yet Lust (1981, p.532) does say that the “Pharisees may be responsible” [italics mine]; he does not make it a definitive assertion. In his later work Lust (2002c, p.30) clarifies that his “reference to the Pharisees as the party responsible for the restructuring of Ezekiel is highly speculative. I clearly presented it as a hypothetical reconstruction with its own merits”. Regrettably, Lust still does not quote from any Pharisaic literature, nor does he seek to further support his proposal from other primary sources. Lust gives little response to Block on this very important point in his ‘Stepbrothers’ (2002c) article. Lust’s (2003, p.90) recent work proposes canonical and eschatological concerns as reasons for these ‘MT plusses’, including this pericope, but he does not provide any suggestion who was responsible for these textual changes.

Block (1998, p.341) counters Lust, with the following reason for $\Theta^{967}$’s chapter order:

the growth of apocalypticism in the late intertestamental period stimulated the rearrangement of oracles in this text-form, 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 speculation here is similar to Lust’s speculative ‘Pharisee’ proposal. Lust (1981a, pp.351f) speculates that any change to the text came out of their reaction to apocalyptic concerns. Block admits that there has been a ‘rearrangement of oracles’ in

---

468 These include eschatological and theological concerns with apocalyptic views, or even “confrontation between Pharisees and Christians” (Lust, 1981a, p.532).
$\Theta^{967}$ due to theological concerns. This raises the point that if $\Theta^{967}$’s text-form can be rearranged, then it may also be possible that the received text is the rearranged text.\textsuperscript{469} The primary difference in their proposals is that Lust speculates that it was the Pharisees rearranging the text in reaction to apocalyptic views, with the result being the ‘received’ text. Block, on the other hand, speculates it was unidentified apocalyptic persons in the late intertestamental period who rearranged the text to give $\Theta^{967}$’s order. Block’s proposal also raises questions of plausibility. Block does not give any explanation why these unidentified ‘apocalyptic’ exegetes would change the text to $\Theta^{967}$’s order, which has Israel amongst the slain of chapter 39, making Israel among the corpses defiling the land, requiring a physical resurrection of Israel in the following dry bones epic. A chapter order change from the received text to $\Theta^{967}$’s order does not make strong theological sense, especially when facing the armies of the Seleucids or Romans. Block (1998, p.341) explains this by saying “the resurrection of the dead is seen as the final eschatological event prior to the reestablishment of a spiritual Israel”. Yet Lust (1981a, p.351) states that “differing opinions circulated as to the exact sequence of these final events”. This means that both the received text and $\Theta^{967}$ could be representations of early Jewish eschatological views. The arrangement of the ‘received’ text presents a more positive military view for Israel; a more apocalyptic theology ($\Theta^{967}$) would see the cataclysmic intervention of God in 38-39 destroying the enemies of Israel. Block appears to find himself in unintentional agreement with Lust; that a text form can be rearranged for theological purposes, be that $\Theta^{967}$ or the received text.

7. Lust’s understanding of 36:23c-38 as a composition intentionally crafted to serve as a bridge between 36:16-23bβ and ch. 37, after these chapters had been brought together, is not convincing. The evidence of lexical and thematic links

\textsuperscript{469} This is based on the methodological argument that if it is possible for one then it is possible for another. Both Block and Lust are being speculative, seeking to find a theological reason for the change of order.
cut both ways. The ties between vv. 23c-32 and 16-23bβ argue for unitary
treatment (Block, 1998, p.341).

Block seems to dismiss Lust’s insertion proposal with this statement. Block
(1998, p.341) defends his point by stating that “the oracle fragments represented by vv.
33-36 and 37-38 appear authentically Ezekielian, and may have been inserted in the
present positions precisely because of their connections with ch. 34 and 36:1-15”. Block
appears to be arguing against his own point by admitting that these two smaller oracles
are insertions, even if Ezekielian. Block criticises Lust, but he is basically presenting a
similar argument, albeit on a smaller scale. The difference is that Block looks ‘back’ in
the book to find reasons for inclusion, whereas Lust primarily looks ‘forward’ to explain
a re-arranged chapter order that results in this pericope’s insertion.

Block (1998, p.342) also states that “the editors of MT intend 37:1-14 as an
explication of 36:27”. This is said to counter Lust’s proposal that 36:27 was included
with the insertion to prepare for 37:1-14. Lust (1981a, p.523) claims that v. 27 has “the
construction, ‘I will bring it about that …’ followed by a subordinate clause expressing
a purpose or a consequence is unusual in the Bible and certainly unique in Ezekiel”.
Responding to Block, Lust (2002c, p.30) refers to vv. 26-28, saying that they serve as a
“good example” of a construction to function as a bridge, especially as they “repeat the
text of 11,17-19 word for word”. This then opens the way for chapter 37. Ultimately,
both scholars find 36:27 to be an insertion, and both link this to 37:1-14. Lust
(2002c, p.30) says that “once the editorial character of the section is admitted, to a large
extent on the basis of an objective philological argumentation, it is perfectly reasonable
to recognise a bridge function in this composition” [of 36:23c-38].

Block (1998, p.342) claims that these verses connect with their context, saying
“37:15-28 not only portrays a reversal of 36:16-23 but also expands on 34:23-31”.
While this is correct, it does not disprove Lust’s proposal, as these texts can still refer to
each other equally in 967’s order as they do with other MSS.
Lust (1981a, p.523) brings out the uniqueness of the Hebrew in this pericope, such as in 36:36 where “the combination of verbs ‘to destroy’ (hrs), ‘to build’ (bnh), and ‘to plant’ (nt) is typical for Jeremiah and occurs nowhere else in Ezekiel”. Lust (1981a, p.524) also points out other unusual aspects in the Hebrew for vv. 35 and 37. Yet, Block (1998, p.340) does not attempt to answer these points, other than by referring to the ‘exalted literary style’ (cf. discussions above).

In summary, Block’s criticisms do not undermine Lust’s proposal, and in some cases he unwittingly supports the possibility of textual inserts (cf. #5 above) and ‘oracle rearrangement’ (cf. #6 above). Block appears to imply, without clearly stating it, that $\phi^967$ is an innovative text. He does not give adequate explanation for the unique Hebrew and Greek linguistic characteristics of 36:23c-38. This is an area of concern, as this is what causes scholars to view this pericope as an insertion (e.g., Thackeray; Johnson; Lust). Lust has addressed these linguistic issues in his attempt to explain this pericope’s genesis and inclusion. Likewise, Block does not adequately address the important issue of the unique chapter order, except to imply that this is a phenomenon for $\phi^967$ and $W$. Lust does address the chapter order, and proposes it was the chapter reorder that created the need for this pericope to be inserted.

In Block’s conclusion (1998, p.342), he surprisingly concedes that “Papyrus 967 may still represent an old text-form. The text-critical task of retroverting the translated text to a supposed Hebrew Vorlage remains an imprecise science”. This statement further weakens his own arguments against Lust, and places him in closer agreement with Lust than he may have intended. In his response to Block, Lust (2002c, p.30) also observes, “somewhat unexpectedly, Block’s conclusions are very nuanced and not diametrically opposed to mine”. In Block’s (1998, p.365) theological conclusion to this pericope, he states that “perhaps because this literary unit brings together so many strands of Ezekiel’s preaching, it is unmatched for its theological intensity and spiritual
depth”. One is left to wonder why if Block can admit that this pericope is ‘unmatched’ and combines ‘many strands’ from Ezekiel, why then does he choose not to deal with the possibility that it may be a later insertion, especially as he appears to suggest that the last two oracles were inserted. One concern from Block’s seven points that does require further examination is his sixth point, which criticises Lust for not providing objective evidence that Pharisee eschatological concerns were the possible reason for this redaction. Before we investigate this point, and other theological implications, there is one other area that gives further support to the view that $G^{967}$ reflects a viable theological trajectory of early Jewish thought.

### 7.4.4. External Evidence Supporting $G^{967}$

Without seeking to be comprehensive in exploring data outside the text of Ezekiel, we may note some other texts that may lend support to $G^{967}$’s chapter order and ‘minus’ of 36:23c-38 being reflective of the Hebrew Urtext.

#### 7.4.4.1 Daniel

Whereas most LXX MSS have a Theodotion styled text for Daniel that witnesses a similar Vorlage to MT, $G^{967}$ preserves the Old Greek translation reflecting an earlier pre-revised Hebrew text.$^{470}$ Like Ezekiel, $G^{967}$ Daniel also has a different chapter order (7-8 come between 4 and 5),$^{471}$ and some significant minuses when compared with other MT or LXX MSS. Although a comprehensive discussion of these complex issues is beyond the scope of this thesis, we do note that the OG text for Daniel reflected in $G^{967}$ finds ‘priority’ amongst scholars as “the best witness to the OG text” (McLay, 2005, p.307). This important papyrus again gives support to the proposal that

---

$^{470}$ The Old Greek of Daniel is also preserved in Codex Chisianus (or Codex 88) which reflects the Hexapla, and in Syro-Hexapla (Lucas, 2002, p.19).

$^{471}$ Daniel $G^{967}$’s chapter order reflects a chronological order. It is debated if chronology influenced $G^{967}$’s order (McLay, 2005, p.317).
later LXX MSS have a revised and edited Theodotion-styled text, with later plusses and revised chapter order, replacing the earlier Old Greek style and reflecting MT. If this is the case for Daniel, then it is likely the case for Ezekiel.

