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ABSTRACT

THE TEXTUAL RELATION OF THE PESHITTA OF EZEKIEL 1-12 TO \( \text{\textit{m}} \) AND TO THE ANCIENT VERSIONS (\( \text{\textit{C}}' \) and \( \text{\textit{G}} \))

by

Joaquim Azevedo

Adviser: Leona Glidden Running
Title: THE TEXTUAL RELATION OF THE PESHITTA OF EZEKIEL 1-12 TO \textit{\textit{IR}}
AND TO THE ANCIENT VERSIONS (\textit{\textit{Cj}} and \textit{\textit{G}})

Problem

The dilemma of the Syriac version is its mysterious provenance and the direct relationship it may have to the other versions (particularly \textit{\textit{G}} and \textit{\textit{Cj}}). Thus some scholars have automatically discarded or ignored the Peshitta version as a useful tool (as a textual witness) for the study of the Hebrew text. The knowledge of textual problems, in this case the relationship of \textit{\textit{S}} to the ancient versions, is of extreme importance in the analysis and study of the Hebrew Bible. The awareness of \textit{\textit{G}}, \textit{\textit{Cj}}, and \textit{\textit{IR}} employed in the textual composition of \textit{\textit{S}} will help in exegetical, semantic, and linguistic studies of the Old Testament.
Method

Critical editions of the OT with their apparatus constitute the basic database for this study. This work consists of a comparative, analytic, and evaluative study of the Peshitta version of Ezekiel in relationship to the ancient versions (6, and C) and to T. The study covers the first twelve chapters of Ezekiel, but only those readings in the S that indicate a probable relationship to an external source are taken into consideration.

Conclusion

S (Ezek 1-12) was based on a Hebrew text similar to that of T, and any relationship to another ancient version can be explained as a mere coincidence or by the use of a common translation technique. In this case S is useful as a tool in textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, for it is a valuable witness to a Hebrew consonantal text very similar to T.
“Humble yourselves, therefore, under God’s mighty hand, that he may lift you up in due time.”
(1 Peter 5:6, NIV)

לבני סל, אדוה וدنيי.
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INTRODUCTION

The name Peshitta, "the simple or plain" (the Jacobite pronunciation is Peshitto), is used for the translation of the Hebrew into Syriac, a dialect of Aramaic. This name is probably used to distinguish the Peshitta from the Syro-Hexapla (the translation of the Greek Hexapla into Syriac, prepared by Paul of Tella in the seventh century), or perhaps to indicate a common version. The Peshitta is the standard version of the Syriac Churches, namely, the Syrian Orthodox, Maronite, and the Church of the East.¹

The date of the Peshitta version is debatable. The entire work must have been completed around the third century A.D. It is believed that the Peshitta was not translated as a whole, but book by book.²

Extant manuscripts of the Peshitta are from the fifth to the twentieth centuries. The oldest are the Add. 14512 palimpsest of Isaiah (A.D. 459/460) and the Add. 14425 of the Pentateuch (A.D. 463/464).³

Statement of the Problem

The provenance and the Vorlage of the Peshitta version (S) are still in

¹Emanuel Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 151-152; S. P. Brock, "Versions, Ancient (Syriac)," ABD (1992), 6:794.

²Tov, 151.

³Ibid.
dispute. Some scholars argue that S has some distinctive exegetical features of the Jewish-Aramaic Targumim (C), especially in the Torah. Consequently S would be of Jewish origin. Examples of possible targumic influence are seen in the following passages: In Gen 2:8 ל and S read "from the east" (נ בֵּית, מָכָּב), while C° and S have "from the beginning." The phrase "from the beginning" is in accordance with Rabbinic tradition, in which the garden was created before the creation of the world. Targums C and C° have a similar exegetical feature. Another example is Gen 8:4, where ל and S read "mountains of Ararat" (רַוָּר אַרְארִי), whereas C° and S read "mountains of Kardu" (קְרַדְרִי). The Kardu mountains refer to the Korduene mountains in Armenia. "The updating of toponyms is a common feature of P." Others identify Christian or Jewish-Christian elements in the text. One of these is the laxness in translating some of the Levitical laws in Lev 11:13-19 and Deut 14:12-18.

---


4 Ibid.

5 Ibid., 155.

6 Those who support this view are considered wrong by J. A. Emerton, "Unclean Birds and the Origin of the Peshitta," JSS 7 (1962): 204. They are B. J. Roberts, The Old Testament Text and Versions (Cardif: N.p., 1951), 221, quoted in Emerton, 204; and Joshua Bloch, "The Authorship of the Peshitta," AJSL 35 (1918-1919): 218. Emerton...
Based on this premise, some believe that S originated with the early Christians in the second century A.D. at the time of the conversion to Christianity of King Abgar IX of Edessa.¹ Still others conclude that "no decisive arguments for either Christian or Jewish authorship have been advanced."²

Furthermore, some scholars suggest that G could have had some influence on S. An example of that is Gen 2:2 where א and ת read "by/on the seventh day," while א, ס, and the Samaritan Pentateuch avoided any ambiguity by reading "on the sixth day."³

Thus the questions to be answered are: Did the Peshitta version (Ezek 1-12) have much or any direct relationship to the Jewish-Aramaic targumim tradition (in this case ת; even though it comes from a later date its tradition may have had an earlier development) and/or to the Septuagint (G)? In what ways does this relationship show in the text? To which of the texts under study is S most related?

The large amount of data makes it impractical to study the whole S. Several other books of the Old Testament have been perused—the Pentateuch, Chronicles, Job, Psalms, believes that this theory of laxness was based on L. Hirzel, De Pentateuch Versionis Syriacae Quam Peschito Vocant Indole Commentatio Critico-Exegeticae (Leipzig: C. H. Reclam, 1825), 126. Emerton presents an elaborate and convincing argument against the theory of a Christian origin for the Peshitta Pentateuch.


³Cook, 159.
Proverbs, Isaiah, and Daniel.1 Little, however, has been done on the Peshitta book of Ezekiel.2 Therefore this study concentrates on an analysis of this major prophet.

**Delimitation**

This study is delimited to the first twelve chapters of the Peshitta version of Ezekiel, which contain several short thematic units and a little more than five sedarim (11:20). Although chaps. 1-11 comprise a literary unity, I have included chap. 12 for the sake of doing one fourth of the total number of chapters found in the book of Ezekiel (forty-eight chaps.) and to observe if the same literary features of chaps. 1-11 are present in the next section.

The first thematic unit is 1:1-3:15 where a description of the theophany is presented followed by the prophet’s commission. Then his call is confirmed by the image of the watchman (3:16-21). The prophet’s first work was to present several symbolic actions predicting the siege and consequent exile of Jerusalem (3:22-5:17). Two messages of judgment are then pronounced, the one that would fall upon the mountains and valleys of

---


Israel (6:1-14), and the one concerning the final doom of the nation (7:1-27). Chaps 8:1 -11:25 contain the reasons for the fall of the nation, their abominations practiced even in the temple, and the departure of God's glory from the temple. In two symbolic but dramatic actions, the people of the land are represented as being exiled (12:1-16) and the land being desolated (12:17-20). Then from 12:21 to vs. 28 the imminent fulfillment of the prophetic word is declared.¹

I have delimited the study to these thematic units due to the enormous size of this book, which comprises a total of 1,273 verses. The bulk of information derived from this section is sufficient for the goal of this investigation. The remainder of the book is reserved for further study. It is almost impossible and impractical to undertake, in a work of this type, an ampler project such as analyzing the OT in its completeness or even a single book of such size as Ezekiel. The aim of this project is to focus on the relationship of the Peshitta of Ezekiel 1-12 (S) to the Greek (H) and/or Aramaic (C) versions, and to מ, rather than on whether S had a Christian or Jewish provenance.

As in almost all textual criticism, the researcher is limited by the lack of a single original manuscript. The manuscripts available are copies of copies with their own peculiarities, but they are the only resource at hand. Consequently, this study is based on the following text-editions: the Peshitta, the Hebrew Bible, the Targum Jonathan, and the Septuagint.² The critical apparatus of each edition is taken into consideration.


²M. J. Mulder, Ezekiel, in The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version, part III, 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1985); Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, ed. K. Elliger and
I took the Masoretic text as it is in the manuscript B19A of the Leningrad codex as the text against which all of the versions were compared. Even though the B19A manuscript is from a later date in regard to the versions under study, I believe that for the purpose of this investigation the lit is adequate.

One may say that to compare the Targum Jonathan to the Syriac version may be invalid due to their differences in the date of composition or translation. This problem is solved when one takes into consideration what Würtzwein stated in regard to the Targum Onkelos and Jonathan: "these are official Targums whose definitive wording was evidently established in Babylon in the fifth century after a long history of development. They are based on older material that probably derives ultimately from Palestine." Therefore even if there was not an official Targum (of Jonathan) at the time of the Syriac composition, there was certainly a tradition of the former in use way before its official acceptance.

Another example of that is the Targum Neofiti I. Considerable attention has been given to the claim that Targum Neofiti I contains an early form of the Palestinian Targum, perhaps going back as early as the first century.  


Justification

This type of study is helpful in the quest for the Vorlage of S, whereby its importance in text-critical studies may be confirmed. Awareness of the relationship of S to the ancient versions, particularly the Greek and Aramaic versions, makes this version a valuable tool for textual studies of the OT.

The knowledge of textual problems, in this case the relationship of S to the ancient versions, is of extreme importance in the analysis and study of the Hebrew Bible. The awareness of \( \text{\textcopyright{}} \), \( \text{\textcopyright{}} \), and proto-\( \text{\textcopyright{}} \) employed in the textual composition of S will help in exegetical, semantic, and linguistic studies of the Old Testament.

Methodology

Critical editions of the OT with their apparatus constitute the basic database for this study. The work consists of a comparative, analytic, and evaluative study of the Peshitta version of Ezekiel in relationship to the ancient versions mentioned above. The study covers the first twelve chapters, but only those readings in the S which indicate a probable relationship to an external source are taken into consideration.

The whole process consists of two phases: first the organization and selection of the variant readings, and second the analysis and evaluation of the variant readings.

---

1 By variant readings of S I mean those variants which arise from the comparison of S with \( \text{\textcopyright{}} \).

2 The criterion for selection is: any Syriac reading that does not agree in any manner with the Masoretic reading is taken as the raw material for this study.
First Phase

1. The data are organized with the versions side by side, with their apparatus, marginal information, and any further detail which may be helpful for the understanding of the text.

2. Only those readings of S which are deviations from RR are seen as possibly related to external sources, those outside the RR and S corpus of MSS.

3. The critical text of S is then compared with the critical texts of the versions.

4. Then those readings of S that are deviations from RR, and had been already compared with the critical text of the editions, will be examined against the critical apparatus of each edition.

5. Each verse of S is compared, analyzed, and evaluated. This evaluation is based on the criteria already established by scholars and by the weight of the evidence which may support the variant reading thus established.¹

Second Phase

1. When the variants are established, they are perused and evaluated to see if they are related to S or C¹.

2. The selected verses are grouped, for a didactic purpose, in their respective chapters. Thus each chapter of this study corresponds to a chapter of Ezekiel's book.

3. The characteristic features of each chapter are gathered. They may indicate how much relationship a particular section had to an external source.

¹The modern criteria of textual criticism are presented in chapter 1.
4. As the results from each chapter are combined, the preponderant characteristic of the book may be seen, in this case its relationship to an external source.

5. A summary of the characteristic features and the criteria which resulted from this study are presented as a tool for further understanding of the book of Ezekiel.

6. Any English translation, if or when necessary, is made by the author; otherwise the source is indicated.

Review of Literature

Various books and articles have been published on the Peshitta Old Testament. I have chosen a selection of them that clarifies the subject under study, particularly the methodological approaches and the various views that characterize the study of the Syriac Old Testament.¹

As early as 1859 Joseph Perles noted agreement between S and CJ. For him this was an indication of a Jewish tradition.² Cornill was one of the first to work specifically on the Peshitta book of Ezekiel. He concluded that S is a mixed recension, therefore extreme caution should be taken when using it in textual criticism of the Old Testament.³


One should remember, however, that Cornill did not have a critical edition of the Peshitta version.

According to P. Wemberg-Møller, the idea that \( S \) displays a close relationship to targumic material, concerning the Pentateuch, was based on the work published by J. Perles.\(^1\) Other scholars, such as J. M. Schoenfelder, A. Baumstark, S. Wohl, and C. Peters,\(^2\) presented different types of literary relations between \( S \) and \( C \). A. Vööbus, based on the analysis of \( S \) and citations in the Fathers, suggested that \( S \) had \( C \) as its most probable origin.\(^3\) M. Goshen-Gottstein has accepted Vööbus's opinion.\(^4\) P. Kahle stated that \( S \) is not to be regarded as the work of Christian translators in Edessa. According to him it was originally a work produced by Jews, based on the Palestinian targum, for the converts to the Jewish religion in Adiabene during the reign of King Izates.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) P. Wemberg-Møller, "Prolegomena to a Re-Examination of the Palestinian Targum Fragments of the Book of Genesis Published by P. Kahle and Their Relationship to the Peschitta," *JS S* 7 (1962): 253-266.


\(^5\) P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959), 269-272; see also Wemberg-Møller, 255. A linguistic approach to support a Jewish-Palestinian origin for the

---
Wemberg-Møller presented the limitations of defining precisely the relationship between S and C. He briefly discussed the theory propounded by A. Baumstark and adopted by P. Kahle that S Pentateuch, "in the words of Baumstark, 'is the result of the oldest Palestinian Targum shaped into an East-Aramaic spoken form.'"  

An evaluation of the hypothesis of a Christian origin for S was made by J. A. Emerton. He discusses Hirzel's arguments that laxness in the translation of unclean birds, based on Lev 11, is a strong evidence for Christian origin. Emerton argues that Hirzel ignores the fact that different Semitic languages often have cognate nouns and that one can use loan-words from another; moreover the same argument would lead to the absurd conclusion that the Targum of Onkelos cannot be of Jewish origin, since it too uses the translation technique which Hirzel condemns.

M. D. Koster preferred to use the terms "midrashic" or "rabbinic" rather than "targumic" for the particularities of S. He analyzed Harold Gordon's method of dealing


"aus einem . . . in ostaramaischen Sprachform umgegossenen ältesten palästinischen Targum hervorgegangen ist." Wemberg-Møller, 253.

Emerton, 204-211.

L. Hirzel, De Pentateuci Versionis Syriacaes, quoted in Emerton, 205.

Emerton, 205.

with $S$ in the Book of Exodus and found it deficient. He reported that Gordon tried to bring order to the mass of variant readings by classifying them according to their types, distinguishing between major and minor variants. He did not classify according to their quality, but only their frequency.  

Some scholars have suggested that $S$ was influenced by $\mathfrak{G}$ at some point in the history of transmission. In 1900, W. E. Barnes studied the influence of the $\mathfrak{G}$ on $S$. After briefly analyzing the OT, he concluded that "the influence of the LXX is for the most part sporadic, affecting the translation of a word here and there." Eleven years later Johannes Hänel published a study of nonmasoretic agreements between $\mathfrak{G}$ and $S$ in Genesis. For Hänel any agreements between $\mathfrak{G}$ and $S$ "would have to be considered late revisions and no conclusion could be drawn from them concerning P's Hebrew Vorlage."  

For Joshua Bloch, the methodology to determine the influence suffered by $S$ from any other source should be to collate all the variant readings of $S$ and then decide upon the original form of the Syriac. After so doing one should list all the cases of agreement between $\mathfrak{G}$ and $S$ against $\mathfrak{M}$, and also those between $S$ and various groups of Greek MSS.

---


2Koster, 106.


5Isenberg, 74.
then proceed to consider the origin of these agreements.1 Bloch quoted Marx L. Margolis, saying, "no single method will do justice to the problem."2

Four dissertations have been written on S’s relationship to 6 and/or Σ. In 1973 Abraham George Kallarakkal compared the Peshitta of Daniel with Σ, 6, and Theodotion.3 Kallarakkal argued for Jewish authorship for 6 and affirmed that it influenced the Greek Ur-Theodotion. However, he based his study on a Peshitta edition that is now outdated.4 In his 1988 doctoral dissertation, J. A. Lund studied the influence of 6 on 5 in Genesis and the Psalms. Lund based his conclusions on 118 variant readings of 5 which deviate from Σ. He evaluates several criteria for judging the variant readings.

The following are some of his arguments:

> When translation technique adequately accounts for the difference between MT and 5, the extra-massoretic agreement between 6 and G must be considered coincidental.5

> What appear to be shared variants between 6 [the P] and G [the LXX] must be considered to be so if the science of textual criticism is to have any meaning. When the 6 and G share the same plus, minus, transposition, or difference in words, one must assume that is what they both read, and not that 6 depended on G, while having Η [Hebrew text] = MT before it.6

---


2Ibid.


5Lund, 117.

6Ibid., 46. See also P. B. Dirksen, "Peshitta Institute Communication XXII: The
Lund concludes that the most important criterion for measuring the direct $G$ influence on $S$ is Grecism, Greek idioms found in the Syriac version. For Lund this is the only valid criterion.¹

In 1994 a book on the Peshitta of Daniel was published by Brill. This book originated as a 1990 dissertation by Richard A. Taylor at the Catholic University of America. His methodology is a verse-by-verse collation of variant readings. First he recognized all the meaningful deviations of $S$ from the Hebrew and Aramaic $\Pi$. Then he collated all the variations in OG and Theodotion, against $\Pi$, to find out what patterns emerged. Taylor explained the variations of $S$ concluding that the Peshitta of Daniel has been based on a text very similar to $\Pi$, and the deuterocanonical portions of the Book of Daniel seems to be related to the Greek text of Theodotion-Daniel.² I have partially followed, though in a modified form, Taylor’s methodology.

In 1991 Heidi M. Szpek defended a dissertation at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. It was published in 1992 in the SBL Dissertation Series. Szpek proposed a new model of translation technique involving four basic components, which are the elements of translation, adjustment, motivation, and effect on meaning. Each component was subdivided into different categories. The book of Job was chosen to test the proposed model of translation technique. Szpek concluded that the Peshitta of Job was based on a Hebrew unvocalized text with sporadic reference to $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{G}$, and that the Syriac of the

¹Lund, 418.

²R. A. Taylor, 309.
Peshitta to Job had some W. Aramaic influence. Although this is an excellent work on translation techniques, Szpek does not present any clear criterion for evaluating variant readings found in S.

J. Cook compared S with © and C (regarding the Pentateuch) to answer the question concerning whether S was a Jewish Targum or a translation proper. On the basis of its text history and its composition, he concluded that "the translator of P (Genesis and Exodus) used a Hebrew which did not differ extensively from MT, in order to create a Syriac translation of the Bible."  

In 1985 Leona G. Running presented a study on the relationship of S to MT, C, and © in Jer 18. Running concluded that S "seems to be translated quite closely from the MT," with a few differences. For Running, "the Syriac translator worked directly from the Hebrew text, in the first half paying attention also to the Targum, and only occasionally casting his eye on the LXX!"

Papers read at the Peshitta symposium held at Leiden 30-31 August 1985 were published in 1988 by the Peshitta Institute of Leiden. Mulder's paper was one of the many contributions to this symposium. He wrote a short article on the importance of S for the

---


2Cook, 168.


4Ibid.
OT study of the book of Ezekiel.\textsuperscript{1} Mulder compared \textit{S} to \textit{M}, and concluded that \textit{S} is a literal translation of \textit{M}, and in those cases where \textit{S} did not translate literally the Hebrew \textit{Vorlage} is clearly evident. Therefore, according to Mulder, the value of \textit{S} for exegetical studies of the book of Ezekiel exceeds that of the other versions except for \textit{G}. Although Mulder made a great advance toward the study of the Peshitta version of Ezekiel, his article does not lessen the value of the present study which may confirm his findings in a more precise manner.\textsuperscript{2}

The works reviewed above contributed to the science of textual criticism by developing some new criteria for the evaluation and classification of the variants in a determined text. Their methodological approaches play a key role in this study.

\textsuperscript{1}Mulder, "Some Remarks on the Peshitta," 168-182.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., 180.
CHAPTER I

GENERAL GUIDELINES

The first twelve chapters of the Peshitta version of Ezekiel were arranged in such a way that each of them corresponds to a single chapter of this investigation. These chapters embody the basic material for this study, and they represent the result of the first phase explained in the general introduction. The presentation of all the basic data of the first phase is not crucial due to its enormous amount of material and its mechanical aspect of selecting and evaluating. On the contrary, in these chapters the selected data, screened through the first phase, are evaluated aiming at the final goal of this investigation, which is the finding of any probable direct relationship of S to C' and/or G.

The data in these chapters are arranged as follows: First of all, the reading of the Masoretic Text (M) is introduced followed by the readings of the respective versions, namely the Peshitta (S), the Targum Jonathan (C'), and the Septuagint (G). Second, an English translation of S is supplied by the author. Only those verses which cast light on this investigation are presented (see methodology in the Introduction). Third, the analysis of variant readings is discussed with the aim of clarifying the interrelation of the versions. Finally, the main characteristics of each chapter of the Peshitta of Ezekiel are summarized in a nutshell at the end of each respective chapter of this study.
Criteria for Evaluating the Relationship Among the Versions

Before any further consideration, the main criteria already in use in textual criticism for the study of S should be presented to the reader. They will guide the reader through the complicated process of evaluation and discussion of the data.1 Criteria already evaluated and accepted by the science of textual criticism are taken into consideration and those generated from this study will be listed as well. It is important to remember, however, that the aim of this investigation is not to find the Vorlage of S, but to find any probable direct relationship of S to 6 and C.

One of the many problems faced in modern textual criticism is that almost all rules concerning evaluation of variant readings were formulated having in mind the search for the original text of M. Consequently, an obvious limitation exists concerning the study of S that needs to be overcome. With awareness of this limitation, rules derived specifically from the study of S are taken into careful consideration. The first seven criteria listed below were taken from Lund’s investigation, then a criterion from Taylor’s work is presented. The last seven were generated from the present study, based on the data of the Peshitta book of Ezek 1-12.

"It is our understanding that common sense should be the main guide of the textual critic when attempting to locate the most contextually appropriate reading. At the same time, abstract rules are often also helpful." Tov, Textual Criticism, 296.
Lund’s Criteria

The following criteria were evaluated by Lund in his studies on the Peshitta version of Genesis and Psalms.1 Lund classified these criteria into two types according to their usefulness for evaluating variant readings in S regarding their direct relationship to G. The result of his investigation showed that there is only one valid criterion that can certainly indicate any direct relation between G and S.

A. Invalid Criteria

1. Shared Exegesis. A common tradition shared by the versions is something that one cannot ignore. This is particularly evident when the extra-Masoretic agreement between S and G agrees with C. In addition, exclusive agreements cannot provide a secure proof of a direct influence among the versions, since common tradition may explain them also. Furthermore, the cases of nonagreement show that the argument in favor of the Syriac version as a daughter of G is false.

2. Greek Word in S, Even Where S Had a Good Syriac Equivalent Available. The general influence of the Greek language upon the Syriac language can be the explanation for the Greek words found in S. Even in cases where S had a good Syriac equivalent available, there is no reason to assume a direct influence of G. In the rendering of Hebrew hapax legomena, common tradition may explain the extra-Masoretic agreement (only two possible instances found in Ezek 1:13, 22).

Lund, 416-418.

---

1 Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
3. **Translation Technique.** Differences between S and IR which can be classified as a translation technique cannot provide evidence of a direct dependence on ©. “The decision of the translator, either from his own free choice or from the requirements of the Syriac language, can adequately account for differences such as these.”

4. **Doublets in S, Where Half of the Doublet Agrees with © Contra MT.** Doublets found in the text of S, where half agrees with © against IR, do not provide evidence of later interpolations from ©. Basically, there is no manuscript evidence for such interpolations. “Furthermore, since the doublets in S Psalms preserve viable alternatives, there is no reason to assume that they were secondary. The original translator(s) could have preserved the alternatives which stood before him/them by a doublet rendering.”

5. **Shared Variants/Non-Variants.** Differences between S and IR, such as the difference between singular and plural, the plus or minus of a conjunctive waw, the plus or minus of a pronoun, the difference between active and passive or causative and non-causative of the verb, or difference of a preposition, the plus or minus of a particle, or the plus of the word הַכּ, are too irrelevant to advance as evidence of a direct dependence. Both text and translation technique adequately explain such differences.

6. **Shared Variants.** Differences in reading between S and IR, which can be reduced to Hebrew variants (e.g., pluses, minuses, transpositions, or differences of words), can provide no evidence of the direct influence of ©. “To suggest direct influence

---

Ibid., 417.

Ibid.
on the basis of a shared variant is begging the question and has no place in scientific
discussion.”

B. A Valid Criterion

1. Grecism. Grecism must be strictly defined as a Greek idiom in S. Therefore,
direct influence is possible where S has a good Syriac idiom, which it does not use. As a
norm, “when S uses a good Syriac expression, there is no reason to assume that it is a
Greek calque.” Moreover, where the Greek idiom violates the Syriac language, the
influence of S can be regarded a feasible possibility. The dilemma is that no examples of
such violation or contradiction can be found so far in S. (Although S avoids Hebraisms,
they are not completely absent from the Syriac version, e.g., Ezek 3:18.)

Taylor’s Criterion

This criterion was derived from Taylor’s study of the Peshitta book of Daniel.

1. Pleonasm in the Syriac Version. The Syriac version has a preference for a
pleonastic style. Therefore, when the pattern of translation is a literal one, pluses or
minuses are more likely due to textual variations; on the other hand, when the pattern of
translation leans toward a freedom of style, the translator deserves to be blamed for

Ibid., 418.

Ibid.
additions or omissions (this criterion can evaluate the many cases of avoidance of redundancies, and ambiguities).

Criteria Derived from the Present Study

The following criteria were derived inductively from the present study, based on the data of the Peshitta book of Ezek 1-12.

1. **Rare Words.** The translation of *hapax legomena* (HL) may help in the differentiation of a determined version. Usually these types of words were difficult to translate, and most of the time a new meaning is given to the HL different from that of all the other versions. Then it proves that this version had a *Vorlage* similar to IR. Otherwise it would reflect its relationship to any other version that the scribes used as a guideline (e.g., Ezek 1:4; 4:12; 4:16; 5:7; 7:22, etc.).

2. **Homonyms and Cognate Words.** These linguistic elements can assist us in the process of recognizing relationships among the versions. The use of homonyms may indicate if a version, in this case $S$, is or is not related to a determined version, in this case $\Theta$. For example, ambiguous words in the Hebrew text that had a homonym in Syriac language that did not match the context of the passage were kept in the Syriac translation. Furthermore, homonyms and cognate words indicate a direct translation from a cognate language to the Syriac, otherwise they would have been lost in the process of

Although he does not call it a criterion, but a factor that helps to clarify the differences between $S$ and IR regarding the addition or omission of *waw* conjunctive, it can be applied in a broader sense, e.g., avoidance of ambiguity and redundancies. Taylor, 317.
Exceptions to this would be in cases of Hebraisms found in $\text{G}$ (e.g., Ezek 2:6, etc.).

3. **Idiomatic Expressions.** All languages have their peculiar idiomatic expressions that sometimes cannot be translated into another language without being changed or even completely lost in the process. In this case if $S$ was based on $\text{G}$, then a Syriac idiomatic expression cognate to the Hebrew language would most certainly be lost most of the time in the process of translating it from the Greek language. The chance to match both the Syriac and Hebrew cognate expressions would be, in the Greek, instances where Hebraisms were kept. Even so, coincidence would have a part to play (e.g., Ezek 2:3; 3:18, 14; 4:16; 5:16; 7:15, etc.).

4. **Epexegetical Additions.** Eliminating all the epexegetical additions, in this case found in $\text{C'}$ or $\text{G}$, of a version with the aim of translating the supposed original text would require a guideline. In another words, if $S$ was based on either $\text{C'}$ or $\text{G}$, it should have had a manuscript of $\text{M}$ recension to be able to achieve the degree of closeness which we find in the Peshitta version to $\text{M}$ (e.g., Ezek 5:1; 2:2; 2:3; 3:4, etc.).

5. **$S$ Agreement with $\text{M}$ While $\text{C'}$ or $\text{G}$ Is in Disagreement.** This is a clear Regarding the Septuagint, Spottorno stated that “semantic fields frequently overlap, it is difficult to find an absolute consistency in translating one Hebrew term by only one Greek word; in this matter the book of Ezekiel shows a certain tendency of variety in relation to the rest of the books of the Bible: we find 245 new equivalences, that is cases in which a different Hebrew word is added to the number of those that are translated by one Greek word.” Victoria Spottorno, “Some Lexical Aspects in the Greek Text of Ezekiel,” in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, vol. 74, ed. J. A. Lust (Leuven: University Press, 1986), 80.
evidence of nondependence of \( S \) on any other version. This is one of the most common types of reading found in Ezek 1-12. Examples of this are the many additions of \( C \) or \( \mathcal{G} \) that are not present in \( S \) (e.g., Ezek 2:3; 4:9, 14; 5:4, 14, 15; 6:10; 7:5, 7:13, etc.).

6. **Unique Readings in \( S \)**. Unique readings are variant readings peculiar to a single version, in this case the Peshitta version. Although it may be an addition, omission, or substitution to the text (the remaining portion of the verse is similar to \( \text{IR} \)), it is still very valuable; it supports \( S \) as a direct translation from a Hebrew text close to \( \text{IR} \). Sometimes the unique reading is due to the misunderstanding of a Hebrew word or phrase, indicating that \( S \) did not refer to another version for assistance (e.g., Ezek 1:22, 27; 3:4, 10, 11; 5:17; 6: 5, 13; 7:3, 6/7, 8, 9, 12, etc.).

7. **Nomina Sacra**. A survey of the instances of *nomina sacra* throughout the first twelve chapters of Ezekiel shows that the Peshitta corpus of MSS is consistent in its translation. Even though some MSS of \( \mathcal{G}^A \) almost always contain the reading of \( \text{IR} \) regarding the *nomina sacra*, it would be almost impossible for a Syriac scribe to have copied it from one of them, for if we accept that, the Syriac scribe should have had a critical edition of the Septuagint at hand to see when a MS would have that reading and when it would not (e.g., Ezek 3:11, 27; 5:7, 8; 6:11; 7:2, etc.).

**The Text of Ezekiel**

It is necessary now to introduce some information on the source-texts on which this work was based. This section is very important for the understanding and evaluation of the variant readings of each verse in each edition. First the Masoretic text is introduced. Then
the Peshitta text is presented with its manuscripts and symbols. Third, some information on the apparatus of the Göttingen edition of the Septuagint of Ezekiel is briefly presented to the reader, and then a word is briefly given on the Targumic text as it is in the Sperber edition with its apparatus and symbols.

The Masoretic Text

The Masoretic text was taken as the basic text against which all the versions were collated to find their deviations from and agreements with it. The Leningrad Codex B 19A was employed as it is presented in the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, 1967/77. Its apparatus and masor.as were taken into consideration when necessary. I took the Leningrad Codex B 19A as the basic text, not because it is the best text, or that it always contains the best reading, but because I needed a standard criterion against which the deviations could be found.

The Syriac Text

For the Syriac text of Ezekiel, I have relied upon the edition prepared by the Peshitta Institute (the Ezekiel material was collated by M. J. Mulder). This edition usually prints for its basic text the reading of MS 7a1, that is, the B. 21 Inferiore of the Ambrosian Library in Milan from the sixth or seventh centuries A.D. whenever it is supported by two or more of the oldest manuscripts.

Regarding symbols and abbreviations, I have used the same ones used in each

respective textual edition. Therefore some explanation is appropriate on that matter. Each edition has its set of abbreviations, symbols, and signs employed to convey all the information the editors had in mind. I did not mix one set of signs from one edition with those of another, so when reading the variants of the Syriac I have used only its respective symbols, and when listing variations in the Septuagint I have used its set of symbols and abbreviations. Some symbols are used by all the versions; in this case the general list provided before the Introduction will suffice. Therefore it is very important for the reader to be acquainted with each set of symbols to avoid misunderstandings.

For instance, if one or more younger manuscripts possess a similar variant reading as recorded in the apparatus of S, an arrow, →, is added to the recorded MSS. On the other hand, if the younger MS belongs to a family, no arrow but the symbol fam is used instead.

The sigla adopted for the MSS consist of three elements. The first is a number indicating the century of the MS. The second element of the sigla is a letter indicating the contents of the relevant MS. The letter “a” indicates a MS which contains a complete or almost complete Bible, the letter “d” the prophetic books, the letter “h” a MS containing one book only, the letter “k” indicates that the MS is a fragment of one book only, the letter “l” a lectionary, the letter “p” a palimpsest. The third element of the sigla is a sequence number, e.g., 7a1.

**Syriac Manuscripts**

It is difficult to group the MSS containing the text of Ezek 1-12 into families with
the same characteristic features regarding their variant readings. The only exception is 9a1
fam. I list here only those MSS that were collated for the first twelve chapters of Ezekiel.

For this list of MSS I have relied upon the Introduction to part III, fasc. 3, Ezekiel, in The
Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version, prepared by M. J. Mulder.¹

6h15. London, British Library, Add. MS 17.107, fols. 2b-68a. It was written in
the Estrangela script. This MS was probably written in Edessa in A.D. 541 (852 of the
Greeks).²

7a1. Milan, Ambrosian Library, MS B. 21 Inferiore, fols. 179b-194b. Estrangela.
This is a manuscript from the sixth or seventh century used as the basic text for the Peshitta
edition of Ezekiel.

7h2. London, British Library, Add. MS 12.136, fols. 1b-100b. Estrangela. This
MS has only the text of Ezekiel.

8a1. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Syr. MS 341, fols. 162a-173b. Written in the
Estrangela script. Because it has fewer mistakes and unique readings it should be preferred
to 7a1 or 6h15.

written in the Estrangela.

9a1 fam (=9a1, 17a6-9). The sigla 9a1 may stand either for 9a1 plus 17a8*, or

See bibliography for full bibliographic entry.

W. Wright, Catalogue of Syriac Manuscript in the British Museum, vol. 1
9a1 plus 17a8 supported by one or more of the MSS 17a6. 7. 9. 9a1 is housed in Florence, the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Or. MS 58, fols. 130b-139b. Written in the Serta script. 17a6, Paris, Bibl. Nati., Syr. MS 8, fols. 51a-70b. 17a7, from Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, MS 194, fols. 332a-352b. 17a8 from Rome, Vatican Library, Vat. Sir. MS 7, fols. 390a-411b. 17a9 from Rome, Vatican Library, Vat. Sir. MS 8, fols. 291b-309a.

9d1. Berlin, German State Library, Sachau MS 201, fols. 101a-137a. Written in the Estrangela script.


11d2. Baghdad, Private property, MS s.n., fols. 3a-4b. 88b-135a. Written in the Nestorian script.

12d1. Cambridge, University Library, MS L 1.2.4., fols. 108a-145a. Written in the Serta script on paper near Edessa in A.D. 1174.


12a1. Cambridge, University Library, MS Oo. 1.1, 2, fols. 163b-174a. Written in the Estrangela script.

911. London, British Library, Add. MS 14.485. It is a lectionary containing (as concerned with this study) chap. 6:1-7.


913. London, British Library, Add. MS 14.487. A lectionary containing chaps. 4:9-12; 9:3-10; 10:18-22, and other portions that are not relevant for this study.

916. Cologne, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, MS s.n. A lectionary containing chaps. 2:8-3:21; 11:17-25, and several other lections not applicable to this study.

1012. London, British Library, Add. MS 17.218. A badly damaged lectionary containing a few incomplete passages like 1:1-3 and others.

1111. London, British Library, Add. MS 12.139. A lectionary containing chaps. 3:10-4:3; 5:5-15; 6:1-9; 8:14-10:22, and several others which are not applicable.


The Greek Text

For the Greek text of Ezekiel I have relied upon the edition prepared by Joseph
Ziegler. The base text of this edition is the Codex Vaticanus, or MS B, and the papyrus 967. The reading of these witnesses is most of the time considered the original reading by the editors of these editions. Sometimes their reading is supported by a manuscript, a version, or a quotation by a church father. I have not considered any reading from the versions and quotations from the church fathers listed in the apparatus of the Göttingen edition. I have relied only upon the MSS which were collated and contain the section of Ezekiel (chaps. 1-12) under study.

There are several terms and abbreviations that deserve some further explanation in order that the reader may understand the way I have organized the analysis of the variants for each verse of the Greek text. For instance, the abbreviation rel. (reliqui) appears usually at the end of the variant reading(s) of a lemma, indicating that all the remaining MSS, which are listed in the manuscript line of the respective page of the edition and which do not support the original reading, read similarly to the variant reading that precedes rel.

The Göttingen edition has two apparatuses. The first apparatus lists the variant readings of the MSS, versions, and quotations by church fathers. The second apparatus lists the witnesses containing the Hexaplaric reading, and when they are not mentioned in the analysis of the variants it is because they read as it is in the Masoretic text (Leningrado Codex B19). In this work I have employed the symbol \( \mathbb{S} \) as representing the Septuagint as a version without taking into consideration a particular witness of its text; except for the symbol \( \mathbb{S}^* \), which indicates the original reading according to the Göttingen edition (usually Göttingen Edition; see bibliography for a complete bibliographic entry.
MSS B and 967), the symbol $\Theta_T$ represents the original text according to the Göttingen edition and the MSS of the first apparatus of the same edition, and the symbol $\Theta^A$ indicates a reading supported by the witness listed in the first apparatus only. Hexaplaric readings are mentioned according to their respective witnessses, e.g., $\alpha', \sigma', \theta'$ Cod. 86, etc.

**Greek Manuscripts**

For a more precise evaluation of variant readings the reader should be acquainted with the witnesses of a determined text. In this manner a more accurate decision can be taken in favor of or against a variant reading. I have taken into consideration all the MSS of the Septuagint, for one cannot know which stage of transmission affected the corpus of MSS of the Syriac version.

**Uncial manuscripts**

**A.** London, British Museum, Royal 1 D. VI, from the fifth century called Codex Alexandrinus.

**B.** Rome, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 1209, from the fourth century, called Codex Vaticanus.

**Q.** Rome, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 2125, sixth century, called Codex Marchalianus.

**V.** Venedig, Bibl. Marc., gr. 1, from the eighth century called Codex Venetus.

Minuscule manuscripts (and papyrus fragments)

First their numbers are mentioned followed by their location and the assumed date of their composition.

not related to this study.


239. Bologna, University Library, 2603, written in 1046.


393. Grottaferrata, A XV, VIII century; it is a palimpsest which has the following passages available today: 6:3 ἐρετις-13 συσκίου; 10:17-11:25 ἐλαλήσα προς, and several other portions not applicable to this study.

403. Jerusalem, Patriarchate Library, Σαξα 283, written in 1542.


410. Jerusalem, Patriarchate Library, Ταφού 36, XIII century; it is a palimpsest.


613. Patmos, Ἡλιανοῦ τοῦ Ἑλεολογοῦ, 209, XIII century.

710. Sinai, Cod. gr. 5, X century.


770. Athos, Λαύρα 234, XII century.


**Manuscript Groups**

The grouping of the MSS is very important for the understanding of the symbols employed in this study and for the evaluation of the weight a group of MSS has in favor of or against a variant reading. This is not an exhaustive explanation; for further information on the Greek text see the general introduction to Ziegler's edition. I did not take into consideration any version or church father quotation for this study, therefore they are not mentioned among the manuscript groups; they were purposely omitted.