Dan. 12:1-3 speaks of a resurrection, which Collins (2000a, p.126) claims \(^{472}\) “is the only passage in the Hebrew Bible that clearly predicts resurrection of individuals”. \(^{473}\) Significantly, this resurrection happens after the conflict in Dan. 11 that appears to reflect Antiochus Epiphanes’ persecution, with the prediction of Antiochus’ death in the land of Israel (Dan. 11:45). This order of a major battle followed by a resurrection corresponds to \(\text{G}^{967}\)’s order of events in Ezekiel. However, Daniel only talks of a ‘king of the north’, unlike Revelation which specifically mentions Gog (see below).

7.4.4.2. Revelation

Although Revelation is a Christian book, and therefore one step removed from the focus of our investigation, it nevertheless has a significant thematic layout possibly reflecting both \(\text{G}^{967}\) and the received text’s chapter order. Lust (1980, p.180) proposes that John likely utilised Ezekiel when writing Revelation’s end time events (Rev. 18-22), while observing a slightly different order of final events in Revelation than in the received text of Ezekiel. Of special interest is Rev. 20:11-15 that has a second resurrection after the battle with Gog and Magog (Rev. 20:7-10), therefore matching \(\text{G}^{967}\)’s chapter order. It does raise the question of what may have inspired John to write of a second resurrection, if he was using Ezekiel’s order of events. Most have focused on the first resurrection in Rev. 20:4-6 before the Gog epic, as that matches Ezekiel’s

\(^{472}\) Dimant (2000, p.528) also says “an explicit statement of the notion of resurrection is found only in the latest biblical book, the book of Daniel (Dan 12:1-2), edited and composed in part around 164 BCE”.

\(^{473}\) Collins (2000, p.119) says “the interpretation of the vision is quite explicit, however: ‘these bones are the whole house of Israel’ (37:11). The resurrection, then, is metaphorical”. Collins (2000, p.127) also says for Daniel “the hope for resurrection resolves a problem arising from religious persecution … faith in the justice of God would be maintained if the righteous could hope for a reward after death”.
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received chapter order. There is nothing, however, in Ezekiel’s received order to match
John’s second resurrection. Significantly, this second resurrection occurs just before the
‘new Jerusalem’ in Rev. 21. While we may grant John theological licence here, we also
suggest that John’s writing was in keeping with differing early Jewish eschatological
viewpoints, and existing variant textual traditions. Lust (1980, p.180) questions which
textual tradition was before John, suggesting that John knew of both, indicating that
“Revelation was made up of two different apocalypses fused into one”. Lust proposes
that $\Theta^{967}$’s order was most likely the tradition influencing John’s order of events, and
Lust presents a schema supporting his proposal. Curiously, Lust’s schema ignores the
first resurrection in Rev. 20:4-6. We suggest that John did know of both textual
traditions for Ezekiel, and sought to include both traditions in Revelation. MasEzek
witnesses the received order; therefore the chapter reorder would have been done well
before John’s time. We modify Lust’s (1980, p.181) schema to reflect the first
resurrection; we have changed his numbering$^{474}$ and included our clarifying additions in
italics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revelation</th>
<th>Ezekiel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The final battle against the beast: 19, 17-21</td>
<td>1. The final battle against …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The first resurrection and Messianic reign: 20, 4-6</td>
<td>2. The resurrection of 37 in the received text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The second resurrection: 20:11-15</td>
<td>4. The revival of dry bones: 37 as in $\Theta^{967}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, we suggest that Revelation is an implicit witness to the chapter order found
in $\Theta^{967}$, giving further evidence that $\Theta^{967}$ is not a maverick text.

$^{474}$ Lust lists the first three events as 1 and 1a (combining our #2 and 3), as he did not put a matching item
in Ezekiel’s column for the first resurrection.
7.4.4.3. **Targum Neofiti and Pseudo-Jonathan Num. 11:26**

We also find implicit support for the different two chapter orders in circulation at some point, in the way the various Targumim exegete Num. 11:26. Where MT and LXX state only that Eldad and Medad “prophesied in the camp”, Targum Neofiti and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan both include a midrash that they prophesied regarding the end of days and the battle with Gog. Targum Neofiti, along with the Paris BN Fragment, appears to support the received order (McNamara, 1995, p.74):

> And both of them prophesied together, saying: ‘At the very end of the days Gog and Magog ascend on Jerusalem, and they fall at the hands of King Messiah, and for seven years the children of Israel shall kindle fires from their weapons; and they will not have to go out (to) the forest.

That Targum Neofiti has King Messiah ready to defeat Gog and Magog\(^{475}\) indicates that the chapter order before these scribes has the dry bones and uniting of the nation under a ‘Kingly’ (even Messianic), military leader coming before the Gog epic as in the received text. Significantly, there is no mention of resurrection. The concept of Israel making fires for seven years emphasises the extent of King Messiah’s destruction of Gog and Magog.

However, Pseudo-Jonathan’s midrash appears to support G\(^{967}\)’s order, and expands on the earlier Neofiti (Clarke, 1992, p.220-221):

> But the two prophesied as one and said: ‘Behold a king shall rise from the land of Magog at the end of days. He shall gather kings crowned with crowns, and prefects attired in silken clothing, and all the nations shall obey him. They shall prepare for war in the land of Israel against the sons of the exile. However, the Lord is near them at the hour of distress, and all of them will be killed by a burning breath in a consuming fire that comes from beneath the throne of Glory; and their corpses will fall on the mountains of Israel. Then all the wild animals and birds of heaven shall come and consume their bodies. And after this all the dead of Israel shall live [again] and shall delight themselves with the good which was hidden for them from the beginning. Then they shall receive the reward of their labors.

\(^{475}\) Neofiti here treats ‘Magog’ as a person rather than a place, following LXX.
Pseudo-Jonathan has Magog as a place, yet does not mention Gog by name, stating only that ‘a king’ will gather other ‘kings’ and that ‘nations will obey him’. In this midrash the LORD appears to lead the battle, destroying Gog and his hosts; there is no mention of any human leader, which matches $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$’s order. The use of the pronoun leaves it unclear as to whether the corpses on the ground also include those of Israel. Regardless, Israel is resurrected after this battle, which reflects $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$’s order. There is also no mention of a human military leader after this resurrection, again reflecting $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$’s tradition. Flesher (2000, p.319) states that “PJ’s [Pseudo-Jonathan’s] shift away from Proto-PT [Palestinian Targum]$^{476}$ understanding of resurrection is purposeful, not accidental … he takes steps to eliminate the other view”. Flesher (2000, p.321) also observes that for Pseudo-Jonathan “the resurrection happens in the world we know, but at the end of time. Thus, for PJ, the resurrection of the dead keeps its special character by happening at a special time rather than a special place—Proto-PT’s world-to-come”.

We refer the reader to Flesher (2000) for a detailed discussion on the various Targumim’s treatment of Num. 11:26 and other texts,$^{477}$ as we only seek to suggest that Pseudo-Jonathan did not create the order of his midrash out of nowhere; he appears to have known the chapter order tradition found in $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$. We can see that both chapter order traditions are reflected in Targum Neofiti and Pseudo-Jonathan’s respective midrashic expansions of Num. 11:26.

### 7.4.5. Summary of Insertion (and Reorder) not Omission

Throughout the sections above covering ‘Insertion not Omission’ we have examined various aspects within the text, and three possible implicit witnesses outside

---

$^{476}$ This includes Targum Neofiti, and the Paris fragment.

$^{477}$ Targum Ezekiel’s expansions reflect only the received order. The one area of interest is 39:16 which contemporises Rome as part of the slain, and therefore identifies Gog with Rome. For more on Targum Ezekiel see Levey (1987), Ribera (1996), or for general information regarding the Targums see McNamara, Carthcart, and Maher (1987).
Ezekiel, in an effort to determine whether sufficient evidence exists to lend support to the proposal that $G^{967}$'s chapter order reflects the original, and that 36:23c-38 is an inserted text. In the ‘Linguistic’ section we saw that there exists sufficient evidence to suggest that this pericope is a later construction than the surrounding text, in both Greek and Hebrew. We also examined and built on Thackeray’s early ‘Liturgical’ proposal for this pericope’s uniqueness, providing a hypothetical suggestion that this was a possible path for its genesis and inclusion. We examined Lust’s ‘Eschatological / Apocalyptic’ proposal, finding it gives credible theological reason for both the chapter reorder and subsequent pericope insertion.

We also addressed the seven concerns that Block levelled at Lust’s proposal that $G^{967}$ reflects the Hebrew Vorlage, often concluding in favour of Lust, as Lust identifies theological motive for both the rearranged order and inserted pericope. We then examined two external Ezekiel witnesses in the form of Daniel and Revelation, finding that $G^{967}$ reflected the Old Greek as compared to most other LXX MSS and MT. We also found sufficient evidence to suggest that John knew of $G^{967}$’s chapter order when writing Revelation. Both Daniel and Revelation show evidence of an eschatology where a battle is followed by a resurrection, as in $G^{967}$. We then examined the third witness of Targum Num. 11:26 and found evidence that Targum Pseudo-Jonathan was aware of the chapter order found in $G^{967}$, as his midrashic expansion reflects this order.

Overall, we find that sufficient evidence exists to strongly indicate that $G^{967}$ is a credible witness of the original Hebrew. Therefore, our received text of Ezekiel has a different chapter order than the original Hebrew and a later inserted plus of 36:23c-38. Yet, this does not mean we now abandon MT (or the other LXX MSS); our textual comparative methodology treats each trajectory as representatives of early Jewish interpretation and theology. We have previously, albeit briefly, covered possible theological reasons and implications for the chapter reorder and resultant inserted...
pericope, with particular attention given to those proposed by Lust. However, as noted above, we agree with Block that Lust does not provide sufficient objective evidence to support his ‘Pharisee’ proposal. Therefore, we now turn to a closer examination of possible theological reasons and hands involved in these textual changes.

7.5. Theological Significance, Timeframe and Motivation

With the premise that $\mathcal{G}^{967}$ is a viable witness to the Hebrew Urtext of Ezekiel, we now seek to discuss the theological significance of $\mathcal{G}^{967}$’s chapter order, and the received order. We will seek to identify a possible timeframe and motivation for the change in chapter order and pericope insertion.

7.5.1. Theological Significance of $\mathcal{G}^{967}$

The theological progression found in $\mathcal{G}^{967}$ shows solid continuity. In the first section\(^{478}\) of chapter 36, the mountains of Israel are addressed preparing them for the return of Israel, and are assured that they will not miscarry the people again (vv. 1-15). In $\mathcal{G}^{967}$’s second section (vv. 16-23b), Israel’s sin of ‘blood’ and ‘idolatry’ is given as the reason for the dispersion; therefore Israel profaned God’s holy name amongst the nations (vv. 20-22). It is significant that this section in $\mathcal{G}^{967}$ finishes chapter 36 with God establishing his holy name (vv. 21-23b), declaring “the nations will know that I am the LORD” (v. 23b).

$\mathcal{G}^{967}$’s progression into chapters 38-39 then provides an immediate answer as to how God will establish his holiness, and let the nations know he is the LORD: he will defeat Gog and his hordes (38: 16, 23; 39:6, 7, 21-24 28). God’s name has been profaned amongst the nations, and now the nations despise him thinking he is weak, so

\(^{478}\) In our chapter dealing with the text of Ezekiel 36 we concluded that chapter 36 can be broken up into three major literary and thematic sections: vv. 1-15; 16-23; 24-38. The first section addresses the mountains of Israel, and the second two sections address the ‘house of Israel’. It is significant that our finding was established before this research on $\mathcal{G}^{967}$ was undertaken.
he will bring them to his mountains and land to show his power by defeating the nations who oppose him and his people.

‘These things’ in 36:22 may refer to what came before this verse. However, the focus seems to be more on what follows. In 967’s order it refers to God’s judgment on the nations (38-39), letting the nations know that the exile was not because of God’s weakness, but because his holiness demanded that he judge his people (39:21-24). God’s people defiled his land and his holy name, so they had to leave the land and God’s immediate presence (36:16-23b). God’s explanation in 39:21-24 is a reference to 36:16-23b, and can be seen as an inclusio, tying these chapters together. God’s declaration that he will ‘now bring Jacob back from captivity’ (39:25-28), sets the scene in 967’s order for the resurrection of the dry bones (37:1-14). In this chapter order, the dry bones appear to include Israel’s slain following the battle with Gog. Therefore, LXX’s use of θυμίως in 39:29, which is likely original, may refer to God’s judgment on Israel in battle, which now requires a physical resurrection. This resurrection follows the battle in 967’s order. However, this resurrection need not refer to a physical resurrection; it may be a metaphor for the regathering of Israel from exile (37:11). If so, their ‘dryness’ may be a reference to their exile, and their ‘resurrection’ a metaphor for the regathering after being cut off (37:11b). This is significant if we take 39:25-28 into account, which introduces the dry bones epic in 967’s order. This then gives a dual application for the dry bones epic. However, unlike the received order, 967’s order favours a literal reading of the resurrection, as it envisions that there will be actual dead.

Regardless of the metaphor of the received text, or the actual resurrection of 967’s order (which does appear to be the primary reading), in the first section of

479 In our discussion of chapter 39, we proposed θυμίως reflected the Vorlage, and MT’s נים is a later post-LXX amendment.

480 Unfortunately we cannot be sure of its original interpretation within early Jewish communities. We also lack evidence of when a physical resurrection became part of Israel’s eschatology. The dry bones epic may be one of the earliest recordings of a physical resurrection, but again, we cannot be sure how this was originally interpreted.
chapter 37.\textsuperscript{481} Israel is raised as a nation and will again be settled in their own land (37:1-14).\textsuperscript{482} The ‘glory days’ of Israel are restored in the second section, with the nation again a United Kingdom (37:15-23) and ‘David’ once again leading Israel (37:24-28). Significantly, in $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$’s order, there is no need for the Davidic ruler to lead Israel into battle, as God has already defeated Gog. The Davidic ruler’s purpose is to shepherd the people peacefully, making sure they are Torah observant (v. 24b), as they live under their ‘covention of peace’ (v. 26). In $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$’s order, his greatest purpose is shepherding the people for the building of God’s sanctuary (v. 26b), so God can dwell with his people (v. 27). $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$’s Davidic leader is seen to be a peaceful shepherd, rather than a military leader, as David was in Israel’s history. This theology may find support with LXX’s use of $\alphaia\pi\omega\nu$ rather than $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ for MT’s $\gamma\gamma\tau\iota\varsigma$ (cf. Excursus in our ‘Chapter 4: The Text of Ezek. 37’).\textsuperscript{483} With Israel fully restored, and Gog and his hordes defeated, then all nations will finally know that it is the LORD who makes Israel holy (37:28).

$\mathfrak{G}^{967}$’s order does not interrupt this everlasting covenant of peace with the Gog epic, but instead flows smoothly into chapters 40-48 where the Temple is built and worship established. In $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$’s order we find continuity in Israel’s restoration:

- The mountains are prepared, and assured that they will not miscarry again.
- Israel’s sin is established as the result for the dispersion.
- The LORD declares he will establish his holy name.

\textsuperscript{481} In our investigation of chapter 37 we found two thematic sections: vv. 1-14 (the dry bones) and vv. 15-28 (the reestablishment of the United Kingdom under a Davidic ruler).

\textsuperscript{482} Ezekiel’s resurrection is a national one, regardless if ‘actual’ in $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$’s order, or ‘moral/spiritual’ in the received order. Yet, Pseudo-Ezekiel reveals a theology of individual resurrection based on personal purity and righteousness. Therefore, while Dimant (2000, p.529) points out that “Pseudo-Ezekiel furnishes the earliest evidence for a complex and well-developed exegesis linked to the theme of resurrection”, its focus on individual resurrection, rather than national, is one step removed from our focus.

\textsuperscript{483} In that Excursus we proposed that rather than LXX ‘softening’ the Hebrew, the LXX translator found $\text{N\nu\nu}$ in his Vorlage, not $\text{\gamma\gamma\tau\iota\varsigma}$ (done at the same time as other word changes to support the chapter reorder: cf. 36:23b; $\text{\gamma\gamma\tau\iota\varsigma}$ to $\text{\nu\nu\nu}$ in 37:10; $\text{\nu\nu\nu}$ to $\text{\nu\nu\nu}$ to 39:29). This is reflected in LXX’s use of $\text{\alphaia\pi\omega\nu}$, which was continued by the later LXX redactor(s) who aligned the Greek to reflect the changed chapter order and inserted pericope in the Hebrew text.
- Gog and his hordes are defeated, establishing God’s holiness.
- Israel is resurrected, united in peace with a ‘peaceful shepherd’ Davidic leader
- The Temple is built and worship re-established.

We suggest that G\textsuperscript{967}'s order may reflect the eschatology of a writer living in exile. The message is that the land is being prepared for us and will not cast us out again. Our sin caused our exile, but God will defeat his enemies, and our dry bones will be resurrected from the battle and from exile. We will return to a peaceful living with our glory days restored, and will rebuild our Temple.

This is not to say that the returnees ceased their call for further restoration, as everyone had not yet returned. The restoration of the nation continued to be a part of eschatological expectation (cf. Acts 1:6). Evidence also suggests that the call for a new Temple continued even while the post-exilic Temple stood (cf. 11QTemple; Mat. 26:61).

G\textsuperscript{967}'s theology may not reflect the situation of those who at a later period are in the land with an existing Temple, but find themselves surrounded by invading armies (of the Seleucids or Romans), who are threatening their security and perhaps hindering their worship. These inhabitants require a military leader like David who will lead the nation into victory over their enemies. They need this to happen now and not in some more distant eschatological fulfilment.

7.5.2. Theological Significance of the Received Order

The most pressing problem for the returnees with G\textsuperscript{967}'s chapter order is that there is no call for Israel to unite and gather against her enemies. They only gather for a peaceful existence to establish a dwelling place for God. Their enemies have already been destroyed. While they may have desired another Temple, they had an existing Temple. Their immediate concern was having the freedom to live their daily lives, without oppression from their enemies. This included the freedom to worship. In
addition, in $G^{967}$, the dead on the ground following the battle with Gog appear to include Israel. This then required a physical resurrection; hardly an inspirational call to arms! In $G^{967}$'s order, Israel was only united with a peaceful Davidic shepherd after the battle with Gog and subsequent resurrection. This order certainly would not have appealed to those facing battle with either the Seleucids or Romans. $G^{967}$'s order could also be seen to leave the resurrection of Israel’s dry bones to a more distant, even eschatological, future; perhaps even seven years after the battle with Gog (cf. 39:9). Likewise, as we saw with Lust’s proposal above (7.4.3), the events in $G^{967}$'s order could be interpreted as happening in the eschatological future.