**B text type** is represented by Codex B and papyrus 967. These are used most of the time as having the preferred reading according to the Göttingen edition.
The Alexandrine text type is represented by the following MSS: A-26-544 (A") + 106-410 (106"'), 198 239-306 (239"'), 403-613 (403'').

The Hexaplaric recension is represented by O' = Q-88 (O) + 62-147-407 (o), 922. An asterisk (*) marks a reading which is in the original but lacking in the respective MS, and an obelus indicates a reading which is lacking in the original text but is present in the respective MS and this reading should be deleted. Here we may also include the readings of α', ω', and θ' that are sometimes mentioned in early MSS as οὶ γ' = οἱ τρεῖς (ἐρμηνευταί) or οὶ λ' = οἱ λοιποί (ἐρμηνευταί). For their readings I have relied on the work prepared by Fredericus Field¹ and on the second apparatus of the Göttingen edition of the Septuagint of Ezekiel.

The Lucianic recension is represented by L' = 22-36-48-51-96-231-763- (L) + 311-538 (II) + V-46-449 (III); Zv; 456; 613; Qc; Qmg.

The Catena group refers to a compilation where exegetical commentaries from different authors are placed in a sequence to provide a commentary on a specific biblical book, and the biblical text itself is usually placed in the center of the page with the commentary around it. The following MSS represent this group: C' = 87-91-490 (C) + 49-90-764 (ci) + 130-233-534 (ciII); 198; 86-710 (86''); 239-306 (239''); 380; 403-613 (403''); 611.

The Targumic Text

The basic text of the Sperber edition of the Targum is MS Or. 2211 of the British Museum. Sperber deviated from it only in those places of "obvious scribal errors in the spelling or in the vocalization of a given word." I did not consider the third apparatus of this edition, which lists the reading from quotations in authors from the Middle Ages, e.g., Rashi, Aruk of R. Nathan, Kimhi, and many others. I have relied only on the actual MSS variant readings.

Targumic Manuscripts

1. Biblical Manuscripts with Babylonian Vocalization.
   
   v. MS Or. 2211 of the British Museum.
   
   z. MS Or. 1474 of the British Museum.
   
   l. MS Or. 1473 of the British Museum.

2. Haphtaroth.

   5. MS Or 1470 of the British Museum.

3. Biblical Manuscripts with Tiberian or no vocalization.

   
   f. Codex Reuchlinianus of the Badische Landesbibliothek, Karlsruhe, Germany.

4. Printed Editions.

b. The first Rabbinic Bible, Bomberg, Venice 1515/17.

g. The second Rabbinic Bible, Bomberg, Venice 1524/5.

0. The Antwerp Polyglot Bible, 1569/73.

Conclusion

For a better understanding of the Source Text of each edition and the organization of the present work, the reader should refer back to this chapter and to the general introduction. For further details on the Source Text the reader is advised to refer directly to the introduction of the respective edition where more information can be found.
CHAPTER II

EZEKIEL 1

Before starting the analysis itself of the text, a few words on the critical edition of Ezekiel are appropriate. The corrections suggested by Mulder to part III, fasc. 3, of Ezekiel in the Old Testament in Syriac (Leiden 1985) were taken into consideration. For methodology and organization of the data please refer back to the Introduction and chapter one of this study.

---

1 Mulder, "Some Remarks on the Peshitta," 181:
- p. XI 1.11 from bottom: insert after v. 10: o.-in^-T for a -t= x A _ i in vii 20.
- p. XII bottom line: xiv 17
  read: xiv 17 (also found in 12a1).
- p. XXVI 1.8 from bottom: דקיק
  read: 20 דקיק.
- p. XXVIII 1.18/19 from top: דקיק
  read: דקיק.
- p. XXX (913) insert as error: xxxvii 14 רכז for דקיק.
- p. XXXI 1.7 from top: מַלְכְּת
  read: מַלְכְּת
- p. XXXI 1.15 from top: preceding xii 28
  read: preceding xxii 28
- p. XXXIV 1.17 from top, col. 1/2: xxxvi 1 מַלְכְּת
  read: xxxvi 1 מַלְכְּת
- p. XXXIV 1.18 from top, col. 1/2: xxxvii 1 מַלְכְּת
  read: xxxvii 1 מַלְכְּת
- p. 7 [Ez IV 7]: read: מַלְכְּת
- p. 10 [20 appar. ad 3 מַלְכְּת]: add מַלְכְּת מַלְכְּת
  read: add מַלְכְּת מַלְכְּת

The remaining corrections do not pertain to the section of Ezekiel under study. Therefore I do not mention them in this note. For reference to them see Mulder's article.
Collation

The collation prepared for this study has the purpose of indicating the differences between ס and ט. The variant readings of ס are analyzed against the readings of צ and ט. Notice that only those variants which are significant for this study are presented. Therefore it is not an exhaustive collation of variants (pluses and minuses of waw, some particles and prepositions, e.g., המלך, etc., are only collated when they may be relevant to this study).

1:1
> bsleshesh yah + Peal Perf. אֵלֶּה "I was."
appearance of, figure of."
1:5
> דּוֹרְתָּה + pr. את "like."
> בְּנֵי יָמָה "sons of men," MS
7h2
1:2
> לַמְדוֹת [om.]
> לָדוֹת [om.]
1:6
> לָא דְאָת לִתִּי [om.]
1:7

1:3
> על [עִלָּיו] "upon me."
> "stretching."
1:4
Noun הָנָה [Aphel Ptc. אָמֹם] "and Abar Ptc. אָמֹם "shining."
Sing. pl. בְּנֵי "of calves."
Adj. הָלָל, אָמֹם "shining."
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1:8
Qere מָסָמְכָּה [תִּיְדִיר] רְדֵה "and the hand."
Mem מִי [תָּל] "from."
Cheth חֶטֶנֶךָ [לֶאֵרָבָּה] "on their sides."

1:9
Heb. אָזָה אַל נַעֲבַר מִי [תַּמָּד] tr.
Idiom. Exp. דְּהַמָּד אַל אֵלְדוֹר [כְּפִי] "to each other."
Idiom. Exp. אָזָה אַל נַעֲבַר מִי [תַּמָּד] Prep. + pron. לַמְצָלִים "opposite to each other."
Fin // מָסָמְכָּה [תִּיְדִיר] tr.

1:10
Cheth חֶטֶנֶךָ [לֶאֵרָבָּה] "on their right sides."
1°, 2°, 3° [לָאֵרָבָּה] om.
1:11
Heb. לָאֵרָבָּה // מָסָמְכָּה [כְּפִי] tr.
Idiom. Exp. אָזָה אַל נַעֲבַר מִי [תַּמָּד] "like."
1:12
Mem מָסָמְכָּה [תִּיְדִיר] Prep. + pron. מָסָמְכָּה [תִּיְדִיר] "from it."

Imperf. m. pl. לְלוֹלֶה Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. מָסָמְכָּה [תִּיְדִיר] "they were going."
Simplification הָלָלוֹל הָלָלוֹל "to the place where."

Infin. Cstr. הָלָלוֹל Peal Ptc. f. s. + enclit. מָסָמְכָּה [תִּיְדִיר] "she was going."

Ni. Imperf. m. pl. לְלוֹלֶה כְּפִי Ethpe. Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. מָסָמְכָּה [תִּיְדִיר] "they were not turning."


Aphel Ptc. f. s. + encl. מָסָמְכָּה [תִּיְדִיר] "and fire was shining."

Pr. מַרָיוֹמָה [לָאֵרָבָּה] sing. מָסָמְכָּה [לָאֵרָבָּה] "lamp, torch."

Aphel Ptc. f. s. אַל נַעֲבַר בָּרֶק [לָאֵרָבָּה] tr.
Mem מָסָמְכָּה [לָאֵרָבָּה] "from it."
1:14
Inf. Abs. [Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit.] "were running."
Inf. Abs. [neg. + Ethpe. Ptc. f. pl. + enclit.] "but they were not returning."

1:15
Sing. [pl. כְּלֵי] "wheels."

1:16
Substit. [獭] "appearance."

1:17
Q. Imperf. [Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit.] "they were going."
Q. Imperf. [Ethpe. Ptc. f. pl. + enclit.] "they were turning."

1:18
Verbal root confusion, Peal Ptc. f. pl. "and they were seeing."
Adv. [םיבר] Ethpe. Ptc. f. pl. "as they were going round about."

1:19
Inf. Cstr. [וּלְכָה] Temp./Circums. particle + Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. "and when they were going."
Q. Imperf. [יָלַל] "they were going."
Ni. Inf. Cstr. [וּלְכָה] Temp. particle + Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. "and when they were rising."
“with them.”

1:20

“and to the place where.”

A. Inf. Cstr. Peal Ptc. f. s. + enclit. "where she was going."

Q. Imperf. Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. “they were going.”

Ni. Imperf. Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. “they were rising.”

Q. Imperf. Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. “they were rising up.”

Ti. Inf. Cstr. Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. “was.”

1:21

Q. Inf. Cstr. + suf. Temp. particle + Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. “and when they were going.”

Q. Imperf. Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. “they were going.”


Substit. “like the figure of the appearance.”

“of a mighty crystal.”

Ni. Inf. Cstr. Temp./ Circums. particle + Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. “and when they were rising.”

"they were standing.”

Ni. Imperf. Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. “they were rising up.”

And when they were standing.”

"was.”

1:22

om.

Ni. Inf. Cstr. Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. "was.”

om.

Ni. Imperf. Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. "was.”

om.

om.

om.
1:23
"under it."

Adj. f. pl. ירשה [Peal Pass. Ptc. m. pl. + enclit. ירהים פל] "stretched."

Idiom יסח ולא הסתע [Idiom לא הסתע] "toward each other."

"from above and from below."

1:24
"of God."

Inf. Cstr. [בכלם] Temp./circums. particle + Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. יבש בך פל פל "when they were going."

4° בך [pr. יבש פל פל] "like."

5° בך [om.]

Explanation [בך פל פל] "in the midst of an army."

Inf. Cstr. [בך פל פל] Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. יבש בך פל פל "who were standing."

1:25
"habitation."

Q. Inf. Cstr. [בתחתית] Temp./Circums. + Peal Ptc. + enclit. יבש בך פל פל "and when they were standing."

Pi. Imperf. 3° f. pl. הרפיות [Aphel Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. יבש בך פל פל] "they were resting."

1:26
"habitation."

1°, and 3° pr. יבש פל פל "like."

2° הרפיות [pr. יבש בך פל פל] "and upon."

1:27
"like the appearance of God."

"Enclosed in it [בתחתית] "from within round about him."

2° המראה [om.]
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Data Analysis

The data presented below are arranged as described in the Introduction and in chapter 2. The full verses represent either the original reading of an edition according to the evaluation of the respective editors (eclectic text) or a text that reproduces exactly the original (diplomatic text), as in the case of the BHS. Starting each Data Analysis I will introduce a general feature of the Peshitta of Ezek 1-12 that may be a literary characteristic not only of the respective chapter but also of another chapter as well. These characteristic literary features will be accumulated and described in the general conclusion of this work.

Ezek 1:2

"On the fifth day of the month in the fifth year of the captivity of Jehoiachin,"
king of Judah.”

Analysis of the Variants

In this verse the S reads like the I with the addition of the last word ᵃⁿᵗᵃⁿᵇᵃ, “of Judah.” The Syriac scribe seems to clarify the background of the event pictured in the narrative for his reader. ᵇ in this case is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of I, and almost all the MSS of ˢ read like I, with the sole exception of MS 534 that reads ᵃⁿᵗᵃⁿᵇᵃ ᵇᵃˢⁱˡᵉᵇˢ ˡᵒᵘᵈᵃ as in S. Accordingly, there are three possibilities for S’s reading: (1) S employed the same Hebrew recension as MS 534; (2) the scribe’s own knowledge of the background of this event; and (3) S copied from MS 534. The second possibility seems the most feasible, and it fits the literary characteristic of the Peshitta book of Ezekiel, which is the effort of making the text easier to read, as will be seen throughout this study. Thus information known to the scribe that can clarify the background of the verse is sometimes added to the text.

Ezek 1:3

(M) התו התו דבֶר יִתָה שָלָה בֶּן בֵּית הָכֹתְּנָם יִתָה
כָּסְדִים עֶלֶּה הָבָר וַהֲרַךְ עַלֵי שְׁם דְּיִתָה

(S) מְלָאֵה הָבָר מִלָּה מִשְׁמַל מִתָה הַמְּשִׁמָּה
ְנָלָה מִלָּה מִלָּה מִשְׁמַל מִתָה הַמְּשִׁמָּה

(ᵇ) התו התו מֵנָאָה מֵנָאָה מֵנָאָה מֵנָאָה מֵנָאָה מֵנָאָה
ואָטְלְפָה מֵנָאָה מֵנָאָה מֵנָאָה מֵנָאָה מֵנָאָה
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(5) καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου πρὸς Ιεζεκιὴλ ὑπὸν Βοζί τὸν Ιερεὰ ἐν γῆ
Χαλδαῖων ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Χοβαρ· καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπ' ἐμὲ χεῖρ κυρίου.

(Trans. of S) “And the word of the Lord came to Ezekiel, son of Buzi the priest, in the land
of the Chaldeans by the river Kebar, and there the hand of the Lord was upon me.”

Analysis of the Variants

Μ reads "the word of the Lord certainly came,"1 while S, Τ, Τ, Τ, Τ read: "( = and) the word of the Lord came." Exceptions are the targumic MSS b, g, o, l, z, which have the same reading as Μ, plus the targumic exegesis and explanations of the text.

The BHS apparatus suggests a dittographic error; for if the Hebrew MS were unwoveled, the perfect and the infinitive absolute would look alike. Consequently, its absence in the ancient versions shows that scribes recognized it as a possible dittographic error. Another possibility is that Τ, Τ, Τ may have been based on a Hebrew MS that started with ענ (waw cons. Q. Imperf.) instead of Inf. Abs. + Perfect.

There are two problems with the suggestion of a dittography as the solution for this possible error: 1. The presence of the Inf. Abs. in several MSS of Τ, Τ, Τ cannot easily be explained. 2. The Inf. Constr. is very common in EBH and DSS scrolls (over 1000 instances), while the Inf. Abs. is extremely rare in LBH, DSS, and in Mishnaic Hebrew.

According to Qimron: "The relative non-usage of the infinitive absolute is typical of

1 "Usually the intensifying infinitive with the perfective conjugation forcefully presents the certainty of a completed event," B. K. Waltke, and M. O’Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 584.
late BH, of Samaritan Hebrew and of 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a-d}, and culminates in MH.\textsuperscript{1} Therefore the S, \textgreek{T}, and \textgreek{C5.c.f.v} may have opted to omit the Inf. Abs. to update its reading for their readers, possibly to avoid an archaism or any misunderstanding of the text besides dittography. In this case the S version seems to be on its own.\textsuperscript{2}

The next variant reading is the preposition "upon" plus the third person singular suffixed pronoun "upon him" (יְ֣שַׁל). In \textgreek{T} the pronoun goes back to its antecedent "Ezekiel." Almost all MSS of S, \textgreek{C5.c.f.v}, and \textgreek{T} have "upon me." The apparatus of the BHS suggests a harmonization with Ezek 8:1, which reads "upon me."

On the one hand, this variant reading seems to be an influence of \textgreek{C} and \textgreek{T} on S. On the other hand, S has the word \textgreek{אֹ} (there) which is present in all the targumic MSS, but absent in some Septuagint MSS (εἰκεῖ is present in MSS A-410, V-449, [X O] εἰκεῖ O [Q mg]-62). S may have been affected by both \textgreek{C} and \textgreek{T}, but more securely by \textgreek{C} on the second part of this verse. Probably this verse was "corrected" or harmonized later in S to correspond with the Greek and Aramaic.

Notice, however, that harmonization was a common translation technique. Therefore S can also stand on its own merit and the variant reading “upon me” cannot be used as a proof of relationship/influence or anything concerning the Vorlage of the versions.

\textsuperscript{1}Elisha Qimron, \textit{The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls} (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 47.

\textsuperscript{2}Even though S avoids Hebraisms, it has a reading that may be considered as a Hebraism in this verse; that is, the introductory καθό. \textgreek{T} has καθ' ἐγένετο, which is a clear Hebraism.
Ezek 1:4

(Trans. of $S$) “And I looked and behold a hurricane coming from the north, a great cloud, fire and brightness were breaking out from round about it. And from the midst of it there was like a figure from the midst of the fire.”

Analysis of the Variants

It seems that the scribe of $S$ did not understand the Hebrew expression "gleaming bronze, gleaming amber," or he avoided it because of its inherent ambiguity. This Hebrew expression is found otherwise only in vs. 27 and 8:2; therefore it could well have been a difficult word for its readers. These Hebrew words were translated by $\text{סָּפָן סָפָן}$, “like a figure,” in the Peshitta version.

Even the $\mathcal{C}'$ does not translate it, but keeps the exact Hebrew expression סָּפָן סָּפָן.
The \( \text{\textit{G}} \) translated it by \( \text{\textit{οδασίς}} \) (except \( \alpha' \) \( \text{\textit{οφθαλμος}}, \) \( \sigma' \) and Cod. 86 \( \text{\textit{εἴδως}}, \) \( \sigma' \) \( \text{\textit{ομοιωμα}} \) \( \text{\textit{ηλέκτρου}}, \) "appearance of amber," and adds a whole nominal clause at the end of the verse \( \kappaαλ \) \( \text{\textit{φέγγυς}} \) \( \epsilon\nu \) \( \text{\textit{αὐτῷ}}, \) "and brightness in the midst of it."\(^1\) Thus we cannot argue for any relation between \( S \) and \( \text{\textit{G}} \). Although \( S \) has the word "figure," which is similar to the one used in \( \text{\textit{G}} \), it does not have the final additional nominal clause or the word "amber" that the latter contains.

Ezek 1:6

Analysis of the Variants

This verse in \( S \) underwent an editorial work to avoid redundancy. The \( S \) omits the

\(^1\)Zimmerli, 82-83. According to Zimmerli the Hebrew \( \text{םזפח} \) is most probably an additional comment necessary to clarify the text. This "gloss," as he calls it, entered \( \text{\textit{G}} \) with a further addition, \( \kappaαλ \) \( \text{\textit{φέγγυς}} \) \( \epsilon\nu \) \( \text{\textit{αὐτῷ}}. \) As one can see, only \( \text{\textit{G}} \) has this reading, consequently it is hard to accept that the Masoretic reading is a gloss. The evidence indicates that \( \text{םזפח} \) is the original reading supported by \( \text{\textit{C}}, S \), and the only gloss is the extra-Masoretic reading found in \( \text{\textit{G}} \).
second or "every" or "each," and of/to them," while \( G T \) holds both (דְָּבָא לָבֶּה גַּוּדֶּה).

Even though \( C I \) contains a partial Masoretic reading except דְָּבָא לָבֶּה, it has for this verse one of the longest textual expansions in the entire book of Ezekiel. This expansion is probably due to the theological implications of the verse in the targumic tradition. \( S \) ignores completely this expansionist interpretation.

Ezek 1:12

(Trans. of \( S \)) "And straight forward they went to the place where the spirit went, and they did not turn."

Analysis of the Variants

\( S \) differs from \( \text{MT} \) by omitting the initial Hebrew word דְָּבָא, “each,” while \( C I \) and \( \text{MT} \) read דְָּבָא, “each of both, both” (εκάστον “every, each” O-147, L’, 106), and the

---

1 "Each had four faces and each and every one of the faces had four faces, sixteen faces to each creature, the number of faces of the four creatures being sixty-four. Each had four wings and each and every one of the faces had four wings, sixteen wings to every single face, sixty-four wings to every single creature; the number of wings of the four creatures being two hundred and fifty six.” Samson H. Levey, *The Targum of Ezekiel*, in *The Aramaic Bible*, vol. 13 (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1987), 20.
indefinite noun אֱלוֹהִים, “creature” (sometimes used for “each” like שְׁם in Hebrew), respectively.

The relationship of S to ג* is represented by the omission of the last Hebrew Inf. Cstr. “as they went.” However, MSS of ג^A, e.g., (션 O, Qtxt) O-62, L-311, 410, 86, and also of ג’ contain εν τω πορευόμεναι αὐτά, which is a typical Septuagintal translation of the Hebrew Inf. Cstr. that can be called a Hebraism (εν τω + Inf.). Another point is that S has the word רוח, “spirit,” as in מ and ג^T, but absent in ג’.

Even though these two versions have a similar extra-Masoretic reading, this shared reading is not enough to support a direct relationship between them, because it can be explained by a common translation technique. In this case, the Syriac scribe may have opted to omit the Hebrew Inf. Cstr. to avoid redundancy and to eliminate the wordy Hebrew style, rather than to have copied from a Septuagintal text.

Ezek 1:14

וּרֶהֶם בְּאֶמֶתָּהוּ וְלֹא מַעְקַדָּה אָפְרָהָוּ אֶפְשָׁר מָשָׁה בְּמַעֲמָרָה נֶלֶּא (ג)

 ولمَّا قَامَتْ تَنَأْ لَا مَلَكُكُ مِثْلَ مَكْفَّرٍ يَا عَلَمَ الْخَيْرُ الْجَادُ الْمُكَْلَفُ الْكَلِيفُ الْكَرِيمُ (ג’)

Omitted in ג* (MSS B, 106), but present in ג^A with some variations among them (rel. and

1 "And the creatures, when they are sent to do the will of their Master who makes His Shekinah dwell on high above them, are like the eye seeing a bird on the wing, they turn and circle the world; and the creatures return together, quickly, like a flash of lightning.” Levey, 21-22.
the Hexaplaric witnesses) as καὶ τὰ ζώα εὑρεχον καὶ ἀνεκαμπτον ὡς εἴδος τοῦ βεζεκ.

(Trans. of S) “And the living creatures were running but they were not returning, like the appearance of radiance.”

Analysis of the Variants

S has its own unique reading by adding the neg. ᾧα, “and not,” to the participial form ἀνεκαμπτον, “they were returning.” Both Hebrew Inf. Abs. were conveyed by the common Syriac use of the Ptc. + enclit. Perhaps this is an effort on the part of the Syriac scribe to convey a good translation into the Syriac language. Therefore the neg. ᾧα may or may not have been in its Hebrew Vorlage.

It seems that some Hebrew recensions had difficult readings or their MSS may have been in such bad condition that their translation was made more on contextual exegesis than on the actual reading of their texts. For instance, notice the long addition of Ζη, and on the other hand the complete omission of this verse by Ζ* (MSS B, 106). Even though the remaining MSS (rel. including MS A) contain this verse, it is not enough to support the assumption that their Hebrew Vorlage had it. The Greek reading of rel. is a literal word-for-word translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of Μ that seems to have been added later on to their Greek text. Therefore the Vorlage of rel. could well be the same as of Ζ* (MSS B, 106) but a later hand included a literal rendering similar to that of Μ. Support for this assumption, even though one may argue the opposite on the same
basis, is that the Hebrew word פֶּתַח, “lightning,” was transliterated as בֵּיתֵק. 1

On the contrary, to support the assumption of the existence of an early Hebrew recension with this verse are the readings found in α′, σ′, and θ′, and in the Peshitta version. The first one reads απορροιαν η αστραπης, “flowing of lightning,” for בֵּיתֵק; σ′ has ακτινος αστραπης, “beam of lightning”; and θ′ reads αστραπης (+ Σ בֵּיתֵק). This indicates that S is based on a different Hebrew recension than the one used by the majority of the witnesses of Θ, and the neg. רֹֽאָשׁ may be an authentic reading.

Ezek 1:17

(3) נל אֵאָבֵי רֹֽאָשׁ בָּלצֶת בְּלֵב לוֹ לֵא יֶחְשָׁב בָּלצֶת

(5) דַּל רֹֽאָשׁ בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת

(1) נל אֵאָבֵי רֹֽאָשׁ בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלцֶת

(3) D) έπι τα τέσσαρα μέρη αυτών ἐπορεύοντο, οὐκ ἐπέστρεφον ἐν τῷ πορεύοντα αὐτά.

(Trans. of S) “They went towards their four sides without turning, and to the place of the region where the first of them was to go they went after him without turning.”

1 According to Zimmerli “the verse is lacking in Θ and we must read with Ω (ibant) instead of the erroneous אֵאָבֵי רֹֽאָשׁ בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת instead of the erroneous אֵאָבֵי רֹֽאָשׁ בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת instead of the mysterious אֵאָבֵי רֹֽאָשׁ בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת בָּלצֶת. Jerome is of the opinion that Θ has deliberately suppressed the verse, which speaks of a return (ἐπι) of the living creatures ne legenti scandalum faceret because it is previously claimed explicitly that the creature did not turn as they went (vv. 9, 13).” Zimmerli, 85.
Analysis of the Variants

CT is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to MT. This is one of the few cases of a textual expansion in S. It holds a very large addition that seems to have entered its text in an early stage of transmission: “and to the place of the region where the first of them was to go they went after him without turning.” This addition might be an explanation to avoid ambiguity concerning where the creatures were going that harmonizes with the context of the passage. Also S tries to improve the text by omitting the redundant and ambiguous syntactical usage of the suffixes attached to the two instances of the Inf. Cstrs. (the first one in the masc. and the second in the fem. gender).

S renders its translation into good Syriac style even though it contains a long addition, while G has a Hebraism for the second instance of the Inf. Cstr. (בָּלָה), "This indicates an independent relationship among the versions; and this is the only instance in the first twelve chapters of Ezekiel where S deviates this much from any of the versions including MT.

Ezek 1:18

נבוות טבש לעה יזאה לעה טבש מלאה טלאה סובר תלרבח (MT)
生まれ, צהל לסרשמע, סנפל תפ. סנרוא נחלו, דצלא, הזפשפשמע, מער מפלחרפ (S)
ניבורט שכל לקבלא רקינא רומא לעה דודלע אייוו, עם טבש מל, תעין סمؤشر מהר לארברח Duchess (CT)

1It is a Hebraism; see C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, repr. 1990), 174.
(G*) οὐδ’ οἱ νῦτοι αὐτῶν, καὶ ὕψος ἦν αὐτῶς· καὶ ἑδον αὐτά, καὶ οἱ νῦτοι
αὐτῶν πλῆρεις ὀφθαλμῶν κυκλάθην τοῖς τέσσαραν.

(Trans. of S) “And their rims were high, and they could see, for their rims were full of
eyes, when the four of them were turning round about.”

Analysis of the Variants

The key word in this verse is הָאָדָם, “and fear.” In a consonantal text it could well
be read as the verb הָאָדָם, “to see.” Thus a confusion of the verbal root may have taken
place causing the Syriac translator to render it as מַאֲדוּ, “and they were seeing.” This
also may be due to a contextual interpretation, for the verse mentions that the wheels were
covered with eyes round about. Then the implication is that they were able to see. This
shows that S was based on a consonantal Hebrew text similar to הָאָדָם.

Even though there is an addition to the targumic reading, the Hebrew word הָאָדָם is
rendered by the Aramaic כַּלְוָי, “and fear,” as in הָאָדָם. G* is related to S, for the former
reads καὶ ἑδον αὐτά, “and they were seeing” (except in some MSS of Ν, e.g., καὶ
φοβεροὶ ἦσαν 88, Λ-ϣ; καὶ φοβερὰ ἦν 62; καὶ φοβερὰ ἦσαν 198). This, however,

is not proof of a direct relationship between them. Both may have used the same
translation technique of contextual exegesis or verbal-root confusion. Furthermore, if the
Hebrew text were only consonantal, this same reading could well be found in both
independently. Moreover, against any relationship between them is the rendering of the
last part of this verse כָּלַע לָאָדָם, “round about to the four of them,” that was translated
in S as כָּלַע לָאָדָם, “when the four of them were turning round about,” and
in ḫT kυκλόθεν τοῖς τέσσαρσιν, “round about [them] the four,” indicating a non-relationship between them.

Ezek 1:19

(III) cnsixn ixor jnxn baa nvnrr xairm nbsx msixr?

(S) rto o & C L lu,\n\n(€) K t o j 1'Din'D x'oo dti*? i n t o  xn'-.o xcim o' prtopb K 't o :  pbm xm ii t o

(Trans. of S) “And when the living creatures went the wheels went with them. And when the living creatures rose from the earth the wheels rose with them.”

Analysis of the Variants

A clear difference can be noticed among the versions. ḫT, as usual, tries to smooth the text and avoid ambiguity. For instance, the prep. phrase ḫtōm, “with them,” was used twice, the first instance for alōn, “by their side,” and the second an addition to the text, thus completing the syntactical meaning of the sentence and the end, making clearer whom the wheels were with at each specific moment. These deviations do not seem a reflection of the Peshitta’s Vorlage but an effort on the part of the translator to improve the text.

ḠT is a more literal translation than ḫT. The Hebrew Inf. Cstrs. were rendered into
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an un-Greek grammatical structure, εν τῷ + Inf. (πορεύεσθαι and ἔξαίρεσαι). Instead of
λογαρίζει, “by their side,” /ion employs ἐχομενεῖν αὐτῶν, “neighboring them.” The remaining
portion of the verse agrees precisely with Μ. The only clear deviation of Σ is the
additional phrase ως ἐρημεύσαντας, “to the heavenly heights,” indicating the direction of the rising
creatures. Therefore, based on these facts none of the versions are related, and each one of
them shows its characteristic literary features.

Ezek 1:20

(Μ) οὖν ἐν θόν ἐν νεφέλῃ, ἐκεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πορεύεσθαι: ἐπορεύοντο τὰ ἥπα
καὶ οἱ τροχοί καὶ ἐξήραντο σὺν αὐτοῖς, διότι πνεῦμα ἐσχήν ἦν ἐν τοῖς τροχοῖς.
(Σ) καὶ ὅταν ἦσαν ἐν τοιάσον, καὶ οἱ τροχοὶ οὗτοι, διότι πνεῦμα ἐσχήν ἦν ἐν τοῖς τροχοῖς.
(Trans. of Σ) “And to the place where the spirit went they went, and the wheels were lifted
up with them, because the living spirit was in the wheels.”

---

1Maximilian Zerwick, Biblical Greek, adapted by Joseph Smith in Scripta
Pontificii Institutio Biblici, no. 114 (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1990), §
387: “such a use is of itself quite Greek, but its regular use in temporal sense may be
attributed to Hebrew influence”; see also Moule, 174.
Analysis of the Variants

C' avoids any representation of the spirit (usually of God) in an anthropomorphic feature while S does not show any fear concerning that matter. The first instance of הכתוב is rendered by אוש, “will, wish,” probably because of its ambiguous source. The second instance, however, maintains the Masoretic reading indicating that הכתוב is applied to the creatures.

S represents an elaborate editorial work. It omits what could be a dittographic error in לדו הכתוב (see suggestion of BHS apparatus), or because of its redundancy in the text. Furthermore, S does not have any relationship to ©. The former does not contain the additional elements that the latter presents, ה נפלה, “cloud,” and תὰἔως, “creatures.”

Regarding the dittographic error suggested by BHS, ©* omitted it, adding instead תὰἔως. In this case the scribe of ©* may have had a Hebrew MS without the dittographic error or he may have corrected it as he recognized this error. Notice, however that Codex B does not contain this reading (תὰἔως instead of לדו הכתוב). Therefore one may conclude that an early Hebrew recension had the repetition of לדו הכתוב in its text and not תὰἔως, which could be a late scribal correction. Thus Codex B and S reflect an earlier reading than the other witnesses of ©.

Ezek 1:22

ורמה על ראש היה ריעון כלים וקורות ונושאר נמי עלי ראשיהם מלוכללת (©)  
_msclltv_rmpst_  

םכללוש letzten בבלצעו בבלצעו.])->(l_ysl_  
_msclltv_rmpst_  

וזימה על ראש ברוחב כלים לעבר ת⌫ץ מרוכז על ראשיהם מלוכללות (C')  
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Analysis of the Variants

S contains the word χρυσταλλος, "chrystallus," which is a Greek loanword and also present in all MSS of 6^A and also in 6^* . The verse, however, is completely different in S. It does not contain the additional word πτερυγων, "wings," and gives a different rendering for υπερ, "firmament" (אֶ imaginable ?), while 6^T has both of them. Interesting enough is the omission of the Hebrew word אֶ铝合金, "awesome," in both S and 6^*, while MSS of 6^A contain it (פֹּבדֶרוֹן 0-147, 46-449c, 86, 410, 62, or פֹּבדֶרוֹן L'·46 [449*]-Z^v, also 86 and 1-99). This may indicate that S reflects a Hebrew Vorlage similar to the one used by Cod. B.

S could have employed the Syriac equivalent for the Hebrew word לְוִית, "firmament," which is אֶ铝合金, but it uses a verbal noun אֶ铝合金 (pass. Ptc. of אֶ铝合金 to stretch out, elongate, prolong). 6^T and 6^I have לְוִית and 6^T the Greek correspondent στερέωμα.

The coincidence of one word (chrystallus), which is a Greek word, does not indicate an influence coming from 6^T . This is a loanword from the Greek to the Syriac language having nothing to do with translation, relationship, or influence between them. Notice that S substitutes the difficult Hebrew expression כֹּלַ by an explanation.
“like the figure of the appearance,” whereas the Greek version reads
δρασις, “like the appearance of.”

S has a unique reading by omitting the last part of the verse that is present in the other versions: “spread out above their heads above.” This omission may be due to the Syriac scribe’s effort to avoid redundancies, for this Hebrew ending contains some redundant prepositional phases and a participle whose sense is already implied before in the same verse. Therefore, this omission is not a reflection of the Syriac Vorlage, but only an editorial work at the outset of the Peshitta translation.

Ezek 1:23

(Trans. of S) “And under it there were stretched wings one against the other, above and under, two covering them, and two covering their bodies.”
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Analysis of the Variants

The idiomatic expression רָאָשׁ מָצְוָהְוָו, “to each other,” is rendered according to the nature of the language of each version. The similarity between S and C regarding the idiomatic expression is due to their language relationship and not to a direct dependency between versions, רֵאָשׁ לַכְּלָיָהְוָו, which means literally “one opposite to the other.”

S contains a unique reading by adding נָלְגָה מִי לִילָה, “from above and from below,” instead of נָלְגָה. BHS suggests a dittographic error for the repetition of the Hebrew נָלְגָה, “and to each two covering them.” S and C contain this reading as in מ against BHS suggestion. ס ת omitted it with the exception of group O-Q, which contains it in an asterisk, ס ת קא דְּן קָאָלֵפִיָּו povai autouc ta swymata autwv.

It is hard to explain why S kept the Hebrew emphatic repetition since this version typically avoids redundancy and ambiguity, and at the same time the plus in S could well be an explanation clarifying where the wings were located. Thus one cannot say that S has a relationship to any version. Based on this verse, S is a translation of a Hebrew text similar to מ with some editorial work.

Ezek 1:24

אֲמַסְמָה אֶל כַּלָּה הַמַּלְאָלִים כְּלָלִיםrobe כְּלָלִים
בַּלְבַּלְבַּלְבַּל הַמַּלְאָלִים כְּלָלִיםrobe כְּלָלִים
(ס) ָּלְגֶת בַּלּוֹכָהְוָו בַּלְבַּלְבַּל הַמַּלְאָלִים robe כְּלָלִים
(מ) ָּלְגֶת בַּלּוֹכָהְוָו בַּלְבַּלְבַּל הַמַּלְאָלִים robe כְּלָלִים robe כְּלָלִים
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(Trans. of S) “And I heard the sound of their wings like the sound of many waters and like the voice of God as they went, and like the sound of a speech in the midst of an army, and when they stood up they left their wings motionless.”

Analysis of the Variants

The Syriacization of this verse is evident in S by the use of the very common Syriac grammatical structure of a Ptc. plus the enclitic, while ꝇ.DataContext employs the un-Greek structure ἐν τῷ plus Inf. for the Hebrew Inf. Constr. The omission of ὁ ὕππων in ꝇ.DataContext (B) seems to be the reflection of a unique recension, or a misunderstanding of the term, for all the remaining MSS contain it with some variants, e.g., ꝇ.DataContext reads (ח Q) ὡς φωνὴν (־ errorHandlerη 62mg-147, 710) ικανοῦ (θεοῦ σαββα [σαββαίκανων 36, 534; σαββαί ικανοῦ 106] 62mg, Lr [22txi, 311txi, 538txi, 449txi]-ZV, 534, 106) ἐν τῷ πορευόμεθα οὐτα φωνὴ (־ errorHandlerη 62 Λr ‑36 763-V-449-ZV; ὡς φ. 86; ὡς φωνὴν 763) τοῦ (>763) λογοῦ ὡς φωνὴ (־ errorHandlerη 62 Λr ‑36 46; ης 198) παρεμβολῆς (־ errorHandlerη 407) rel. In addition, θ has an asterisk, ὡς φωνὴν ικανοῦ (α and σ ικανοῦ; οἱ λοιποὶ ῥεῖ θεοῦ σαββα and Cod. 86) ἐν τῷ πορευόμεθα οὐτα φωνὴ τοῦ λογοῦ ὡς φωνὴ παρεμβολῆς Τr. ꜇.DataContext reads αὐτῶν, “like the voice of God.” The Syriac reading seems to be more a clarification

1This is a Hebraism; see Moule, 174, and Zerwick, § 387.
of the Hebrew term רע, rather than an actual reading of its Vorlage.

\(C'\) avoids anthropomorphism by translating כָּכַל שֵׁד, “like the voice of Shaddai,” as כָּכַל מִכָּכַל שֵׁד, “like the voice from before Shaddai.” Also there is a textual expansion in \(C'\) probably related to the Merkabah, where angelic chants praise God in the heights of heavens:

\[
כָּל מָלְאָךְ כָּל מָלְאָךְ כָּל מָלְאָךְ כָּל מָלְאָךְ כָּל מָלְאָךְ
\]

"the sound of their words was as if they were giving thanks and blessing their Master, the everlasting King of the worlds; like the sound of the host of the angels on high."

Based on these points one cannot assume any relation among the versions, even though they may have used a similar Hebrew text as their Vorlagen.

Ezek 1:27

\[
(\text{L})
\]

Based on these points one cannot assume any relation among the versions, even though they may have used a similar Hebrew text as their Vorlagen.

Ezek 1:27

\[
(\text{M})
\]

Based on these points one cannot assume any relation among the versions, even though they may have used a similar Hebrew text as their Vorlagen.

Ezek 1:27

\[
(\text{S})
\]

Based on these points one cannot assume any relation among the versions, even though they may have used a similar Hebrew text as their Vorlagen.

Ezek 1:27

\[
(\text{ST})
\]

Based on these points one cannot assume any relation among the versions, even though they may have used a similar Hebrew text as their Vorlagen.

\[
1\text{Levey, 23, n. 17.}
\]
(Trans. of S) “And I saw something like the appearance of God, and like the appearance of fire within it from the appearance of his loins and upward and from his loins downward I saw something like the appearance of fire, and brightness encircled him.”