Therefore, the chapter order was changed from $G^{967}$'s order to the received order, in an attempt to rally Israel with a present call to arms, and unite all Israel for both spiritual renewal, and to militarily rise against their enemies. The textual flow still has the mountains prepared for Israel’s return (36:1-15). Israel’s idolatrous sin and God’s holiness are still addressed as in $G^{967}$’s order. However, the resurrection of Israel’s dry bones is now placed immediately after this, and before the Gog epic. In the received order, the battle has not yet occurred to result in these dry bones. The chapter reorder can therefore only mean that the resurrection of the dry bones is a ‘moral’ and/or ‘spiritual’ resurrection. It is a nation rising to deal with its present reality, requiring the casting off of an oppressive enemy.

The use of metaphoric language in 37:11 assists this change. This does not mean to imply that those responsible for changing the chapter order did not believe in, or had ceased to believe in, physical resurrection. But their primary goal was a call to arms, and talk of death does not often inspire the oppressed to rise up. The later LXX insertion of ἀνθρωπόπωλαν (B,A) may have been the result of this chapter reorder, in an effort to clarify that these dry bones were human. This is not required in $G^{967}$’s order. This may indicate that the LXX community still interpreted this as both a physical and
metaphorical resurrection. While the dry bones epic in the chapter reorder is primarily interpreted metaphorically, it may still have retained its original intent, speaking of a physical resurrection interpretation.\textsuperscript{484} As mentioned above, while the dry bones epic in \textit{G}\textsuperscript{967}’s order clearly portrays a physical resurrection, it may also have allowed a metaphorical interpretation, calling the exiles to return (37:11). If so, then this chapter reorder, which reflects a more metaphorical interpretation, would not be seen as theologically offensive, especially with the call to purity and spiritual renewal found in the inserted pericope. In the received order, the dry bones coming together are clearly the scattered and demoralised Israel being united on their land, and no longer feeling cut off from each other (37:11). The placement of the dry bones chapter does fit its new location before chapter 38, as it continues the restorative theme in 36:1-15, but it implies a new military purpose for the Davidic leader.

In this new order the uniting of Israel (37:15-23), and the Davidic leader (37:24-28), takes on new meaning and purpose that is tied to the ‘call to arms’. This new united ‘Davidic’ kingdom resembles the glory days, when David united Israel into one kingdom, led them to victory against their enemies, and set up his Tabernacle in Jerusalem. Whereas \textit{G}\textsuperscript{967}’s Davidic leader is the ‘peaceful shepherd’, the Davidic leader found in the received chapter order is primarily a ‘military’ leader. While chapters 38-39 do not explicitly include Israel in the battle against Gog, the chapter reorder implies that the united Israel under David is involved in defeating Gog.\textsuperscript{485} In this reorder, there is no need for a physical resurrection for Israel following the battle. The dead in chapters 38-39 of the received order are implied as only Gog and his hordes. Therefore, no resurrection follows this battle in the received order; the corpses of Gog and his

\textsuperscript{484} Collins (2000a, pp.119-120) comments that “the resurrection, then, is metaphorical, although the passage would be interpreted literally in the Dead Sea Scrolls (4Q385) and later tradition”. Unfortunately we don’t know what textual tradition of Ezekiel was before the Dead Sea community. However, this does demonstrate one clear example of a community that interpreted the dry bones as a literal resurrection.

\textsuperscript{485} This interpretation can be seen in Targum Neofiti’s use of the Gog epic in Num. 11:26 (cf. above).
hordes remain buried. This may explain MT’s later unique יִשְׂרָאֵל plus in 37:12, clarifying that the ‘resurrection’ in the renewed order refers only to Israel and not to their enemies. As such, it reinforces the metaphorical ‘moral/spiritual’ sense of the dry bones resurrection. In this new chapter order, once Israel defeats her enemies under their Davidic leader they are able to build the new Temple (40-48), just as David established his Tabernacle after defeating his enemies. However, in their day it was likely to just reinstate Temple worship, as the Temple already existed.

Thus, like David’s rule of old, the chapter reorder brings both military and spiritual success to an oppressed people, changing their reality, and bringing future promises into their present. Unlike the distant eschatological future represented in שָׁאוֹר’s order, the changed chapter order addresses Israel’s present reality of oppression, especially during the Hasmonean times. They are surrounded by an enemy that they are called to rise against and defeat, so they can reinstate Temple worship and their Jewish lifestyle.

Those changing the chapter order now insert 36:23c-38 as support for their chapter reorder. As the chapter reorder appears to be a call to arms, this inserted pericope appears to be a call to purity. Its purpose is to introduce and assist the ‘new’ moral and/or spiritual resurrection metaphor for the dry bones, and the uniting of the united nation under a military Davidic leader; events that now immediately follow chapter 36.

The insertion of this pericope causes the text to flow from Israel’s sin and God’s holiness (36:16-23b), to now cover what God will do to cleanse Israel from their sins and idols (v. 25). Israel will be gathered (v. 24) and given a new heart and spirit (v. 26), echoing Ezek. 11:19 and Jeremiah (cf. Jer. 31). They will also receive God’s Spirit (v. 27; cf. 11:19). They will be resettled and established in the land which would now be
like Eden (vv. 33-35). Israel will once again gather as ‘flocks of humanity’ in Jerusalem for the festivals (vv. 37-38).

These textual changes result in a new theological flow in Ezekiel 36-39:

- Israel’s mountains are prepared, and assured they will not miscarry again.
- Israel’s sin is established as the result for the dispersion.
- The LORD declares he will establish his holy name.
- A [new inserted] call to purity declaring what God will do to cleanse Israel.
- Israel is morally/spiritually resurrected, and united for battle under a military Davidic leader [now as a call to arms].
- Israel’s covenant of peace is interrupted as Gog and his hordes are defeated.
- The Temple built and worship re-established.

The change in chapter order to the received text does cause a degree of disjointedness within chapters 36-39, where 38-39 now seem out of place, disturbing Israel’s covenant of peace (37:26). This has caused a number of scholars to question the legitimacy of 38-39 in Ezekiel. While 39:25-29 still provides an inclusio to 36:16-23, it no longer looks forward to fulfilment with the dry bones as it does in ס.

Its ‘new’ distance from chapter 36 causes this inclusio to be often overlooked. LXX’s θυμός (39:29) also appears to be out of place, with no referent directly following. This may explain MT’s change to מְסֹלֶל. ‘These things’ (36:22) now directly refers to what God will do for his people, not the establishment of his holy name by defeating his enemies, as seen in ס. Also, the inserted pericope does not directly address the way that God will show his holiness among the nations; only how God will purify and renew Israel. The pericope begins (36:23c) by echoing the last phrase in 38:16, but in this chapter order the echo distance is much further away than in the original order.486

486 We suggest above that 38:16, which was originally just a few verses away from 36:23b, inspired the use of this phrase in 36:23c.
Finally, it is difficult to establish a reason why the text would have been changed from the received chapter order, and its inserted pericope, to that found in G967. Any proposal for a change from the received chapter order to G967’s order must cover why the scribe would ‘omit’ 36:23c-38; parablepsis and other scribal errors were discounted at the beginning of this chapter. The received text makes good moral and spiritual sense, especially with the inserted pericope, yet with ‘military’ overtones. We propose that these factors led to a wide acceptance of the textual changes, which also resulted in them being added to LXX being at an early stage. The popularity of the changed text in both Hebrew and Greek linguistic circles may explain why we only have one Greek and one Latin extant witness to the original text. It is important to note that although we claim that these changes were made, the basic wording of the surrounding text has remained unchanged, except for a few word changes that may well have been because of the change (e.g., LXX’s ἀνθρωπίνων 37:1; MT and LXX 39:29). This reflects a reverence for the original text even though they changed its order. This may also have helped the change to gain acceptance. We are now left with the question of when these textual changes may have taken place.

7.5.3. Possible Timeframe.

In our ‘Chapter 2: MT and LXX in Comparison’, we found a broad LXX translational timeframe of 180 years ranging at the earliest 230 BCE (Thackeray; Dorival, Siegert) through to 132 BCE (Swete; Jobes and Silva), and the latest at 50 BCE (Turner). However, another indicator for us is the MasEzek fragment, which includes the chapter reorder and the inserted pericope. MasEzek is dated “the second half of the last century BCE” (Talmon, 1999, p.60). If we take our premise that G967 reflects the OG of Ezekiel, just as it reflects the OG for Daniel, then we project that the OG Ezekiel was

487 We briefly discussed this above under Block’s (1998, p.341) sixth objection to Lust’s proposal (7.4.3.2).
initially translated after 200 BCE, but before \textit{ca} 50 BCE. Our conclusion in chapter two was a timeframe between 230 and 135 BCE for the OG Ezekiel, placing it in the translational timeframe generally held by scholars.

The change in chapter order, encouraging a call to arms by enhancing the metaphor of a moral and spiritual resurrection, and the call to purity in the inserted pericope, would fit the time of the Hasmonean uprising in which Antiochus IV could be recognised as Gog from the north.\textsuperscript{488} While not agreeing with Lust’s ‘Pharisee’ proposal, Botte and Bogaert (1993) propose that the chapter rearrangement is linked with the Seleucid period as a response to enemy opposition coming after the return to the land.\textsuperscript{489} Yet this scenario may also fit a later timeframe as tensions continued with the Seleucids, or possibly in the face of the threat and aftermath of the Roman invasion of 63 BCE, which fanned royal messianic expectation.\textsuperscript{490}

Following the evidence of MasEzek, we suggest the chapter reorder and resulting insertion of 36:23c-38 took place initially in the Hebrew text \textit{after} the OG was translated, but \textit{before} MasEzek \textit{ca.} 50 BCE. This helps explain the unique Hebrew in the inserted pericope, as it was penned at a date later than the original surrounding Hebrew. This revised Hebrew text was then taken as the standard for all subsequent Hebrew MSS, leaving us today without an extant Hebrew witness to the \textit{Urtext}. We also suggest that the Hebrew redactor(s) inserted the other ‘eschatological’ plusses noted by Lust (see above) at the same time that these major textual changes where being made, and for similar theological and shifting eschatological concerns.

\textsuperscript{488} The repression of Israel under Antiochus IV is covered in 1Macc. 1:44-50.
\textsuperscript{489} Botte and Bogaert (1993, p.643) state that “our feeling is, it is more likely an establishment of the historic fact of the return (37) and the application of chapters 38-39 to Antiochus IV, which have brought about a new sequence where individual purification (36:23b-38 added), and the return and repopulation (37), preceded the events in view (38-39 and 40-48). The original sequence attested by the Septuagint was focused entirely towards the future conflict defeat of Gog and purification of the land (38-39), revival and return (37), New Israel (40-48). In our opinion the literary explanation of J. Lust is worth consideration, not the theological interpretation he offers, with reserve by the way” [translation mine].
\textsuperscript{490} It is beyond the scope of this study to pursue this, but our finding does provide a further important resource for understanding this period and the responses of pious groups to their crises.
All the textual changes in the Hebrew text were then incorporated into LXX by a recensionist at some later date, using the ‘proto-Theodotion’ style of his time for 36:23c-38. We propose this LXX recension took place in a broad timeframe around 50 BCE (based on MasEzek), through to sometime in the first century CE. As with the Hebrew text, this LXX recension became the standard for all subsequent LXX MSS (including $\mathfrak{G}^{B,A}$). Today $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ remains the only extant Greek witness to the OG, and the Hebrew Urtext.

Some have questioned (cf. Thackeray above) how a Theodotion styled text could find its way into LXX Ezekiel when the historical Theodotion lived somewhere around the second century CE.\(^{491}\) Significantly, scholars today do not see the historical Theodotion as the innovator of the style named after him. They now speak of a proto-Theodotion, placing this style as early as the first half of the first century CE (Fernández Marcos, 2000, pp.148-153).\(^{492}\) This matches our proposed timeframe for a Greek recension.

These timeframes, be that for translation of the OG, or the Hebrew revisionist changing the chapter order requiring 36:23c-38, are firmly outside the Christian era. The later LXX recension to this revised Hebrew (suggested between 50 BCE to sometime in the first century CE), did not add to the Hebrew text before them, and yet supported the OG LXX variants, which also reflects Jewish hands. Thus, we can dispel any suggestion of Christian involvement, or even any early Jewish reaction to Christian theology. We now explore further the motivations during these timeframes that may have generated these textual changes.

\(^{491}\) See Fernández Marcos (2000, pp.142-154) for more on the historical Theodotion and the difficulty in dating his existence.

\(^{492}\) McLay (2005, 304) claims that “the term Theodotion is employed for convenience. The Theodotion version of Daniel was known to the New Testament writers, so it could not have been written by a putative second century person known by that name”.
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7.5.4. Possible Motivations.

We proposed above two motivating factors for these textual changes: firstly a military call to arms, and secondly, a call to purity or spiritual renewal. While the call to arms may reflect Hasmonean resistance to external threats, there are many groups who could lay claim to the spiritual renewal as defined in the inserted pericope.

These textual changes occur within a period where there was the rise of a number of different Jewish religio-political parties. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to provide a definitive identification of the many groups of that day, and their theological and eschatological views, even for those supposedly well known to us. We agree with Tomasino (2003, p.162) that the three groups mentioned by Josephus (Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes) should not be taken as the only groups in existence at that time. In fact these groups may represent only a small number of the Jews living then. Meier (2001, p.290) points out that “the huge library we awkwardly dub ‘the intertestamental writings’ or ‘the OT pseudepigrapha’ reminds us that there were probably many religious leaders in Palestine of whom we are largely ignorant”. Scholars today must realise that the histories of many of these groups have been lost forever, and attempts to reconstruct them are often based on speculation from later sources.493 Even the traditional view of the Hasidim as the forerunners to the Pharisees or the Essenes is now a matter of dispute. As Tomasino (2003, p.162) states, “evidence for either identification is scant. We know nothing of what the Hasidim believed or how they worshipped, and little of why they fought against the Greeks”. Meier (2001, p.292) says that we can date these groups “only to the period after the Maccabean revolt in the 2nd century B.C., when the Hasmoneans Jonathan, Simon, and John Hyrcanus were consolidating their power”. Scholars today also distance themselves from the traditional belief that the Pharisees were the forerunners of Rabbinic Judaism. Likewise “scholars

493 Tomasino (2003, p.163) points out that even the various Targumim “were produced centuries after the time when the sects existed and must be used with caution”.

now understand that it’s really impossible to speak of ‘normative’ Judaism until well into the rabbinic era (fourth century A.D. and beyond)” (Tomasino, 2003, p.162).

Modern research has revealed that our primary sources for this period are scant, and often written by those with theological and/or political bias. Even “the picture presented by Josephus is murky” (Meier, 2001, p.294). Most today admit that Josephus wrote with bias. He also wrote over a century after our proposed timeframe. Even the New Testament was written over a century after our Hebrew revision timeframe, and was written from the viewpoint of defending the ministry of Jesus, making it a secondary source. Therefore, it is questionable to place NT theology and eschatology onto earlier religio-political group(s).

While we can determine theological motivations behind these textual changes in Ezekiel, the lack of trustworthy primary sources creates difficulty in clearly establishing who believed what during that timeframe. Certainly theologies surrounding the resurrection of the dead have eschatological and apocalyptic overtones, but we are left with little objective evidence for these various resurrection views prior to 50 BCE. Also, we do not know definitively when the view of physical and/or individual resurrection came into Jewish thought. As pointed out previously, Ezekiel’s dry bones may well be the first evidence of physical individual resurrection, especially in G’s order. However, we cannot be certain whether this is the case.

In addition, while we do have some evidence of eschatology and resurrection in early writings, we now cannot be sure what party was responsible for them. Traditionally, scholars have turned to the OT pseudepigraphic books of The Psalms of Solomon and the Book of Jubilees to construct the Pharisees’ views on eschatology and resurrection. However, the Pharisaic authorship of these books has been challenged

494 Meier (2001, p.299) further states that “the sole primary sources for our knowledge of these groups, sources that were once cited with naïve faith in their total reliability and with remarkable blindness to their mutual (or even self-) contradictions, are now viewed with a much more sceptical eye by many scholars”.
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recently. Today such authorship “is considered dubious or impossible by many critics” (Meier, 2001, p.324). While many have sought to establish a Pharisaic eschatology based on Paul’s writings, Meier again cautions that “we must not leap to the conclusion that the eschatology and/or messianic substratum that we may find at the basis of Paul’s Christian theology can be attributed to all Pharisees at the time of Paul, to say nothing of all Pharisees from about 150 B.C. to A.D. 70”. Perhaps this is the reason Lust distanced himself in his later writings from his earlier ‘Pharisee’ proposal.

We can agree with Lust (7.4.3.2), that the primary eschatological difference between $\Theta^{967}$’s chapter order and the received order, is that the received order places the Gog epic into their immediate time and reality, and not into a more distant eschatological future. We also agree with Lust, that this effort to bring the text and events into their historical present, appears to be reflected in the other inserted texts as noted above (12:26-28; 32:24b-26; ch. 7).

However, we need to concede that the change of chapter order may have been motivated primarily by a call to arms to face their present enemies under a Davidic military leader. It may be lacking the influence of any major eschatological or apocalyptic theology. We can also propose that any number of religious groups of that day, from those within society (e.g., Pharisees; Scribes; Sadducees), or those in withdrawn communities (e.g., Essenes; Qumran), would have embraced the call to purity as found in the inserted pericope.

While we are left without a clear knowledge of who was responsible for these changes, we can with some certainty suggest the Hasmonean times prior to 50 BCE. We also suggest that it was a response to a crisis during that period, possibly the time of suppression under Antiochus IV, or the Roman invasion of 63 BCE. Whatever group, or groups, was responsible for the change in the text, these changes were accepted in early Jewish (and later, in Christian) circles for this text to become the dominant text. The
result is that there is now only one Greek and Old Latin witness to the OG, and possibly the *Urtext*. However, as we have shown above (cf. Revelation; Targum Numbers), both textual trajectories may well have been in circulation for a period of time.