Analysis of the Variants

Based on this verse S would not have a targumic dependency or relationship, for it does not avoid anthropomorphism as the latter does. T transliterates the Hebrew expression כנעני חמה, and contains a large expansion of the text. Its rendering of this verse is: “I saw something like the hashmal, like the appearance of fire from the midst of it round about, an appearance of glory which the eye is unable to see, and such that it is impossible to look at it and upward; an appearance of glory which the eye is unable to see, and such it is impossible to look at it and downward” (the italics are the non-Masoretic readings).

S contains a singular reading not found in any version: כנעני כנעני כנעני כנעני כנעני, “like the appearance of God.” There are two possibilities for this. First, the translator may have not understood, or have tried to simplify, the difficult expression of the Hebrew text (ר"ן כנעני חמה), see also on 1:4.

Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 1

1. S seems to have been based on a Hebrew text similar to ר"ן (1:22, 27).

2. It has some unique readings (1:22, 25, 27).

---

1Levey, 22. The italics in Levey’s translation indicate the words that are not found in ר"ן.
3. The scribe did not understand, or purposely avoided, some Hebrew words, e.g. 
(1:4, 27).

4. It avoids the paraphrasing and additions of C (1: 22).

5. Greek loanwords are not evidence to support any relationship. They may 
indicate only that the translator used words that he was acquainted with and that were 
common in the Syriac language (1: καρπούμην in 13, and κρυσταλλον in 22).

6. S does not have any direct relation to C' because the former does not avoid 
anthropomorphism and lacks all the textual expansions of C'. (1:22, 27).
Collation

Based on the collation one may see that Ezek 2 contains the fewest difficulties regarding its relationship to מ"א.

2:1 [ם"א] Synonym עָסָק “rise up.”
Q. Perf. w. waw as Imper. 2° m. s. מָאָס ‘וֹתַה “say.”

2:2 1° עָה הָעָלָה, 2° אֵל “with me.”
2:3 1° עָה הָעָלָה “against me.”
Q. Perf. 3 c. p. + prep. “rebelled against me” פִּשַׁע בַּעֲלַמָּה “and they have done wrong against me.”

2:4 הָעָלָה לֹאֵש [לָב “their heart.”
2:5 נִגְדָּב [tr.

2:6 כַּנַּנְהוּ 1° אָלִים // . . . רְבִּים [tr.
Ni. m. pl. Peal Ptc. m. pl. מַכַּכְכֵּם “for [they will] deny.”
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Ni. m. pl. אֵלָה אֵלָה הָאָרְאֵה tr.
Aphel Ptc. m. pl. מְּדַבַּר יְהֹוָה tr.
“and [they will] despise.” מִרְרָה הָאָרְאֵה tr.

Data Analysis

The distinct textual features that characterize $S$ in chap. 2 of Ezekiel are represented and discussed below in comparison with the other versions. Notice that one of the main characteristics of $S$ is the effort of the Syriac scribe to produce a translation with a literary Syriac flavor. This can be seen in all of the twelve chapters of Ezekiel under study.

Ezek 2:1

וַיִּקְרָא אָלֶיךָ הָעַנְבּ תַּחַת הָאָרְאֵה וַתַּרְכֶּז אֶחָד (מָיִם)

סַגָּל לְעַנְבּוֹת אֲבָל יָאַלֶּלֶךָ בְּאֵוָה (ס)

אָרְאֵה לְבַּר אֲבָל קַמְשׁוֹת אֲבָל יְשֵׁב (ט’)

(צ”) אַשְׁאָר הָאָרְאֵה אֲוַיָּבָשׁ אוֹמְרֵים אָבָשׁ קִיוּרִוּב. כָּאֵי אִיבָּאֲנַק פָּיָמָת אֲוַיָּבָשׁ קִיוּרִוּב. כָּאֵי אִיבָּאֲנַק פָּיָמָת מֵאֵי אֲנַדְרְוָפָא. אָשָּדְרֵה אֲנַדְרְוָפָא אוֹמְרֵים אֲנַדְרְוָפָא. כָּאֵי אִיבָּאֲנַק פָּיָמָת אֲנַדְרְוָפָא. אָשָּדְרֵה אֲנַדְרְוָפָא אֲנַדְרְוָפָא אֲנַדְרְוָפָא אֲנַדְרְוָפָא אֲנַדְרְוָפָa

(Trans. of $S$) “And he said to me ‘Son of man, rise up on your feet; I will speak with you.’”

Analysis of the Variants

This verse is similar to מ with the sole exception of the word רָכַב, “to stand.” $S$
uses the synonym בָּא, “to rise up,” which can be just a synonym. This is the verb used in 
C' and is the correspondent verb for the Hebrew דיב. The usage of the verb דיב can be 
explained by the lexical characteristics of a language in particular. This verb is peculiar to 
Early Biblical Hebrew (EBH), while the verb דיב is employed more in the context of Late 
Biblical Hebrew (LBH). ¹ Therefore the Syriac and Targumic versions reflect a more 
ancient lexical development and not a relationship between S and C'.

S' has an entirely new introductory portion that makes any relationship to S 
impossible: אִם הָיָה בֵּית נָחַל דְּבֶל הָבִים טֶרֶם אָסְפָּה אָסְפָּה כָּל יְבָא תִּלָּשׁוּב, “this vision was similar to the glory of 
the Lord, and [when] I saw, I fell upon my face and I heard a voice saying.” Then the 
remainder of the verse is similar to S. It is clear that the Syriac scribe employs a linguistic 
feature (the verb דיב) that is related to the Aramaic language and he is not dependent on any 
of the versions. The coincidence of both—S and C'—regarding the use of the verb דיב is 
not strong evidence for a relationship, for it can be due to their related language.

Ezek 2:2

1Mark F. Rooker, Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of 
Ezekiel (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 149; E. Y. Kutscher, “Aramaic Calques in 
toûs pôdas mou, kai ἢκουον αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος πρὸς με.

(Trans. of S) “And the spirit came into me when he was speaking to me. And he caused me to stand upon my feet and I heard him speaking with me.”

Analysis of the Variants

This verse is related to C' concerning the usage of the verb μεμέχθη, “to rise up,” instead of ἔφθη, “to stand.” This relationship is a reflection of their similar languages, having nothing to do with their Vorlagen (see 2:1). S does not contain any of the Greek additions (καὶ ἀνέλαβεν με καὶ ἔξηρεν με). MS 407 omitted this addition, probably by homoiooteleuton.

Ezek 2:3

(Trans. of S) “And he told me ‘son of man I am sending you to the sons of Israel, to a
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rebellious people who had rebelled against me; they and their forefathers have rebelled against me until this day’.”

Analysis of the Variants

$S$ has its text closer to $\text{IR}$ than to any of the ancient version under study. It avoids the Targumic Memra (םיר) and further accommodation of the text and the variations of $\text{S}$ (םרט “house” for בְּנֵי “sons”) and its omissions (סֵר > “a people,” and מְשֶׁה “they rebelled”). The Syriac scribe seems to avoid Hebrew words that he did not understand clearly, or the ones his community would not understand. He omits עָבְד “bone, substance (?)” which is a difficult idiomatic usage of this word (“this very day”). The verb מְשֶׁה, “they rebelled,” is explained rather than translated by the verb מַלְעָה from חָבַל, “do wrong, injustice.” Therefore, $S$ seems to have been based on a Hebrew text similar to $\text{IR}$ for this passage; $S$, however, smooths the text, making it easier to read.

**Ezek 2:5**

(\text{IR}) n\text{mr} rr\text{nr} tt: “d\ u\ rn\ an\ -\ id\ rv\ -\ a\ b\ in\ h\ n\ *o\ ok\ nnm\ (“S\) .^atpA> - 1  trf» . n 1 T > O .rtfl - - 1~ T  -

(C) ]n’ra  mn s a n  p tm  pno  nv,^-i« ‘ana^a dk p w

(©*) ‘Eav apa aKouawaiv fj TTToriQoai, Sion oiko ? TrapamKpoavov ecm, tear yvwaovTai o n  ‘irpo4nyrns’  €i c rii ev peaw outwv.

(Trans, of $S$) “Perhaps they may listen and tremble, for they are a rebellious house, and they may know that you are a prophet among them.’”
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Analysis of the Variants

At first glance $S$ seems to be related to $\mathbb{T}$. Both omit the introductory word "and they,"$^1$ and both avoid the redundant repetition of the second instance of $\textit{ʤ}$. The difference is that $S$ employs $\textit{_caption}$, "perhaps, maybe," for $\textit{ʤ}$, while $\mathbb{T}$ employs its Greek equivalent $\textit{_caption} \textit{_caption}$, "if, whether." Thus the construction of this clause is different in each version:

$\mathbb{T}$ $\textit{_caption} \textit{_caption}$ (whether) $\ldots \textit{_caption}$ (or) $\ldots$

$\mathbb{T}$, and $\mathbb{T}$ (Whether/if) $\ldots \textit{_caption}$ (whether/if) $\ldots$

$S$ $\textit{_caption}$ (perhaps) $\ldots \textit{_caption}$ (and) $\ldots$

Furthermore apparently related to $\mathbb{T}$ is the clause $\textit{_caption} \textit{_caption} \textit{_caption} \textit{_caption} \textit{_caption}$, "and they will know that a prophet you are among them" (the Syriac version renders $\textit{_caption} \textit{_caption}$, "and they may know that a prophet you are among them"), while $\mathbb{T}$ has $\textit{_caption} \textit{_caption}$, "and they will/may know that a prophet was among them." This can be easily explained without recurring to any redactional relationship of $S$ to another version. The Syriac copyist may have mistaken the letter $\textit{_caption}$ for the $\textit{_caption}$ in the process of copying $\textit{_caption}$, "you," for it can be easily confused with $\textit{_caption}$, "there was/is," as in MSS 7a1, 12d2. Therefore some $S$ MSS support the $\mathbb{T}$ reading while others contain this confusion between the personal pronoun and $\textit{_caption}$, "there are, is." This shows that $S$ is without any relationship to $\mathbb{T}$.

$^1$Zimmerli, 90: "nom was lacking in the Hebrew Vorlage of $\mathbb{G}$." The same can be applied to $S$'s Vorlage.
Ezek 2:6

“As for you son of man, do not fear them, and do not tremble at their words, for they will deny and despise you; for you dwell among scorpions. Fear not their words, and not tremble before them, for they are a rebellious house.”

Analysis of the Variants

$S$ has a rare variant type. The word כרובים, “briers” (?), is a *hapax legomenon*, and כָּלַתים, “thorns,” occurs elsewhere only in 28:24. The scribe of $S$ misunderstood these two Hebrew words. This is a classical semantic case of homonymy between cognate
languages. Both words have the same spelling in Syriac and Hebrew, but with different meanings. Thus the scribe may have read both words in Hebrew and understood them with the Syriac meaning. The result was the interesting translation “for they will deny and despise you” (יהיו מתפללים אליך). צ reads “even if they rebel and argue against you” (אך אם ירבעו ונוגעו אליך). The ג has δικτὶ παροιστησονται καὶ ἐπαιστησονται εἰπὼ σὲ κύκλῳ, “for they will entice and rise against you” (אך יתקננה ויררך נא דע אליך). This indicates that S was based on a Hebrew text similar to II.

More evidence for a careful translation based on a Hebrew Vorlage is the chiastic structure found in II [A]A’ [אלא ידוהי [מדבריהו [A]]B’ [ מפני וברא] A, “do not fear them, and by their words do not be dismayed.” All the versions recognized it including S. However, in the second part of the same verse, S presents a chiastic structure that is not found in the Hebrew sentence. The latter has [A]B’ [מדבריהו [אלא ידוהי [מדבריהו [A]]B [מדבריהו [A], “their words do not fear and before them do not be dismayed.” The ג and צ agree with the Masoretic reading, while S, instead, has [B]A [אלא ידוהי [מדבריהו [A]A’ [מדבריהו [B], “do not fear their words and at their faces do not be...


2According to Zimmerli the Hebrew phrase כ רביכם הסלכינא אתנק is unsatisfactory. He stated that “the קְוָקֵל points to an occurrence of the root בֹּכֶב in the Hebrew original. Scribal considerations permit us to conjecture in כ רביכם a scribal error for בֹּכֶב.” Zimmerli, 90.
dismayed.” The Syriac scribe seems to have a good knowledge of literary structure and was able to make some poetic arrangement of the text, or simply $S$ harmonized this section with the first part of the same verse.

**Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 2**

1. The additions of $\mathfrak{G}$ are not found in $S$ (2:1, 2).

2. $S$ uses synonyms, e.g., for מִשָּׁמָה it employs the Syriac verb for מָשָׁמֵר. $S$ is related to $\mathfrak{G}$ in this point rather than to any other version. This may be due to their related languages rather than to any direct influence between both versions (2:1, 2).

3. $S$ seems to have a Hebrew text similar to תּו as its *Vorlage*.

4. It avoids the targumic Memra (מִסְמָר) (2:3).

5. The Syriac copyist may have confused the letter nun (ג) for the yod (י) (2:5).

6. There are signs of careful editorial work in the Syriac version of a Hebrew text similar to תּו indicated by some modification of sentence types (vs. 5) and the construction of chiasm (vs. 6) and word order.

7. Syriac has a unique reading due to a semantic case of homonymy in rendering two Hebrew words (2:6).
CHAPTER IV

EZEKIEL 3

Collation

3:1
Imperf. אָמַר ApHEL Ptc. + pron. אֵלֶּה "you are finding."

3:2
Jurf + pron. אֵלֶּה "eat it."

3:3
Hi. Imperf. 2° m. Juss. אַלנֶּה om.

Pi. Imperf. 2° m. Juss. אַלנֶּה Peal
Imper. אַלּו "fill."

3:4
אַלנֶּה / . . . tr.
Amal [pr. כָּשְׁרו] pr. כַּשְׁרו "from."

3:5
K כַּשְׁרו pr. כַּשְׁרו om.
Q. Pass. Ptc. אֶלָּם Peal Perf. 1° s. + suf. אָלָם "I have sent you."

3:6
Q. Imperf. 3° m. pi. אָלָם "you are not going to understand."
Q. om.

3:7
Q. Imperf. 3° m. pl. יהוֹשֶה Peal Ptc. m. pl. + enclit. "they are going to listen."

3:8
pr. "for."
Q. Imperf. 3° m. pl. יהוֹשֶה om.
Q. Inf. Cstr. [Piel Ptc. m. pl.] "listening."

3:8

Q. Perf. [Piel Ptc. + pron.]

3:10

Piel Imperf. [Piel Ptc. + pron.]

3:11

Perf. w. waw cons. Imper. sense [Imper.]

3:12

Piel Imperf. [Piel Ptc. m. s.]

3:13

Peal Pass. Ptc. + copula [Imper.]

3:14

Ambiguity [Piel Ptc. m. s.]
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3:15
Spell. [להלך לארבע "to Tel Akiv."
Q. Ptc. m. p. [רשבים] Peal Ptc. m. s. [רשבים]
“that is located/situated.”
Ambiguity [ומע] om.
Q. Ptc. m. p. [רשבים] Peal Ptc. m. s. [רשבים]
“as I was speechless.”
3:16
Q. Perf. 2° m. s. [רשבים] Peal imperf. + Peal Ptc. [רשבים]
“for you are listening.”
Sing. [דיבור] Pl. [דיבורות] “words.”
3:18
“when I say.”
Inf. Cstr. + Imperf. [דברים] Hebraism,
Inf. > 1 + Peal Imperf. נקחוה נקחוה “you will surely die.”
3:19
With the sense of “if” [כ"כ if.”
Q. Inf. [לראות] Peal Imperf. “to the sinner.”
Sing. [לראות] Pl. [לראות] “from his sin.”
3:21
“he will live.”
3:23
Q. Inf. Abs. [חיים] “the righteous.”
Sing. [חיים] Pl. [חיים] “in his sins.”
Inf. Cstr. + Imperf. [חיים] Hebraism,
Inf. > 1 + Peal Imperf. נקחוה נקחוה “you will surely die.”
“and there was standing the glory.”

“There was standing the glory of the God of Israel.”

3:24

Q. Imperf. וְיִהְיֶהָ נָאָה [peal ptc. + pron.]

“I am going to speak.”

3:25

Q. Perf. 3° c. pl. הניח [peal ptc. m. pl.]

“I am going to open.”

Q. Perf. 3° c. pl. וְיִהְיֶהָ נָאָה [peal ptc. m. pl.]

“they are going to put.”

Ezek 3:4

(III)

יְאֵשֶׁר אֲלֵי בְּנֵי לֵב אֲלֵי בָּית יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבְרֹכַת בּוֹרֵבָר אֲלִיוֹדָא (III)

(5)

מָצַטְתָּ תַּלָּתְךָ לְנָעְלֶךָ לְמַעְלֶךָ לְנָעְלֶךָ לְמַעְלֶךָ לְמַעְלֶךָ (5)

(5)

ניַמְרָא לָה בֶּר אֲדֹم אֲרוּד לָה בֶּר יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבְרֹכַת בּוֹרֵבָר אֲלִיוֹדָא (5)
(Trans. of S) “And he told me, son of man, go to the captives, to the children of Israel and speak my words to them.”

Analysis of the Variants

S has הַעֲבָדֶים, “children of Israel,” as in CJ, but in the targumic text MSS z and f are similar to MJ having בית ישראל, “house of Israel.” SJ agrees with MJ (וּקְרָא תַּעֲרָסֵי) having לְעָשֵׂה, “to the captivity,” probably a collective noun to indicate the captives of Israel. This may not be a reflection of its Vorlage, but only an explanatory addition to its text, making it clearer where the prophet should go.

Although S uses “children of Israel” like the reading found in CJ, it is more related to MJ than to the targumic text. S omits several interpretative words found in CJ, e.g., וּרְאֵיתָם בַּפַּרְשָׂה, “and proclaim my prophetic words.” Furthermore, S did not try to harmonize with 3:1; 5 and 7, which contain חַיָּה כִּי אֵין נָשָׁה, “house of Israel.” Probably the S Vorlage had this reading.

Ezek 3:6

לֹא אֶל עָמִים רָבִּים מָפָךְ שָׁפַה מִבְנֵי כָּלָה אֵלָה אֵין לָהּ תְמוּם

(מ)  "ורָאוּת אֶל הַעֲבָדֶים כִּי אֵין לָהֶם חַיָּה כִּי אֵין לָהֶם נָשָׁה הַעֲבָדֶים (S)"
Analysis of the Variants

S seems to be an elaborated version of a Hebrew text similar to P. The particle אָּמַּע indicates a continuation from the preceding verse. Consequently S omits the redundancy of P: יִּשְׁמַע נְאַמִּשׁ, "of foreign speech and difficult language," in vs. 5 and again in vs. 6. Both T and C agree with P, reading as it is against S (see 3:7 for the same type of omission in S). Notice that the Syriac scribe struggles to render a good Syriac translation, and he does that masterfully by using participles with their respective enclitic of the verb רָאָה instead of the imperfect. ¹

Ezek 3:8

Ezekiel 3:8

(ML)


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The Syriac scribe conveys his Hebrew text into a rearranged translation that transfers all the senses of its original in a good Syriac style. This is not the case of $\text{S}$ that is a partial literal translation. For instance, the Hebrew adjective גָּבְלָה, "strong," was conveyed by the verb $\text{סָגַרְתִי}, "I caused to be strong," for the first instance, and in the second instance by the verb $\text{שָׁגַרְתִּי}, "I cause to be hard/strong." Notice this is not a reflection of an actual reading in the Syriac’s Vorlage, but only a literary arrangement of the text avoiding monotony and bringing more action into the narrative.

$\text{S}$, on the one hand, contains a literal translation regarding the first part of the verse. It even has a Hebraism, the un-Greek usage of the verb דָּתָֽשְׁרִי in the sentence דָּתָֽשְׁרִי תְּרוֹמֹפִּים:םְ תְּרוֹמֹפִּים, “I gave/made your face strong,” as in י. On the other hand, the second part of the verse has a different literary style, a Greek style, e.g., κατοιχύσω, “I will make strong,” instead of the simple Hebrew adjective גָּבְלָה, “strong.” In this regard $\text{C}$ agrees with the Masoretic text.

The Hebrew word נַפְשׂ, “forehead,” was interestingly conveyed by an idiomatic
expression that does not support any relationship between \( C \) and \( S \), but only a common 
linguistic feature due to their related languages. \( C \) reads, “between your eyes,” 
for \( תָּשֶׁר \), and \( S \) contains the same idiomatic expression. \( G \) rendered it by \( νεῖκος \) (θ’ 
μετωπον “forehead” Cod. 86), which is not an idiomatic expression but a simple noun 
equivalent to the Hebrew one. Therefore none of the versions are related concerning this 
verse. Each one of them reflects the literary knowledge of the scribes who translated it into 
their respective languages.

Ezek 3:9

(III) כִּמָּמָר חֹק מֶצֶר נַעֲשָׁה מִצְמַח לַא הֵיכָה אֶדְמוֹת לָא חָזָה מַפְנֶה כְּבִית מֵרִי דַּם

(S) יָשָׁב בְּעָרֶסַת הָעֲשָׂרָה לָא בְּלָיָה דְּבָרָהּ כֶּלֶת דְּבָרָהּ לָא דְּבָרָהּ

(CJ) כֶּנָּמָר דֶּפֶר מָצְמַח לָא מַפְנֶה כָּלָה מַפְנֶה כָּלָה מַפְנֶה

("\( \Theta \)\) καὶ ἔσται διὰ πάντος κραταιότερον πέτρας μὴ φοβηθῆς ἀπὸ αὐτῶν μηδὲ πτοοθῆς απὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν, διότι οἶκος παραπικραίνων ἐστίν.

(Trans. of S) “Like an adamant harder than flint I have made your forehead. Do not fear 
them and do not be dismayed before them for they are a rebellious house.”

Analysis of the Variants

Even though \( S \) agrees with the III reading, the Syriac scribe evades the use of the 
verb \( יָשָׁב \) with the sense of “to make” by employing another verb that conveys a more
specific sense, in this case the verb "make." 

I have made (given) your forehead." Some MSS of 

contain this Hebrew portion, e.g., 410 (δεδώκα τὸ προσωπὸν σου), O', L'-ZV (δεδώκα τὸ μετωπὸν σου), and ε' (δεδώκα τὸ μετωπὸν σου Qṭx) contain a reading similar to that of Μ. The introduction of 

is different; it reads καὶ ἔσται διὰ παντὸς κραταιοτερὸν πέτρας, "and it will be continually stronger than a rock," which is a unique reading among the versions.

Although Τ has all the Μ reading, it contains an expansion to the text that S ignores completely: ἔλασεν τὰ ἔργα τῶν κρυπτών, "do not break in pieces before them," and instead of 

Targum reads 

people." Therefore S seems to be based on a Hebrew text similar to Μ.

Ezek 3:11

(Μ')

(Τ')

(Θ') καὶ βάδιζε ἐξελθεῖ ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας πρὸς τοὺς νεώτεροὺς τοῦ λαοῦ σου καὶ λαλήσεις πρὸς αὐτούς καὶ ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτούς Τάδε λέγει Κύριος, εὰν ἡρά ἀκούσωσιν, εὰν ἡρά ἐνδοξάσωσιν.
(Trans. of S) “Go to the captives, to the sons of your people, and speak with them and say to them; thus says the Lord of Authority. Perhaps they will listen and tremble.”

Analysis of the Variants

S reworked the last two clauses, "perhaps they will hear and tremble," probably to harmonize with 2:7 in which the same type of clause appears. $S^*$ reads ἀκούσωσιν, ἀκούσωσιν, “whether they will hear, or whether they will give up.” $S^A$ has MS 147' that reads πυροθωσιν (“be terrified”) for ἐνδόσιν, which is a reading similar to the Syriac one. $\alpha'$, $\sigma'$ read παυσωσιν, “they will cease,” while $\theta'$ and Cod. 86 have κοπασωσιν, “they will cease.” $T'$ is completely alien to both versions. It reads: ἐκάει ἡ ἐνδόσις ἡμᾶς ἦττασεν φλυσάζων, “whether they would heed the instruction or whether they would cease from sinning.”

$S$ has a consistent way of translating the name of God. It uses the words ἡμῶν ἡμῶν, “Lord of Authority/Lordship,” for יהוה יוהיה, whereas $T'$ has ἡμῶν ἡμῶν. Although $S^*$ has only κύριος, “Lord,” MSS L’ - 449 Zv of $S^A$ have αὕωνατ prior to κύριος, and MS 62 has o θεός. Taking into consideration the entire set of variant readings of this verse, the only possibility for $S$ is a relationship to a Hebrew text very similar to that of $M$.

---

1L. J. McGregor, *The Greek Text of Ezekiel*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 18 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 57-96. He devoted two chapters (3 and 4) to the discussion of the *nomina sacra* in the Greek text of Ezekiel. On p. 227 of his book, he presented a table with the readings of the Greek text and its witnesses at the 434 passages where BHS records יהוה יוהיה. There are many variations among the Greek witnesses of $S$ concerning the translation of the *nomina sacra*, whereas $S$ is more consistent in its rendering.
Although several MSS of $\mathcal{G}^A$ contain a reading similar to $\mathfrak{M}$ concerning the nomen \textit{sacrum}, all of them have the same alternative $\text{בכ}$ clause found in $\mathfrak{M}$ but substituted in $\mathfrak{S}$.

Thus $\mathfrak{S}$ is related to the other versions inasmuch as they all together were based on a Hebrew text similar to $\mathfrak{M}$, but probably slightly different from each other.

\textit{Ezek 3:12}

(\textit{IR}) $\text{תַּחְפָּשִׁים מְרֹמֶה יְהוָה, כּלֶּהָ יָעַשׂ מְצֹא מְרוֹמֶה יְהוָה מְצֹא מְרֹמֶה.}

(\textit{S}) $\text{תַּחְפָּשִׁים מְרֹמֶה יְהוָה מְצֹא מְרוֹמֶה.}$

(\textit{C}) $\text{תַּחְפָּשִׁים מְרֹמֶה יְהוָה מְצֹא מְרוֹמֶה.}$

(\textit{C'}) $\text{תַּחְפָּשִׁים מְרֹמֶה יְהוָה מְצֹא מְרוֹמֶה.}$

(\textit{S'}) $\text{καὶ ἀνελάβεν μὲ πνεῦμα, καὶ ἥκουσα κατόπτησθεν μου φωνὴν σεισμοῦ μεγάλου Εὐλογημένη ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ.}$

(Trans. of \textit{S}) “And the spirit took me up and I heard behind me a great rushing sound saying ‘blessed be the Glory of the Lord from his place’.”

Analysis of the Variants

$\mathfrak{S}$ adds the Peal Ptc. $\text{דִּבֵּק},$ “saying,” in the beginning of the direct speech to smooth the flow of the sentence. $\mathfrak{S}'$ does not have it. However, some MSS of $\mathcal{G}^A$ have a participle $\text{λεγοντων},$ “saying”; $\mathfrak{A'},$ 147, 535-46, $\mathfrak{C'}-86^\text{A}-710-239'-403,$ and MSS $86^\text{mg},$ 410 have the participle $\text{λεγοντος},$ “saying.” This may indicate a possible later addition in $\mathcal{G}^A$. Therefore the relationship between some MSS $\mathcal{G}^A$ and $\mathfrak{S}$ is merely the coincidence of a common editorial work rather than a relationship.
Ezek 3:14

And the spirit lifted me up and took me away, and I went in the eagerness of my spirit and the hand of the Lord was strong upon me.

Analysis of the Variants

S lacks a Syriac word for רמ, “bitter,” as \( \text{\textit{S}} \) does in their texts. \( \text{\textit{S}} \) has πυκρος and \( \text{\textit{S}} \) has πεπκραμμενος, both words having their roots from the word “bitter.” Several other MSS of \( \text{\textit{S}} \) (rel.) contain the word μετεφρας, “anxious.” The omission of רמ, “bitter,” in \( \text{\textit{S}} \) and \( \text{\textit{S}} \) is not enough to support any direct relationship or a common Vorlage. It can be explained by a common translation technique. This omission may be an effort on the part of the translators to avoid any difficult or redundant word that would cast some misunderstanding on the text. Regarding this omission, \( \text{\textit{S}} \) has a reading similar to \( \text{\textit{S}} \).

The idiomatic expression מטי, “in the heat of my spirit,” was carefully translated by all the versions. The Syriac scribe conveyed it as “in the eagerness of my spirit.” The Hebrew word הים, “heat, rage,” is a case of polysemy in the Hebrew language. And, as it is in this verse, the expression הים can be considered the only...
instance in the Hebrew Bible. The Syriac language possesses a form cognate to the
Hebrew that is. Perhaps to avoid the strong sense implied in the Syriac word
“to burn with anger, be enraged, angry,” ęż employs another word (“in the
eagerness”) instead of its cognate one. LXX reads εν ὀρμή τοῦ πνεύματος μου, “in
the impulse of my spirit,” while C reads ἐν πνεύμα ἐρυθρί, “in the strength of my spirit.”

Based on these slightly different translations one can see that idiomatic expressions
are sometimes difficult to convey into another language without losing some of their
original nuances. The targumic text that reads, “and a prophecy
from before the Lord overwhelmed me,” which does not have a parallel in any of the
versions, and seems to be an avoidance of anthropomorphism applied to God.

Ezek 3:15

1See BDB for further meanings: “fever,” Hos 7:5, “venom, poison,” Deut 32:24,
“burning anger,” Gen 27:44, “fury,” Dan 8:6, etc.
And I went to the exiles/captives to Tel Akiv which is located by the river Kebar. And I sat there for seven days speechless among them.”

Analysis of the Variants

One of the key words in this verse is בֵּית יָהִי, “Tel Aviv,” which is rendered by S and CJ as בֵּית אָבִי, “Telakiv” (probably a scribal error at some stage) and בֵּית אָבִי, respectively, whereas ש ת substituted בֵּית יָהִי by μετέωρος καὶ περιβάλλον, “and I went anxious round about” (α’, σ’, θ’, and Cod. 86 contain θελ αθβ). This indicates that ש ת was based on a different Hebrew recension from the one employed by S and CJ, or the translator of ש ת did not identify the geographic place and substituted it with another expression as suggested by Zimmerli.1

The awkward usage of the Hebrew relative particle רָאָשָׁה together with the entire nominal clause that follows it was omitted by S; as we have consistently seen, the Syriac version is prone to avoid ambiguity. Therefore it seems more the result of a scribal correction than the actual reading of S’s Hebrew Vorlage. We cannot discard the possibility of a homoioteleuton as the cause for this deviation; since the Masora Parva of ש ת suggests a Qere reading for רʾאָשָׁה, that is, בֵּית, the Syriac scribe may have jumped from

1“ש ת did not recognize the place name בֵּית יָהִי and renders it at random... μετέωρος καὶ περιβάλλον appears to presuppose in לֶה a derivation from לֶה ‘to be high’ and to have read in the form בֵּית אָבִי or בֵּית אָבִי.” Zimmerli, 94.
making this common translation error. $\textit{CT}$ rendered the relative nominal clause by τοὺς ἐν εἰρήνῃ, “who were there” and $\textit{C'}$ by τεμ οὕτως, “and I went down among them where they where dwelling.” These variant readings indicate that although all versions had a similar Hebrew $\textit{Vorlage}$, their translations were not related at all.

Ezek 3:16


Analysis of the Variants

$\textit{S}$ avoids Hebraisms, thus it omitted the introductory רָּהי that is translated by an un-Greek expression Kaî ἐγένετο in $\textit{CT}$. Even the second instance of רָּהי is translated by $\textit{ΘA}$ as καὶ ἐγένετο in rel. (Θ O), and in α’, σ’, θ’.

A normal characteristic of $\textit{C'}$ is the avoidance of any anthropomorphic feature applied to God. Thus the last portion of this verse was translated as οἶχα μόνιμα μόνιμος κύριος, “and the word of the prophecy from before the Lord was with me.” $\textit{S}$ is completely alien to this tradition.
Ezek 3:18

(Trans. of S) “When I say to the wicked one ‘you will surely die’ and you have not warned him and have not told the wicked one to take heed of his way and live, he the wicked one shall die in his iniquity but I will require his blood from your hand.”

Analysis of the Variants

Even though S is similar to T by omitting the word וָרוּשׁ, “wicked,” in the phrase וָרוּשׁ מָרָךְ, “his wicked ways,” it is not strong evidence in favor of a direct relationship between S and T, for it may be due to the common translation technique of avoiding redundancies.

Another possible relationship is the rendering of the syntactic Hebrew structure Inf. Abs. plus Imperf. מָתַת, “he will surely die,” conveyed into S and T as a non-Syriac
and an un-Greek form, which is usually called a Hebraism (θανάτος and θανατωθήσην respectively). This also can be explained by a Hebrew influence in both versions. Notice that this is one of the few instances of a Hebraism in S.

On the other hand, S T has ἀποστρέψατα, “to turn” (ἐπιστρέψατα 239’), against the Syriac reading σέρνε, “that he might take heed,” and the Masoretic reading לָנוֹר, “to warn” (C אָּנָה), and the word ἁμαρτανός, “wicked one,” is rendered by סלך, “sinner,” in the Syriac version (see also vs. 19 for this same reading), and by τὸ ἀξιωμα, “lawless,” in G T. If both S and G T were somehow related, the verb ἀποστρέψατα, “to turn,” which is found in G T, would be expected to be found in S instead of the verb ἁμαρτανός, “that he might take heed,” which is closer to the Masoretic reading לָנוֹר, “to warn.”

Ezek 3:21

A bare infinitive, namely without ΄, is frequently used in the manner of the Hebrew infinitive absolute to color the verbal notion in a variety of ways. Whatever its historical origin, the usage is by no means confined to the Syriac Old Testament where one might justifiably suspect Hebrew influence.” Muraoka, Syriac Grammar, § 96; Regarding quotations from the Septuagint in the NT Zerwick states that “we find also participles used to render the Hebrew absolute infinitive used to emphasise a finite verb.” In the present case the word θανατωθήσην is a noun in the dative case. Zerwick, § 369.
(Trans. of S) “For if you warn the righteous not to sin and he does not sin, the righteous will live, for he took heed and you will have saved your soul.”

Analysis of the Variants

The only important extra-Masoretic agreement between S and ฿ (except MS 62) is the rearrangement of the text by lacking the ambiguous second instance of הָעָ֥ד present in the Hebrew text, and the substitution of the pronoun וַיָּהּ, “and he,” by the actual noun הָעָ֥ד, which makes more sense than the awkward reading of ฿. This deviation can be explained by the use of a common translation technique—the avoidance of ambiguity—which is found in several verses of both versions.

Ezek 3:22

(Trans. of 5) "And the hand of the Lord was upon me there, and he told me, ‘Arise and go out to the plain and there I shall speak to you’."

Analysis of the Variants

S is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to ฿ while ฿ probably contains an editorial work omitting ִּֽאֵֽכֶּ, “there,” from the first sentence, whereas MSS ✡ Q O Q-
62 of א contain it. MS 12a1 of S has instead, “again,” probably to harmonize with the preceding statement (3:14) which is similar to it.

C reads, “the spirit of prophecy from before the Lord rested upon me there” for מֹשֶׁה, יְהוָה בְּאֶפֶן הַיָּדוֹ, “and the hand of the Lord came upon me there.” This is a clear substitution of an anthropomorphic feature by another one without this connotation.

Ezek 3:23

This verse reflects a careful rendition by supplying a specific reference to God, in
this case לַאֲבָדְנֵנִים, "of the God of Israel," instead of יהוה, "Yahweh." This is a unique reading among the versions, and may indicate that the Syriac Vorlage had a different reading, or that the Syriac scribe inserted it as a part of his task of making the text even clearer to his audience. One may even suggest that it was in the margin of an early Syriac MS and a later copyist added it to the text itself. I would suggest the last two possibilities as the most probable ones, based on the overall characteristics of the first twelve chapters of the Peshitta of Ezekiel.

Ezek 3:27

(3) נָבֹאָה רֹאֲשׁ收纳 פֶּרֶךְ אֶפֶרֶךְ אֶלְיָהוֹ הָיָה אָמַר (M)

(5) רְחַבִּים הָיוּ חֵלֶקֶת תַּעֲם שָׂרֵף רַעְשָׂר שֶׁרֶף לְמַעַר חָמָה (S)

(3) נַפְסֵם נְחַלָּה חֵלֶקֶת רַעְשָׂר שָׂרֵף נְחַלָּה לְמַעַר חָמָה (C)

(6*) וּמִשְׁלֵלוּת טֹמֶךְ אָרְבָּךְ יִתְנַפְּשֶׁה נִמֵּשׁ לְחַמְּרֵךְ טֹמֶךְ יִתְנַפְּשׁ אָרְבָּךְ וּמִשְׁלֵלוּת (S)

(6*) καὶ ἐν τῷ λαλεῖν με πρὸς σὲ ἀνοίξω τὸ στόμα σου, καὶ ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτοῦς Τάδε λέγει κύριος ὁ ἀκούων ἀκούστω, καὶ ὁ ἀπειθῶν ἀπειθεῖτω, διότι οἶκος παραπληκτῆς ἐστίν.

(Trans. of S) "And when I speak to you I will open your mouth and you shall speak to them, thus says the Lord of Authority. He who hears let him hear, and he who ceases to hear let him refuse. For they are a rebellious house."
Analysis of the Variants

The use of the *nominasacra*, “Adonai Yahweh,” indicates that S had a Vorlage close to M. ᾿<* employs κύριος, “Lord,” for the whole expression ἀρνίον υἱός (pr. αὐτοῦ Ο’[Qtxt] L'-311, Cod. 86, rel. has + κύριος), while the Peshitta of Ezekiel always uses ἀρχή κυρίου, “Lord of Authority” (see 2:4; 3:11; 4:14; 5:5).

In this verse one can see the effort of the Syriac scribe to render a translation that would have a Syriac literary style; see for instance the rendering of the first two Imperfects by the common Syriac structure Ptc. + enclitic pron.

C′ has unique expansions of its text. They are אַשְׁכְּרֵךְ, “incline your soul,” אָבֶל, “instruction,” and אַלָּמַטָה, “from sinning,” and instead of בֵּית, “house,” it reads בְּעָם, “people.” All of these additions and the deviation are not found in the versions altogether.

**Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 3**

1. Several unique or singular readings are found in S (3:4; 23).
2. S shows a careful editorial work in relation to its Hebrew text (3:6; 7; 11; 15; 22).
3. S agrees with M most of the time (3:9, 11, etc).
4. S omits all the interpretative additions of C′.
5. S’s translations of the *nominasacra* are similar to that of M against ᾿< (3:11, 27).
6. There are some mere coincidences that can be explained by a common
translation technique (see 3:12, 14, 15, 18).

7. Many pluses that are present in $G^T$ are not in $S$ (3:18).

8. $S$ has an instance of Hebraism in its text (3:18).
CHAPTER V

EZEKIEL 4

Collation

4:1

“However.”