We cautiously suggest that MasEzek’s presence at Masada⁴⁹⁵ may indicate that the Zealots were one group who supported this chapter reorder, as it reflected their aspirations to unite and rise militarily against the Romans. We also suggest that the surprising⁴⁹⁶ find of two *mikva’ot* at Masada, revealing their purity concerns as observant Jews, may also have supported the Zealots’ acceptance of the inserted pericope, especially 36:25-28. However, while this may identify one group who found the changes compatible with their aspirations and theology, it does not tell us who was responsible for making the textual changes, although it possibly flowed from comparable concerns.

Again, we cautiously suggest the acceptance of this chapter reorder along with the inserted pericope can be found with its early inclusion in the *haftarot* lectionary readings (cf. Thackeray 7.4.2.). Thackeray (1921, p.40) emphasises the importance of examining the liturgical use of a passage, saying that it is “a factor in exegesis which has been unduly neglected”. As above, we again suggest that this inserted pericope *may* have had a liturgical life as part of the early Special Sabbaths, before it was inserted into Ezekiel 36 to assist the flow of the revised chapter order. If so, this liturgical use and the resulting familiarity may have helped the pericope gain acceptance as an inserted text.

---

⁴⁹⁵ Tomasino (2003, p.317) claims that MasEzek was “deliberately buried by Masada’s defenders so it could be found by future generations”. He (2003, p.317) proposes various reasons, asking “was it a last act of defiance – a testimony that they were sure their nation would be restored? Or was it a proclamation of faith in the resurrection: that even though they would die, yet they would live again? Or perhaps the text had some significance to them that from our vantage point we can’t even begin to guess”? While these may be reasons for MasEzek’s burial, this does not give any reason for its presence at Masada. However, we may find agreement with Tomasino’s last point, that it had special significance for those at Masada.

⁴⁹⁶ The concept of this find being a ‘surprise’ comes from Yadin, who concluded that this discovery “illuminates, as do the inscriptions about tithes mentioned earlier, that the defenders of Masada were devout Jews, so that even here, on dry Masada, they had gone to the arduous lengths of building these ritual baths in scrupulous conformity with the injunctions of traditional Jewish laws” (Yadin, 1966, p.167)
Difficulty exists however, in determining when a text was set within a lectionary, especially that of the haftarot, due to the absence of any original liturgical MSS. We noted above that the exegetical expansions for this pericope in Targum Ezekiel may have been the result of later defence for its inclusion. These expansions link this pericope to the ‘Red Cow’ (and the Parah Special Sabbath reading), the reference to a holy, cleansed people, identifies the festival as the Passover, the cities as those in the land of Israel, and the people belonging to the House of Israel. Again it must be stated that this is conjecture. Yet of all the surrounding pericopes, this pericope has clear theological Targumic expansions.

7.5.5. Summary of Theological Significance, Timeframe and Motivation

Overall, we have found that $G^{967}$ has a strong theological cohesion. There is internal, as well as implicit external, evidence to propose that it may represent a legitimate theological trajectory of the original Hebrew Urtext. $G^{967}$’s order of events shows God leading the battle against Gog, but the dead on the ground may include Israel, which requires the physical resurrection of dry bones that follows the battle. However, this chapter order may also contain a metaphor for Israel’s return from exile to be united as one nation under a Davidic leader. $G^{967}$’s David is a peaceful shepherd who prepares for the sanctuary of the Lord and the building of the Temple.

We propose that the chapter reorder in the received text appears to have been motivated by a call to arms, and a desire that their texts would match their reality, requiring an oppressed people to unite and rise against their oppressors. The inserted pericope of 36:23c-38 is a call to purity, and included to support their chapter reorder.

The chapter reorder and inserted pericope were completed initially in the Hebrew text, utilising the Hebrew style of that day. At some later time the Greek text
was also edited to align it with the revised Hebrew text, with the newly inserted pericope written in the ‘proto-Theodotion’ style.

While we were able to identify that the initial change occurred at some point during the Hasmonean times, (ca. 165-50 BCE), and was possibly done to stir the people in the face of either Seleucid or Roman oppression, we were unable to establish which particular group was responsible. We experienced difficulty in establishing objective evidence in identifying a clear religio-political group that may have been responsible for the textual changes, due to the shortage of primary sources from the various communities prior to 50 BCE, and the current disputes over which group wrote them. To establish definitively a particular group from the Hasmonean times, responsible for adjusting the text of Ezekiel to match their theological or eschatological views, would be a full study on its own. Our purpose is to establish that we have two extant textual traditions for Ezekiel, a possible time frame and motivation, but not to define who adjusted the text.

We agree with Lust that this chapter reorder likely reflects the other eschatological plusses in Ezekiel. However, we conclude that the probable eschatological reason was to bring the text into contemporary relevance, not leaving these events in a more distant future as G967’s order may imply.

The early and wide acceptance of these changes, as evidenced by its inclusion in all extant Hebrew and Greek MSS, with the exception of G967 and codex W, compels us to accept the received order as a legitimate theological trajectory of early Jewish views.\(^497\) This means that at some point in time there existed two different Ezekielian texts in active circulation, the shorter OG represented by G967, and the longer represented by the received text of MT and other LXX MSS.\(^498\) We saw implicit

---

\(^497\) Actually the problem today is the acceptance of G967’s order as a legitimate theological trajectory.

\(^498\) It is difficult to know or establish, but this may have been what Josephus (\textit{Ant.} 10:5:1) referred to when mentioning two books for Ezekiel.
evidence of this in Revelation 19-21 and in the Targum traditions for Num. 11:26. As Tov (1999d, p.410) correctly states, “as we are confronted here with different stages in the literary development of the book (preserved in textual witnesses), no reading should be preferred textually to that of another, as is customary among most scholars”. Finally, we saw that there were two early Jewish communities who appear to have accepted these changes, the Masada community, and the inserted pericope’s use in the early special Sabbath lectionaries. We also speculated that this pericope may have had a liturgical life within these special Sabbaths, which may have led to its quick acceptance in Ezekiel 36.

7.6. Overall Summary: Chapter 7

While many scholars have viewed Papyrus 967 as a textual anomaly that has omitted a major pericope in Ezekiel 36, and changed the ‘correct’ chapter order, yet we have demonstrated that this is not the case. Rather than being a maverick manuscript, \( \text{G}^{967} \) is in fact a viable witness to the Old Greek, and the Hebrew Urtext. We have noted that \( \text{G}^{967} \)’s pericope minus and chapter order is also witnessed in the later Vetus Latina Codex Wirceburgensis; and importantly, variants between these two MSS indicate \( W \) represents an independent textual witness to the textual order and pericope minus in \( \text{G}^{967} \).

We initially verified this by examining various ‘scribal error’ proposals attempting to explain the minus of 36:23c-38 in \( \text{G}^{967} \). However, we found no satisfaction with these proposals, as they did not address the other key textual issue of the different chapter order in \( \text{G}^{967} \), where chapter 37 follows chapter 39.

It was established that both the ‘missing’ pericope and chapter order should be discussed together. Discussed in isolation, one may conclude some level of scribal error for each item, or even for both. Dealt together, these two textual issues will result in a
satisfactory answer for both, and will show deliberate scribal activity; initially in the Hebrew and then in later LXX recensions.

The examination of $\text{G}^{967}$’s unique chapter order established that this chapter order made solid, reasonable and acceptable theological sense. We demonstrated that chapter 38 (and 39) in $\text{G}^{967}$’s order was a plausible continuation from 36:23b. This was also true of chapter 37 following 39, wherein a resurrected, united and peaceful Davidic kingdom was in place to rebuild the Temple (40-48). We found, along with Lust, that there is no theological place for 36:23c-38 in $\text{G}^{967}$’s chapter order. The conclusion was that, rather than $\text{G}^{967}$ being minus this pericope and having a ‘confused’ chapter order, the received text reflects a changed chapter order from the Urtext, and this reorder required the insertion of 36:23c-38. It seems logical that both these textual changes would have been completed at the same time.

To support this finding, we examined the unique Hebrew and Greek linguistic styles in this pericope, concluding that it shows evidence of later linguistic styles than the surrounding texts. Further textual support was also found with variants at the various junction points of the chapter reorder (36:23b; 39:28, 29; 37:1), indicating a text in a state of flux.

An exploration was undertaken to determine potential pathways for this pericope’s inclusion into text. This began with Thackeray’s lectionary proposal, to which we added by hypothesizing that this pericope may have had a liturgical life prior to its inclusion into the text of Ezekiel. This liturgical life may have been associated with the haftarot of the four special Sabbaths, as it was, and remains, part of the Parah Sabbath haftarah reading. However, while providing a possible genesis for this pericope, this proposal did not give answer to the question of how the chapter reorder may have occurred, which led to the pericope’s inclusion into Ezekiel.
We therefore turned to Lust’s proposal that the chapter reorder and resulting insertion of this pericope came about due to shifting eschatological views in the early Jewish communities. While we agreed that Lust made many strong points, as he provided both pathway and reason for these textual changes, we did not concur with his Pharisee involvement. This led to an examination of Block’s seven objections to Lust’s 1981 proposal that $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ represented the Vorlage. We frequently sided with Lust, while still not agreeing with his Pharisee hypothesis.