4:2

Q. Perf. הָשָׂבֵב Peal Imper. חָבַשׁ “make.”

Q. Perf. w. waw consec. וַיְבָרֵךְ Peal Imper. מַעְבָּד “and build.”

Q. Perf. w. waw consec. וַתִּשְׁכַּח אֶפֶל Imper. מָשַׁחֵךְ “and cast up.”

Q. Perf. w. waw consec. וַתְּכַחֵּשׁ אֶפֶל Imper. מָשַׁחֵךְ “and set.”

Q. Imperf. וַיְשַׁחְתָּ Peal Imper. מַעַּשְׂתוֹ “and make.”

4:3

Q. Perf. הָשָׂבֵב הָשָׂבֵב Peal Imper. מַעַּשְׂתוֹ “and make it.”

Q. Perf. וַיָּשָׂבֵב Peal Imper. מַעַּשְׂתוֹ “I have laid.”

4:4

Q. Perf. w. waw consec. וַתַּשְׁכִּית Peal Imper. מָשַּׁכִית “and place.”

Q. Imperf. וַתֵּשְׁכַּחַת Peal Ptc. + Pron. מַשַּׁכַּחַת “you are going to lie.”

4:5

Sing. וַיִּשְׁכַּחַת Pl. מַשַּׁכַּחַת “days.”

4:6

ומָאָה om.

4:8

Q. Perf. וַיְשָׁבֵב Aphel Perf. מַעַּשְׂתוֹ “I have laid.”

om. תָּשָׂבֵב om.

om. וַיְשָׁבֵב om.

om. וַיְשָׁבֵב om.

om. וַיְשָׁבֵב om.

om. וַיְשָׁבֵב om.
Pi. Inf. Cstr. + pron. 2° m. s. [בָּלָה יִךְ] Peal Imperf. 3° m. pl. [כִּפּוּ עֲבָדֵיהֶם] "they will be completed."

4:9

They will be completed.

Pual Ptc. f. s. [לָא מָשָׂה] Verb + noun

4:10

"it was not defiled."

Verb + Ptc. m. pi.

4:11

"by beast."

4:12

"unclean."

4:13

"of sons of man."

4:14

"one of the sixth part of a hin."

4:15

"behold."

4:16

"Staff of bread" [כָּסֵךְ] "staff of food."

4:17

"one another."
Data Analysis

A literary feature of the Peshitta of Ezek 1-12 is the avoidance of Hebraisms on the part of the scribe. It seems that he wants to translate the Hebrew into a good literary Syriac style. His avoidance can also be seen for redundancies and syntactical ambiguities.

Ezek 4:2

(Trans. of S) “And lay siege against it, and build forts against it, and cast a mound against it, set camps against it, and set battering rams against it round about.”

Analysis of the Variants

S* and S omitted the fifth הַלַּיְלָה, “against her.” S however has a synonymous prepositional phrase אֶל instead of הַלַּיְלָה, while S* does not have anything. Some MSS of S contain it; see MSS 881’-311. It may be only an editorial work rather than an actual reading in their Vorlagen.
Each version employed a different approach to render the verbs of this verse. \( \text{G} \) and \( \text{Cj} \) interpret them in the future/Imperfect tense (or aspect), taking the waw before the Hebrew Perfect as consecutive waw, which makes them equivalent to imperatives, while \( \text{S} \) has them in the Imperative mood, understanding the Hebrew idiom.

\( \text{IR} \) employs the verb הָנָה, “you place, give, put,” in this verse. \( \text{S} \) translates the first instance by וָתָא, “and make,” and the second by חָתָם, “and set.” \( \text{IT} \) renders both instances with a more literal translation δώσῃς, “you will give,” which sounds more like a Hebraism than a Greek usage of this verb. \( \text{Cj} \) reads יָהָר “and lay siege” and יָשָר, “and pitch,” respectively.

There is a very interesting deviation in \( \text{Cj} \) וָהָר אָפְרִירָו וָהָר סָחַר, “and appoint guards round about it,” that seems to be related to MS 538 of \( \text{GA} \). The latter one reads τάξεις επὶ αὐτὴν φυλασσοντας καὶ τάξεις επὶ αὐτὴν, “you will set up guards against her and you will set up against her....” This may indicate the existence of a Hebrew recension that may have had it in its text as an actual reading.

\text{Ezek 4:3}

אַחַת כֹּלָה מָסְבַּת בְּרוֹלָה מַגְּלַת אַחַת כֹּלָה בְּרוֹלָה בִּינְכֶּה יִשְׂרָאֵל (\( \text{II} \))

הַכְּבֵשׁ אַחַת פְּעִמָּה אַחַת תַּחֲנוֹת בְּרוֹלָה צָרָה עֲלֵיהָ אַחַת הָאִיל הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁאוֹל

סַמָּכָה מִטָּלָה לִפְנֵי מֶלֶךְ מִשְׁרוֹנָה. מְסַפָּרָה רַמָּה מְסַפָּרָה מְסַפָּרָה לְכָלָה מְסַפָּרָה. (\( \text{S} \))

מִלְמָלָה לְהַמַּשֶּה לְרַמְּלָה לְרַמְּלָה לְרַמְּלָה לְרַמְּלָה לְרַמְּלָה לְרַמְּלָה לְרַמְּלָה לְרַמְּלָה לְרַמְּלָה (\( \text{Cj} \))

אַחַת כֹּלָה מָסְבַּת בְּרוֹלָה מַגְּלַת אַחַת כֹּלָה בְּרוֹלָה בִּינְכֶּה יִשְׂרָאֵל (\( \text{Cj} \))

נִעֲשֶׂה יִחְדָּה אַחַת לְהַמַּשֶּה בָּשֵׁרָה מְסַפְּרָה עַל הָאִיל הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁאוֹל. (\( \text{GA} \))
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(ивается) καὶ σὺ λαβὲ σεαυτῷ τῇγανον σιδηροῦν καὶ θῆσαι αὐτὸ τοῖχον σιδηροῦν ἀνὰ μέσον σοῦ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τῆς πόλεως καὶ έτοιμάσεις τῷ πρόσωπόν σου ἐπὶ αὐτήν, καὶ ἔσται ἐν συγκλεισμῷ, καὶ συγκλεισεῖς αὐτήν· σημεῖον ἐστίν τοῦτο τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ.

(Trans. of S) “And take for yourself an iron pan, and set it for a iron wall between you and the city; and set your face against it, and it will be besieged and you will lay siege against it. This is a sign to the house of Israel.”

Analysis of the Variants

S and CJ agree with ™ concerning the phrase βαχ κ Ἰσραήλ “house of Israel,” while 转型发展 is ὦ ιός Ἰσραήλ, “sons of Israel,” harmonizing with 3:1. Furthermore, to avoid redundancy, S omitted the second ἐν, “between.” 转型发展, however, contains both instances of the preposition ἐν.

Ezek 4:4

(转型发展) θάρσεις χειρὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ τῇ πόλει τῶν υἱῶν βαχ Ἰσραήλ (转型发展) υφίστασθαι τὸν τοῦτο τῆς πόλεως· εἰς διέσχεσιν, διέσχεσιν αὐτῷ.

Analysis of the Variants

S and CJ agree with ™ concerning the phrase βαχ κ Ἰσραήλ, “house of Israel,” while 转型发展 is ὀ ιός Ἰσραήλ, “sons of Israel,” harmonizing with 3:1. Furthermore, to avoid redundancy, S omitted the second ἐν, “between.” 转型发展, however, contains both instances of the preposition ἐν.
(Trans. of S) "Then lie upon your left side, and lay the iniquity of the house of Israel upon that side; according to the number of days that you will lie upon it, you will bear their iniquity."

Analysis of Variants

S agree with M by omitting the addition of ST (πεντηκοντα και ἕκατον).

Manuscript group C' omitted it as in M, T, and S. MS group O has an obelus marking this reading, indicating that this reading was not in its original text; and MSS O (Qmg)-147, 538, 534-239'-710 read ενεκοντα και εκ., and MS 410 has ενεκοντα και τριάκοσιας.

For S to have had a Vorlage related to ST, S should have had a recension similar to manuscript group C', which is the catena group. Therefore the chance is minimal for a relation between S and G.

Ezek 4:5

(III) αυτή τοῦ οίκου Ἰσραήλ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ κατὰ ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἡμερῶν πεντηκοντα καὶ ἕκατον, δός κοιμηθήσῃ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ λήψῃ τὰς ἁδικίας αὐτῶν.

(S) τοῦ οίκου Ἰσραήλ ἐπὶ αὐτῷ κατὰ ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἡμερῶν πεντηκοντα καὶ ἕκατον, δός κοιμηθήσῃ ἐπὶ αὐτῷ, καὶ λήψῃ τὰς ἁδικίας αὐτῶν.

(CJ) τοῦ οίκου Ἰσραήλ ἐπὶ αὐτῷ κατὰ ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἡμερῶν πεντηκοντα καὶ ἕκατον, δός κοιμηθήσῃ ἐπὶ αὐτῷ, καὶ λήψῃ τὰς ἁδικίας αὐτῶν.

(HT) καὶ εγὼ δεδώκα σοι τὰς δύο ἁδικίας αὐτῶν εἰς ἀριθμὸν ἡμερῶν ἐνεκοντα
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καὶ ἕκατὸν ημέρας. καὶ λήμψῃ τὰς ἀδικίας τοῦ οἴκου Ισραήλ.

(Trans. of S) “I have given you two iniquities according to the number of the days, three hundred and ninety days; so will you bear the iniquity of the house of Israel.”

Analysis of the Variants

Regarding numerical figures S agrees with Μ (שלש זאצ אלפים), whereas ΘΤ has its own reading (Ἐνενήκοντα καὶ ἕκατὸν “a hundred and ninety”) against Μ, Ε, and S (триακοσία, “three hundred and ninety”). Manuscript group C', MSS 403' and 410 hold the reading τριακοσίας for ἕκατὸν. Also α' δ' and Θ' contain the reading τριακοσίας καὶ εὐνήκοντα (three hundred and ninety). This and the preceding verse indicate that the Syriac version is more related to the Masoretic text regarding numerical figures than to the ΘΤ as a whole.

Ezek 4:6

καὶ ἐκατὸν ἡμέρας καὶ λήμψῃ τὰς ἀδικίας τοῦ οἴκου Ισραήλ.
When you have fulfilled them you will lie on your right side, and you will bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days. A day for a year I have given to you.”

Analysis of the Variants

S agrees with 6* by omitting ינשע, “second,” and the repetition of the Hebrew phrase ינשע ינשע לָשׁוֹן, “a day for a year.” Some MSS of 6A , e.g., (X O) O-62, 147' δευτερον, and L'-311 εκ δευτερον, contain a reading similar to that of 71. The omission of the repetition of ינשע לָשׁוֹן is a general reading in all the witnesses of 6א even in the Hexaplaric witnesses of 71. 71 agrees with 6* in this regard (נשע רוגה לָשׁוֹן “a day for a year”).

There are two possibilities for the reading of the Syriac version, first that S was based on some Greek MSS that did not contain this reading, such as 6*. Second, although S was most probably based on a Hebrew text, it underwent an editorial work eliminating redundancies, which is a clear characteristic of the Syriac version of Ezek 1-12. Notice that the verse does not lose any of its sense by lacking these two readings.

Since the second suggestion is based on a consistent characteristic of the Peshitta of Ezekiel, it seems the more plausible to be accepted as the actual cause of this deviation rather than a relationship to 6*.

Ezek 4:9

The Lord said to me, “Take a measuring line, and go out to the city of Jerusalem and measure its length, twenty-one thousand six hundred cubits; and you shall see its width, as long as a man's outstretched arm, seven thousand cubits.”
Analysis of the Variants

S and C agree with M concerning the reading of the number שלש מאות וכאן (390 days). Although G* reads ἐνενῆκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν (one hundred and ninety), some MSS of Σ'A (ἐνενῆκοντα καὶ τριακοσίας C'-403') contain the same reading as M. Regarding numerical figures, S agrees with M closely throughout the first twelve chapters of the Peshitta book of Ezekiel.
Ezek 4:10

And your food will be twenty shekels a day, from time to time.”

Analysis of the Variants

S has a different reading from ΣΤ, Η', and Μ, a unique reading which seems more an editorial work than an actual reading found in its Vorlage. As we have seen, S is prone to avoid redundancies and ambiguities that, according to the translator’s perception, could make the text harder to read. Thus the arrangement of this verse shows evidence of this type of translation technique. Even though the Syriac version contains the shortest reading, it does not commend its reading as being the original. E. Tov seems to be right when he argues that one should not automatically decide that a shorter reading is the original one.¹

Ezek 4:11

¹Tov, Textual Criticism, 302. According to Tov the validity of this rule is questionable, for “often a scribal error creates a lectio difficilior.” Furthermore it is unclear when a reading reflects a scribal error; the rule of lectio difficilior cannot be applied automatically.
And you will drink water by measure, a sixth part of a hin; from time to time you will drink.”

Analysis of the Variants

S has a unique reading, an additional word with the proleptic pronoun “its portion,” while C, T, and M do not contain this addition. This addition does not reflect the actual reading in the Syriac Vorlage, but only the manner in which the Syriac scribe chose to render the Hebrew expression into more precise Syriac.

Ezek 4:12

(Trans. of S) “And you will eat barley cakes baked upon excrement of man in their sight.”

Analysis of the Variants

The Syriac scribe seems not to have understood the prepositional phrase “on dung of the excrement of,” or he simplified it, which seems to be the more reasonable alternative. S translated only the first word by “dung.” We can see that in vs. 15
the word יִנַּכְתַּל appears again translated by the same Syriac word יִנַּכְתַּל. Therefore to avoid any difficult expression that was unnecessary for the understanding of the text, it was simplified for the sake of clarity.

S תָּנָכָס and C תָּנָכָס ("the dung of the discharge of") translated both. Therefore S had another approach to this verse against the word-by-word translation of S תָּנָכָס and C תָּנָכָס. The omission of רָאָס, "and it," by S תָּנָכָס and S is a common attempt to eliminate redundancies.

Ezek 4:13

(Ezr) יִאֶמְרָה יִהְוָה יִשְׁרָאֵל לְיִשְׁרָאֵל לְיִשְׁרָאֵל לִשְׁמָא אֶלֶף אֲרֵיחָם שָׁם

(S) יִאֶמְרָה יִהְוָה לְיִשְׁרָאֵל לְיִשְׁרָאֵל לְיִשְׁרָאֵל לִשְׁמָא אֶלֶף אֲרֵיחָם שָׁם

(C) יִאֶמְרָה יִהְוָה לְיִשְׁרָאֵל לְיִשְׁרָאֵל לְיִשְׁרָאֵל לִשְׁמָא אֶלֶף אֲרֵיחָם שָׁם

(Trans. of S) "The Lord said, thus will the children of Israel eat their unclean bread among the nations where I will drive them."

Analysis of the Variants

S and C are literal translations of a Hebrew text similar to Ezr, while S contains some additions and some omissions to the text, e.g., the additions καὶ ἐπεφυγε τὸν Ἰσραήλ (Cod. 86 and 81 Σ read καὶ ἐπεφυγε κύριος πρὸς μέ, “and the Lord told me,” instead of the addition found in S), and the omissions of τὸν Ἰσραήλ, “their bread,”
and *where I will drive them* (ギ). *A contains some MSS that have a reading for the first omission that reads *τον *αρτον *αυτῶν* (αυτῶν Q, L^-46) *ακαθαρτον* (-τα 88) Ο (*τον *αρτον *αυτῶν* under a *-62', L`, and some MSS with a reading for the second omission [in] + ου διασκορπιω (-πρω 88-62', L`-46-311) αυτους εκει O`, L`, C`-233-86'-239'-403', while οι γ` and Cod. 86 have an obelus, which might be a damaged asterisk with the final reading ου διασκορπιω αυτους εκει.

Consequently, if 5 had any relationship to *A*, 5 should contain those additions and omissions, or at least part of them.

**Ezek 4:14**

(ギ) 

*And I said; 'O Lord of Authority! I never have defiled myself from my youth until now, I have never eaten of that which dies of itself or is torn in pieces by wild beasts; neither has unclean meat entered into my mouth'.*

(Trans. of 5)
Analysis of the Variants

Each version has its unique reading regarding the rendering of the nomen sacrum. Thus, א reads את אלוהים כונן, "God Lord of Authority," whereas ת has קא אופא מיהאמו (א reads א א א, א' has ב), κύριε θεό του Ισραήλ, "then I said 'not so, Lord God of Israel'," which is a reading not found in any other version. Probably ת harmonizes with the preceding verse that has the same reading (א θεό του Ισραήλ see vs. 13). The additional words of ת and the unique rendering of the nomen sacrum show that א did not have any relation to ת and to א concerning this verse. It may be a gloss in the Syriac and Septuagintal texts rather than an actual reading of a Hebrew recession. The targumic reading is the traditional manner in which the nomina sacra are consistently translated.

Ezek 4:16

(א) והאמר אליה בנה לך ברך ממכלא ירושלם עכלה (תstitial)
לך במשכלו וברחמה ומכברה ובמשמך ושיה

(ת) קא אופא מיהאמו (א reads א א א, א' has ב), κύριε θεό του Ισραήλ see vs. 13.
משכלי לשת, שחלולו, פסחי כסמה חכללו נפלתי
אמר לך בנה לך ברך ממכלא ירושלם עכלה (תstitial)
מכיולת במשכלו וברחמה ומכברה ובמשמך ושיה

(ס) קא אופא מיהאמו (א reads א א א, א' has ב), κύριε θεό του Ισραήλ see vs. 13.
וכ╔異なる πρὸς μὲ τῷ ἄνθρωπον, ἵδον ἐγὼ συνετριβὼ στήριγμα αὐτοῦ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ φάγονται ἄρτον ἐν σταθμῷ καὶ ἐν ἐνδείᾳ καὶ ὅσιῳ ἐν μέτρῳ καὶ ἐν ἀφανισμῷ πίνονται.
(Trans. of S) "And he said to me. Son of man, behold I will break the cane of food in Jerusalem, and they will eat bread by weight; and when thirsty, they will drink water by measure."

Analysis of the Variants

S, ℒ, and ℞ give slightly different translations for מִשְׁמֵרַת הָאֵיבִּים, "staff of bread." ℒ reads מִשְׁמֵרַת הָאֵיבִּים, "food supply," S מִשְׁמֵרַת הָאֵיבִּים, "cane of food," and ℞ מִשְׁמֵרַת הָאֵיבִּים, "firmness of bread." MS 46\* is a exception to that; it reads מִשְׁמֵרַת הָאֵיבִּים, "destruction of bread." The Hexaplaric witnesses have Cod. 86, and α' reading ροδόν ἄρτου, "rod, staff of bread," which is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of ℜ, while σ' and θ' read στερεωμα ἄρτου, "firmness of bread," a reading similar to ℞.

Even though the Syriac version has the reading that is the closest to the Hebrew expression, the only thing one may surely say is that all of the versions had the same Hebrew expression in their Vorlagen (see 5:16 for the same expression).

Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 4

1. S seems to have made an independent translation concerning ℒ and ℞ (4:2).

2. S, in several passages, is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of ℜ (4:3, 4, 5, 13).

3. S seems to have undergone a careful editorial work right at its outset. This can be seen by the avoidance of redundancies common to ℜ, which were kept in ℒ and ℞ (4:3, 6).
4. $S$ ignores the additions of $\mathcal{C}'$ and $\mathcal{G}$ (4: 4, 5, 13, 14, etc.).

5. $S$ has smoother texts in some verses than any other version (4:6).

6. Regarding numbers, $S$ agrees with $\mathfrak{M}$ closely (4:9).

7. $S$ has several unique readings (4:10, 11).

8. The Syriac scribe strives to render the Hebrew text into a good Syriac style.
CHAPTER VI

EZEKIEL 5

Collation

5:1
+ Q. Perf. w. consec. waw [םשה] Peal Imper. יְהַעֲרָה “take for you.”
Pi. Perf. + Obj. pron. [םֶּעָשׂ] Peal Imper. יְהַעֲרָה “and divide them.”
Fin] + “into three parts of them.”

5:2
+ Hi. Imperf. “you shall strike” [רהּ]ורוֹה “and one of the third part of them.”
Prep. 3° m. s. [םַּכְלָה] Imper. יְהַעֲרָה “and a part of the three.”

5:4
Prep. 3° m. s. [םַּכְלָה] Prep. + 3° m. pl. יְהַעֲרָה “of them.”

5:5
+ Perf. יְהַעֲרָה “when they are completed.”
+ Possessive pron. יְהַעֲרָה “of your siege.”
+ Hi. Imperf. 1° c. s. יְהַעֲרָה “of the city.”
+ Possessive pron. יְהַעֲרָה “another part of it.”
+ Hi. Imperf. יְהַעֲרָה “and you shall cut.”
+ Hi. Imperf. יְהַעֲרָה “of the city.”
+ Possessive pron. יְהַעֲרָה “of your siege.”
+ Hi. Imperf. יְהַעֲרָה “and a part of the three.”

113

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
5:6
Hi. Imperf. [Peal Perf. 3° f. s. שׁלֹה] "she has exchanged."
my statutes you did not walk."

5:7
Q. Inf. Ctr. 2° m. pl. suf. [אַהֲמָכֵם] Ethpe.
Perf. 2° m. pl. שׁלֹה [תְּפִלֹהשֶׁה יָמָה 7a1] "you have regarded." you are all
\[ om. ambiguity.\]

5:8
\[ om. redundancy.\] המִי הָא רָאשׁ "all of them."

5:9
[Cm or tr.]

5:10
כְּבֹדֵו [ם] "their sons."
in your midst."

5:11
[ם] he says."

5:12
\[ tr.\] one part of you."
and another."
\[ om. סְעָמ.\]
\[ tr.\] it will slay [by the sword]."

5:13
3° m. s. שׁלֹה [יָכָל] 1° c. s. שׁלֹה "and I will fulfill." on you."
Prep. + Inf. Ctr. [בכְּכָל Particles+ Shaphel Perf. 1. c. s. שׁלֹה 7a1 when I have fulfilled my anger." [ט] tr.
my anger."

5:14
כְּבֹד [לְתִינוו] "before."
5:15 Perf. 3° f. s. הָיוֹתָהּ] Peal Imperf. 2° f.s. מְסַמֵּשׁ “you will be.”

5:16 Pi. Inf. Cstr. Temp. Particle + Peal 1° c. s. הָיָהוּ “when I send.”

among the nations

5:17 Piel נָשֶׂל “and they will destroy you.”

Data Analysis

The scribe of S strives to make his translations readable and smooth, so that the flow of the narrative may be easily understood by his community. For that purpose, substitutions, short explanatory additions, and different word order are employed to accomplish that goal.

Ezek 5:1

אֵלֶּה בָּנִים כָּלָּם כָּלָה וַתֵּדַע הָעָרֶת הַעַלָּמִים חָקָה לָּהּ (IR)

Data Analysis

The scribe of S strives to make his translations readable and smooth, so that the flow of the narrative may be easily understood by his community. For that purpose, substitutions, short explanatory additions, and different word order are employed to accomplish that goal.

Ezek 5:1

אֵלֶּה בָּנִים כָּלָּם כָּלָה וַתֵּדַע הָעָרֶת הַעַלָּמִים חָקָה לָּהּ (IR)

Data Analysis

The scribe of S strives to make his translations readable and smooth, so that the flow of the narrative may be easily understood by his community. For that purpose, substitutions, short explanatory additions, and different word order are employed to accomplish that goal.

Ezek 5:1

אֵלֶּה בָּנִים כָּלָּם כָּלָה וַתֵּדַע הָעָרֶת הַעַלָּמִים חָקָה לָּהּ (IR)
And you son of man, take for yourself a sharp sword like the barber’s razor and pass over your head and beard. And take for yourself scales to weigh and divide them in three parts.”

**Analysis of the Variants**

S smooths the text by adding the comparative particle שָׁרָא, “like,” between “sword” and “barber’s razor.” In II these two phrases are in apposition without any particle between them. Furthermore, S adds the phrase הַלְוָלָה תַּנָּה, “three parts of them.” Probably this addition was to harmonize with the context (see vs. 2) and to make clearer the statement “divide them,” or it might have been an explanatory marginal note that a later scribe introduced into the actual text.

**Ezek 5:2**

סלשחא בָּאָר הַבָּרוֹר בִּרְשֵׁי הַעִיר הָכָלָאָה יִי הָמְפֶּרֶדְוַת אָה (III)

הסלשחא הַכְּהָה בָּiệu הָסִיבָּהָה הָסָלָשחא הָוָה לִרְחָב הָהֲבָר אָרְיָק אֶחְזֶרוֹז

(5)

הסָלָשחא מְסֵמָה כָּרָאָה כָּרָאָה. מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה

הסָלָשחא הַלִּפְדוֹת הַלִּפְדוֹת. מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה

הסלשחא בָּאוּר הָדָלִיק בּוֹ כּוֹרָה. מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה מְסֵמָה.


(5)


(5)

כָּרָאָה כָּרָאָה כָּרָאָה כָּרָאָה כָּרָאָה כָּרָאָה כָּרָאָה. כָּרָאָה כָּרָאָה כָּרָאָה כָּרָאָה תְּלָאָה הַלִּפְדוֹת בּוֹ הַלִּפְדוֹת.

(5)


(5)
(S) \(\text{τὸ τέταρτον ἐν πυρὶ ἀνακαύσεις ἐν μέσῃ τῇ πόλει κατὰ τὴν πλήρωσιν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ συγκλεισμοῦ. καὶ λήψῃ τὸ τέταρτον καὶ κατακάυσεις αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ τέταρτον κατακόψεις ἐν ρομφαίᾳ κύκλῳ αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ τέταρτον διασκορπίσεις τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ μάχαιραν ἐκκενώσω ὑπὸ σῶ ἀντῶν.}

(Trans. of S) “One of the three parts you shall burn by fire in the midst of the city when the days of your siege are fulfilled, and you shall take another part and cut with the sword around the city and a third part scatter in the wind. A sword will slay after them.”

Analysis of the Variants

S seems to have reworked its Hebrew Vorlage. S is not related to any other ancient version. It lacks the epexegetic addition of כְּנֶכֶסּלִע בָּרָה אֱכָנָי בַּכּוֹרִים, “those who slay by the sword I will send after them,” and the distributive particle with a preposition, לְךָל, “to every.” Syntactically the Syriac version strives to render the clearest sense; note for instance the additional specification for the possessive pronoun “her” in מַעְרִיתָה, “her environs/round about her,” with the additional word added to that phrase מַעְרִיתָה, “the environs/round about of the city.”

<0 T reads τέταρτον, “fourth,” instead of τρίτον, “third” for מַעְרִיתָה, “third,” with exception of some MSS of א, e.g., τρίτον 91 and Cods. 86, 87, and α’ α’ θ’.

Concerning numerical figures, the Peshitta of Ezek 1-12 is always in agreement with III. See 5:12 for another case of similarity in numerical figures between S and III.

S avoids picturing God sending a sword after the Israelites, as in the other versions; instead it changes the person of the verb פִּירָא, “I will unsheathe,” from the first to...
the third person, placing the sword as the subject and not the object of the verb, “a sword will slay after them.”

A redundancy is omitted from the text; the second instance of "ثالث", "third," in obierno was substituted by "أخرى", "another." This substitution does not change the meaning of the verse, but makes the reading of it flow more smoothly and naturally. It is clearly not a reflection of S’s Vorlage, but the literary skill of the Syriac scribe.

The additions of 6T are not present in S (καὶ κατακαίσεις αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς “and you shall burn it in the midst of her”). Manuscript group O marks this reading with an obelus, indicating that it might not have been in its original text.

The Syriac version seems to have been based on a Vorlage close to the Masoretic text, but the Syriac scribe made a highly elaborate translation with all the literary characteristics of the Peshitta of Ezek 1-12. It is an independent translation without any relationship to the targumic or Septuagintal translations.

Ezek 5:4

מָהָה עַדָּ חֵקַק הַשְּׁלֵשָׁה חֲזֹּיקָה אַל חַוָּא חַזָּה (II)

סְרֹפָת אֲשֶׁר בָּאָם הָעָם אַלּוֹ כְּלֵי יְשָׁרָאלוֹת

סְרֹפָת אֲשֶׁר בָּאָם הָעָם אַלּוֹ כְּלֵי יְשָׁרָאלוֹת (S)

סְרֹפָת אֲשֶׁר בָּאָם הָעָם אַלּוֹ כְּלֵי יְשָׁרָאלוֹת

מָהָה עַדָּ חֵקַק הַשְּׁלֵשָׁה חֲזֹּיקָה אַל חַוָּא חַזָּה (C)

καὶ οἱ τοῦτοι λήψετε ἐκ καὶ ρύζεσιν αὐτούς εἰς μέσον τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ
κατακαύσεις αὐτοὺς ἐν πῦρι ἐκ αὐτῆς ἐξελεύσεται πῦρ. Καὶ ἐρείς πάντι οὐκ Ἰσράηλ,

(Trans. of $) “And from them you shall take again and cast them into the midst of the fire, and burn them in the fire and from them will go out a fire against all those of the house of Israel.”

Analysis of the Variants

$T$ and $S$ are literal translations of a Hebrew text similar to $M$, while $G^T$ added at the end of the verse Καὶ ἐρείς, “and you shall say.” Manuscript group O and Cod. 86 indicate this reading with an obelus showing its dubious origin.

Ezek 5:5

(Trans. of $) “Thus says the Lord of Authority, ‘This is Jerusalem, among the nations I have placed her, and all the cities around her.’”

Analysis of the Variants

$S$ reworked the last Hebrew nominal clause ἔρτα τῆς ἱπποδρομίας ἀραβικάς, “and lands/countries
around her,” as “and all of them” the cities around her.” Although the term means cities, it also may convey the meaning of “countries/lands.” Therefore the only addition in the Syriac text is “and all of them.” It does not seem to be an actual reading of the S’s Vorlage, but probably only a way of emphasizing the geographical location of Jerusalem. C' and G agree with M in this regard.

The nomen sacrum is rendered by the correspondent Syriac “Lord of Authority,” while G* (B, 544, 927) has κύριος. Several MSS of G, however, read κύριος] + αὐθαναι 36° (+κύριος) 46, 130°; + αὐθαναι κύριος 407, 410; pr. αὐθανα rel. = M. S has consistently rendered the nomina sacra by the same terms Ἡ ἡμέρα, which correspond to the Hebrew terms

Ezek 5:6

(Trans. of G) But she has exchanged my judgments by the evil of the nations and my
statutes more than the cities around her. For my judgments they have rejected and not walked in my statutes.”

Analysis of the Variants

\$ reworked some portions of the subordinate clause introduced by \( \text{כְּ} \). The use of the preposition \( \text{ב} \) in IR seems awkward; see nrn rbrr K b mpm iokc ‘aatDon, “for [in that] my judgment they have rejected and as for my statutes, they have not walked in them.” \$ corrects the use of the preposition based on the context of this verse. \$ places the preposition \( \text{ב} \) with \( \text{חקותי} \), “my statutes,” so it became mshcherem, “and in my statutes.” Notice that in vs. 7 IR has the same clause with a slight variation, and the preposition \( \text{ב} \) is present there in the expected place before \( \text{חקותי} \) (ב), “in my statutes.” Therefore it might be a contextual harmonization of the text with the purpose of avoiding syntactical ambiguity.

\( \text{C}^l \) makes better use of the direct object mark found in the Masoretic reading. \( \text{C}^l \) reads אָשְׁרָאַ֣ה יִרְדֵּ֣י לִפְרָהּ בּוֹדִ֣י, “she altered my judgments to sin by them.” Thus the targumic scribe changed the intransitive Hebrew verb \( \text{מָכָּה} \), “she has rebelled,” for a transitive verb that requires a direct object. In this manner \( \text{C}^l \) avoids any syntactical blunder in its text.

Regarding \( \text{G}^t \), it has a reading on its own. It reworked the text presenting a different interpretation: קאֹּל ַרְאֵ֣י דָּקָּאֲוָמָּ֣ת מִּפְּלֵּ֣ה יִרְדֵּ֣י אֶנְוָ֣אֵמִ֣שׁ הוּאְּ לִפְרָהּ בּוֹדִ֣י, “and you will declare my statutes to the lawless one from out of the nations; and my commandments [to those] out of the nations round about you.” On the one hand \( \text{G}^t \) presents this verse as the purpose God had
for Jerusalem, “to declare His statutes” to the nations; on the other hand, $S$ and $T$ take it as a rebuke to Jerusalem.

Ezek 5:7

(Trans. of $S$) “Because of that, says the Lord of Authority, because you have regarded more the nations around you and you have not walked in my statutes and you have not performed my judgments, but you have performed the judgments of the nations around you.”

Analysis of the Variants

$S$ agrees with $III$ regarding the translation of the *nomina sacra* (see 3:11), while $6*$ has its typical κύριος, “Lord.” The difficult Inf. Cstr. plus the third person plural suffix
“you are turbulent?” appears only once in imson. It was translated by the verb רָעָם, "to think, regard, count," in the Ethpeel verb form. The cognate root of הָרִיב, "to be turbulent," in the target language is the noun יָרָם, "death, place of death." The cognate word is not a verb, but a noun, and with a completely different meaning. They are homonyms regarding their root, but not synonyms. Therefore it could not be used in this verse. Another Syriac verb close to the Hebrew one is the Syriac verb מְעָם, "to disregard, neglect." It might be the verb behind the guessing translation that took place here. The scribe inverted the negative meaning of the verb מְעָם to a positive one, from "disregard" to "regard." This shows that ס did not have at its disposition any MSS of א or ס recensions. For if ס had access to א or to any MS similar to the latter, the Hebrew verb מְעָם would probably be translated by ס based on the Greek translation (oriously, "pretext, occasion, opportunity," from the verb ἀφορίζω, "to separate, excommunicate," MSS 62, L-449-613 read μορφή). If a targumic tradition were behind its Vorlage, then ס would agree with the reading of ס that translated מְעָם by מְעָם (particle ד plus Peal Perf. 2° masc. pl. of the verb רָעָם, "to sin, be guilty"). Therefore, for translating difficult words ס did not recur to any other version, but depended on the context of the passage. Furthermore, ס lacks the ambiguous VE found at the end of the מ, while 6 ת (except MS 613) and ס have it.

Ezek 5:8

לִכְךָ כָּלָה שְׁאָרֵי הָעָה הָנָה עָלָה מִמֶּנָּה וְאֵין בָּהֶם בִּשְׁמָה בִּשְׁמָה מָסַפֵּר לֶחֶם לַגָּזִים (M)

כלְכָּלָה שְׁאָרֵי הָעָה הָנָה עָלָה מִמֶּנָּה וְאֵין בָּהֶם בִּשְׁמָה בִּשְׁמָה מָסַפֵּר לֶחֶם לַגָּזִים (S)
Analysis of the Variants

On the one hand, S is related to גת for both lack the emphatic phrase "also I/ I myself" (only MS 63 of ח, and α’, θ’ καὶ γε εγώ, Cod. 86 and α’ καὶ αὐτὸς εγώ contain it). S, however, agrees with מ concerning the translation of the nomina sacra as we have seen before (some MSS of ח contain κύριος ἁδώνα, 449, 86’ and rel.).

On the other hand, omission of redundancies is a common translation technique in the Peshitta book of Ezek 1-12. Therefore the similarity with גת may be purely coincidental and has nothing to do with a later revision based on a Greek recension similar to the latter.

Ezek 5:11

נָכֵי דָּה יִתְנֵא תָּא דַּתִּי יַתְה יַתְּרַח טַא מָדֵּב פָּמֵא בַּכֶּל (מ’)
שִׁפְכּוּר בַּכֶל הָעַבִּד תָּמִי אַנֶּרֶת לֵא הָתָא נַחְתִּי טַא מַל אָלָא אָחוֹתל
סִילָל קַמְדֵּה מַכְּה מַכְּה מַכְּה מַכְּה מַכְּה סִילָל מַכְּה מַכְּה מַכְּה מַכְּה מַכְּה מַכְּה מַכְּה מַכְּה מַכְּה מַכְּה מַכְּה מַכְּה מַכְּה מַכְּיְל
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Analysis of the Variants

Although C, D, and S are similar to M, one word seems to be difficult for them to translate. It is the verb אינא, "I will diminish, withdraw," in the Imperf. from the root עיד. The Syriac and Aramaic languages have a homonymous verb. It is the verb אינא and עיד "to shave, cut the hair" respectively, and its root is used in vs. 5:1 for the noun "barber’s razor." The semantic range of these cognate verbs אינא and עיד does not fit the context of the sentence. Therefore, there was a need for another verb, which was supplied by דק in C, and דק in S, “to cut, break off” and “drive you out/ reject you,” respectively. One may suggest that this is one of the few cases where S seems to be related to D. The latter has the verb אינא, "I will reject," from אינא, similar in meaning to the Syriac verb דק, "drive you out/ reject you" (א’ συγκλασω σε, "I will shatter you"). On the other hand, one word is not a proof for a direct relationship, for coincidence might be involved. S simply substituted a Syriac homonym for its Hebrew

(Trans. of S) "Therefore as I live, says the Lord of Authority, because you have defiled my sanctuary with all your abominations and by all your sins, I also will reject you and my eyes will not spare you and I will not have pity."
counterpart that would not fit the context of the passage in the Syriac language.

The *nominasacra* are rendered in the Syriac version in the same consistent way as usual by *καθαρτιᾶς ἡμῶν*, while in *G* (B, 927) by *κύριος* (*MSS in G* A rel. have *ἀδωνας*).

Also the Hebrew prepositional phrase כִּלְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְלַכְлַכְлַל
(Trans. of $S$) "One part of you will die by pestilence and by famine will they be consumed in your midst. And another by the sword will fall round about you, and a third I will scatter to all the winds and a sword will slay after them."

**Analysis of the Variants**

The main point in this verse is the rendering of the ordinal number ῥampoo, "the third," which is most of the time omitted in $S$ due to its redundant usage in the Hebrew text. Ȼ reads ῥεταρτόν, "the fourth," for ῥampoo (except Cod. 86-margin that has μονόν for the first instance and for the second μονόν τρίτον; ᾗ', Qtext and ȼ read καὶ τὸ τέταρτον οὖν). Probably the reading ῥεταρτόν in the Greek version is due to a syntactical arrangement of the text. Notice that there are four clauses in the Hebrew text before the last concluding one (ῥῆφα, "and a sword will I send after them"). Thus the scribes may have tried to improve the Hebrew text by exchanging "third" to "fourth," and by adding an extra ῥεταρτόν, "fourth," before ῥῆφα, "and by famine," which fits the sense of this verse even though it is not in the original.

Ȼ is also similar to 𝑚, but it reads for the last part ῥηθήσατο ἄνδρας ἀνεσθήσαι, "and those who slay by the sword I will incite after them." Therefore regarding this verse $S$ is an independent translation based on a Hebrew text similar to 𝑚 with a unique reading without any relationship to any version.
Ezek 5:14

And I will make you a desolation and a reproach among the nations round about you before the eyes of all that pass by.

Analysis of the Variants

\( S \) and \( \mathcal{C}' \) agree with the reading of \( \text{IR} \) word by word. \( \mathcal{G} \), however, has a unique reading not shared by the other versions. Its reading is, “and I will make you a desert, and your daughters \( (\kappa\alpha\iota\; \tau\acute{a}s\; \theta\upsilon\gamma\alpha\tau\acute{e}r\acute{o}\varsigma\; \varsigma\omega\upsilon) \) round about you, before all that pass by.” Only MSS 407 and 106 omitted this reading concerning \( \theta\upsilon\gamma\alpha\tau\acute{e}r\acute{o}\varsigma \). See also vs. 15 where \( \mathcal{G} \) has additions that are not present in the other versions, while \( S \) has a reading similar to that of \( \text{IR} \).

Ezek 5:17

Ezekiel, unto you hath he turned his eye, and he hath visited all your works, and all your doings he hath been mindful of.
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Analysis of the Variants

S has its own translation concerning the verbal sentence "if you will be bereaved." It reads "and you will be deprived/destroyed/slain." The Syriac language has a cognate word for the Hebrew verb "will be bereaved." The Hebrew "corresponds to ר in some Semitic languages. This is a normal linguistic phenomenon. S, however, did not use its cognate verb but a completely different one. CT employs the corresponding cognate verb, while G has a different reading: "and I will take vengeance upon you." This may indicate that this verb was rather confusing for the scribes or for their community, so it was substituted by another expression easier to be understood by the respective scribe/community.

Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 5

1. S shows a careful editorial work by omitting redundancies (5:1, 2, 8).
2. Contextual harmonizations are present in S (5:1, 6).
3. $S$ is always related to $M$ regarding numerical figures (5:2).

4. Pluses and minuses of $G$ and $C'$ are alien to $S$ (5:2).

5. $S$ agrees with $M$ concerning the translation of the *nomina sacra*, while $G^*$ has its typical $κυριος$ (5:5, 7).

6. Unique readings are present in $S$ (see for example 5:7).

7. $S$ has a careful translation of homonymous words (5:11, 7).

8. There are some unique readings of $G$ that are against $S$ (5:2, 14).
CHAPTER VII

EZEKIEL 6

Collation

6:3 Q. Perf. w. waw consec. נאשאיה] Peal Imperf. מְסָחַט “and say.”

6:5 Q. Perf. w. waw consec. נאשאיה] tr.

6:6 Q. Imperf. “they will be ruined” רְשָׁפְהָה] Peal Imperf. מְסָחַט “they will be desolated.”


6:8 Q. Imperf. “they will be guilty” רְשָׁפְהָה ] Peal Imperf. מְסָחַט “and they will be waste.”

6:9 Q. Act. Ptc. f. pl. וַהוֹזַה] Peal Perf. 3° f. pl. מָלָה “and they shall remember me, those of you who have escaped.”

Q. Imperf. “they will be ruined” רְשָׁפְהָה] Peal Imperf. מְסָחַט “they will be desolated.”

N. m. s. פָּלְפֵל] Ethpe. Imperf. 3° m. pl. מָסְחֹף “who have escaped.”

N. Inf. Cstr. בַּדַּמְלַכְתָּם] Ethpe. Imperf. 3° m. pl. מָסְחֹף “and they will be scattered.”

Q. Act. Ptc. f. pl. וַהוֹזַה] Peal Perf. 3° f. pl. מָלָה “they went astray.”
Data Analysis

Chapter 6 completes almost 50 percent of this investigation. About this time the reader may already be able to recognize some literary features and style of the Syriac translator: For example, he avoids redundancies, and strives to convey the text into a good Syriac style. Up to this point one can notice that the Peshitta book of Ezek 1-6 seems to have been prepared by a single hand, for the literary style, vocabulary, and translation techniques have kept consistent throughout the chapters.

Ezek 6:2

(31) בַּכְלֵי שָׁם פָנֵיכָל אָלֹהֶיךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל נִגְנֵבֶת נַעֲזֵמָה

(35) כָּרְכָּה. חֲסָרֵךְ מִשְׁפָּטָם לִפְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל סְגָלָה יְשִׁיבָה חֲסָרֵךְ.

(37) בַּכְלֵי בֵּית נַבְאָה כְּלָי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיֶשֶׁבֶת יָדוֹ בַּכְלֵי הָעַלֶגֶּשׁ.

(64) Ἐν γὰρ ἀνθρώπῳ, στήριξιν τῷ πρόσωπόν σου ἔπι τὰ ὀφθ. Ἰσραήλ καὶ
Analysis of the Variants

*S* is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of *מ*. Although *צ* is very similar to *מ*, it omits the idiomatic expression של פנים, "set your face," which is present in *ס* and *צ*. This is a classical example of Hebraism in *צ* (στηρισθην το πρόσωπόν σου).

*צ* reads public, "receive the prophecy."

Ezek 6:3

(Trans. of *ס*) “Son of man, set your face against the mountains of Israel and prophesy against them.”

(Trans. of *צ*) “And say, ‘Mountains of Israel, hear the word of the Lord of Authority. Thus says the Lord of Authority to the mountains and to the hills, to the valleys and to the
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springs: Behold, I am bringing against you a sword, and I will destroy your high places’.”

Analysis of the Variants

The Syriac text is similar to IR; the only exception is with the form of the first verb of the verse. IR has רָכַּב, “and (you will) say,” Qal Perf. 2° pers. sing., which with its waw consecutive is equal to the imperative, while ָסָי, “say,” Peal Imper. 2° m. s. ֶךְ and ָט have the verb in the future tense: “and you shall say,” and ָט, “and you shall say,” respectively. The Syriac version is a literal translation of the idiom of its Hebrew Vorlage. ֶך has also a unique reading regarding the Hebrew sentence אֶלֶיךָ מְשָׁרְתִּי וְאֵת הַשְּׁמָטָהּ, “I am bringing against you a sword” (ַ and ָט read similarly to IR regarding this sentence); ֶך reads כָּאַמְתָּא מְזִה, “I bring against you those who slay by the sword.” This rendering was probably done with the purpose of removing all possibility of any anthropomorphic implication to God.

Concerning the nomina sacra, אֲדוֹנָי יְהֹוָה, “Adonai Yahweh,” ֶט * keeps its usual way by omitting יְהֹוָה, and translating only הָוָה by κυρίον. There are, however, some MSS in ֶט א that contain the Masoretic reading, e.g., 36, 763, and rel.

Ezek 6:4

תִּנְסָמֵא מֵתוֹעָכוֹן וְתֵמוֹךְ וְהָפְלִיתָא חָלָיֵיכָא לֶפִי נֵאָלוֹלֵיכָא (III)

טֵיֵוְ קַעְסִיָּטָא, סִיָּטִיָּיָתָא, מַסְיִיָּהְוָא, מֶסֶּיָּיָוָא, כַּעָּסִיָּיָוָא, שֶׁמַּיְיָא, מַשַּּיְיָא, מַשָּיָיָוָא, מַשְׁיָיָוָא (S)

יוֹדְיוֹן אָנָוָרָכָו וְהָפְלִיתָא כַּרְפָּר וְאָרָמָא כַּפָּרָלָרָו קַעְעָר פְּיָרָן מַעְמָחָן (׳)

(6* ) כְּאֵּנָּו וְשֵׁעִירְיָהְוָא דַּאְתְּ שׁוֹעְסָאָתוֹ דַּאְתְּ שׁוֹעְסָאָתוֹ דַּאְתְּ שׁוֹעְסָאָתוֹ (׳)

(6* ) כְּאֵּנָּו וְשֵׁעִירְיָהְוָא דַּאְתְּ שׁוֹעְסָאָתוֹ דַּאְתְּ שׁוֹעְסָאָתוֹ דַּאְתְּ שׁוֹעְסָאָתוֹ (׳)
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τραυματίας ὑμῶν ἐνώπιον τῶν εἰδώλων ὑμῶν,

(Trans. of S) “Your altars will be desolate, and your idols will be broken; and I will cast down your corpses before your idols.”

Analysis of the Variants

S has its reading identical to ℳ, while at first glance ᵃ* seems to have omitted the Hebrew verb תַּגְּרִים, “and they will be broken.” Based on the context of this verse there are two possibilities for the Greek translation. First, the Greek deviation can be a dislocation or a substitution for the Hebrew verb תַּגְּרִים in the Greek text. In other words, ᵃ* substitutes the introductory verb תַּגְּרִים “and they will be desolate” by καὶ συντρυβήσονται, “and they will be broken into pieces,” or it seems that ᵃ* dislocates backwards the second Hebrew verb (רָכִּים) and omits the first one. Notice, however, that some MSS of ᵃ contain the Masoretic reading, e.g., αφανιζούσαι (ὁσονται 46, 106) τα θυσ. υμών καὶ συντρυβήσονται (ὁσονται 311; > 106; καὶ συντρυβ. sub * O) Ο’ Λ’-311, 106 “your altars will be destroyed and broken.” The Hexaplaric witnesses read, init. -2° καὶ] α’ θ’ καὶ αφανιζούσαι (π’ καὶ αφανιζούσαι 86) τα θυσιαστηρια υμών καὶ συντρυβήσονται ῥαα; α’, θ’ καὶ συντρυβήσονται 86; α’ καὶ συνκλαθήσονται, “they will be shattered,” 86.

The only possibility for S is to have been based on a Hebrew text similar to ℳ.

Another deviation of ᵃ* is the rendering of רָכִּים, “your pillars/incense altars,” by the phrase τα τεμένη υμών, “your sacred things” (α’ ξοανα “wooden image” 86). This may be due to an interpretative translation of the Hebrew counterpart and not due to an actual
reading in $\mathfrak{G}^*$'s Vorlage. $\mathfrak{C}^i$ contains some explanatory additions, e.g., “your decaying idols,” and $\mathfrak{C}^j$, “your heathen altars.”

Ezek 6:5

(Trans. of $\mathfrak{S}$) “And I will cast the dead bodies of the house of Israel before their idols; and I will scatter your bones round about your altars.”

Analysis of the Variants

$\mathfrak{S}$ has two deviations from $\mathfrak{M}$. The first one is הָעֵצְיָם, “house of Israel,” for the Hebrew בָּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, “sons of Israel,” whereas MS 12a1 has the Masoretic reading בְּנֵי. $\mathfrak{C}^i$ reads like $\mathfrak{M}$ regarding this word, though it has some interpretative additions to this verse. The second deviation is the rendering of the first Hebrew verb וְזָרַע, “and I will set, put, lay,” by זָרַע, “and I will cast.” Even though the main sense of זָרַע is “to give,” it is a polysemic verb. Thus the Syriac scribe may have avoided any ambiguous sense or a Hebraism. That is not the case in several MSS of $\mathfrak{G}^\mathfrak{A}$ containing the Greek verb δῶσω, “I will give,” which sounds more like a Hebraism than a good Greek translation.

$\mathfrak{G}^*$ (B, 106) omits the entire first clause from לֹא לְהַלָּלוֹת הַוָּדִים אֶל הָעֵצְיָם אֶל הַיָּתוֹם מָשָׁה הַמְּבֹהֵטִים (Trans, of $\mathfrak{S}$) “And I will cast the dead bodies of the house of Israel before their idols; and I will scatter your bones round about your altars.”
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86*-239', 26) ὑιῶν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ (καὶ τὸ 407) προσώπων τῶν ἐσόντων αὐτῶν, rel. On the other hand they read ὑιῶν Ἰσραὴλ in the same way as III. Consequently S has a unique reading concerning Ἰσραὴλ, “sons of Israel.”

Ezek 6:6

(III) בְּכֵל מִשְׁפַּטָיו מַעְרֵי תָּחְרְבָה וְתָהְרֹתָם וַיָּכְמוּ לְפָנָיו יְהוָה (S) בְּכֵל מִשְׁפַּטָיו מַעְרֵי תָּחְרְבָה וֶהָרֹתָם וַיָּכְמוּ לְפָנָיו יְהוָה (C) בְּכֵל מִשְׁפַּטָיו מַעְרֵי תָּחְרְבָה וְתָהְרֹתָם וַיָּכְמוּ לְפָנָיו יְהוָה (S*) בְּכֵל מִשְׁפַּטָיו מַעְרֵי תָּחְרְבָה וְתָהְרֹתָם וַיָּכְמוּ לְפָנָיו יְהוָה (C*) בְּכֵל מִשְׁפַּטָיו מַעְרֵי תָּחְרְבָה וְתָהְרֹתָם וַיָּכְמוּ לְפָנָיו יְהוָה

In all your dwelling places your cities will be laid waste and the high places desolate, so that your altars may be made desolate, and your idols may be broken and made desolate, and your images may be cut down, and your works may be blotted out.”

Analysis of the Variants

S and C mostly agree with III with the exception of Ἰσραὴλ, “and they will be made guilty.” They substituted this verb, probably based on contextual exegesis, by ἁφανισθῆναι and...
I'ış'H, “and they will be desolate.” Another possibility is that the Syriac scribe may have confused the radicals of the verbs ܢܘܫܐ, “to ruin,” and ܢܘܚܢܢ, “to make guilty,” as well as the verb from vs. 4, ܢܘܡܢ, “to become desolate.” Thus the Syriac scribe decided to translate all of them by the same Syriac verb ܢܘ^, “to become desolate.” © also deviates from ܠ by omitting this verb (דאומך).

Further Septuagintal minuses are ܢܘܫܐ, “and they will be destroyed,” and ܢܘܫܐ ܢܒܫܒܒܐ, “and wipe out your works,” and pluses are καί ἔξαρθησεται τὰ τεμένη ܘܡܘܢ, “and your sacred things be abolished.” Some MSS of ©Λ contain a reading corresponding to ܢܒܫܒܒܐ, “and they will be destroyed,” with slight variation, e.g., καταπατασσόμεν, “they will cease” ( Xml, ὁσοί 88), O-407, L-51-311, also a ξ in θ', Qtxt, and 86.

The unique reading of ©Τ καί ἔξαρθησεται τὰ τεμένη ܘܡܘܢ, “and your sacred things/areas will be abolished,” is rendered by ξοανα, “wooden image,” in a’s version as in the preceding verse. The final omission (ܢܒܫܒܒܐ ܢܒܘܐ ܢܒܘܐ, “and your works will be wiped out”) of ©* (MSS B, 233) is present in some MSS of ©Α, e.g., ( Xml O, 449) καί ἐξαλειφθῶσιν τὰ ἐργα (ὁρια 106) ܢܒܘܢ and rel., and ξ ὦ καί ἐξαλειφθῶσιν τὰ ἐργα (α’ πωτιματα 86) ܢܒܘν Qtxt, “and your works will be wiped out.” S contains the Hebrew reading regarding the last portion ܢܒܘܐ ܩܢܛ뎡, “and your works will be blotted out,” as also occurs in some MSS of ©Α.

Ezek 6:8

גֵּדִיהוּ בִּשְׁמַיָּו לֹא יָשַׁמֶּר הָרָעָב בְּנֵינוּ בַּהוֹרָהֲשָׁם בָאֲרוֹן תָּכֹת (רָא)
Yet I will leave some of you among the nations, those who have escaped from the sword and have been scattered among the cities/countries.

Analysis of the Variants

$S$ and $C'$ agree mostly with the reading of $M$. $C'$ has the same word order, while $S$ rearranged the text avoiding a construct chain (בר יר). $S$ is closely related to $M$ regarding its vocabulary. $G^*$ (B C' - 87-86'-393, 106), however, omits the first Hebrew word, "and I will leave." Several MSS of $G^A$ have ὑπολείψομαι, "I will leave a remaining portion," e.g., (ψω 147) rel. Also $B'$ and $Q'$ have an asterisk with this reading indicating that their Vorlagen had it.

The Hebrew idiomatic expression, Inf. Cstr. + לصاص, was rendered as סנהפמ "a part/some of you," in the Syriac version. Note the Hebrewism in $G^T$ γενέσθαι εξ υμῶν, except in MS L'-311 that reads του γεν, and in MS 62 (1°) that has εν τω ειναι.

Ezek 6:9

(Trans. of $S$) "Yet I will leave some of you among the nations, those who have escaped from the sword and have been scattered among the cities/countries."

Analysis of the Variants

$S$ and $C'$ agree mostly with the reading of $M$. $C'$ has the same word order, while $S$ rearranged the text avoiding a construct chain (בר יר). $S$ is closely related to $M$ regarding its vocabulary. $G^*$ (B C' - 87-86'-393, 106), however, omits the first Hebrew word, "and I will leave." Several MSS of $G^A$ have ὑπολείψομαι, "I will leave a remaining portion," e.g., (ψω 147) rel. Also $B'$ and $Q'$ have an asterisk with this reading indicating that their Vorlagen had it.

The Hebrew idiomatic expression, Inf. Cstr. + לصاص, was rendered as סנהפמ "a part/some of you," in the Syriac version. Note the Hebrewism in $G^T$ γενέσθαι εξ υμῶν, except in MS L'-311 that reads του γεν, and in MS 62 (1°) that has εν τω ειναι.

Ezek 6:9

(Trans. of $S$) "Yet I will leave some of you among the nations, those who have escaped from the sword and have been scattered among the cities/countries."

Analysis of the Variants

$S$ and $C'$ agree mostly with the reading of $M$. $C'$ has the same word order, while $S$ rearranged the text avoiding a construct chain (בר יר). $S$ is closely related to $M$ regarding its vocabulary. $G^*$ (B C' - 87-86'-393, 106), however, omits the first Hebrew word, "and I will leave." Several MSS of $G^A$ have ὑπολείψομαι, "I will leave a remaining portion," e.g., (ψω 147) rel. Also $B'$ and $Q'$ have an asterisk with this reading indicating that their Vorlagen had it.

The Hebrew idiomatic expression, Inf. Cstr. + לصاص, was rendered as סנהפמ "a part/some of you," in the Syriac version. Note the Hebrewism in $G^T$ γενέσθαι εξ υμῶν, except in MS L'-311 that reads του γεν, and in MS 62 (1°) that has εν τω ειναι.

Ezek 6:9

(Trans. of $S$) "Yet I will leave some of you among the nations, those who have escaped from the sword and have been scattered among the cities/countries."
And those of you who have escaped will remember me among the nations where they are taken captive, when I have broken their adulterous heart, for they have departed from me, and their eyes, for they have gone astray after idols. Their faces will be contracted [as in pain] with the evils they have done and with all of their abominations.

Analysis of the Variants

S has a similar reading to that of $\mathbb{M}$ with some editorial rearrangement of the text, e.g., construct chains are avoided, and the redundant repetition of the Participle תָּנָּה, “adulterous,” is substituted by the Peal Perf. 3° f. pl. verb וְעָלָּחֵן, “they have gone astray,” probably to avoid monotonous repetition. $\mathbb{C}^i$ has some interpretative substitution, e.g., רַדְשָׁה, “my worship,” for רָצוּ, “me,” probably indicating that the people were worshiping strange gods, idols, as is implied in the context.

$\mathbb{G}^\ast$ is very different from S, $\mathbb{C}^i$, and $\mathbb{M}$. It has several substitutions which are supported by almost all its MSS. Concerning the sentence תָּנָּה תָּנָּה, “when I have
broken for myself” (Ni. form with middle voice sense)\(^1\), \(\text{T}\) reads \(\delta \mu \mu \mu \alpha\kappa\alpha\), “I have sworn”; the only exception is MS 62 that has \(\sigma \nu \varepsilon \tau \rho \pi \alpha \), “I will shatter.” The Hebrew word behind \(\delta \mu \mu \mu \alpha\kappa\alpha\) is \(\text{N} \text{H}\), “I have sworn,” which is also present in \(\text{T}\). BHS suggests \(\text{N} \text{H}\) (Qal cf. \(\alpha\), \(\theta\) \(\sigma \nu \varepsilon \tau \rho \pi \alpha\), and \(\sigma\) \(\sigma \nu \gamma \kappa \alpha \tau \varepsilon \alpha \zeta\), “I will bring down/destroy”) as an alternative reading for the Hebrew Ni. perf. 1 c. sing. \(\text{N} \text{H}\) “when I have broken for myself.” \(\text{S}\) reads \(\tilde{\alpha} \tilde{\iota} \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{\mu} \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{\kappa}\), “when I have destroyed,” in the active form (Peal) as the vocalization suggested by BHS (Qal form). It does not mean, however, that the \(\text{S}\)’s Vorlage had it (\(\text{N} \text{H}\) Ni.) in the active voice (\(\text{N} \text{H}\) Qal) as BHS apparatus suggests, because in several instances the choice between active or passive voice in the Syriac version depends on the translator’s perception and interpretation of the context of the specific passage,\(^2\) e.g., see from passive to active voice change the collation of verses 1:20, 21; 3:4; 10:11, 13, 16; 11:15; 12:25, 28. This may only be a misunderstanding on the part of the Syriac translator of the Nifal with the force of the middle voice.

\(\text{T}\) translates both instances of the participle \(\pi \tau \sigma \), and it has general support of its MSS (see \(\text{T}\) in Göttingen edition), while \(\text{S}\) substitutes for the second instance of it as

\(^1\)The Niphal here should be taken as having the force of the middle voice, cf., “Nifal can have the force of the Greek middle voice, e.g., \(\text{N} \text{H}\) to ask for oneself,” Paul Jotion and T. Muraoka, \textit{A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew} (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1993), 151; cf., Ronald J. Williams, \textit{Hebrew Syntax: An Outline} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 27; E. Kautzsch, ed., \textit{Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar}, 2nd. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), §51c-e; C. F. Keil, and F. Delitzsch, \textit{Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes}, vol. 9 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, rep. 1991), 94: Regarding this passage they stated that “the Niphal here is not to be taken as passive, but middle,” and they translated it as “when I have broken to me.”

\(^2\)Lund, 418.
mentioned above. In addition, \( \text{**}" \) reads ἑπτὰδειμάτων αὐτῶν, “their practices,” for וֶעָנְבָּם, “their idols.” The only MS similar to \( \text{**}" \) is MS 62 that reads εἰμὶ ἀλήθειαν.

The Hebrew verb 'Ep3 from הָשָּׂם, “and they will abhor, be unwilling, be reluctant, be loathsome,” seems to have been difficult to be understood by all the versions. \( \text{T}" \) has κόψουνται, “they will mourn,” instead of this verb (only MS 62 1° reads καὶ προσοχεῖοντο, “and they will be angry, provoked/offended”); \( \text{S}" \) reads ἀγαθομαχία, “they will be contracted [as in pain, wrinkled]”; \( \text{T}" \) reads τίμησαν, “they will feel remorse, regret.” This verse is clear evidence supporting a noninterrelationship of \( \text{S}" \) to any other version, but to a Hebrew Vorlage similar to \( \text{**}" \).

Ezek 6:10

(\( \text{**}" \)) ידוע כי יְהוָה לא אלה תבdi לְעֵשת לְהוֹם וְרָעָתוֹם.

(\( \text{S}" \)) הנהו תֹּם אָנָּה יְהוָה לְהוֹם לְעֵשת לְרַעָתוֹם.

(\( \text{T}" \)) וַיִודְעוּ אֲדֹנָיו אֲלֵהֶם לְעֵשת לְרַעָתוֹם לְרָעָתוֹם.

(\( \text{**}" \) to the reading of \( \text{**}" \) with a single modification of a nonfinite form of the verb (רָעָתָם “to make”) to a finite one (רָאָתָם “I will do”). The only targumic addition is “my Memra,” which is a common targumic characteristic. Although \( \text{**}" \) lacks half of the
verse, “not in vain,” and “to do to them this evil,” this is not a secure evidence for preference, for a shorter text may be due to scribal error. There are, however, several MSS of ₫Α that read like ₫, e.g., οὐκ εἰς δωρεάν τοῦ (τοῦτο 311) ποιησαί αὐτοῖς ἀπαντά (παντά 538) τὸ κακὰ ταῦτα (αὐτῶν 410), and rel. The same reading is present in θ' and Qtxt marked by a X οὐκ εἰς δωρεὰν τοῦ ποιησαί αὐτοῖς ἀπαντά τὸ κακὰ ταῦτα. In this case Σ is an independent translation avoiding the targumic interpretation and the omission of ₫.

Ezek 6:11

(_stage) 

כָּעָם אֲדֹנִי יְהֹוָה צַדְּקֵנִי תָּחַת גְּבוּלֵךְ וְרָפֵאָךְ וְאֶזְרָךְ אַלּ (II)

cel tov unh th bi tis lroa amr bhr brt bbr pl

כָּעָם אֲדֹנִי יְהֹוָה צַדְּקֵנִי תָּחַת גְּבוּלֵךְ וְרָפֵאָךְ וְאֶזְרָךְ אַלּ

כָּעָם אֲדֹנִי יְהֹוָה צַדְּקֵנִי תָּחַת גְּבוּלֵךְ וְרָפֵאָךְ וְאֶזְרָךְ אַלּ (II)

cel tov unh th bi tis lroa amr bhr brt bbr pl

(_stage) 

(6*) τάδε λέγει κύριος Κράτησον τῇ χειρί καὶ ψόφησον τῷ ποδὶ καὶ εἰπόν Εὐγενεῖ 

(Trans. of Σ) “Thus says the Lord of Authority: clap your hand, and stamp your foot, and say, Alas for all the evil abomination and evil of the house of Israel! for they will fall by the sword, by famine and by pestilence.”
Analysis of the Variants

S’s word order is in agreement with ⼒R, while 6* has a transposition between
"by famine," and "by pestilence," namely θανάτῳ, "pestilence," and
λημψ, "famine." Some MSS of 6A contain the Masoretic word order, e.g., O’, L’-Z’,
534-403’. ⼒ agrees mostly with ⼒R in its rendering of the text. The only deviation is the
verb ἔσται, "they will fall," which was translated by
τρίτοι, "they will be removed." S
translates both proper names μεθίσ as usual, while 6* renders only κύριος. Some MSS
of 6A read like ⼒R regarding nomina sacra, e.g., A, O’, L’-46-311, C.

Ezek 6:12

(⼒R) ἡρῴδης ναόμματοι εἰς τὸ ἱερό τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἐνεργεῖ ὑπὸ τῶν κελευθερωμένων ἤπειρον (⼒S)

(6*) ὁ ἐγγύς ἐν Ῥωμαίοις πεσεῖται, ὁ δὲ μακρὰν ἐν θανάτῳ τελευτᾷ, καὶ ὁ
περιεχόμενος ἐν λῃμῷ συντελεσθήσεται, καὶ συντελεσώ τὴν ὄργην μου ἐν
αὐτοῦς.

(Trans. of S) “He who is far away will die of pestilence, and he who is near will fall by the
sword, and he who remains and he who escapes will die by famine; thus will I accomplish
my fury against them.”
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Analysis of the Variants

S is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of IR with only a different word order (transposition) regarding the two words "by pestilence they will die." CJ may have had a different recension or undergone some epexegetical interpretation based on the context; for it reads "he who enters the besieged fortification/fortified cities will perish by famine," following the S* reading, καὶ ὁ περιεχόμενος ἐν λιμῷ συντελεσθῆσεται, "and he who is in the siege will be consumed by famine." Some MSS of S contain the Masoretic reading, e.g., A, O-62, 538-449, 239-403 καὶ ὁ ὀπολειφθεὶς, "and the one who remains," and MSS L-311-V-46-Z, 410 read καὶ ὁ περιλειφθεὶς, "and he who is left behind," and the Hexaplaric witnesses are o' o πολιορκουμένος, ὀ' has an asterisk marking its reading καὶ ὁ ὀπολειφθεὶς Q tekst, Cod. 86 and λ το [καὶ o] περιλ[ε]φθεὶς.

Ezek 6:13

ירשעכ כ איה ידה ביתו שליליהם בתוכ נוליליהם ספרות מובאותיו (S)
לא כל שנשת רמה בכלי רטש הוהות היה כל פן ענג והוהות כל אלה
עבשה מוקד אשף נמר פיר ניזא לכל נוליליהם

{ךונסך מ-envelope, ב-Envelope, כ-Envelope, מ-Envelope חסמה (S)
עלIndexPath, ב-IndexPath, ד-IndexPath, חסמה חסמה
למע), חסמה חסמה טעמכ עלIndexPath, חסמה חסמה, שמסהו.
{מקסך פי מצפה, ל-IndexPath, חסמה חסמה

חדרן או איה ידה ביתו שליליהם בכי פרה פנהותם מצפהו אראיה (C)
Then they will know that I am the Lord, when their corpses will be among their idols round about their altars on every high hill and at all the tops of the mountains and under every green tree and under every thick oak, in the place where they put incense for all their idols.

Analysis of the Variants

S is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of M. While S* (B) omitted some key phrases, e.g., "on every top of the mountains," and "and under every leafy oak," there are some MSS of S* that contain these two minuses. A group of these MSS have the first part, e.g., (X O) καὶ εὖ (ἐπὶ 311, 239, 403') πασσαὶ (+ ταῖς V-449) κορυφαῖς τῶν (≥ 26) ὀρέων rel, "and in every top of the mountains." The second minus is present in (X O) καὶ ὑποκατὶ πασης (≥ C' 393, 26) δρυος δασ(ε)μας rel, "and under every bushy tree."

Another interpretative translation that does not change the original sense is the rendering of ἀρωματία, "pleasing aroma." S translates it by καραθοῦ, "incense," C* has ψαρμὴν εὐωδίας, "sweet savor."
Ezek 6:14

And I will stretch out my hand against them, and I will make the land desolate and waste, more than the wilderness of Diblath, throughout all their inhabitation. Then they will know that I am God.

Analysis of the Variants

One of the problems of this verse is the paragogic he in the word רבדלאה, “Diblath.” This he is a he locale indicating direction “toward, to.” It seems that the translators of the versions avoided it, or they just tried to make a syntactical arrangement of the text to improve its reading. א"ו transliterated it as part of the word itself, דבלאה. צ' has “from the wilderness of Diblat,” or “more than the wilderness of Diblat.” $ reads similarly to צ'.

---

indicating delimitation or comparison. Scholars have recognized that the hapax legomenon Diblah probably involved the common scribal error, ה for ה, and that the Hebrew text means the extent of destruction, from the desert in the far south to the area of Riblah in the far north; so the proposed emendation of BHS apparatus for the Hebrew text would be “from the wilderness to Riblah” (רַבְרִילָה). 1

Concerning C, it avoids anthropomorphism by substituting “my hand” by “my destructive power.” S completely ignores this interpretative translation.

Another deviation of G* is that it has ἐπιγνώσεσθε, “you will know,” instead of the Hebrew רְדָו “and they will know,” while S and C agree with M regarding this reading. Some MSS of G, however (L'-311-ZV), read υπηγνωσονται as in M. These nonshared readings of the versions indicate a dynamic process in their translations.

Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 6

1. S is most of the time a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of M.

2. Concerning nomina sacra S is always consistent and in agreement with M, while G* has its deviations (6:3, 11).

3. S has some unique readings, e.g., נְּבִי for נְבִי (6:5).

---

1[הָרָעִית] cannot = ‘from the wilderness of Diblahah,’ as the punctuation intends, because the second word is an accus. = ‘to Diblah,’ not a gen. ; 1. מַמְנוֹרָת דּוֹלְבָּה. G Δεβלדב (so Jer. 529.26.27, 4 Regn. 2333 cod.A) follows M, shewing that the mistake was ancient; the letters r and d are easily confused both in the archaic and in the square character, cp. 39 n. S ‘desolate more than the land of Dablah,’ but in the Ambr. and other MSS ‘and I will make the land a destruction and an astonishment from the wilderness of Dablah.’” G. A. Cooke, The Book of Ezekiel, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1951), 75; Zimmerli (182) is of the same opinion as Cooke.
4. $S$ does not have the pluses and minuses of $G^T$.

5. It does not avoid anthropomorphism as occurs in $C'$ (6:14).

6. $S$'s relationship to $C'$ can be explained by contextual exegesis (6:6).

7. Reworking of the text is a normal characteristic of $S$, e.g., word order, and omitting redundancy (6:9).
CHAPTER VIII

EZEKIEL 7

Collation

7:2
[7] רעתי אשת רעה קאבחה tr.‎
om. וַאֲפִלָּה “as for.”
Q. Perf. 3° m. s. pr. Peal Imper.
מ. s. נָלַח “say.”
ומ. נָלַח יְרָאָלע tr.‎
כַּא tr.

7:3
[7] אֲנִי יְרָאָלע [שְׁלֵמָה] "and I will pour out,”
מש 9a1 אֲנִי יְרָאָלע "and I will send.”
7:4
[7] וּדְוַיְשָׁרָה [יִדְוַיְשָׁרָה] “and you will know.”
ומ. נָלַח יְרָאָלע [עָלֵיה] "that I am.”
7:5
7:6
ומ. נָלַח יְרָאָלע tr.‎
כַּא tr.

7:7
בָּא synonym Peal Perf. 3° m. s. מַרְתָּל “has come.”
ואו ויהו ודיחי [ומ.]
כַּא "trouble.”
7:8
וכלַּמ [בַּל] “upon you.”
7:9  יִדְרִי רָאָה נָא  "but."
om. (MSS 6h15, 7h2, 8a1c, 9d1.2, 10d1, 11d1.2, 12a1, 12d1-3 have it after "my eyes.").
Q. Perf. 1° c. s. נֶפֶל Peal Perf. 1° c. s. + Object pron. מָשַׁתַּחְתָּנָה "I will repay you, reward you."
2° f. s. מָשַׁתַּחְתָּנָה "and you will know."
Hi. Ptc. m. s. מְכַלֶּה Peal Ptc. m. s. + 2° f. s. מָשַׁתַּחְתָּנָה "who have smitten."
7:10  הָנָה כֹּל הַמְּכַלֶּה "and injustice."
20 om.
7:11  מְכַלֶּה מִלְּכַלֶּהוּ "disorder, tumult."
מְכַלֶּה מִלְּכַלֶּהוּ "from their works."
מְכַלֶּה מִלְּכַלֶּהוּ "I will not rest on them."
7:12  Hi. Perf. 3° m. s. מְשַׁה "and near."
ומְשַׁה "their purchase, possession."
7:13  om. מְשַׁה מִלְּכַלֶּהוּ // לָא יֵשׁ "in their lives." מְשַׁה מִלְּכַלֶּהוּ // לָא יֵשׁ "their purchase, possession."
7:14  Hi. Inf. Abs. מְשַׁה מִלְּכַלֶּהוּ "they got ready." מְשַׁה מִלְּכַלֶּהוּ "their purchase, possession."
7:15  מְשַׁה מִלְּכַלֶּהוּ "in the house."
7:16
Q. Perf. 3° pl. מ’anăm [Peal Imperf. 3° pl.
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים “and they will escape.”
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים “those who escape from them.”
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים om.
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים “valleys” [Subst. מְסַפָּקִים “crags, ledges.”
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים Peal Imperf. 3° m. pl. מְסַפָּקִים “they will die.”
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים “in his sins.”
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים

7:19
Prep. + n. f. s. + Q. Imperf. מִלְּדוֹת וַיָּהָה [Aphel Pass. Ptc. m. s. מְסַפָּקִים “they will be despised.”
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים

7:20
Q. Perf. 3° pl. מְסַפָּקִים [tr.
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים “they made.”
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים “because of this.”
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים Q. Perf. 1° c. s. + suf. מְסַפָּקִים [Peal Perf. 1° c. s. + suf. מְסַפָּקִים “I have made it.”
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים Prep. + n. f. s. מִלְּדוֹת [Aphel Pass. Ptc. מְסַפָּקִים “despised.”
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים

7:22
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים “My treasure place” מַעֲזָרִי [_conditions מְסַפָּקִים “my watchtower.”
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים

7:23
Q. Imper. 2° m. s. מִלְּדוֹת [Peal Imperf. 3° m. pl. מְסַפָּקִים “and they will cross, invade.”
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים מְסַפָּקִים “with bricks, mud, mixture.”
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים “iniquity.”
 CONDITIONS מְסַפָּקִים
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Data Analysis

Chapter 7 of Ezekiel is one of the most important chapters for establishing the relationship, if any, of S to any other version, especially S. Notice that the verse order of S is completely different from the versions all together. The differences start in vs. 3, which corresponds to vs. 6 of ℳ, and vs. 4 to vs. 7 of ℳ, vs. 5 to vs. 8, vs. 6 to vs. 9, vs. 7 to vs. 3, and vs. 8 and 9 to 5. S in this case remains faithful to its basic Hebrew text, which is identical in this regard to ℳ.

Ezek 7:2

והזה בַּכּ רְאוּ הַכּ בּ הוא היי יפּוֹ הַכּ בּ לְאֹרֵעַ יִשְׂרָאֵל יָדוּ הכּ בּ הַקּ בּ הַעֲבֹרָה לְאֹרֵעַ יִשְׂרָאֵל (ℳ)

שֶׁלָּכְכּ מֶכְרָפָה, יָדוּ כּ בּ מֶכְרָפָה, מֶכְרָפָה לְאֹרֵעַ יִשְׂרָאֵל (S)

אַשְׁוַא בּ כּ בּ שֶׁלָּלְו מֶכְרָפָה מֶכְרָפָה מֶכְרָפָה לְאֹרֵעַ יִשְׂרָאֵל (C)
154

(6*) Кαὶ οὖ, οὐε ἀνθρώπου, εἶπών Τάδε λέγει κύριος τῇ γῇ τοῦ Ἱσραὴλ Πέρας ἦκει, τὸ πέρας ἦκει ἐπὶ τὰς τέσσαρας πτέρυγας τῆς γῆς.

(Trans. of S) “Then you son of man say: thus says the Lord of Authority, the end has come upon the land of Israel, and the end has come on the four corners of the land.”

Analysis of the Variants

S and 6* share the same extra-Masoretic variant regarding the addition of the Imper. 2ο s. of ἐγὼ, “say,” and εἶπών, “say,” respectively, before οὖ ἀνθρώπου, “thus says the Lord. . . .” On the other hand, several MSS of 6 do not have this plus in their texts, e.g., MSS O-Q, V-Z. Regarding this addition C* agrees with M’s reading.

As we have seen above, S has a tendency to smooth the text, making it more readable, thus the addition of the Imperative may well be a reflection of this literary characteristic and not an actual reading of S’s Vorlage. In Biblical Hebrew and in Biblical Aramaic this type of verbal hendiadys—twice the verb ἐγὼ—is frequent with verbs of speaking, and it may be the case in this verse, so S has supplied the Imperative even though its Vorlage lacked it. The use of this feature (verbal hendiadys) in 6* could well be a Hebraism and not a normal Greek style. This may be the case of S following a literary feature of the Aramaic language rather than a Hebraism.

S translates the nomina sacra as usual against the minus of it in 6*'s reading (אומרא). Notice that most of the MSS of the latter version contain the Masoretic reading ἐγὼ.

R. A. Taylor, 64.
Ezek 7:3

Now the end is upon you, and I will pour out my wrath upon you, and I will judge according to your ways, and I will bring upon you all of your abomination.

Analysis of the Variants

S agrees with MT; the sole deviation is the unique reading of the verb רָצַח, "and I will send." Instead S has רָצַח, "and I will cast, throw, pour." It seems more an interpretative rendering, rather than an actual reading. On the other hand, MS 9al of S reads רָצַח, "and I will send," which is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to MT.

As I have said above, the entire chap. 7 is very important regarding S’s Vorlage; for 6T has a completely different sequence for the verses in this chapter. Vs. 3 of 6T corresponds to vs. 7 of the Greek version, and vs. 6 of the former to vs. 3 of the latter, whereas S remains related to MT. It shows that the Syriac version follows a Hebrew recension very close to that of MT.