Further implicit support for $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$’s chapter order was also found by the eschatological order of events in Revelation, Daniel and Targum Num. 11:26. While these three do not prove $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$’s priority, they are nevertheless proof that its chapter order represents a known and accepted eschatological trajectory.

All this evidence caused us to conclude that $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ is a credible witness to the OG and Hebrew Urtext, leaving the received text with a chapter reorder and inserted pericope.

An examination of the two chapter orders revealed two different eschatological viewpoints. In $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$, God alone brings about the victory against Gog as part of showing his holiness. The battle dead in this chapter order implicitly includes Israel, requiring a physical resurrection; $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$’s literal reading presents the dry bones as real death, rather than a metaphorical death. Israel is resurrected to be a united nation after God defeats her enemies, and securely exists under a peaceful-shepherd Davidic leader, who prepares a place for the Lord. The flow of this textual order then proceeds into the building of the Temple (40-48). Yet these events could be viewed as occurring in the eschatological future.

In contrast, the received chapter ‘reorder’ brings the text into their present, and reveals a call to arms; the resurrection of dry bones is now primarily a metaphor of the people uniting under a military Davidic leader, ready for a battle reminiscent of Israel’s
glory days of old. The inserted pericope is a call to purity. Both the call to arms and call to purity were designed to encourage an oppressed and discouraged people to rise against their current oppressors.

We established that this chapter reordering and pericope insertion was likely completed during the Hasmonean times, after the Old Greek was translated. $\S^{967}$ remains the only extant witness to the OG. But we were not able to establish an exact date, leaving us with a doorway from ca. 165 to 50 BCE for the initial change in the Hebrew text. This timeframe covered a number of tumultuous events in Israel’s history, as they faced the armies of both Antiochus IV and the Romans. This timeframe also left open the possibility of a plethora of religio-political parties in Israel who could have felt strongly enough about their reality to change the text. The shortage of primary sources, and difficulty in establishing clearly the identity of who wrote extant primary sources, prohibited us from identifying any particular group(s) responsible for changing the text of Ezekiel. We suggested this is a study on its own.

Overall, we have demonstrated that $\S^{967}$’s chapter order and minus of 36:23c-38 is the best witness to the OG and Hebrew Urtext. The received chapter order and the resulting insertion of this pericope was done in the Hasmonean times, first in the Hebrew and then later in a proto-Theodotion styled Greek. These changes were likely motivated by a shift in eschatological views, a call to arms, and a call to greater purity, as they sought to interpret and exegete the text to match the reality of their time. $\S^{967}$’s eschatology appears to be more distant than that of the received text. This then leaves us with two viable extant trajectories for Ezekiel, both of which were in circulation at that time. One was lost to us until the relatively recent discovery of $\S^{967}$. The apparent quick and wide acceptance of the received text in that day enables us to accept this as a viable witness of early Jewish exegesis and eschatology. However, based on this research, we must also accept $\S^{967}$’s text as a viable witness, even of the
Urtext. While it should not be used to replace the received text, the theology found in its textual structure should be held in equal regard as the received text.
8.0. Chapter 8: Overall Conclusion

The intent of this thesis was to examine how the restoration of Israel in Ezekiel 36-39 was seen by the earliest Jewish communities. We started with the Greek Septuagint on the premise that differences between it and the Hebrew text may reveal the earliest extant Jewish interpretation. It is a common understanding that a translation by nature is also an interpretation, due to word choices in the receptor language. We have demonstrated that this is the case for Ezekiel 36-39, by utilising our textual comparative methodology.

We examined the oldest extant manuscripts, both Hebrew and Greek, giving each MS equal status to the others. We compared each MS with the other MSS intralinguistically, and established variants within each language. We then compared these MSS trans-linguistically, noting variants between the Hebrew and Greek. Our comparative methodology was not only able to highlight all textual variants, but also enabled us to provide plausible interpretive explanations for variants in our chosen block of Ezekiel 36-39.

We found very few variants between the three oldest extant Masoretic texts (MT\textsuperscript{C,A,L}). While these are later Hebrew MSS (ranging from 896-1009 CE), we found few variants between them and the early Hebrew fragment from Masada (MasEzek; \textit{ca.} 50 BCE). This reveals that they are all from a similar textual family.

However, we did find a number of intra-linguistic variants amongst our three oldest extant LXX MSS (\$\textsuperscript{G967,B,A}\$). Likewise there are many trans-linguistic variants between these three Greek MSS and MT; these typically reveal implicit interpretive exegesis deliberately done by the translator. The variants between the different LXX MSS makes it difficult, if not impossible, to speak now of ‘the LXX Ezekiel’; instead we often need to note which LXX MS we are referring to when discussing variants in the text of Ezekiel. If all LXX MSS have the variant, then we may say ‘\textit{the LXX}’.
However, the agreement between MT MSS still permits us to refer to just ‘MT Ezekiel’ (or the Hebrew text of Ezekiel).

Our textual comparative methodology permitted these variants to remain as a trajectory witness to some early community. We did not seek to establish which variant was correct, which then left the other(s) in a sense being incorrect. We did conclude a number of times that one variant was likely original, but this was done only to determine which variants were ‘interpretive’. We have shown that in many cases these variants were produced by deliberate scribal exegetical and theological interaction, rather than some form of scribal error. Interpretation was also found in the various textual plusses; these were found in MT as well as in different LXX MSS. MasEzek’s witness of MT, especially with its plusses, supports our proposal that these variants are early Jewish and not done by later Christian hands.

We have shown that the LXX translator(s) understood the Hebrew texts before them, and interpreted whilst they translated, utilising different scribal practices. We briefly list here a few of the ways that LXX interacts with the text before them: 499 LXX performs trans-lingual wordplays (e.g. 36:2, 8, 12, 17, 30; 37:19, 23; 38:11, 14; 39:11, 28); interprets MT’s metaphors (36:13-16; 37:19; 38:4, 12); interprets MT’s action (36:3; 37:8; 39:4, 11, 23); clarifies MT (36:3, 8; 37:1; 39:11); adjusts for cultural sensitivities (36:17 ‘idols’ for MT’s ‘dung-heaps’); interprets countries as people groups, and according to contemporary names (38:5, 13); and LXX’s use of the passive implies a feeling of being victimised by events that happened to Israel, and that the ‘dishonour’ continued from current surrounding nations (36:1-15). We also found that both MT and LXX reveal a New Exodus motif (36:3, 8, 30; 37:19, 21, 25); a creation / recreation motif (36:11, 35, 37:5, 9-10); and that both have echoes of the Book of Numbers (36:3, 8, 13-15, 18, 25; 37:5, 15-19; 39:12). Whilst these are found in MT,

499 The details are in discussion of the relevant verses.
LXX frequently clarifies and expands on the points, making the link easier for its readers to follow. Overall, we found LXX exegeting and interpreting the Hebrew text for their community based on their socio-political-theological world view as those now living in the land. MT’s later plusses also expand the text with a purity and holiness motif.

We found that the Old Greek (ca. 230-135 BCE) is most likely represented in \( \text{G}^{967} \). This papyrus witnesses the majority of LXX exegetical variants with MT, which demonstrates that these variants are certainly early Jewish interpretations, and most likely done by the original Greek translator. That the later LXX MSS, such as \( \text{G}^{B,A} \) continued these variants, without correction during different recensions to the Hebrew text, indicate their acceptance of the original translator’s exegetical and/or theological interaction with the Hebrew text. These variants therefore have now become an accepted part of early Jewish interpretive tradition, and should be recognised as such today.

We found that \( \text{G}^{967} \) at times follows MT closer in syntax and/or thought closer than \( \text{G}^{B,A} \): 36:3 (insult of the people); 36:8 (hope to return); 37:17 (ways and sins); 37:1 (bones); 37:25 (David my servant [syntax]); 38:7 (reflects MT’s hostility); 38:11 (walls); 38:17 (Gog as vocative beginning v. 17); 38:17 (‘hand’ follows MT’s syntax); 39:7 (syntax); 39:8 (it is coming and will be done). \( \text{G}^{967} \) has two longer plusses in 38:20 and 39:4, which reveal a ‘holiness’ concern, firstly that the LORD will be known among the nations, and secondly, the protection of his name (cf. Unique Plusses Excursus, chapter 6). That the translator sought to follow the Hebrew syntax and thought actually emphasises his deliberate intent to interpret and exegete the text before him.

\( \text{G}^{B} \) witnesses the major variants found in the OG, and agrees with unique variants in either \( \text{G}^{967} \) or \( \text{G}^{A} \), yet it does not witnesses \( \text{G}^{A} \)’s plusses. However, it does witness the initial redaction of the chapter reorder and inserted pericope (see \( \text{G}^{967} \))
Therefore, $\mathcal{G}^B$ has very few unique plusses or variants, the exceptions being 38:11 (a land); 38:21 (minus ‘sword’); 39:27 (minus ‘many’). This shows that $\mathcal{G}^B$’s translator did not seek to theologically interpret the text before him (unlike the OG translator, or the later $\mathcal{G}^A$’s), but only transmit (or translate) the text before him.