6 omits the noun רָצַח, “my anger,” but some MSS of 6A contain the phrase רָצַ ח.
Regarding the preposition כ (in כ-דרכיך), $\text{S}^*$ omits it, while MSS L'-311-Zv read קרַעַשׁ סֶכֶתָא תַאֶזׁ אֹדוּס. Although MSS L'-311-Zv read close to the Masoretic reading, they have the same verse order of $\text{S}^*$. Therefore if $\text{S}$ had any relationship to $\text{S}^\text{A}$, $\text{S}$ would not be able to have the same verse order as in $\text{M}$. Although $\text{C}^\text{I}$ has its paraphrases, it agrees with the verse order of $\text{M}$.

**Ezek 7:5**

(M) הִנֵּה אַלְָלְוִי יְהוָה דְרָעָה אָתָה רֵעָה הַנָּה בָּאה

(S) כֹּנַן אָםְרָה יְהוָה בְּמַעֲשָׂא בֵּית יְהוָה שְׁלוֹם כְּפָלָה

(9 of $\text{C}^\text{I}$) διοτι τάνδε λέγει κύριος,

(Trans. of $\text{S}$) "Thus says the Lord of Authority, 'Behold an evil for an evil is coming'."

**Analysis of the Variants**

$\text{S}$ and $\text{C}^\text{I}$ agree mostly with the Masoretic reading. Their only deviation is the rendering of the numerical noun הננ, "one." Instead they have סָלֵח, "for, instead, because, on account of," and בָּא, "after," respectively. $\text{S}^*$ lacks the entire clause רַעַשׁ בָּא. Several MSS of $\text{S}^\text{A}$, however, contain a reading similar to the Masoretic regarding הננְגַּה בָּא, e.g., MSS 410, 534, L-311-V-46-Zv κακία μα κακία ἑνὲς παρεστοῦν or ἔρχεται.

Regarding nominasacra $\text{S}$ has its usual Syriac counterpart לְוִי קָשָׁם, "Lord of Authority," while $\text{S}^*$ reads only κυρίος. Several MSS of $\text{S}^\text{A}$ read αὐθωναί, e.g., L-311-V-
46-ZY, etc., while others have twice κυριος, e.g., O-Q C'-87-130-233-86-403'. α', ο', and θ' have αδελφη prior to κυριος, and also have the missing clause of δ* (ῥηθα... βαθα).

Ezek 7:6/7

(Trans. of 5) "The end has come afflicting you, the dawn has come upon you, O dwellers of the land! The time has come upon you and near is the day of trouble."

Analysis of the Variants

These are very controversial verses regarding their composition. All three versions—δ, Σ, and Τ—differ among themselves. This may indicate that Hebrew Vorlagen close to Μ might have been the texts behind them all without any relationship between them regarding the transmission of their text.

Vs. 6 is almost completely absent in Τ. It seems that Τ could not make any
sense of its Hebrew text, which seems to be similar to the Masoretic text, and omitted what was not understood. Another possibility is that S suffered two scribal errors. First, two haplographic errors may have taken place by skipping one of the two very similar Hebrew words of סנ and סנ, and one homoioteleuton type of error by jumping the eyes from the first סנ to the second סנ, and continuing from there on.

S, however, contains vs. 6 with some minuses regarding IT. It omits the phrases הַנִּים שֶׁנִּים, and renders סנ, “awakened,” by סנ, “wearying, annoying, distressing, afflicting.” Regarding vs. 7, S has a substitution as in IT, but both differ in vocabulary. Both omit the last nominal sentence וַיַּרְאוּ הַרְמִים, “and not of joyful shouting mountains,” and substituted וַיַּרְאוּ הַרְמִים, “tumult,” by וַיָּרְאוּ הַרְמִים, “of destruction, trouble,” and סנ וַיָּרְאוּ הַרְמִים, “not with tumult, nor with pangs,” respectively. S has an interpretative reading by reading סנ, “the kingdom has been revealed,” and סנ, “there is no escaping to the mountain stronghold.” It shows that if a scribe (whether of S, or IT, or S) had at his hand another version to consult, some similarities between the versions would be observed in this verse.

The polysemeic Hebrew word סָנִים (nnmn), “doom, fate, morning, diadem?” is translated by S by its Syriac cognate word, which has a well-known meaning סנ, “dawn, early morning, daybreak” (cf. 7:10).

Based on this verse, S seems to follow exclusively a Hebrew text similar to IT, and the Hebrew nominal clause וַיָּרְאוּ הַרְמִים may have been ambiguous or unnecessary to the comprehension of the text, therefore it was omitted in S.
Ezek 7:8

Now soon I will pour my wrath upon you and I will pour my anger upon you, and I will judge according to your ways and I will bring upon you all of your abomination.”

Analysis of the Variants

Σ renders a translation similar to that of Μ, and also is similar to the latter one despite its interpretative additions. Although Σ has a reading very close to that of Μ, it contains a unique reading. This extra-Masoretic reading is the rendering of the Hebrew verb רכזת, “and I will accomplish,” by πουλεστε, “and I will pour.” is the same verbal expression used before in the same verse for the Hebrew word פְּרָשָׁה, “I will pour.” Probably Σ harmonizes the text rather than being based on a different Vorlage from that of Μ.
Ezek 7:9

And my eye will not spare, neither will I have pity. But according to your ways I will repay you; and your abomination will be in your midst, and you will know that I am surely the Lord, who has smitten you.

Analysis of the Variants

S has some extra-Masoretic variants which are not shared by any other version.

For instance, the verb נשק, "I will give," is rendered by דם, "I will pay you back." S gives its characteristic identificatory expression, almost with the same sense of a copula (Syriac copula idiom) נשקמ, "that I am the Lord," for the Hebrew והנה הeuillez, "that I am the Lord," and the addition of the suffixed pronoun as the direct object of the relative participle נשקמ, "who has smitten you."

1Muraoka, § 105, b.
S has a similar reading to that of ṭT regarding the number of the verb רָדוּתָם 2° m. pl. “and you will know.” This similarity, however, cannot be taken as a direct relation between them, because if one takes into consideration a contextual exegesis, this supposed direct relationship disappears.

ṬT has τεπειγνωσθείς 2° s. “you will know,” and S reads מָמוּס 2° f. s. “and you will know.” The Syriac feminine suffixed pronoun מָמוּס 2° f. s. “and you will know”) may go back to its antecedent the Land of Israel in 7:2, which is a feminine noun. On the contrary the Hebrew masculine suffixed pronoun רָדוְתָם 2° m. pl. “and you will know”) may refer back to the inhabitants of the land. ṭ has several targumic additions which are completely absent in ṭT, S, and ṭR.

Ezek 7:10

(_MSB) וְהָיוּ הַכַּלֶּה הָאֶזְרָךְ הָאֶפֶר הָאֶפֶר צֶּא חַכָּרָה צֶּא הָכַּלֶּה הָאֶפֶר צֶּא

(S) וְהָיוּ הָכַּלֶּה הָאֶפֶר הָאֶפֶר צֶּא חַכָּרָה צֶּא

(ṭ) וְהָיוּ הָכַּלֶּה הָאֶפֶר הָאֶפֶר צֶּא חַכָּרָה צֶּא

(ṭ GLuint) ἰδοὺ τὸ πέρας ἤκει, ἰδοὺ ημέρα κυρίου· εἰ καὶ ὁ ἥρεμος ἤφθασεν, ἢ ἄποκρισίς ἐξανέστηκεν.

(Trans. of S) “Behold the day has come. The dawn went out and the rod has blossomed and shame has budded.”

Analysis of the Variants

The text of S indicates that its Vorlage had a text similar to that of ṭR. S smooths
the flowing of the text by omitting the redundant repetition of the 2° הָנָה, “behold,” while
בּ* has an entire additional sentence יָדָע תְהִי הֶדֶם הָנָה, “behold the end has come,”
before the 1° הָנָה. Some MSS of בּא, however, contain an additional reading prior to the
aforementioned addition, יָדָע תְהִי הֶדֶם] pr. תָּבְדֵה לֵאמֵיה אֲדֹנָא קוֹרִיָּא לֶ-311-
בּv; pr. תָּבְדֵה לֵאמֵיה קְוִרִיָּא אֲדֹנָא 62 and 770. It shows the diversity existent among the
witnesses of בּ.

בּ* (ב) omits the entire clause יָדָע תְהִי הֶדֶם, “behold it comes, has gone out,
the diadem/doom?/plait?,” whereas several MSS of בּא (רל.) contain it as אֶפְשָׁלְחֵנ קָה
תְלָוּנָה, “a complication or a dramatic plot (metaphoric! usage of “anything twisted or
woven”) has gone out.” It seems that the omission of this difficult section by בּ* and its
different rendering by some MSS of בּא are clear evidence that all of them—בּ* and
בּא—had it in their Hebrew text, but they tried to avoid it or they did not understand it so
another meaning was provided.

The Hebrew word כֹּרִיָּא is a case of polysemy. ב translated it by its Syriac cognate
word, which has only one sense, “dawn, early morning, daybreak” (see 7:6/7). בא
translated it by תְלָוּנָה, “braiding, twisted thing, woven,” which does not fit the context of
the passage, except if we take it metaphorically as mentioned above (“a complication or a
dramatic plot”).

ב׳ renders the Hebrew כֹּרִיָּא, “behold the day of
retribution,” which is an acceptable rendering, and substitutes מַלְאַכָּא כֹּרִיָּא הַצָּרוּר with מַלְאַכָּא הָצָּרְוָן הָבָה. 1

1 See Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, Greek-English Lexicon (Oxford:
“the kingdom has been revealed,” which seems to be an interpretative translation.

Consequently, S, on its own, has nothing to do with T and T'.

Ezek 7:11

(T) "injustice has grown up on a wicked staff. None of them [will remain], nor their disturbances, nor their works, nor will I rest on them."

Analysis of the Variants

Vs. 11 is a good example of a noninterrelationship among the versions. For instance, T is similar to T concerning the first part of the verse "injustice has grown up upon a wicked staff," which is very close to Aquila’s version too. Whereas T reads καὶ συντρίψει στήριγμα ἀνόμου καὶ οὐ μετὰ θορύβου οὐδὲ μετὰ σπουδῆς. "and he will break the firmness of the lawless," a has ἀδικία αἰετὴ εἰς ῥαβδὸν αθεσίας, "injustice has grown into a faithless staff," and T as well as Cod. 86 have η ἀλεονεξία εστηκεν εἰς προσκλησιν (κλεσιν 86) ἀνομίας, "avarice has grown up into a lawless inclination."
has an interpretative translation, "violent men have arisen to support the wicked ones." $S$ and $S'$ have the closest reading to that of $M$.

The middle part of the verse presents a more difficult situation regarding its translation by the versions: "none of them, nor their abundance, or their wealth, neither among them." $S$, instead, reads, "none of them, and neither their disturbances nor their works." $S$ contains an interpretative translation for the last part of the Masoretic reading ("none among them") that reads, "and I will not rest on them." This interpretative reading in the Syriac version is unique among the versions and reflects the awkward reading of its Vorlage. Probably the Syriac scribe tried to avoid ambiguity by translating $n$ into a more understandable word $n$, "to rest." $S$ renders it by $\text{καὶ οὐ μετὰ θορυβὸν οὐδὲ μετὰ σπουδῆς, “neither with tumult, nor with haste,” which is also an interpretative rendering.}$ $T'$ also resorted to the same translation technique, rendering it into a highly interpretative

---

1 (K) Kimhi's commentary reads לֶמֶשׁ רֶשֶׁת ::: "to stir up the wicked ones." See Sperber edition on this verse.

2 William L. Holladay, A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 229: According to Holladay it is an unexplainable word and should probably be deleted.

3 Although some MSS of $\text{G}^A$ ($\text{G}^* \text{ B}$) have a rendering of this section, they are all with a different sense, e.g., καὶ οὐκ εἶναυν εἰσὶν οὐδὲ φραγμὸς εὐν αὐτοῖς, "none of them, nor will there be adornment among them,” rel. $S'$, and Cod. 86 οὐδὲ εξ ξαρτασίας αυτῶν οὐδὲ εξ τοῦ καλλους αυτῶν, “neither from their ravenous hunger, nor from their beauty,” and $G'$ has a Χ καὶ οὐκ εἶναυν εἰσὶν οὐτε φραγμὸς εὐν αὐτοῖς, “none of them, nor will there be adornment among them,” Qtxt.
translation, "none of them, nor of their noisy crowds, nor of their children, nor of their children’s children." This shows a common translation technique among the versions that can be defined as an avoidance of ambiguity when met with a difficult text. Their differences indicate that the versions are not related to each other in this regard.

Ezek 7:12

(IR) bn hwh hwdr kdn n kr hwh bx n hwh l c krh n l c hwhn

(S) Ct L tCt b L tCt n k tCt L tCt m tCt m tCt m tCt m

S agrees mostly with IR; deviations are the predicative attributive adjective (מְכֻּלָה, "near, close"), instead of the verb מְכֻּל, "it draws near," and the substitution of the noun מְכֻּלָה, "multitude," by מְכֻּלָא, "their purchase/belonging/possession," which might be an exegetical interpretation of the Hebrew word מְכֻּלָה, "multitude," implying the totality of

Analysis of the Variants

S agrees mostly with IR; deviations are the predicative attributive adjective (מְכֻּלָה, "near, close"), instead of the verb מְכֻּל, "it draws near," and the substitution of the noun מְכֻּלָה, "multitude," by מְכֻּלָא, "their purchase/belonging/possession," which might be an exegetical interpretation of the Hebrew word מְכֻּלָה, "multitude," implying the totality of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
their possessions, since the context is about sellers and buyers. א" lacks the entire subordinate nominal clause תםא ... כ. י. The following MSS of א, though with some minor variants from each other, read similarly to that of י (כ ו ס"Cod. 88, L'-311-Zv, 147, 534, 538, 130 etc., ס"ן, etc. ρατ πούτος ("multitudes") αυτής. א has expanded the Masoretic text by means of an exegetical complement; it reads "the time has arrived for the repayment of debts; the day of punishment for sins draws near; let not the buyer rejoice, nor the seller be sad, for there is anger from before me upon all their noisy crowds."

By the substitution of מַעַה, S makes a contextual exegetical harmonization. The word מַעַה, "their purchase, belonging," may be a contextualization with מַעַה, "buyer," and מַעַה, "seller." Regarding the possessive pronoun of מַעַה ("their-") S is related to א (מעון) and א ("their noisy crowd"). Although they are related, this is not a secure proof for interrelationship among them. It could well be explained by a common translation technique as contextual exegesis or syntactic harmonization with the flow of the text.

S does not have the explanatory additions of א nor the omission of א. On the contrary, S has a unique reading that supports its independent translation and transmission.

Ezek 7:13

כ יomain, א main, לא main, ו main, ב main, הם main, י (י)

1Levey, 33: "Tg expands on MT, which says simply that the time has come and the day draws near, explaining that these refer to the imminence of divine retribution."
Analysis of the Variants

Despite its different word order, S agrees mostly with M. \( \delta T \) renders the first subordinate clause by \( \text{διότι ὁ κτώμενος πρὸς τὸν πωλοῦντα οὐκέτι μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃ, καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐν ὀφθαλμῶι ζωῆς αὐτοῦ οὐ κρατήσει.} \n
(Trans. of S) “[As] the seller returns not to [his] sale, so also life in their life span. Because neither will vision return on all their possession, nor will a man in his iniquity retain his life.”

Concerning the second subordinate (circumstantial nominal) clause (ἐν τῷ τῶν ἀστυνομίων ἀρχαίων ἱερατείᾳ, but they do not repent; and every man willingly commits his sins; but until they stand in repentance they shall have no strength.” Levey, 32.

1For the seller shall not return to what he has sold; for while they are still alive they shall be carried away bodily; for the prophets prophesy to all their noisy crowds, but they do not repent; and every man willingly commits his sins; but until they stand in repentance they shall have no strength.” Levey, 32.
...”) and the third subordinate (causal verbal) clause (אֱלֹהִים בָּאָמָה, “for vision . . .”), Θ* omits them, while several MSS of ΘA contain them with some variations among its witnesses, e.g., (Ξ O, 86) καὶ εἰς (συνετέλεια 46, C-534; 106) εν (+ τη 147, 106) ἐνως τον ζην αὐτῶν (-του 147) οτι ῥασις εἰς παν το πλήθος αὐτής (+ καὶ 46 534-86mb) οὐκ ἀνακαμψει (αναστρεψει 26), “still in life, their lives, because vision will not return to her multitudes,” rel. The last part of the verse is translated by Θ* as καὶ ἀνθρώπος ἐν ὀφθαλμῷ (ἐν ὀφθαλμοις Λ'-311-ZV, C'-403') ἐνως αὐτοῦ οὗ κρατήσει, “and a man will not grab with the eye his life,” against the Μ and S readings. Θ has an exilic connotation in the interpretation of this verse by introducing τις ἀντιλυκεῖται (τίς ἄνθρωπον ἐν τοῖς οἰκίσ εἰς το τίμιον, τίς ἀνθρώπος ἐν τοι οἰκίσ εἰς το τίμιον), “for while they are still alive they will move slowly in their bodies.” This may be an interpretative translation implying the deportation of the people.

Although S has some relationship to several MSS of ΘA regarding the first and second parts of this verse, those same MSS do not relate themselves to S concerning the last portion of the verse.

Ezek 7:14

(Μ) τοῦ δακρύσαν οὐκ ὄνει ὅσα ἡ μιχρά ἑλετονές αὐτοῖς, ἃν ἐνα φλέγην.

(S) καὶ τοῦ δακρύσαν οὐκ ὄνει ὅσα ἡ μιχρά ἑλετονές αὐτοῖς, ἃν ἐνα φλέγην.

(Θ') σαλπίσατε ἐν σαλπίγγῃ καὶ κρίνατε τὰ σύμπαντα.

(Trans. of S) “They blew the trumpet and got everything ready, but there is none that goes to the battle because my wrath is upon all of their possession.”
Analysis of the Variants

S renders as it is in Ṣ with a few alterations that can be justified by translation techniques. An example of contextual exegesis is the word מְרֵצָה, “multitudes,” translated by מְרֵצָה, “their possession, purchase.” Notice the instrumental usage of the preposition בִּמְרֵצָה, “with trumpet”). BHS suggests it be omitted, but it is present in S.

Since the motif of the verse is “war,” הֵרָא has an additional interpretation:

Any human feeling and emotion may have been seen as an anthropomorphism, so they were substituted or omitted; in this case the Aramaic Prepositional Phrase אֲרֹן רְמַתּ קָדָם, “for there is anger from before me,” was used instead for כּו וַיִּרְאוּ, “for my anger/wrath.”

Some MSS of 6Τ have their unique readings concerning the coordinative and subordinate disjunctive clauses כּו וַיִּרְאוּ בִּמְרֵצָה, “get ready all, but none goes to battle.”

They read (6* (B) καὶ γράφει τὰ σύμπαντα, “and pass judgement on all together”), fin.,

Also θ has an asterisk with the Masoretic reading. Although 6* omits that last part: כּו וַיִּרְאוּ בִּמְרֵצָה, “for my anger is upon all of her multitudes,” several MSS of 6A contain it; see above. The Greek omission in its original reading (6* B) may be due to a misunderstanding of the Hebrew expression כּו וַיִּרְאוּ, “for my anger.” Note that in the preceding verse a similar כּו וַיִּרְאוּ clause appears but with a different noun; instead of כּו וַיִּרְאוּ.
“anger,” it has ὀργή, “vision.” Therefore the Septuagintal scribe may have tried to solve this problem by omitting it—the ἢ clause—in both verses. \( S \) has a reading similar to that of \( \text{IR} \).

In spite of the fact that \( S \) may have a similar reading to some of \( \text{6A} \) MSS, it does not indicate a direct connection between both versions, for \( S \) has not the addition of \( \text{6T} \) and the omission of \( \text{6A} \). \( S \) does not show any effort to avoid anthropomorphism as found in the interpretative exegesis of \( \text{C} \) (א), “for anger from before me”).

Ezek 7:15

(Trans. of \( \text{S} \)) “The sword is in the market places and pestilence and famine are inside the house. He who is in the field will die by the sword and he who is in the city, famine and pestilence will devour him.”

1“They go forth at the blast of the trumpet, and they prepare themselves with weapons, but there is none who goes to war, for there is anger from before me against all their noisy crowds.” Levey, 32.
Analysis of the Variants

S is similar to M, even by the figurative usage of “house” to indicate inside, while ST and CT have their respective adverb of place ἐσωθεν, “inside,” and מִלְחָמָה, “from its midst/inside.” ST has a different word order, and the last verb, συντελεσθείη, “he/it will destroy,” is without the object pronoun “them” or “him” as in ἐκεῖνοι, “it will devour it.” MS 62 reads αὐτὸν, “him,” which is its object pronoun; it is the same person as M “him,” CT “him,” and S “him.” Despite its relation to CT, S depends on a Vorlage closer to that of M, because the additional targumic interpretations and the word order of ST are completely alien to the Syriac translator.

Ezek 7:16

(Trans. of S) “But they will escape, those who have escaped from them, to the mountains like doves in the crags; all of them will die, each man in his own sins.”
Analysis of the Variants

S has a unique reading by rendering "all of them are groaning," as "all of them will die." The Syriac scribe might have confused the Hebrew verb חכן, which comes from חנן, "to groan, uproar," with the verb חן, "to die." S או.א reads פְּנָהָה אֵסְפָּקְטֵנָה, "I will kill all," for כלם חכה. Both versions may have had the common misunderstanding of the verb חכן, "to groan, uproar." Thus, it shows that they were based on a similar Hebrew text.

The entire phrase כנני הנגוזים, "like a dove of the valley," is lacking in ס" (B). Several MSS of סא, however, contain it with some deviations from מ, e.g., סא סא, and rel., as перיסטרפַּה文创ויה, "like doves meditating." S holds a unique reading by rendering it כנני הנגוזים—as כנני הנגוזים, "like doves in the crags." זא (כני הנגוזים, "like doves of the valleys") is closer to the Masoretic reading than ס.

Ezek 7:19

כָּכָּפְסְבּוֹתִי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּחוֹבֵּם לְלֹא יִתֵּה כָּכָּפְסְבּוֹתִי וּחוֹבֵּם לְכִלּוּ הלְוִיִּים (מ)

בַּיִם עַבְּרָה יִוָה כָּכָּפְסְבּוֹתִי אָנָּא שֶׁנֶּמּּוּ בֶּן בֵּאֲמוּר כִּלָּו כִּלָּו תָּמִם

סָכָּפְסְבּוֹתִי סֵפְסְבּוֹתִי נֶסְפְּסְבּוֹתִי (ס)

סָכָּפְסְבּוֹתִי סֵפְּסְבּוֹתִי סָכָּפְסְבּוֹתִי לְאִּשָּׁה לְחֵי רָפָא ל* אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁפְּכָּתֵנָה לְאִּשָּׁה

סָכָּפְסְבּוֹתִי סֵפְּסְבּוֹתִי סָכָּפְסְבּוֹתִי לְאִּשָּׁה

לְאִּשָּׁה סָכָּפְסְבּוֹתִי סֵפְּסְבּוֹתִי סָכָּפְסְבּוֹתִי לְאִּשָּׁה

כָּכָּפְסְבּוֹתִי בְּכָל רַבָּה דָּרִי נֶמָּסְרָה לְאִשָּׁה לָא כָּכָּפְסְבּוֹתִי וּחוֹבֵּם לְכִלּוּ הלְוִיִּים (זא)

לְחֵי רָפָא לְאִּשָּׁה רַבָּה דָּרִי נֶמָּסְרָה לְאִשָּׁה לָא כָּכָּפְסְבּוֹתִי וּחוֹבֵּם לְכִלּוּ הלְוִיִּים (זא)
(☞*) τὸ ἀργύριον αὐτῶν μικρήσεται ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις, καὶ τὸ χρυσὸν αὐτῶν ὑπεροφθησεται· αἱ φυγαὶ αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ ἐμπληθῶσιν, καὶ αἱ κοιλίαι αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ πληρωθῶσιν· διότι βάσανος τῶν ἁδικίων αὐτῶν ἐγένετο.

(Trans. of ☞) “They will cast their silver in the market place and their gold will be despised. Their silver and their gold will not be able to deliver them in the day of the wrath of the Lord, nor will they satisfy their souls, neither fill their bellies. This is the torment, the reward for their iniquity.”

Analysis of the Variants

Although ☞* lacks, “silver and gold will not be able to deliver them in the day of the wrath of the Lord,” several MSS of ☞ contain it, e.g., (☞ O, ☞ θ', L-449) τὸ (καὶ τὸ 62, l-311, 410) ἀργύριον αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ χρυσὸν αὐτῶν (>233, 410) οὐ δυνηστεται (δυνηστεται Α'-410, 130-233-239'); ὑπεροφθησεται prob. οὐ δυνηστεται (τοῦ εξελ. 62) αὐτοὺς εἰς ἡμέρα ὁργῆς κυρίου (κυρίου ὁργῆς prob. o. κυρίου 233) rel. ☞ and ☞ have this clause as it is in ☞.

☞ renders the subordinated causal clause καὶ, “for it was the stumbling block of their iniquity,” by the subordinated demonstrative nominal clause ὁ, ἡμέρα ὁργῆς Κυρίου, “this is the torment, the reward for their iniquity.” Notice that ☞ has a unique reading by adding ἡμέρα, “reward, retribution,” as an apposition to ὁ, “torment.” ☞* seems to be related to ☞, because both have the same reading for the
Hebrew word בּּכֶשֶל, "stumbling block," namely בָּשָׁלָל, "torment," and בָּשָׁלָל, "torment."

This relationship, however, cannot support a direct connection between S and א in terms of translation, for the Greek version translates the verb by its usual ἐγένετο, which is a Hebraism, while S ignores it. Furthermore, S adds כָּלָה, "reward," a word alien to the Greek version. Therefore the similar rendering of בּּכֶשֶל, "stumbling block," is not convincing evidence for a direct relationship between both versions. א reads as it is in א without any interpretative addition; the Aramaic word נבּּה means "offence, stumbling-block."

Ezek 7:20

וַיַּעַר לָאוֹן יָבִא וְלַמַּכֶּבֶת מְפֶרֶץ וּפְרֵץ עַל כָּנָו לָאוֹן לָוָה (א)

לְקַלַּמָה מְפֶרֶץ וּפְרֵץ כָּנָיָה (ס)

וַחֲזֹת נָפְלָה לָאָוֶה יָבִא וְלַמַּכֶּבֶת (א')

מִקְרָאִים מְבַשְּרוּ בֵּית וַלֵּאָוֶה לָאָוֶה (ג')

(א') ἐκλεκτὰ κόσμου εἰς ὑπερφανίαν θέντο αὐτὰ καὶ εἰκόνας τῶν βεβηγμάτων αὐτῶν ἐποίησαν εἰς αὐτῶν ἐνεκεν τοῦτον δέδωκα αὐτὰ αὑτοῖς εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν.
(Trans. of S) "and the beauty of their ornaments which they have made with excellence for the images of their abominations and for their idols. Because of this I have made it despised."
Analysis of the Variants

Although $S$ agrees mostly with א as $G^*$ and $C^1$ do, it has some unique readings by rendering the Hebrew מָשַׁח, “they placed, put, or used,” by הביאו, “they have made,” and by using the same Syriac verb to translate the Hebrew וָנָה, “I have made it.” It is probably an editorial work with the aim of avoiding a Hebraism as in the case of the verb וָנָה with the extended sense of “to give.” $C^1$ reads אֲבָשִׁיתוֹ, “they have placed,” for וָנָה, and אֶנְנָה, “I have given,” for וָנָה; both are exact renderings of the Hebrew counterpart. $C^1$ has in both instances the verbal expression יֵיבְשָׂהוּ, “I will give/make it,” probably with the same extended sense of its Hebrew counterpart.

Another unique reading of $S$ is the noun מָך, “unclean thing,” translated by the Apel Ptc. אֶנְנָה, “despised.” The noun מָך has its correspondent Greek counterpart in $C^1$, which is ἁκάθαρσις, “uncleanness” (σ' συκχος “fastidious person, disgusting, loathsome”), and in $C^1$ it is substituted by רֵסֵר, “contempt.”

$G^*$ omits מִשְׁפַּרְתֵּם, “their detestable things,” but some MSS of $G^A$ hold it, e.g., (ס O) $καὶ ( > O-407, cI-403')$ προσοχθισματα (-ματων L-V) αὐων O-62’, L’-46-311-Zv C’-403’. Although BHS suggests that the last part of this verse is probably a gloss, the witnesses all together, including $S$, support the Masoretic reading.

---

1 $S$ is not familiar with the targumic interpretation of this verse. Levey, 35, n. 12. Regarding the מַשֵּׁר דוּרִי, “its/his beautiful ornament,” Levey states that “this is a reference to the temple, according to the Tg. supported by the translation in v. 22 of the Hebrew sefuni (My treasure place) as the ‘abode of My Shekinah.’ Rashi and Kimḥi follow the Tg.” Ibid.
Ezek 7:22

And I will turn my face from them, and they will profane my watchtower and robbers will enter it and profane it.

Analysis of the Variants

S and ᾸΤ have similar readings to that of Μ. The only two problems are the rare Hebrew word ‘3ias, "my treasure place, hiding place," translated by Μανα, "my watchtowers," from Μανα, "watchman, one who observes," and by ἐπισκοπή, "visitation," of a divine power or "office of an overseer"; and the Hebrew noun οὐτς, "robbers," rendered by the Syriac equivalent noun κρατός, "robbers," and in ΟΤ by the adverb ἀφυλάκτως, "unguardedly." These renderings are due more to the misunderstanding of the Hebrew words rather than a translation of actual readings of their Hebrew Vorlagen.

It seems that ᾸΤ underwent a more elaborate editorial work than S in this verse. The two instances of the Hebrew verb בָּלַח, "to profane," are translated in S by the same Syriac verb Pael מָלַש, "to defile," while ᾸΤ has μαίνιο, "defile," for the first instance and Μανα, "to profane," for the second.

מסע has a completely different rendering for פָּרִיצֵים הָעַדְּלָה, "and I will turn my face
from them.” CJ renders it by אָסְכַּלְפֶּהַפּ הַמָּזוֹרַת, “I will make my Shekinah depart from,” which is a characteristic feature of targumic translation; in another words, it strives to avoid any hint of anthropomorphism applied to God, in this case וַיָּרְדֵה, “my face.” The entire Hebrew verse was translated as follows in the Targum: “and I will make my Shekinah depart from them because they have profaned the land of the abode of My Shekinah, and wickedness will enter it and profane it.” Although ST and S are similar to T, they are different from each other, showing an independence in matters of translation and transmission of their texts.

Ezek 7:23

(III) ההמה והררחך, כי השם מלאהーム זכרו והנערו מלאהーム

(S) הַמְּסַכְּלוֹת, נִשְׁאַרְוָה, הַמַּכְכְּרוּת, הַמַּכְכְּרוּת, הַמַּכְכְּרוּת.

(CJ) אָסְכַּלְפֶּהַפּ הַמָּזוֹרַת.

(ST) עַבְּדֵי השם,اور אֶרֶץ אַחֶם אַחֶם וְיוֹבָל וְכֵרָהוּ אֶת-פִּסְמָלָתָוּ הַשֵּּפִירֵי.

(Trans. of S) “And they will invade/cross the mud-bricks, because the land is full of bloody judgment, and the city full of iniquity.”

Analysis of the Variants

It seems that all of the versions had some difficulties in understanding their own Vorlagen, for none of them are related to T regarding some of the key words of the text.

1Levey, 34.
S reads "and they will cross, invade," for the imperative "make" (יָשָׁק פֹּתוֹחַ, "they will make") and "in with bricks, mud, mixture, dough," for "the chain." S may refer to the invasion of the walled cities. The latter word is rendered in G as ψυχρόν, "confused mass, mixture" (in MS 407 ψυχράγμα from ψυχράμα "wanton behavior," σ' and θ' have ἐποιήσανεν καθήλωσιν "they have made a revetment"), probably referring to the intermarriage with foreign nations (λαῶν).

The Hebrew expression מְסַפְּרֶׂה דַּרְמֵּה, "bloody judgment," is substituted by λαῶν, "foreign people, nation," in G. Some MSS of G contain a reading similar to that of מ, λαῶν] κρύσεως αἰματῶν ο'; αἰματῶν 62; + αἰματῶν 403'; and a conflate reading κρύσεως αἷμα τῶν λαῶν in MS 534. S is similar to מ regarding דַּרְמֵּה.

C agrees with מ by translating רַדְרֵק, "the chain," with its Aramaic equivalent סְלָסָל, "chain." The phrase מְסַפְּרֶה דַּרְמֵּה, "bloody judgment," however, is substituted by קֶסֶל דָּיוֹנ, "those who deserved to be killed." This may be due to the exilic interpretation of the context. According to C many would die during the invasion and exile.

The Hebrew word הֵוָסֶת, "violence," is substituted by חֲמָס, "iniquity," in S, and ἁνομίας, "lawlessness," in G, while C has ὑπατίκοι, "robbers." It seems likely that G, S, and C were based on Vorlagen similar to מ, without any direct relationship among themselves.

Ezek 7:24

(מ) וּהְבָאָתָּהוּ רֵעֵי נִום וְיַרְשָׁהָ אָמַּבְדוּ אֲבוֹתָם הַשָּׁבָתִים נַגְּרֵי נִוְיָה נְתָלִי מְכַדָּשֵׁם

(ס) מְסַפְּרֶה דַּרְמֵּה. מְסַפְּרֶה דַּרְמֵּה.
Analysis of the Variants

S has two unique readings: for the phrase רע נימא, “evil peoples,” it reads נ‟ע־מ, “shepherds of peoples.” Probably the deviation is due to the confusing similarity between the noun רע, “evil, misery, distress,” and the verb רע, “to tend, pasture, shepherd,” whose Ptc. m. pl. Constr. may be spelled as רע or רע, particularly in a Hebrew unvocalized text. This is a semantic case of homonymy, for the Syriac language has the verb לק, “to keep, shepherd, feed,” and its pl. Act. Ptc. לק, “shepherds,” with only one sense. The Syriac word for רע, “evil, misery, distress,” is completely different in spelling (לע).

S ı (B) lacks the entire Hebrew clause רע נימא, “I will bring evil people and they will take possession of their houses.” Some MSS of S ı, however, have the Masoretic reading πονητος εθνων “evil people,” e.g., (X O, X ı, 449) καὶ αξω (εξω 147) πονητος εθνων και κληρονομουσιν (κατακληρ. 62) τους οικους (την γην προ τ. οικους 407) αυτων rel.

The second unique reading of S is the rendering of the passive verbal form נאתי.
“and they will be profaned,” by נְבִירָיָה, “and they will possess.” It seems a careful editorial work due to some theological reasons, for נְבִירָיָה, “and they will possess,” is the same verbal form as the Hebrew נְבִירָיָה, “and they will possess,” used in the second part of this verse. Thus the Syriac translation would imply that the “sanctuary” would not be defiled but possessed by the “shepherd people.”

Gregory employs the singular passive form μακροθεοτεται, “it will be profaned,” for the Nifal form נְבִירָיָה, “and they will be profaned.” The word מָכַרְתָּנָא, “their holy places, or sanctuaries,” is in the singular in ג, while in the plural in Gregory and Cod. 86. These readings may be due to the implication each translator had in mind. The Syriac scribe may have taken into consideration the sanctuary in Jerusalem, whereas Gregory and Cod. 86 are considering each pagan place of worship. Thus these translations have nothing to do with the actual reading of their specific Vorlagen, but with the assumed interpretation of each text.

Gregory has a unique reading for מָכַרְתָּנָא, “and I will put an end to their pride,” by rendering it as καὶ ἀποστρέψω τὸ φρύγαμα τῆς λοχίας αὐτῶν, “and I will turn back the boasting of their strength.” Only a’ καταπανω ην υπερεφερειαν, υπερφανειαν Qmg and υπερφανειαν η’, Cod. 86 have their readings similar to ג, “I will put to an end to the pride.” The rendering of Gregory seems more an interpretative translation of a Hebrew text, while a’, η’, and Cod. 86 are more literal translations.

Ezek 7:25

(ג) קֵעֶרֶה בַּהֲבַצֶּמָּה שָׁלֹם אֶלֹהִי. (ס) מִינֵהוּ מִכֶּנֶה שֶׁל שָׁלֹם.
Analysis of the Variants

The Hebrew word ח都會, probably “anguish,” brings an enormous problem for translation, for its meaning is highly debatable and it seems that none of the ancient translations knew its exact equivalence in their respective languages. Consequently, ס renders it by ס, “wrath,” ג, “propitiation,” ס and ס have ס, “discouragement,” and Cod. 86 reads ס, “distress, anguish.” The clue for a better translation is found in צ that translates it by its cognate form ח, “destruction,” and its MS 6 by ח, “anger, indignation.” Therefore, this is another clear evidence for a non-interrelationship among them all together.

Ezek 7:26

1Holladay, 321.
ορασις ἐκ προφήτου, καὶ νόμος ἀπολεῖται ἐξ ιερέως καὶ βουλή ἐκ πρεσβυτέρων.

(Trans. of S) "Calamity upon calamity will come, and rumor upon rumor will be. Then they will seek a vision from the prophets, but the law will perish from the priests and counsel from the elders."

Analysis of the Variants

ὅτ', S, and ᾗ seem to be based on Hebrew texts similar to Μ. None of them, however, are dependent on each other regarding this verse. S has Ethpeel ἤκουσε, "will be heard," for the Hebrew ἵκνη, "will be" (Q. Imperf. 3ο f. s.). It should not be taken as an actual reading of its basic Hebrew text, but a contextual interpretation made by the Syriac translator. Notice that the verb ἤκουσε, "to hear," better fits the context of the verse where "rumors" were to be heard instead of the Hebrew ἵκνη, "will be." ᾗ has ἔτεινεν, "there will be," for both Hebrew verbs ἵκνη fem. "it will be," and ἵκνη fem. "it will come." ᾗ agrees with Μ in both instances.

S seems to have undergone an editorial work during its translation, for it renders all three Hebrew nouns in the plural, ἵκνη, "prophets," ἐξειδίκευσε, "elders," and ἑκκλήσαι, "priests," probably to make a syntactical agreement with ἐκκλήσαι, "elders." ᾗ agrees with Μ having the same number for these nouns, except MSS L'-46-311-ZV, which are in agreement with S and Μ most of the time, but in this case they have πρεσβυτέρου, "of the elder," in the singular.

There is an interpretative addition in ᾗ: Ῥβάνεν ἀλφαθ μέσα ἡ αριστερά ἡ τεμεῖον μέχρι τοῦ καλλίου, "they will seek instruction from the scribe and the decision will cease from the
priest, and counsel from the sage.”¹ According to Levey this interpretative translation is
due probably to Yavnian redaction of the Targum of Ezekiel, and it seems a prediction
about the Jewish nation after the catastrophe of 70 C.E. m. Sotah 9:15.² After the
destruction of the temple there would not be prophets, but there would be scribes; the
temple would be no more, so the priests are no longer the leaders, and the word “sages”
may be an indirect Rabbinic reference.³ S is completely alien to this interpretation.

Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 7

1. Some agreement between S and Σ* can be explained by a common Semitic
influence (Hebraism, verbal hendiadys, etc.) (7:2).