There are a number of times where $\mathcal{G}^{967}$ and $\mathcal{G}^B$ uniquely agree together: 36:11 (birth people on you); 36:19 (way/sin [singular]); 37:13 (brought up my people from their graves); 37:16 (those added to him); 37:23 (just ‘idols’ [without MT / $\mathcal{G}^A$’s plus]); 38:13 (Carthaginian). There are other times when $\mathcal{G}^{967}$ and $\mathcal{G}^B$ agree with MT against $\mathcal{G}^A$: 36:9 (‘for you … you be sown’); 36:15 (people); 36:17 (set apart women [cultural sensitivity]); 36:20 (his land); 36:23 (my great name); 37:16 (sons of Israel); 37:28 (the nations will know). Yet there are times when $\mathcal{G}^B$ agrees with $\mathcal{G}^A$ against MT and $\mathcal{G}^{967}$: 36:8 (hope to return); 37:1 (human bones); 37:23 (I am the LORD); 38:7 (bring together [without explicit hostile intent]); 38:8 (he will come [plus]); 38:11 (in stillness/quietness [adds to those in rest]); 38:17 (Gog at the end of the introduction formula); 38:17 (‘hand’ smooths MT's syntax); 39:4 (given to be devoured); 39:8 (it is come and you will know it will be); 39:27 (from the countries of the nations). This indicates that $\mathcal{G}^B$ is a ‘middle-of-the-road’ manuscript, whereas $\mathcal{G}^{967}$ shows the initial OG interpretive variants, and $\mathcal{G}^A$ revealing later variants and MT plusses; this signifies a text in a state of flux. The variants in the later post-hexaplaric $\mathcal{G}^A$ are also likely early Jewish, as it was Origen’s goal to rescind the Greek text to the Hebrew before him. This can be seen where $\mathcal{G}^A$ witnesses many of MT’s later plusses (cf. Unique Plusses Excursus, chapter 6). Yet we also found that there are several MT plusses not represented in any LXX MSS, which indicates that recension activity still continued in the Hebrew text past the Vorlage for our representative LXX MSS. Interestingly, these unique MT

---

500 Talmon (1999, p.70, n.19) refers to this point, stating “where preserved, the Hexaplaric tradition is adjusted to MT”.

plusses are witnessed, where extant, by Aquila, Symmachus and/or Theodotion. This suggests that the Hebrew text was more in a state of flux than the Greek.\textsuperscript{501}

We listed and examined the many plusses (glosses) in both MT and LXX (cf. Unique Plusses Excursus in Chapter 6). These plusses reveal theological interpretive interaction with the text, MT’s unique plusses often revealing a priestly and/or holiness concern. We found that scholars often propose a particular word or phrase to be a plus or gloss, yet without textual evidence of this being minus in other MSS to support their claim. We propose that if all ancient manuscripts witness the word(s), then these scholars are without proof that it is a plus or gloss. Therefore, caution needs to be exercised making such claims, and should not be used to explain away words or phrases that may not flow with the modern mind.

We took the ancient sense divisions witnessed in our representative manuscripts into consideration as part of our comparative methodology, and found implicit exegetical interpretation in the way each MS divided its texts. This original paragraphing is often overlooked by the modern reader and commentator. Yet we have shown that these should be examined to give us insights as to how these early communities thematically and exegetically divided their texts. Again, a greater sense of unity was found in MT, and greater diversity in LXX.\textsuperscript{502}

Finally, we examined the uniqueness of $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$, covering its different chapter order than the received text (in $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$, chapter 37 follows chapter 39), and its pericope minus of 36:23c-38 (cf. Chapter 7: Papyrus 967). We found that both the chapter order and pericope ‘minus’ must be examined together; when studied separately, scholars often propose scribal error for each of these two textual variants. However, we concluded that rather than these textual variants occurring by scribal error, $\mathfrak{G}^{967}$ likely represents the

\textsuperscript{501} In our chapter 2 we referred to Müller’s (1996, p.102) point that the changes in the Greek text “only gradually came to a standstill once a particular Hebrew text became normative”.

\textsuperscript{502} These are too complex to go into here, but we refer the reader to the beginning of each pericope in our four chapters dealing with the text of Ezekiel 36-39.
Urtext, leaving the received text with a chapter reorder and inserted pericope. Our textual comparative methodology enabled us to outline the different theology found in \$G^{967}$'s chapter order, and that in the received text (along with its inserted pericope). We concluded that the change in chapter order was motivated by a theological call to arms, and the inserted pericope by a call to purity, and that this was inserted as support for the chapter reorder. These textual changes were undertaken most likely during the Hasmonean times (ca. 165-50 BCE), and in response to the surrounding Seleucids and/or Roman armies. They were also likely motivated by an attempt to bring the text into their historic present rather than some eschatological future. These changes were done first in the Hebrew text, and then incorporated into the Greek in a later recension to the Hebrew. However, we were not able to discern a responsible party owing to a lack of objective evidence. We also found that MT performed a few word changes after the chapter reorder and pericope insert, and perhaps in support of these changes: the declarative formula inserted into 36:23b; the change from \( \text{h} \) to \( \text{h} \), in 37:10; and \( \text{ayfin} \) to \( \text{ayfin} \), 37:22-24; and \( \text{hmx} \) to \( \text{xWr} \) in 39:29. In these occurrences, LXX can be viewed as original, and again the Hebrew text as being in a state of flux.

Overall, we conclude that both MT and LXX MSS represent theological and exegetical interpretive interaction with their texts, and that these variants are from early Jewish communities. These variants reveal a text in a state of flux, and often are the result of scribes seeking to meet the theological views of their various representative communities.

Following his examination of variants in 1QpHab, Brooke (1987, p.100) stated that,

it could be that in the light of the use of the biblical text in the commentaries at Qumran it is now time for a complete reconsideration to all the additions and omissions, as well as the alterations, in the various recensions so that the exegetical traditions as well as scribal errors can be properly described.
We suggest that Brooke’s point can also be applied when researching books in the Tanach, just as we have done here in Ezekiel. Hopefully our textual comparative methodology can be used alongside the time honoured textual critical methodology, be that for examining an individual verse or pericope, or even when writing commentaries.

We conclude this study with the realisation that there are many other areas yet to be considered. Our comparative methodology can be applied to other translations of Ezekiel, such as the Old Latin (especially Codex $W$ which also witnesses $\Theta^967$’s chapter order and pericope minus), and the Peshitta. Initial investigation has shown Targum frequently expands on MT, and even LXX. A comparison should be done with Targum Ezekiel, to determine if Müller (1996, p.43) is correct in regards to Ezekiel, when he says that, “the Targums are dependent on the Septuagint, not the reverse”. We identified that 37:23 is represented in the 4Q Florilegium, yet further research can be done in other Qumranic literature, especially Pseudo-Ezekiel (Dimant, 2000). Speaking of the War Scroll, LaSor (1987, p.129) says “A reference to Gog (1QM 11:16) suggest that the idea of this great battle was drawn from Ezek. 37-38”. Bauckham (1992) also finds reference to 4Q Second Ezekiel in the Apocalypse of Peter; this can be examined further. We agree with Wong (2002, p.141) who, in reference to grammatical features of 39:27, says “the reason for adopting different translations is not clear. More studies on the translation of grammatical features such as verbal forms are needed to arrive at any conclusion”. We also suggest that more studies can be done on punctuation variants found between the Hebrew and Greek texts, along with a more detailed examination of sense divisions. A specific study could be undertaken to determine what hands changed the chapter order and inserted 36:23c-38. Therefore, the investigation continues.
Appendix: Abbreviations

Full bibliographical details are given in the Bibliography.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>First, second, third person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aq.</td>
<td>Aquila.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANE</td>
<td>The Ancient Near East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aram.</td>
<td>Aramaic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDB</td>
<td><em>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEV</td>
<td>Contemporary English Version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan.</td>
<td>The Book of Daniel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>Dative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCH</td>
<td>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td>The Book of Deuteronomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS</td>
<td>Dead Sea Scrolls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV(V)</td>
<td>English Version(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td>The Book of Exodus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek.</td>
<td>The Book of Ezekiel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Feminine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰ</td>
<td>The Greek translation of the Old Testament; the Septuagint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἸΑ</td>
<td>Codex Alexandrinus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἸΒ</td>
<td>Codex Vaticanus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἱ_PARENTHESS</td>
<td>Papyrus 967.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>The Book of Genesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GKC</td>
<td><em>Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar</em> (Cowley, ed.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hitp.</td>
<td>Hitpael.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hif/hiph</td>
<td>Hiphil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hol.</td>
<td>Holladay's <em>Lexicon</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impf</td>
<td>Imperfect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>The Yahwist tradition of the Pentateuch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPS</td>
<td>Jewish Publication Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KJV</td>
<td>King James Version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEH</td>
<td>Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, <em>Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev.</td>
<td>The Book of Leviticus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Liddell, Scott and Jones, <em>A Greek English Lexicon</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Septuagint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXA</td>
<td>Codex Alexandrinus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXB</td>
<td>Codex Vaticanus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX967</td>
<td>Papyrus 967.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Masculine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MasEzek</td>
<td>Masada Ezekiel fragment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Masoretic Text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Masoretic Text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS(S)</td>
<td>Manuscript(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT⁸</td>
<td>The Aleppo Codex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT⁸</td>
<td>The Cairo Codex of the Prophets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT⁸</td>
<td>The Leningrad Codex.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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