2. S translates the nominasacra as usual against Σ*, though ΣΛ has it as in Μ
(7:2).

3. S agrees with Μ regarding verse sequence as CJ¹ does, but ΣΤ has a complete
rearrangement of the verses (7:3-9).

4. Although there are similar renderings between S and Σ, they cannot support a
direct relationship between them (7:7, 9, 11, 19).

5. S has some unique readings (7:5, 9, 12, 16, 20, 24).

6. S underwent a careful editorial work of its text (7: 8, 10, 12, 20).

¹Levey, 34.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
7. Overall $S$ is closer to the Masoretic reading than to any other version.

8. $S$ does not avoid anthropomorphism (7:22).
CHAPTER IX

EZEKIEL 8

Collation

8:1


8:2

[נָכְסָה] Substit. מְסֻמָּה מְסֻמָּה “image of trouble.”

“lamentation”

8:3

[םַזְּפָה] Substit. מְסֻמָּה מְסֻמָּה “of the angle, corner.”

noun מְסֻמָּה [םַזְּפָה] Peal Ptc. מְסֻמָּה “standing.”

8:4

[םַזְּפָה] Substit. מְסֻמָּה מְסֻמָּה “of trouble.”

Hi. Ptc. מְסֻמָּה om.

8:5

“the eastern gate.”

8:6

[בְּתֵחַנֶּא] tr.

8:7

[םַזְּפָה] Substit. מְסֻמָּה מְסֻמָּה “of trouble.”

8:8

Q. Inf. Constr. [םַזְּפָה] Ethpe. 3° m. pl. מְסֻמָּה מְסֻמָּה “they have been gone away.”

Ad. 2° נָלַסִּים Peal Ptc. מְסֻמָּה “which [they] were doing.”

8:9

Data Analysis

Ezek 8:1

186

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
And it happened in the sixth year on the fifth day of the sixth month. I was sitting in my house and the elders of Judah were sitting before me and the hand of the Lord of Authority fell upon me there.

Analysis of the Variants

One can see through the collation that $S$ agrees closely with the reading of $\mathfrak{M}$. $\mathfrak{G}$ substitutes ἐντο, “on the sixth (month),” by ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ μήνι, “on the fifth month.” Further deviations (of $\mathfrak{G}$) are the omissions of the possessive pronoun of ἑμαυ, “my house,” rendered by τῷ οἶκῳ, “the house,” and the omission of the demonstrative particle ἐκεῖ, “there.” $\mathfrak{G}$ contains the latter two readings omitted by $\mathfrak{G}$ in some of its MSS, e.g., τῷ οἶκῳ + μου $O$-$62$, $L$-$ZV$; ἐπὶ ὑμᾶς + ἐκεῖ after ἐπὶ ὑμᾶς (καὶ Ω) $O$-$62$, $L$-$311$-$46$-$ZV$; pr. ἐκεῖ π. The nominasacra are translated as usual, κυρίου in $\mathfrak{G}$ (B 26, 403', 544, σ') and + ἀξιωματικ in $\mathfrak{G}$ MSS e.g., pr. κυρίου ἀξιωματικ 36;+ pr. ἀξιωματικ rel.

$T'$ agrees with $\mathfrak{M}$ more closely than $\mathfrak{G}$, but it contains an additional reading ἀρα, “the prophet said,” and as a normal targumic characteristic anthropomorphism is avoided. Therefore ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ μήνι, “and the hand of the Lord God,” is rendered by ἀρα, θεὸς ὑμᾶς ἀξιωματικ, “the spirit of prophecy from before the Lord God.” Consequently $S$ agrees with $\mathfrak{M}$ more than with any other version regarding this verse.
Ezek 8:2

And I saw, and behold a form like the appearance of fire, from his loins downward fire, and from his loins upward I saw like the appearance of brightness and like the appearance of God.

Analysis of the Variants

Gr has a unique reading that most certainly is a possibility for a translation based on a consonantal Hebrew text. It has άνθρωπος reading ἄνθρωπος, “man,” instead of ἄνθρωπος, “fire.” Gr lacks the first two instances of ἀναπαύειν, “appearance,” and also the noun ἀναπαύειν, “brightness.” Notice, however, that some MSS of Gr contain the first instance of ἀναπαύειν as ἀναπαύειν (O) O, 36 C'–403', and the second instance is found only in MS 62 by ἀναπαύειν. MSS L–311–V–ZV, which are usually closer to L and S, do not have the three instances of ἀναπαύειν.

The Hebrew word ἀναπαύειν, “brightness,” though absent in Gr, is present in several
MSS of \( \text{GB} \), e.g., MS B renders the 3° נַעֲרֵי נֶאֶשׁ by \( \text{סַרְאִים} \). Qm, L-311-V-46-Zv substitute the third instance of נַעֲרֵי (ם) by \( \text{סַרְאִים} \), "radiance, light," while rel. render אָוְרָא וָאֵינָדֶא, "a breeze like the appearance of."

The last Hebrew comparative nominal phrase כְּנַיְּסָם, "like gleaming bronze (\(?\))," is rendered by אֲוָרָא וָאֵינָדֶא, "like the appearance of God," in S, and \( \text{סַרְאִים} \) אָוְרָא וָאֵינָדֶא, "appearance of amber," in GB (\( \text{S}, \text{a}', \text{b}' \)) \( \text{סַרְאִים} \) אָוְרָא וָאֵינָדֶא, "like the appearance of God," in \( \text{S}, \) and it is transliterated by \( \text{C} \) כְּנַיְּסָם, "like the appearance of hashmal." This is support for an independent translation and transmission of the text among the versions.

The two instances of מְנִי, "his loins," are avoided by \( \text{C} \) as an anthropomorphism. It renders "וָאֵינָדֶא כְּנַיְּסָם מִנִּי מִנִּי," "a manifestation of glory which the eye could not perceive and at which it was impossible to look." The targumic reference to "eye" may come from the same tradition used by Aquila’s version (\( \text{S}, \text{a}', \text{b}' \)) \( \text{סַרְאִים} \) אָוְרָא וָאֵינָדֶא. S ignores the unique reading of \( \text{S} \) (אָוְרָא וָאֵינָדֶא) and the targumic interpretation.

Ezek 8:3

(...)

This is a reproduction of the text with permission from the copyright owner. Further reproduction is prohibited without permission.
And he put forth the form of a hand, and took me by the hair of my head; and the spirit lifted me up between the earth and heaven, and brought me in a vision of God to Jerusalem, to the entrance of the gate of the corner which looks toward the north; there stood an image of trouble.

Analysis of the Variants

The Hebrew paragogic ה or he locale has its equivalent in the Syriac preposition ᵁ, which conveys the same syntactical sense of the former (לְגָן / לְגָה, “to the north,” יְרוּשָׁלוֹם / יְרוּשָׁלָם, “to Jerusalem”). Therefore it is not a deviation from IR. Some portions, however, of this long verse seem to be confusing to the versions all together.

Though the Hebrew word הָרֶצֶם, “inner court,” is omitted by א*(B, 407), it appears in some MSS of א, e.g., וְהָרֶצֶם, “the inner place, inside,” 106, Cod. X 88, and rel. א has a unique reading for this Hebrew word (וְהָרֶצֶם, “inner court”) that is אֶרֶךְ, “of the corner, angle.” It may be an explanation of the geographic localization of the gate based on the scribe’s knowledge of the former temple.

1Jotion and Muraoka, § 93.
The Hebrew phrase בְּעִיטֵ֣ת רֹאֶֽף, “by the hair of my head,” is rendered similarly by S, but as קֹֽרְעָתְךָ מַעְעָה, “by my extremity,” in G* implying the extremity of the prophet’s head. GΔ has several MSS that are explicit by reading קֹֽרְעָתְךָ דֹ֖חַ קַֽפֹּלָנָֽךְ, “the extremity of the head,” as in 5, e.g., Qmg, L'-311-Zv, 26', 544, 62. Notice, however, that some of these MSS, though in this case related to 5 and S, add to the text an extra-Masoretic reading not found elsewhere, αὐθαματισθεὶς eis χειρός (L'-311-Zv). Therefore it is hard to conceive that S is related to them at all.

The last Hebrew nominal clause אֲשֶר שֶׁמֶֽלָּה הַכְּנַנָּה הַסַּקְּנָה, “where was the seat of an image of jealousy which provokes jealousy,” is very debatable, particularly the last two words. G* renders נַסָּה נַסָּה by τοῦ κτωμένου, “of the purchaser.” Probably G* understood that the Hi. Participle נַסָּה came from the root נָשָׁה, “to get, acquire, buy,” from whence the meaning τοῦ κτωμένου, “purchaser,” instead of the similar Hebrew root קָּפָ, “to be jealous”1 (S has מַסָּה מַסָּה, “an image of trouble”). The Syriac language has the verb קָּפָ to buy, acquire,” which has the same spelling of the Hebrew קָּפָ, “to be jealous.” Thus the Syriac translator seems to avoid any ambiguity by substituting the last two Hebrew words by the interpretative Syriac term קָּפָ, “of trouble.” This may have been due to the confusion or misunderstanding of the Hebrew verbal root קָּפָ for נָשָׁה as it occurred in G* rather than to an actual reading of S’s Vorlage.

---

1Emmanuel Tov, The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research, 2d. ed., Jerusalem Biblical Studies no. 3 (Jerusalem: Simor, 1997), 172: Regarding G, Tov stated that this type of translation can be classified as “etymological exegesis.” He defines it as that exegesis which is based “on the translator’s understanding of the structure of Hebrew words.”
has some MSS with a reading closer to the Masoretic one, e.g., στηλή + της εἰκόνος του ζηλου (εἰκόνες O, ζηλου 147) O′, L′-311-ZV, 407′ or εἰδωλοῦ του ζηλους in 86, and εἰκόνες του ζηλους in Qixl. T′ has a unique reading that substitutes the Hebrew בּאֵרָא הַאֲדֹנָי, “in visions of God,” by the interpretative rendering בּאֵרָא הַאֲדֹנָי מְרַב מִדָּרֶךְ, “by a prophetic vision from before the Lord which rested upon me.” Therefore any direct relationship among the versions cannot be drawn out of this verse.

Ezek 8:4

(III) וְהָבִיא הַגּוֹיָמִים אֶל הָעֵדֶת הַיְהוֹעֵדָה אֶל הַבְּרֵא הַיְהוֹעֵדָה בְּבִכְפְּעָת.

(S) וַיְהִי בְּרֵא הַיְהוֹעֵדָה אֶל הָעֵדֶת הַיְהוֹעֵדָה בְּבִכְפְּעָת.

(T) וַיִּשְׁכָּב הַגּוֹיָמִים אֶל הָעֵדֶת הַיְהוֹעֵדָה בְּבִכְפְּעָת.

(Trans. of S) “And behold there was the Glory of God of Israel according to the vision which I saw in the plain.”

Analysis of the Variants

S is a word-by-word translation of a Hebrew text similar to III, while T adds θεοῦ after κυρίου. This is a unique reading supported by all of its MSS, and may be evidence for a different Vorlage of T in regard to S. T′ agrees with the Masoretic reading without any addition or interpretative expansion of the text.
Ezek 8:5

(III) "And he said to me, 'Son of man, lift up your eyes to the way of the north,'" and I lifted up my eyes to the way of the north and behold, from the north side of the gate of the altar was an image of this jealousy." It is rendered by S as "to the gate of the altar was an image of this jealousy." It is rendered by S as "... of the eastern gate stood an image of trouble," and by S*(Ra.) as "toward the eastern gate,” omitting the last part. This is not proof for a direct dependency between these two versions, for it can be explained as a common knowledge of the geographical situation of the temple in Old Testament times. The eastern gate was..."
the entrance to the temple and was the place where the altar was located.  ΘΑ has several MSS that support the Masoretic reading, e.g., τὴν (τῆς Β) πρὸς ἀνατολάς Ῥα.] του
θυσιαστηρίου η (>544) εἰκῶν του ζηλοῦς τουτου (του 239) εν τω εισπορευσθαι
(+ σε Α*-544) αυτὴν την βλέπουσαν προς (κατ 233) αναπολας (ομ. την βλ. προς
ανατ. 26', 86η) Α"-106', 46, cII-86'-239'; and + (α Ω) του θυσιαστηρίου ου (> Ω-
Ω-147', C'-403';+ την Ε) η (ουκ prob. ου η 62) εικων του ζηλου (-λους Ω) τουτου
eν τω εισπορευσθαι αυτην (+ την προς αναπολας 538) Ω', L'-46, C'-403'; Θ' and
α' also contain it as (α Θ) του θυσιαστηρίου η εικων (α' ειδωλον Cod. 86) του ζηλους
tουτου εν τω εισπορευσθαι αυτην.

The Hebrew expression פתק יوحد, "image of jealousy," is also found in vs. 3
where one can observe the same type of variations in the versions. Consequently S
cannot have any relationship to ΘΤ all together, because half of the Syriac’s verse agrees with Θ*
against ΘΑ, and the second part has a unique reading closer to ΘΑ, but against Θ*.

Ezek 8:6

יואם אל ב אמר רבים חabilité מלא עם עפר ועפר יועדו נהללו אשר בי ישראל עפר פה (Μ)

לדחייה טעם מקרקיע ועפר עפר נהלל

מקהלו ל מרכה. שמה חכמה חכמה. פלאים פלאים מרכビル (S)

שנה וمشاهים מיך חכמים. מקהלו מיך פלאים פלאים

ירכתי לה חכמים (C)

אמר אל בר אמרים חculo אל מי ארואים עפרים (T)

ועברים ורצה לבית ישראל עפרים אל ארואים עפרים מיך מקרקיע ועפר נהלל
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And he told me, 'Son of man, see what they are doing; great abominations the house of Israel is doing. For they have gone far from my sanctuary, but you will turn again and you will see great abominations which they are doing'."

Analysis of the Variants

S has a unique reading. It adds after the last adjective μεγάλας, "great," the relative participle, "which they are doing." This seems rather a careful editorial work than a different Vorlage from מ. The only minus of S is המ, "here." Although ג (B) lacks אמר ביה ישראל, several MSS of ג have it, e.g., (א, ב, ג, ד) + νομος (ט α', β, γ) of ש. The Hebrew יקרא, "you will return, or turn" (jussive?), is omitted too in almost all the witnesses of ג; only MSS 62 and 403' have it, επιστρέψοι. מ renders its Hebrew text, which is similar to מ, as it is without any deviation. S is an independent translation, and is carefully translated in comparison to the versions.

Ezek 8:8

(מ) יאמר אלהי בני אדム תחר את בקורתכם ו걱תכם וקשתו אדו

(ג) אמרו יבר אדמא והורכים חמשה עשרים וחמשה וארבעים חמשה וארבעים
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(S) καὶ ἐξείπεν πρὸς με τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, ὄρυξον καὶ ὄρυξα, καὶ ἴδοὺ θύρα μία.

(Trans. of S) "And he told me, 'Son of man, dig in the wall,' and I dug in the wall and I found a door."

Analysis of the Variants

S contains a unique reading by substituting ἀναθέσαι, "and behold," by ἴδον, "and I found," which is an anomalous verb with a prosthetic aleph. This may be only an editorial effort and not an actual reading of its Vorlage, for the Syriac verb ἰδον conveys a stronger sense and action in the narrative than the simple Hebrew ἴδον.

S contains a unique reading by substituting ἀναθέσαι, "and behold," by ἴδον, "and I found," which is an anomalous verb with a prosthetic aleph. This may be only an editorial effort and not an actual reading of its Vorlage, for the Syriac verb ἰδον conveys a stronger sense and action in the narrative than the simple Hebrew ἴδον.

S contains a unique reading by substituting ἀναθέσαι, "and behold," by ἴδον, "and I found," which is an anomalous verb with a prosthetic aleph. This may be only an editorial effort and not an actual reading of its Vorlage, for the Syriac verb ἰδον conveys a stronger sense and action in the narrative than the simple Hebrew ἴδον.

©* omits both instances of the prepositional phrase ἐπὶ τὴν, "in the wall." ©* has a MS with a completely different reading for the first instance of ἐπὶ τὴν, e.g., ἀναθέσαι τῶν ὄφθαλμων σου πρὸς βορρᾶν καί, "you will turn your eye to the north"; and (α' + καὶ δή εν τῷ τοίχῳ Q'') rel. reads as Ἔν τῷ τοίχῳ, "in the wall." For the second instance of ἐπὶ τὴν some MSS read as follows: καὶ ἴδοςεθύρα μία] + Ἑ'-311-ZV εν τῷ τοίχῳ; pr. O-62, 538, C'-534-86'-403', 26', 410. ©* agrees with © as it is.

Ezek 8:12

(1) וַאֲסֹרֵם אֶל הָרָאיה בַּכֹּל אֲרָם אֶפְרָי בֶּיתָּ יִשְׂרָאֵל בֵּשְׁכָּן אָתָּים (2)

בַּתּרָה מְסַכַּת כֹּל אֲפָרָי בֵּית הַרְאָה בֵּשְׁכָּן עֲבָדֶים אֲשֶׁר (3)

בֵּית הַרְאָה מְסַכַּת כֹּלָּה שֶׁלָּה וְשֶׁלָּה מִבֵּית הַרְאָה שֶׁלָּה שֶׁלָּה שֶׁלָּה. (5)

הַשַּׁלְחַת לֶ- נָּּה לֶ- נָּּה כֹּלָּה לֶ- נָּּה לֶ- נָּּה כֹּלָּה לֶ- נָּּה לֶ- נָּּה. (4)

וַאֲסֹר לְהוֹדֵאוֹת בָּרֶנֶם דְּמֶנֶם בְּית יִשְׂרָאֵל לְכַבֵלָה מָכָר בָּרֶנֶם (12)
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And he told me, ‘See, son of man, what the elders of Israel are doing in the darkness. Each man is in his secret chamber and they are saying, “The Lord does not see us, because the Lord has forsaken the land’.”

Analysis of the Variants

All the versions had some difficulties in rendering the Hebrew word הפּוֹכָה, “his carved figure.” There are only a few instances of this word in the Old Testament, and the semantic range of it is wide, e.g., “imagination, image, conceit, figure, carved image, idolatrous idol.” ס has הָסֶה, “secret, hiding,” place or thing.

Although ס תומכ תבכ תּוּכְבַּה, “in their secret chamber,” similar to ס, the Syriac scribe might have committed a mistake of the eyes, by transposing the Hebrew letters ל תכ in the word הפּוֹכָה, as it occurs in the linguistic phenomenon called metathesis. Then one has the word אָסֶה or הסה, which is an Aramaic Pass. Ptc. of הסה “to hide, conceal,” and the Syriac language has the same Ptc. נס. ס has a unique reading: הסבכ, “his sleeping quarters.”

S could well be related to ס תומכ תבכ תּוּכְבַּה for the former has הסבכ and the latter הסבכ, but it also can be explained as part of a careful editorial work on the Syriac text rather than a dependency between them.
Ezek 8:13

And he told me, 'Turn again and see the great abominations which they are doing'.

Analysis of the Variants

S renders the entire Hebrew relative nominal clause (אֲשֶׁר פֹּה יַעֲשֵׂה הַרְעֹתָה נָדְלוֹתָה אֶפְרָי יִשְׂרָאֵל, “which they are doing”) into a relative participle (אֲשֶׁר פֹּה יַעֲשֵׂה הַרְעֹתָה נָדְלוֹתָה אֶפְרָי יִשְׂרָאֵל, “which they are doing”), which is an equivalent Syriac style. $^6*$ lacks וַיְיִשְׂרָאֵל, while $^6^A$ contains it in MSS O (Qmg)-62 (X O) επιστρέφων; $^6^A$ has a unique reading in two of its MSS, e.g., πρὸς μὲν + κυρίον 46, pr. Zv. $^C^f$ has the same reading as that of $^M$. 

Ezek 8:14

And he said to me, 'Let the north wind blow over the earth which they have plowed.'
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(S) and εἰσήγαγέν με ἐπὶ τὰ πρόθυρα τῆς πύλης οἰκοῦ κυρίου τῆς βλεπούσης πρὸς βορρᾶν, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἕκας γυναῖκες καθήμεναι θρηνοῦσαι τὸν Θαμμουζ.

(Trans. of S) “And he brought me to the entrance of the gate of the house of the Lord which is toward the north, and I saw there women as they were sitting and weeping for Tammuz.”

Analysis of the Variants

S has a unique reading by substituting ἀναλύω for ἀναλύει, “and I saw.” T also has a unique reading that seems to be a harmonization with vs. 3. It reads, τῆς βλεπούσης πρὸς βορρᾶν, “which looks/faces toward the north.” T reads like M.

Ezek 8:16

(Trans. of S) καὶ εἰσήγαγέν με ἐπὶ τὰ πρόθυρα τῆς πύλης οἰκοῦ κυρίου τῆς βλεπούσης πρὸς βορρᾶν, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἕκας γυναῖκες καθήμεναι θρηνοῦσαι τὸν Θαμμουζ. 
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Analysis of the Variants

S underwent a careful editorial work, producing a unique reading by the addition of the Ptc. "standing," after "men," and "and I saw," instead of नाभ, as also in verse 14, and a synonym for the 1st instance of ख्रेव, "to the east," लज्जिन, "to the east."

G* has a loan word, or a transliteration for the Hebrew word יַלְכוּ, "the porch," that is, αύλα. Furthermore, it reads twenty men instead of twenty-five, and lacks the second ख्रेव, probably to avoid redundancy. G* has several MSS that read like म, e.g., έκοσι B] + καὶ περὶ rel. The second ख्रेव is present in some MSS, e.g., (O) κατὰ ανατολάς rel.

E has an interpretative addition to the text ἀναρρητός, "and behold they are associating together." Therefore, based on the text, S is not related to any of the versions, and it seems to have undergone a careful editorial work based on a text similar to म.
Ezek 8:17

(Trans. of S) “And he told me, ‘Do you see, son of man? Is it a small thing for the house of Judah? That they practice this abomination and return to provoke me to anger? Then they snort with their nostrils’.”

Analysis of the Variants

All the versions seem to be on their own, for each has a unique reading not found elsewhere. S was carefully translated, as one can see by its avoiding redundancies; e.g., the first instance of verb the ἔστιν, “to do,” in the participial form, ἐστιν, is omitted and the perfect ἐστι, “they did,” was rendered by its participle form ἐστιν, “which [they] were doing.” The word ᾠδηγεῖ, “violence,” was substituted by ἑκατέροις, “iniquity,” perhaps to fit it in the context of idolatry.

The last clause was a crux interpretum for the versions.
“Lo! they sent forth a branch to their nostrils.” The Syriac scribe tried his best to render this as closely as he could to its Hebrew counterpart, "departing asunder with their nostrils.” Probably this is a Hebrew idiom for an idolatrous practice unknown to the Syriac scribe. The only similarity to the rendering of נָפָל Niphal of כָּלַל, “to trifle, to consider in a slight manner,” by the adjective מָקָט אָשֶׁר, “small.” All the differences, however, make it—the similarity—look like a mere coincidence.

/sweetalert translates the first instance of the verb וַיַּפְרַשּׁ by παρέτησεν and the second by παρετηθησαν as in L against S. כ, which is missing in S, is rendered by διότι, and the entire sense, “and they return to provoke me to anger,” is lacking in Ῥ. In Ῥ, the last sentence appears as καὶ εὐπρέπεσθαι (εὐπρεπ. L)”-311) τοῦ (ἵον) παραργείσα τοι με rel. Also the sentence ἢνοιξεν τὰ ἀνώτατα ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνθρώπου, “Lo! they sent forth a branch to their nostrils,” is translated as it is by Ἱ, e.g., (κ α τ) εὐπρέπεσθαι, “to stretch out” (εὐπρέπ. 147; εὐπρέπεσθαι 46) το (συν το 62) κλημα, “branch” (κριμα, “dispute, judgment,” 410; + συνων 407) rel. MS 130 reads μικτηριζωσω, “scorners,” for the last Hebrew nominal clause.

شاء personalizes the word סָנס, “violence,” into παραστέρη, “violent men,” and renders the last nominal sentence by μικτηριζωσω, “behold they are bringing disgrace right in front of their faces.” Therefore, conclusively S is not related to any of the versions concerning its translation.

**Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 8**

1. S does not avoid anthropomorphism (8:1, 2).
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2. S has some unique readings (8:2, 3, 6, 8, 14, 16).

3. S is alien to several renderings of Г translation (8:2, 3, 14, 17).

4. S is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to Μ (8:4, 13).

5. Similarities between $S$ and Г* can be explained by a common translation technique (8:5, 12, 17).

6. As a whole, the Syriac version is a careful translation rendering its Hebrew text into a good Syriac style.

7. Regarding numerical figures $S$ is closer to Μ than to any other version (8:16).

8. Redundancy is omitted by $S$ (8:17).
CHAPTER X

EZEPKIEL 9

Collation

9:1 Q. Inf. Constr. יכלון] Peal Perf. יכלון “and he said.”
Substit. יכלון “corner of.”

9:2 הלאה] Substit. Peal Perf. 1° s. יכלון “and I saw.”
Yבש] Peal حادة “her retribution.”

9:3 oמ. Q. Perf. 3° m. הלאה] Peal Ptc. + enclit. יכלון “who were standing.”

9:4 מי] Substit. יכלון “and evils.”

9:5 יבש] Idiom חכמה “between their eyes.”

9:6 יבש] Substit. חכמה “to my sight.”
ם] Peal 2° m. pl. מלתה “kill.”
ם] Peal 2° m. pl. מלתה “there is, exists.”
ם] Peal 2° m. pl. מלתה “begin.”
Data Analysis

Besides several other characteristic features of chap. 9, the consistent way of rendering the Hebrew וַיַּהֲלָם, "behold," by וַיֵּדַע, "and I saw" (vss. 2, 11) leads us to assume a single translator for the entire chapter.

Ezek 9:1

(III)
Analysis of the Variants

Although S has its own reading, it is very close to that of MT. S has two words which are derived from the same root, "to avenge," for the Hebrew words מָאָס, "visitation, punishment," and לֵי נַע, "his destruction," while all the versions have their own rendering for each Hebrew word. For instance, S reads ἐκδίκησις, "judgment," for מָאָס, and ἐξολοθρεύσεως, "utter destruction," for לֵי נַע. T and 8' have the same reading for מָאָס; they read ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, "who are in charge of," and ἐπιτάγα, "overseer." MS 46 changes the Infinitive Construct לְהוּד to the simple past εἶπεν, "he said," as it shows in S. Probably the repetition of the same root מָאָס, "to avenge," is an attempt to smooth the flow of the text, avoiding rare Hebrew words.

The Infinitive Construct לְהוּד is rendered by the perfect Peal in S. This does not mean that S had a different Vorlage, but it is a normal feature of the Syriac version to adapt the text to the Syriac style.
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Ezek 9:2

(II) ונהה משא אנסים לעשות ים פורף שער העליל

(III) אֶשְׁרַ מֶשֶׁה צָפַנוּ אֵלָּא כָּלָּא בָּרָּא בִּכְרָנוּ חָּוֹזָה לָּבֶּשׁ

(IV) בֶּדֶרֶם וְקֶסֶת הַפְּסֵר בְּחַגֵּיהֶנָּה יִרְבָּא וְיִפְרָדֵה浑ָּא הָאָדָם הַנַּחַת

(V) סָמַכָּה חִלָּתָם לָהֶם, פָּרָּתָם, שָׁמַלְתָם מַעֲלוֹתָם.

(VI) מָכְסַמֶּה מְסָמִיתָם מְלָּשׂה חָמָה. מָכְסַמֶּה שָׁמַלְתָם מְסָמִיתָם.

(Trans, of S) "And I saw six men coming from the way of the upper gate that looks toward the north, and each man with his instrument of retribution in his hand, and one man clothed in linen was among them, and he bound his loins with a girdle of sapphire. And they went and stood by the side of the bronze altar."

Analysis of the Variants

S has the second half of the verse in agreement with $^T$, while the first part
contains a unique reading in harmonization with the preceding verse. S substitutes וַהֲנָה, "and behold," by a more specific term וַהֲנָה, "and I saw," and for a better harmonization of the text, which is a normal translation technique, the Hebrew word מְפֹרֶז, "his slaughter," is rendered by מְפֹרֶז, "his retribution," which is the same word used twice in vs 1.

The problem comes in the second part of the verse with the phrase וַהֲנָה, "and an inkpot/inkhorn of the writer/writing." On the one hand, it seems that the Vorlage of S (שֵׁרֶץ מְפֹרֶז, "and he bound his loins with a girdle of sapphire") was related to ס ב, because the latter reads כִּי הָעַל כְּפָפָרָה תֶּהָה כָּלָה אֲבֹתְו, "and a girdle of sapphire was upon his loins." α' and θ' and MS 86 read close to מ ל כִּי הָעַל כְּפָפָרָה תֶּהָה כָּלָה אֲבֹתְו, "and the reed of a scribe"; o εφ' reads כִּי הָעַל כְּפָפָרָה תֶּהָה כָּלָה אֲבֹתְו, "and the reed of a writer was upon his loins." On the other hand, the Hebrew word מְפֹרֶז, "writing, writer," could well be a misunderstanding of an unvocalized text containing the word לֵבִי, "lapiz lazuli" (see Exod 24:10). Thus it indicates that even though S and ס ב have a similar reading, it is not strong evidence to support a direct relationship. They may reflect two independent translations based on a similar Hebrew text.

Cε agrees with מ ב, but the only interpretative phrase is כִּי הָעַל כְּפָפָרָה תֶּהָה כָּלָה אֲבֹתְו, "with his instrument of scattering," as is found in MS 62 of ס א (πελατπ) + τοῦ σκορπίσμου αὐτοῦ, "his scattered ones").
Ezek 9:3

(Trans. of S) “And the Glory of the God of Israel went up from the cherub who was standing at the corners of the house, and he called to the man who was clothed with linen and whose loins were bound with a girdle of sapphire.”

Analysis of the Variants

If vs. 2 is considered as in direct relationship to GT, than vs. 3 denies that assumption, because the same phrase, “and whose loins were bound with a girdle of sapphire,” which is found in vs. 2 of both versions, is found here in vs. 3 in S, but it is partially absent in vs. 3 of GT. It has, however, only γῦνη, “girdle,” instead of γυμνη. This is strong evidence for an independence of translation between S and G.

S has a unique reading in its translation by substituting the verb ἔδωκα by the
grammatical structure אֶזֶר מְרֹמָה, “who was standing” (Ptc. + enclit.). This could simply be an adaptation to the Syriac language and nothing to do with its Vorlage. The Hebrew word נֶמֶדּ, “threshold,” was rendered by אַפְסָא, “corner, angle,” whereas טת has אֶנֶּפֶר, “porch.” This may be explained by each scribe’s architectural perception of the temple rather than an actual reading of their Vorlagen.

The reading of כְּנֶשׁ is similar to that of מ; the only addition is מַולְשֶׁת קָדָשׁ, “holy of holiest,” after בִּיב, indicating the most sacred place of the temple. This may be an interpretative rendering casting emphasis on the importance of the location, and should not be taken as an actual reading.

Ezek 9:4

(ע”ז) "And the Lord said to him, ‘Cross in the midst of the city, in the midst of Jerusalem, and put a mark between the eyes of men who weep and who are tormented"
because of all the abominations and evils which have been done in her midst’.”

Analysis of the Variants

\( \mathcal{C} \) is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of \( \mathcal{I} \). There is a minus in \( \mathcal{S} \) and a plus in \( \mathcal{S} \), namely the omission of the Hebrew prepositional phrase "in the midst of the city," in \( \mathcal{S} \), which is present in some MSS of \( \mathcal{S} \), e.g., O-62', L''-46-Zv, and the addition of "evils," in \( \mathcal{S} \). This shows that \( \mathcal{S} \) did not copy from any version but did its own editorial work, improving the sense of the verse.

The idiomatic expression "between their eyes," which is also the same Aramaic expression (בְּאִי עֵינֵי), was used to render the Hebrew word מַצָּה, “forehead.” This is just a case of a cognate expression between related languages rather than a relationship between \( \mathcal{S} \) and \( \mathcal{C} \).

Ezek 9:5

(\( \mathcal{M} \)) "And to those who were with him, he said in my sight, ‘Cross the city after him and destroy, let not your eyes have pity nor have mercy’.”
Analysis of the Variants

S holds a unique reading regarding the first portion of the verse. The Hebrew clause רָאָלָה אֲפֶרֶד, “and to those he said,” is rendered by the Syriac מָיְנָהֵן לִדְבַּשָּׁה, “and to those who were with him, he said to them,” and the Hebrew idiom יָאָשׁוֹנ, “in my ears,” is translated by a Syriac idiom לַאֲשָׁה, “in my sight/eyes.” Probably לַאֲשָׁה, “in my sight/eyes,” indicates proximity and may convey a more significant sense for the Syriac scribe’s audience.

S demonstrates a more careful editorial work than אֶלֶת, for the latter keeps the Hebrew Idiom (Hebraism) in the phrase כָּלָה בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל מּוֹדִית, “do not spare with your eyes.” Though S has מַלְכָּה מָשְׁמֵשׁ מַשְׁמַח, “let not your eyes have pity” which seems to be an editorial work, substituting מָדִית מָשְׁמֵשׁ מַשְׁמַח, “spare,” by מָשְׁמֵשׁ מַשְׁמֵשׁ מַשְׁמַח, “have pity.” This reading fits in the context of a merciless destruction. In the first part of the verse S uses a more Syriac idiom for the sense of proximity לַאֲשָׁה, “in my sight/eyes,” while אֶלֶת reads אָקָעְטַנְו וּמְנַע “in my hearing,” which is a closer reading to that of אֶלֶת.

Ezek 9:6

יְהוָה בֵּית יְהֹוָה מַלְכָּה מַשְׁמֵשׁ מַשְׁמַח (א)　
לָמָּשָׁה וּלָעָל כָּל אֱלֹהִים וּלָעֱלֹה וּלָעֵל אֱלֹהִים וּלָעַל אֱלֹהִים (א)　
רְוֵחל בְּאָנֶמֶס הָוֶסֶק אֵשׁ לַאֲפֶרֶד (א)　
מלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה מֵלֶשֶׁה (א)　
וְסֵפִּיָּה לְהֵסֵפִּיָּה. מִי זָכָר אָחָש מִי זָכָר אָחָש מִי זָכָר אָחָש מִי זָכָר אָחָש. מִי זָכָר אָחָש מִי זָכָר אָחָש מִי זָכָר אָחָש (א)　
כֹּ בַּלֶּה לְצָלָה לְצָלָה לְצָלָה לְצָלָה לְצָלָה לְצָלָה לְצָלָה לְצָלָה לְצָלָה לְצָלָה לְצָלָה (א)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
(S*) πρεσβύτερον καὶ νεανίσκον καὶ παρθένον καὶ νήπια καὶ γυναῖκας
ἀποκτεῖνατε εἰς ἐξάλειψιν, ἐπὶ δὲ πάντας, ἐφ' οὐς ἐστὶν τὸ σημείον, μὴ
ἐγγύσητε· καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων μου ἀρξάσθε. καὶ ἤρξαντο ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν
πρεσβύτερων, οἱ ἵππαι ἐσώ ἐν τῷ οίκῳ.

(Trans. of S) “Kill utterly old men as well as young men, virgins, children, and women.
But do not come near to any man who has the mark upon him. Begin with my sanctuary.
And they began with the old men who were standing in front of the house.”

Analysis of the Variants

S has a reading similar to ⁵¹ by the use of the Imperative instead of the Hebrew
Imperfect וַנֵּשָׁם, “you will kill,” and וַנְצָה, “you will begin.” ⁵¹ renders them by
imperatives, namely ἀποκτεῖνατε, “kill,” and ἀρξάσθε, “begin,” respectively as in S.
This, however, does not support a direct relation between them for the following reasons:
S* lacks ἐληλυθών, “elders,” but ⁵¹ has it in (X ⁰) τῶν πρεσβύτερων rel. Notice, however,
that ⁵¹ reads εἰσώ/εἰσωθεν, “within, in,” for ἐν, “before, in front of.” Therefore if one
takes S as being based on some MSS of ⁵¹ regarding the Imperatives, then S corrected the
usage of the preposition ἐν, “before, in front of,” in agreement with a Hebrew text
similar to ⁴, otherwise, S should have a reading similar to that of ⁵¹ εἰσώ/εἰσωθεν,
“within, in.” This assumption seems too much of a conjecture.

S shows a careful translation adapting its translation into a good Syriac style; this
can be seen in the rendering of the Hebrew Imperfect by the Syriac Imperatives as
mentioned above, and by the addition of the composite construction (מְלֹאֵל, "who were standing"), a common feature of the Syriac language, instead of omitting the verb "to be," a normal future of the Hebrew Language. The skillfulness of the Syriac translator can be seen also in the addition of the direct-object marker אָ above each object of מְלֹאֵל, "you will kill," instead of the simple waw of the Hebrew version, casting emphasis upon whom the action of the verb was to be brought. The only relationship between both the Syriac and Greek versions is the use of a common translation technique, making the reading smoother in their respective target language.

Ezek 9:7

( jim - vjn ism nsn tr^ n nx -ixbm non nx ixna nrr^x -inxn
(S) o \,n  C L o c u a  ,ri;i>' iu p tfn .T  aL n a .«ien A  ■tejrtfa
(CJ) xmpn ipEji ipis pb'ap s n n
(©*) Kai eiTtev rrpos' auTou? M iavaT e
(tov o I kv)
(kai Trkfoa Te
?o S ou
vecpuiv
(eciropevdgevoi Kai
k o t t t €T€.
(Trans. of S) "And he said to them, 'Defile the house and fill the courts with corpses. Go, kill in the city'."

Analysis of the Variants

S is related to ©T inasmuch as both used a similar translation technique. They tried to improve their reading, yet tried to keep close to their Hebrew Vorlagen. The verbs יִפְּלַע מְלֹאֵל, "go, and they went and smote," is rendered by מְלֹאֵל מִלָּה, "go and kill," two
imperatives, while ΣΤ reads καὶ κόπτετε, “and smite.” The Greek Ptc. ἐκπορευόμενοι, “while going out,” is related to the preceding sentence πλήσατε τὰς ὀδοὺς, “fill the ways,” and to the last imperative καὶ κόπτετε, “and smite.” Though the Syriac version omits עזרו, “and they went,” it has משה משלח, “go, kill,” both imperatives conveying an emphatic sense stronger than that of the Hebrew אָשִׂית, “and they went out.” The two Imperatives carry their action toward the word מָלֵךְ, “city.” The Prepositional Phrase מִלְךְ עָבְרָה, was omitted in ס*, while סא contains it in MSS (X O) καὶ παταξάτε τὴν πόλις Ο (Qxt) 410; (X Qmg) καὶ ξελαδοντες έτυπτον (εκκόπτων 22o) τὴν πόλιν Qmg-62, L‘.

The Hebrew word מִלְךְ עָבְרָה, “courts,” probably related to the temple, is rendered by ὀδοὺς, “ways,” in ΣΤ, whereas ס has it as in סא, מִלְךְ עָבְרָה, “court” (Cod. <86>, 91 and <01 γ> read similarly to סא τὰς αὐλὰς, “courts”).

To accept ס as being a translation based or directly related to ס as a whole, one would have to assume that the Syriac translator had at hand a critical edition of ס to create the actual reading of ס.

Ezek 9:8

(מ"ש אַבָּא יָדָע אֲלֵי וְהָלַךְ עָלָיו פָּתי וַעֲשׂהָו אֱלֹהִים (ס)

אַבָּא יָדָע אֲלֵי וְהָלַךְ עָלָיו פָּתי וַעֲשׂהָו אֱלֹהִים

(5) הַמָּשָּׁה לְהוֹדוֹא עַל־אָשִׂית עַל־אָשִׂית אֵשׁ מְכַלֶּה הַמָּשָּׁה קָרָבָה

לָעַל אַשֶּׁר מִכְלָה עַל־אָשִׂית מְכַלֶּה הַמָּשָּׁה קָרָבָה.
And when they had slain them, I was left and I fell upon my face and I cried with a loud voice and said, ‘Ah, Lord of Authority, are you destroying all the remaining ones of Israel, and will you pour your wrath upon Jerusalem’?”

Analysis of the Variants

S has a unique reading by rendering כהותם, “while they were smiting them,” by the Syriac מוחת סמה, “and when they were slaying them.” Ṣ and ℣ agree with ℜ in this respect. Another unique reading is the addition of מיהא, “in a loud voice,” after פאר, “and I cried,” which is absent in the other versions all together. Ṣ has אפייה and ℣jadi, “I cried out,” for מיהא, “and I cried.” Regarding the nomina sacra, Ṣ (B) always lacks קדיש, while ṢA contains it in many of its MSS (rel.). ℣ expands the text with the words ק USART בנוית, “receive my petition”; this is a reading completely absent in the other versions. Although S shows a reworking of the text making it to sound more Syriac than Hebrew, it strives to keep as close as possible to its Hebrew Vorlage, as one can see in this verse.
Ezek 9:9

(3) And he told me, 'The iniquity of the house of Israel and Judah is exceedingly great and the land is full of blood and the city is full of injustice, and they say the Lord has forsaken the land and the Lord does not see us'.

Analysis of the Variants

$S$ agrees with $\text{III}$, having nothing to do with the textual expansion of $\text{C}^j$ and the additions and substitutions of $\Theta$. A consistent characteristic of $S$ is its avoidance of Hebraisms, which is not a concern of $\Theta$ as a whole. Notice that the emphatic repetition of $\text{nxn nxnn}$, "exceedingly great," is found in $\text{C}^\text{T} \"\text{ofdava ofdava,\" but } S \text{ has its customary}
combination of two adjectives 'iniquity,' and 'injustice,' are rendered by the same Greek word αδικίας, ‘injustice,’ in ST (S has its Syriac counterpart).

Furthermore, this version adds ἀκαθαρσίας, ‘uncleanness,’ after ἁπλος αδικίας, which is a unique reading. Another peculiar reading of ST is the substitution of ὕδωρ, ‘blood,’ for λαῶν πολλῶν, ‘many nations,’ implying foreign nations. Probably the translator had in mind the separation of the Israelite from other nations as mentioned in the book of Leviticus. Cod. 88 has the reading αἵματων, ‘blood,’ instead of πολλῶν. Only 81 γ’ and 81 λ’ read αἵματων instead of λαῶν πολλῶν. C’ contains some targumic interpretation for this reading. It has זְכֵּרַי, ‘those who deserve to be killed,’ after וַתִּהְיֶּה אֱלֹהִים, ‘and the land became full of.’ This verse is strong evidence for an independent translation and transmission of S.

Ezek 9:10

(枇) "They shall not help me in doing evil, all of them, men of iniquity.
(ס) המ לא אמרון עינו ולא אשתם דברם נזיר
(ח) וַתִּהְיֶה אֱלֹהִים, "and the land became full of.
(ס') וַתִּהְיֶה אֱלֹהִים, "and the land became full of.
(Trans. of S) ‘And as for me, I will not have mercy upon them nor I will have pity. But I will recompense their [evil] ways on their head.’"
Analysis of the Variants

S avoids some Hebraisms present in ג', καὶ οὐ φείδεται ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς μου, “and my eyes will not spare,” and the use of the verb δέδωκας as the Greek equivalent for ננ뎬, while S has ἔλεημένης, “I will not have mercy upon them,” and ἐμαυήσωμεν, “I will recompense,” for רָבָה. G avoids anthropomorphism by substituting for the Hebrew idiomatic usage of עין, “my eye,” its targumic term מזרה, “my Memra.”

Ezek 9:11

הנה האש לבה העביר בקרב הקפת בצורת מסיב דבר לאפר כפשים כפאר פאתי (G)

มนשה להככיה לוחמת דמיון, חומצה מסתאות. חומצה סבתאות (S)

אַּזָּא נבניוּבָיו לַעֲמֵשָׂא דַּפְּנָקָיו חוֹרֵצָה מִשְׁבֵּי פָּטְלָא לַעֲמִיר עַבְדָּא תֵּמָא פּוֹקְדָיו (G)

(Γ') καὶ ἴδον ὅ ἄνθρωπος ἐνδυκῶς τὸν ποδήρη καὶ ἔσωσμένος τῇ ζωῇ τὴν ὅσφυν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων Πεποίηκα καθὼς ἐνετειλάν μοι.

(Trans. of S) “And I saw the man clothed in linen, who answered and said, ‘I have done according to what you commanded me.’”

Analysis of the Variants

The relationship between S and ג' can be easily explained by a common effort of conveying a better sense of their Hebrew Vorlagen. For example, S has ἔλεημένης Ptc. of ἔλεημεν, “to answer,” while G reads ἀπεκρίνατο, “he brought answer,” for the Hebrew idiomatic expression מזרה דְּרוֹר, “bring back the word” (Hiph. Ptc. דְּרוֹר). G has a reading similar to that of ג' in some of its MSS, e.g., ἀπεκρίνατο ἐν (X O Q) λόγον ἀ´-403', O-
62. Both versions are just rendering the two acceptable possibilities of translating their Hebrew texts.

Quite strong evidence that leads us to posit a single translator for the entire chapter is the consistent way of rendering the Hebrew expression ראה, "behold," by בֵּן, "and I saw," as occurs in this verse. It might be also an avoidance of Hebraism on the part of the Syriac scribe, while ס has כַּא תִּנְדָע, "and behold," which seems to be a clear Hebraism.

The relative clause בֶּן הַיָּלָד, "who [had] the inkhorn on his loins," is lacking in ס as in previous verses where the same phrase appears (9:2, 3 ר יְד). ס reads כַּא הָלַכָּה תַּהֲנָה הָסָּלָם חַלָּם וחַלָּם וַיִּנָּלֵא "and his loins were girt with a girdle" (א', and Cod. 86 read ע הָלַכָּה תַּהֲנָה הָסָּלָם חַלָּם וחַלָּם וחַלָּם וַיִּנָּלֵא, "who had a scribe's inkhorn on his back," and א' has ע הָלַכָּה תַּהֲנָה הָסָּלָם חַלָּם וחַלָּם וחַלָּם וחַלָּם וחַלָּם וַיִּנָּלֵא, "who had the writing tablets in his loins"). Another difference is the rendering of the Hebrew word מִדֵּי, "linen." It is translated as בְּּרֵס which is the Syriac word for linen, and פַּדְגַּפון, "long robe," in ס. Only א', Cod. 86 (ר לִנְא), and ב' (ר בַּדִּינ) read in a way similar to that of מ and ס.

**Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 9**

1. The scribe strives to convey his translation in a good Syriac style, as is noticeable in almost all the verses.

2. ס has several unique readings (9:2, 4, 5, 8).

3. Similarities between ס and מ can most of the time be explained by a common translation technique, or by a relationship between the languages and not between versions.
(9:2, 3, 6).

4. $S$ prefers Syriac idiom (9:5).

5. $S$ does not contain the targumic interpretation (9:9).

6. $S$ does not avoid anthropomorphism as $C'$ does (9:10).

7. $S$ avoids Hebraisms, which is not a concern for $C$ as a whole (9:10).
CHAPTER XI

EZEKIEL 10

Collation

10:1
1° mi. pr. “appearance.”
2° om.

10:2
1° Subst. Pael Perf. “and he called.”
2° + “to him.”
Pl. “cherubim.”

10:3
Inf. Constr. Temp. particle + Pael Ptc. “when he was entering in.”

10:4
1° “of God” (MS 1111 “of the Lord”).

10:5
Ni. Perf. Ethpe. Ptc. “was being heard.”

10:6
Pi. Inf. Constr. Temp. particle + Pael Ptc. “and when he had commanded.”
+ enclit. “it was filled.”

222
“saying.”

“whirling wheels.”

“of the man.”

“and I saw.”

“and I saw.”

“each wheel.”

“where [they] were going.”

“and [they] were not turning.”

“and when [they] were going.”

“they were not turning.”

“except to.”

“where [they] were going.”

“and [they] were not turning.”

“whirling wheels.”

“they were full of eyes.”
"when they went (Peal Ptc.) round about to their sides.”

10:13

Pu. Perf. קָרָא (Karāa) [Peal Perf. קָרָא (Karāa) “he called.”

Substit. קָרָא (Karāa) “before me.”

10:14

“belonging to each one of them.”

10:16

Q. Inf. Constr. נִבְלַח (Nīlāχ) [Peal Perf. נִבְלַח (Nīlāχ) “they were going.”

Q. Imperf. נִבְלַח (Nīlāχ) [Peal Perf. נִבְלַח (Nīlāχ) “they were standing [too].”

Q. Imperf. יָרֵנוּמ (Yāreno’ūm) [Peal Perf. יָרֵנוּמ (Yāreno’ūm) “and when they were mounting up.”

Qal Imperf. יָרֵנוּמ (Yāreno’ūm) [Peal Perf. יָרֵנוּמ (Yāreno’ūm) + enclit. “they were mounting themselves
up [too]."

“and when the cherubim were lifting up their wings the wheels were lifting up with . . .”

10:19


Q. Imperf. 3 m. s. Peal Perf. 3 m. pl. "and they stood."

10:20

pr. "this."

10:21

1° Idiom "to each one of them."

2° Idiom "to each of them."

10:22

pr. "like."

pr. "thus, likewise."

M. suf. f. suf. "their appearance" (MS 7h2 m. suf.).

om. "to his side."

Q. Imperf. Temp. part. + Peal. Ptc. "they were going."

Data Analysis

Ezek 10:1

אשראות והנה אל הרכינו את עלו כן עמדים (מ)
כאמל ספיר כמראת עמדה כאם נראת עלהמ" (ס)
מנצחה חמלֵלָה, תלדלו מכִּים חומָשָׂה, כִּים שָׂפָה חומָשָׂה (ס)
כאמלָה. כִּים שָׂפָה וַחֲמוֹרָהּ כִּים שָׂפָה תלדֵלָה.
And I saw the firmament which was above the head of the cherubim, like the appearance of a sapphire stone, and something like the appearance of the image of a throne was above them."

Analysis of the Variants

One can argue for a relationship between \(\text{G}^*\) and \(\text{S}\) in terms of the common omission of the verb \(\text{n}
\text{r}
\text{v}\), "it appeared," or for a relationship with \(\text{GA}\), for the latter contains a group of MSS that has the reading found in the Syriac version and \(\text{L}\), but lacking in \(\text{G}^*, \text{omouwma}\) pr. \(\omega\) \(\text{osai} \times \text{O}; \text{pr.} \omega\) \(\text{etos} \text{62}; + \text{etos} \text{L}^*, 46\). These, however, are not sufficient proof to establish a direct relationship between them. The reason is that if \(\text{S}\) was based on a MS or recension similar to \(\text{G}^*\), how does it also have the reading of \(\text{GA}\)? On the other hand, if \(\text{S}\) is related to \(\text{GA}\), then the question is which group of MSS \(\text{S}\) is it related to? for \(\text{S}\) has half of its reading similar to group \(\text{O}\) or \(\text{L}\), whereas group \(\text{O}\) has the equivalence for the Syriac omission of \(\text{n}
\text{r}
\text{v}\), "it appeared," that is, \(\text{o}\) (\(\text{O}-62\), and also \(\sigma, \theta, \times 86\)). Therefore to accept any relationship, the Syriac scribe should have had an entire collection of the Septuagint manuscripts to choose the most appropriate reading. \(\text{C'}\) agrees with \(\text{L}\) without any deviation.
Ezek 10:2

(Trans. of S) “And he called to the man dressed in linen and said to him, ‘Go among the wheels under the cherubim, and fill your hands with coals of fire from among the cherubim, and scatter upon the city.’ And he went before my sight.”

Analysis of the Variants

There is a possible relationship between S and T regarding their agreement in both instances of the Hebrew word הֵלְכִּיות (לכְרַבִּים, לְכָרְבִּים) (1° לְכָרְבִּים, 2° לְכָרְבִּים). S and T translate both in the plural form. T has both as they occur in III, with the sole exception of MS c that has them in the plural (לְכָרְבִּים). This, however, can be explained by the careful editorial work of S. Usually, S tries to harmonize with the context or with the immediate context; thus vs. 2 was harmonized with the preceding verse that has both instances of it in the
plural form. Therefore this verse does not support a direct relationship between $S$ and $G_T$.

Against a direct relationship between $S$ and $G^* is the presence of the second instance of the verb אֶזְכַּר (אֶזְכַּר) in $S$, which is absent in $G^*$ (some MSS of $G^A$ contain it; O-62 καὶ εὐτεθεῖν). Furthermore, the substitution of the introductory verb יְהֵן אֶזְכַּר by אֶזְכַּר, “and he called,” which is found only in $S$, weighs against any possible relationship between them. Notice also that the rendering of the Hebrew idiom לְיַעַז תְּאֹר, "before my eyes,” was translated by its Syriac cognate idiom לְיַעַז, “before my sight/eyes”; on the other hand $G_T$ renders it by a preposition and the enclitic pronoun ενωΝυν μου, “before me.” This indicates that $S$ did not base its translation on $G_T$.

Ezek 10:3

(ML) rra'jsn isnn nx xbn pum erxn

(S) Arrii. .T T x OLU3L. Q C Iffl rizjei'i^a .pdLLi. Xacn it-A rrfk l.T C l .O ta

(< E J) xrru xrrn n' nx'bnnx xre'D K pin birns xn'2b n m o pep x'2H3t

(©*) ical t o x^pouPiv elcm fcei €k 8e£id)v toO oikou €v t<3 daTTopeueoQcti to v avSpa, ical f| ve^lXr) €tt	| 0 ev ttiv auXtiv rf|v eaorepav.

(Trans. of $S$) “And the cherubim were standing at the right hand of the house. When the man went in, the inner court was filled with a cloud.”

Analysis of the Variants

$S$ translates the Inf. Constr. with suf., הבא, “when he entered,” by the Peal Ptc.
with the temporal mark אֶלֹ נָ נָ הֹ ל, “when entering,” which is the consistent way Syriac renders the Hebrew Inf. Constr. structure. סְת renders it by the form יֵרַ וֹ אֶלֹ נָ נָ הֹ ל (Dep. Inf.), “while entering,” probably a Hebraism. Notice that the word order is different between ס and סְת. The latter agrees with the order of הֹ ל, whereas the former has its own word order. This shows the literary skills of the Syriac scribe. This literary skill can be seen, also, in the usage of the Perfect with an enclitic form of the verb רָחְבָא; for instance the Q. Perf. רָחְבָא אָסָלָה, “it filled,” was rendered by אֶלֹ נָ נָ הֹ ל אָסָלָה (Ethpe.), which can have the same time reference as the simple Perfect, but in the passive voice, “it was filled.” זה adds אָסָלָה אָסְפָה אָסָלָה, “dark misty, dense,” after the word אֶלֹ נָ נָ הֹ ל, “cloud.” This addition is intended, probably, to convey a more dramatic description to the narrative; it however should not be considered as an actual reading existent in a Hebrew recension, but only a complementary addition to the text made by the targumic scribe or tradition.

Ezek 10:4

[Hebrew text]

1Moule, 174: “יֵרַ וֹ אֶלֹ נָ נָ הֹ ל with Infin. in a temporal sense (as distinct from the sense consisting of) seems to be a Hebraism.”

2This can be classified as a shared variant/nonvariant according to Lund’s criteria, p. 409. See Guidelines, p. 19.
(5) And the Glory of God went up from the Cherub who was over the threshold of the house, and the house was filled with a cloud. And the inner court was filled with the brightness of the Glory of the Lord.

Analysis of the Variants

S has a unique reading by rendering the first instance of the nomen sacrum *κυρίον* as *Ωίνε*, "God," and the second by *Ρόδαν*, "Lord" (only MS 1111 has both instances as *Ωίνε*). 6T translates both by *κυρίου*, "Lord." A further reading peculiar to S is the addition of *ἐστιν* "inner," to qualify *τῆς δόξης κυρίου*, "and the court," as in the preceding verse ("inner court").

Another clear difference between S and 6T is that the Syriac scribe translates as if the “Glory of God” went up from the cherub who was standing at the threshold of the house, while 6T scribe(s) translates as if the cloud went up from the cherubim to the porch of the house. This could be a mere interpretation of the text, but the usage of *Ωίνα*, “cherub,” in the singular by S indicates that the Syriac version has a closer relationship to the reading found in 117 than to that in 6* concerning this verse, for the latter has a Hebrew transliteration *χερουβίν* in the plural (only MSS Q-88 read *χερουβ* as in 117).
Ezek 10:5

And the sound of the wings of the cherubim was heard as far as the outer court like the sound of God when he speaks.

Analysis of the Variants

$S$ has an arrangement of the text that does not change its overall similarity to $M$. The only significant deviations are the rendering of the Ni. Perf. רָאָה by the common Syriac usage of the composite tense Ethpe. Ptc. plus the enclitic form of the verb רָאָה, “to be,” namely רָאָה, “[it] was being heard,” whereas $G^T$ has the Imperf. 3° s. הָקֻсто, “it was heard,” and the rendering of the Pi. Inf. Constr. בָּדַר, “when he speaks,” by the Pael Ptc. בָּדַר + ד, “speaking,” preceded by the temporal particle ד, “when.” Notice that $G^T$ has a participle also, λαλοῦντος, “speaking,” without the temporal marker “when.” The crucial difference, however, is the rendering of the nomen sacrum אֱלֹהִים. $S$ reads אֱלֹהִים, “God,” while $G^T$ has transliterated it with an additional explanatory apposition of it, namely יְהֹוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל. $G$ also has אֱלֹהִים, but it avoids

1Nöldeke, § 263; Muraoka, § 70.
anthropomorphism by substituting the expression "like the voice of Shaday," by "like a sound/voice from before Shaday." Therefore, S is not related to any of the versions, but has its unique rendering of the text.

Ezek 10:6

(Trans. of S) "When he commanded the man, who was dressed in linen, he told him, ‘Take fire from between the wheels from among the cherubim,’ and he went and stood at the side of the wheels.”

Analysis of the Variants

Although S has a peculiar reading, it agrees mostly with ־יר. The changes of the Syriac text seem to be only an adaptation based on the literary skills of the Syriac scribe. For example, S renders the Piel Inf. Constr. plus its suffixed subject "בִּרְצוֹת, "when he
commanded," by a Syriac equivalent, a temporal particle plus the Peal Perf. 3 m. s.

๕, "and when he commanded." ๕ has _when it happened," is present in ๕ (kal ݝ, Hebraism), but avoided in S.

Another indication of a high level of literary skills is the rendering of the two synonymous Hebrew words for "wheel," ה and ב. S translates both using the same Syriac word רפ "wheels," since the text is about the same wheels. Probably this was done to avoid misunderstanding or ambiguity. ๕ and ܸ also translate both instances by the same correspondent Greek or Aramaic word, ῥ and נח,.

The usual Hebrew introduction of a Direct Speech, the Inf. Constr. רפ, "saying," is translated by a more direct expression in S, the Peal Perf. plus the Ind. Obj. י, "he said to him," while ๕ and ܸ keep the Hebrew expression conveyed in their Participle and Infinitive respectively, ל and ל, "saying," which can be considered a Hebraism in the case of ๕.

๕ contains an extra-Masoretic reading, which is not shared by any other ancient version. It is the addition of ṣ, "sacred," after στολήν, long "robe," that can be considered an explanatory gloss rather than an actual reading of its Vorlage. Furthermore,
G* reads a Ptc. of place¹ εχομενος, "neighboring, close, near," for the Hebrew י거나, "side." The only exception to this reading is Cod. 86 which reads πλησιον, "near, close by," similar to מ.

Consequently, one may say that the Syriac scribe, though keeping close to his Hebrew Vorlage, which seems to be similar to that of מ, strives to make a highly literary translation in good Syriac style. On the other hand, C is more a translation that struggles to render the Hebrew text as closely as possible, even to the point of sacrificing the style of the Greek language.

Ezek 10:7

(מ) רשלתcherubim את יד מבין לcherubim אלה דאמ "אש
בית הכרבים יהושע ורות אל חפי לבלם הביר וידא
(ס) השבל יהושע נפשו שישקמה עניני תועה חנק בקעה ושעב
ואושפcribeים זה ידיים מבני credite Latino עני
כדרכובים המתים וצון להבש להבש לכתם והם
(צ') קא אִצְטְטוֹאֵנ תִּי נפְּרָא עַלּוֹ הַיָּבָא מֵאָוָא תוֹי וֹואָסָא אֶֽנֶּ הָמָוָא תֵּב
תוֹי נפְּרָא בַּיְנוּ נְפָשַׁיָּא וַאֲלָבַּן קאֶנֶּ שַׁיָּא כִּי תַּשְּקַּהַּיָּא תוֹי הֶנֶדְוּקַּוָא תִּי נוֹפְּרָא תֵּב
תוֹי נפְּרָא אֲנָוָא, קאֶלָבַּן קאֶזְקַלְבַּן.

(Trans. of S) "And the cherub stretched his hand from between the cherubim to the fire that

was between the cherubim, and he took [some] and placed [it] in the hands of the man who
was dressed in linen and he took [it] and went out.”

Analysis of the Variants

The Syriac scribe shows here a high level of literary expertise. In this case, S
employs synonymous words instead of repeating the same ones as occur in \( \text{ST}, \text{CJ}, \text{and M.} \)
Notice that the Hebrew verbs \( \text{סנ}, \) “and he took,” and \( \text{nip}, \) “and he took,” are rendered by
the same Greek verb \( \text{εξαφέω} \) and the Aramaic verb \( \text{ספיס}, \) “and he took,” whereas S uses
synonymous verbs \( (\text{ספיס} \text{ and } \text{ספיס}, \) “and he took”) for the instances as they occur in \( \text{M.} \)

The unique reading found in the Syriac version can be explained by its characteristic
feature of avoiding ambiguity; S adds \( \text{ספיס} \text{, “of the man,” in the text, making sure that}
the hands where the cherub placed the fire belonged to the man dressed in linen and not
another cherub.

\( \text{ST} \) has several omissions which are ignored by \( \text{ST} \) (e.g., \( \text{ספיס} \) and \( \text{ספיס} \), but none of them gives any indication for a Syriac relationship. \( \text{ST} \) contains \( \text{ספיס} \)
\( \text{ספיס} \text{ ו \text{ספיס}}, \) “a long sacred robe.” The last part \( \text{ספיס} \text{ ו \text{ספיס}}, \) is an extra-Masoretic
reading not found elsewhere. Vs. 7 has the same expression; probably it has to do with the
scribe’s intention to differentiate this robe “the sacred one” from any other made out of
linen in use at that time.

Ezek 10:8

\( \text{ספיס} \) \( \text{ספיס} \) TR(\( \text{ספיס} \) \( \text{ספיס} \) \( \text{ספיס} \))
Analysis of the Variants

In this case S is similar to ΘΤ (except MS A). Both versions read סנסא and כטסא, "and I saw," against the Masoretic reading נ. 3° מ. s. דר, "and it was shown, or appeared." This can be explained based on the unvoweled Hebrew text, or based on the preceding chapter where סנסא, "and I saw," was used instead of נ. 3° מ. דר, "and behold" (9:2, 11), and here (10:8) for the verb נ. 3° מ. דר. It can be considered as a characteristic feature of the translator of the Peshitta of Ezek 1-12. Thus two arguments may be raised from this datum: first it might be a harmonization with the preceding chapter; second it is an attempt to avoid any syntactical ambiguity in the text. Therefore, no strong evidence exists for any relationship between the versions. Θ agrees with the reading of ΙΙ.

Ezek 10:9
(Trans. of S) “And I saw four wheels beside the cherubim. One by one a wheel was by the side of each cherub, and the appearance of the wheels was like the appearance of a stone of Tarshish.”

Analysis of the Variants

S and $\Theta^*$ (B, 147, 311-46, 764-130-233) omitted the second instance of the Hebrew nominal sentence, א揠ס איעל יחרב יחרב, “and one wheel was beside each cherub.” There are two possibilities that can explain this omission by the two versions. On the one hand, a common dittographic error, that the Greek and Syriac scribes detected in their basic Hebrew texts, may explain their effort to avoid it in their translation. On the other hand, it can simply be a literary element conveying a distributive force, which is a normal feature of the Hebrew language.1 The second possibility seems to be the more plausible one, for several MSS of $\Theta^A$ contain it, e.g., (*)(O, Cod. 86) $\xi\alpha\iota\tau\rho\omega\chi\omicron\varsigma\omicron\eta\omicron\mu\nu\varepsilon\omicron\nu\varsigma\varepsilon\omega\mu\omicron\eta\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma\omicron\eta\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma\omicron\eta\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (eph. 91) χερουθ (του χ.Α.; του χερουθειμ του 62; βειμ L36-538, 87-239-613, 26; των χερουθιμ 410) €ος (> A, 407) and rel, and because avoidance of

1 Moshe Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20, AB, vol. 22 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 48 and 181: Greenberg supports the distributive force of this repetition; see also Jotion-Muraoka, 134q on the distributive force of repetition in the Hebrew language.
redundancies is a consistent feature of $S$.

Those that omitted it, including the Syriac version, produced a more elaborated translation, though this does not mean a better reading than those that contain it. As we have seen, $S$ is a well-edited translation where redundancies and ambiguities are omitted or substituted with the aim of simplifying the text. Therefore it is not secure evidence for a direct relationship between $S$ and $S^*$ because there are several key differences that do not allow for that conclusion. For instance, $S$ omits יְדַנְנוֹן, whereas $T^*$ has it, and the rendering of the two instances of the prep. יָצֵא, "beside," is by a long verbal sentence Pluperfect 3\textsuperscript{a} pl. plus the Ptc. of יָצֵא in its participial adverbial usage, namely יָצֵאִים יָצֵא, יָצֵאִים יָצֵא, "stood close," for the first instance, and for the second by the Ptc. used as an Adv. of place יָצֵאִים, "close, near." $S$, on the contrary, uses its Syriac noun יְדַנְנוֹן, "side," in a construct state, and $J$ has בּסָר, "in the side of," a prep. plus a noun in construct state.

The next evidence for an independent translation in $S$ is the rendering of the last Hebrew word יְדַנְנוֹן, which is transliterated by $S$, while $T^*$ interpreted it as being לֶחֶם יְדַנְנוֹן (א' χρυσοδέμον; σ' νακυνθού; ἑβρ' and θ' θαρσίς), and $J$ reads הַftime, "precious." This shows that the Syriac scribe tried to get as close as possible to his Hebrew Vorlage without sacrificing his Syriac style.

Ezek 10:11

(ת"ר) יָצֵאִים יָצֵאִים יָצֵא

הַftime יְדַנְנוֹן הַftime יְדַנְנוֹן

(ת"ר) יְדַנְנוֹן הַftime יְדַנְנוֹן הַftime יְדַנְנוֹן (ת"ר)
The main point to be noticed here is the “Syriacization” of the text of S, whereas $^\Theta$ reflects a Hebrew influence in its Greek language. For instance, all Hebrew Inf. Constr. and Imperf. are rendered by the composite Syriac tense, which is the most frequent structure to signify an ongoing, repeated or habitual action in the past (Ptc. + enclitic of $\varepsilon\varsigma\alpha\upsilon\alpha\upsilon\alpha$). $^\Theta$, however, employs a non-Greek form for translating these Hebrew Inf. Constr., namely $\varepsilon\nu$ το $^\Theta$ plus Inf., which is considered a Hebraism in Greek.\(^1\)

Notice the closeness of S to $^R$ by the use of the Syriac cognate word $\varepsilon\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\varsigma\upsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu$, “first (head) of them,” for the Hebrew counterpart שָׁמַר, “the head,” while $^\Theta$ has an

---

\(^1\)Muraoka, § 71.

\(^2\)Ibid.; Moule, 174.
Aramaic synonym, but not cognate word, כִּרָאָם, "the first." אֲנִי reads two nouns in apposition, הָאָרְכֹּת הַמִּית, "the first one (the first, the one in the beginning)"; only Cod. Q has נְכוֹלָה (א' וְמַעְלָה; ס' אֱרָכָה; ת' בָּרָק). Therefore one may conclude that the Syriac version was a very skillfully translated version based on a Hebrew text very similar to that of מִלִּים.

Ezek 10:12

(Ezekiel 10:12)

And their whole body and their backs and their hands and their wings of the wheels were full of eyes as they were going around toward their sides.

Analysis of the Variants

S has a unique reading not found elsewhere in the ancient versions. The last portion of the verse, "round about to the four of them, their wheels," which is an awkward phrase, is rendered by כִּרָאָם, כִּרָאָם, "as/when they were going around toward their sides." It is not easy to explain this reformulation of the Syriac text, but one can suggest some possibilities. It could have been an attempt to improve the...
sense of the verse in the target language, in this case Syriac, employing the verb "to go round about," in a composite tense implying a continual, habitual action in the past, for the Hebrew Adv. "round about," and by substituting the last two Hebrew words that seem to be syntactically misplaced, by a clearer Syriac prepositional phrase "toward their sides." Another possibility is that the Syriac scribe harmonized it with vs. 11, which reads, "as they went toward their four sides."

\( \text{G}^* \) omits "and their whole body," while \( \text{G}^\text{A} \) has it in \( \times \) \( \text{O} \) \( \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\iota \alpha\iota \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\varepsilon\zeta \) (\( \pi\alpha\sigma\alpha \eta \sigma\alpha\rho \) \text{prob. π. σ. III}) \( \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu \) \( \Omega' \) \( \text{III} \). Notice that \( \alpha' \), \( \sigma' \), and \( \theta' \), Cod. 87-91 contain it as in \( \text{M}, \) init.] pr. \( \times \) \( \kappa\alpha\iota \) (> Cod. 91) \( \pi\alpha\sigma\alpha \alpha\iota \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\varepsilon\zeta \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu \) \( \text{-tou} \) \( \text{87-91} \) \( \text{Q}^\text{txt} \) \( \text{86} \) (without \( \times \)) \( \text{87-91} \) (both are without \( \times \)).

\( \text{C}^t \) agrees with \( \text{M} \), its only deviation being the repetition of "round about," for emphasis, which is an Aramaic feature and not a deviation per se. Therefore the Syriac version is on its own regarding the translation of this verse.

**Ezek 10:13**

(\( \text{M} \)) "לכוסים ולחרוות נחלות באהים"

(\( \text{S} \)) "נחלות באהים ונחלות אלוהים"

(\( \text{C}^t \)) "לכוסים ולחרות נחלות אלוהים"

(\( \text{G}^* \)) "τοῖς δὲ τρόχοις τούτοις ἐπεκλήθη Γελγελ ἄκουοντός μου."

(Trans. of \( \text{S} \)) "As for the wheels, he called them whirling wheels before me."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Analysis of the Variants

S has a unique reading due to an editorial arrangement of the text. The Syriac scribe skillfully managed to smooth the Syriac translation by rendering the Pual קָרְאָה, “it was called,” by the active Peal קָרַא, “he called” (6T has a passive reading as in IR), and by substituting the Hebrew idiom ראותי איש, “in my ears,” by a Syriac prepositional phrase with a similar sense כְּפָנַי, “before me,” indicating proximity, whereas 6T has ἀκοοντός μου, “in my hearing,” which is closer to the Hebrew expression “in my ears,” and can be a Hebraism.

CJ agrees with IR, while 6T transliterates the Hebrew word דנָלָל, “whirling [wheel],” as Γελγηλ, even to the point that MS 62 transliterates the Hebrew article αγιγηλ. α’ reads τροχός, “wheel,” σ’, Q, and Cods. 86, 87 have κυλισματά, “whirling,” and Cod. 91 reads εμπνευσται τροχός, “proclaiming/interpreting wheel.”

This verse shows that though the reading of S is closely related that of IR, the Syriac scribe strives to render his translation into good Syriac style, which is not the case of 6T into Greek.

Ezek 10:14

[Hebrew text]

This verse shows that though the reading of S is closely related that of IR, the Syriac scribe strives to render his translation into good Syriac style, which is not the case of 6T into Greek.

Ezek 10:14

[Hebrew text]
And every one of them [had] four faces. The first, the face of a cherub, the next the face of a human being, the next the face of a lion, the next the face of an eagle.

Analysis of the Variants

S has a unique reading, which seems to be the result of a skillful arrangement of the text rather than a reflection of its Vorlage. Notice that the Syriac scribe transfers the Hebrew prepositional phrase מְאֹד, "belonging to each one," into a clearer idiom in the Syriac language אֲשֶׁר מְאֹד, "belonging to every one of them," thus making the Syriac syntax of the sentence smoother to its reader, avoiding ambiguity; whereas 𝔅 contains what seems to be a Hebraism תַּחַת, "of each" (_scroll omits vs. 14 altogether). This shows the proficiency of the Syriac scribe regarding his ability to handle both the Syriac and Hebrew languages. He always tries to render the Hebrew text into good Syriac style.

Another unique reading of S is the rendering of דָּשְׁנֶה, דָּשְׁנֶה, דָּשְׁנֶה, דָּשְׁנֶה, "second, third, and fourth," respectively, by the same Syriac word דָּשְׁנֶה דָּשְׁנֶה דָּשְׁנֶה דָּשְׁנֶה, "and the next," which

---

1 Vs. 14 reads as follows in 𝔅: καὶ τεσσαρα προσωπα τω ενι (+ καὶ 534) το προσωπαν του ενος (ειχεν εκαστον των χων το προσωπαν το εν L*-46-311 et ειχε τ. ζ. εκ. και το προσ. το εν 46 προ τω ενι το πρ. του ε.) προσωπων (>544) του (των 26, 410: > A, L* 710) χερου (-βι 147; -β(ε)μ 62, 48c-II, 87-cII-613, 26, 410) και το (>62', V-46) προσωπων του δευτερου (το δευτερου προ του δευτ. L*311) προσωπων ανθρωπων και το τριτον (το προσωπων του τριτου προ το τριτου Α) προσωπων λεοντος και το τεταρτου προσωπου αετου rel., see Apparatus of the Göttingen Edition. This verse also appears in Cod. Qext.
reflects more of an editorial work than its Vorlage. Θ reads τοῦ δευτερου, το τρίτον, and το τεταρτον, similar to the Masoretic reading.

Ezek 10:16

( Heb) ^nx nxem nbsx n-aixn ob ' n'2rDn robm nbsxn an n: n22ixn -D O ' xb p xn  bua m i*?

(S) ^nx nxem nbsx n-aixn ob ' n'2rDn robm nbsxn an n: n22ixn -D O ' xb p xn  bua m i*?

(CJ) ^nx nxem nbsx n-aixn ob ' n'2rDn robm nbsxn an n: n22ixn -D O ' xb p xn  bua m i*?

(© *) Kai  en tu porpevou tə xepouvin eporeuvnto oı troxoı, kai ouıı xepouvin εxomevıı aytwv. kai en tu xəairev tə xepouvin tıs περυγas aytwv tıı meteωrizevıı aπıı tıs yhıs ouv epıstrefvıı oı troxoı aytwv.

(Trans. of S) “And when the cherubim were going, the wheels were going with them, and when the cherubim lifted their wings up to mount themselves up from the earth, the wheels were not turning away from them.”

Analysis of the Variants

The Siriacization of the verse is evident in S. All Hebrew Inf. Constrs. were rendered in S by the common composite tense, Ptc. + enclitic of “to be” with a temporal mark in this case, the particle ש, “when,” and the Imperfect by the same grammatical structure without the temporal particle. As was mentioned before, the composite tense
(Ptc. + enclitic) is the normal Syriac feature to express a habitual action in the past. renders the Inf. Constr. by a Hebraism, namely \( \varepsilon \nu \tau \omega + \text{Inf.} \)

S substitutes the Hebrew expressions בфикור, "beside them" (prep. of place), and ממקימין, "from beside them" (of source), by two simple Syriac expressions חָפַד, "with them" (of accompaniment), and ממשי, "from them" (of source), respectively.  translates the first instance by the participle of place plus the pronoun εξώμενοι αὐτῶν, "near them," and the second instance is omitted in S, but present in S\( ^{A} \), e.g., \( \text{fin} + (\% \ O) \)

καὶ γένα αὐτοὶ απὸ τῶν (απ αὐτῶν or probably απο τῶν 106; om. απο τῶν 46)

εξώμενα (-τών 147. L'\( ^{-449*} \), 764-233-613, 544) αὐτῶν (-τω 233) rel., and also in an asterisk in Cod. Q\( ^{\text{nt}} \) καὶ γένα αὐτοὶ απὸ τῶν εξώμενα (α πη(σιν) Cod. 86) αὐτῶν. \( ^{C} \) agrees with the reading of S; its sole deviation is the substitution of the word ἄριστα by ἀσάμε, "heavens."

Ezek 10:17

\begin{align*}
\text{(S)} & \quad \text{Greek} \quad \text{Greek} \quad \text{Greek} \\
\text{(C)} & \quad \text{Greek} \quad \text{Greek} \quad \text{Greek} \\
\text{(C\( ^{*} \))} & \quad \text{Greek} \quad \text{Greek} \quad \text{Greek} \\
\end{align*}

\text{Muraoka, § 71; Moule, 174.}
(Trans. of S) "And when they were standing, they [the wheels] were standing [too] and when they [the wheels] mounted themselves up, they were mounting themselves up, and when the cherubim lifted their wings up the wheels lifted up with them, because the spirit of the living creatures was in them [the wheels]."

Analysis of the Variants

The Syriac scribe renders his translation into a masterful Syriac style. It is one of the many cases that supports the high level of literacy of the Syriac version of Ezekiel. Notice for instance that in the compound tense construction (Ptc. + enclitic) the Syriac scribe was very careful in rendering the appropriate gender for each case, making very clear the syntactical flow of the verse. This distinction is not perceived in Hebrew, because both nouns, cherubim and wheels, have the same gender in the Hebrew language. Thus when referring to the cherubim the Syriac composite tense was in the 3° m. pl., but when referring to the wheels it was in the 3° f. pl.

To avoid any misunderstanding, the expression "... cherubim their wings," was added to "when the cherubim lifted their wings up," and the plural noun "wheels" (some MSS of Σ have this reading, e.g., 239 ev τοις τροχοῖς; τιν εν τοις τροχοῖς 403') was added to this verse making clear whom the composite tenses were referring to. The verse ends in a clearer way than the Hebrew verse, for the Syriac gender for the nouns wheel and cherubim is different. Thus by ending in "in them" (f. pl.), it indicates that the spirit of the living creatures was in the wheels and not in the cherubim. Consequently the Syriac has a better
syntactical structure due to the Syriac language itself.

\( \text{\textit{C}} \) agrees with \( \text{\textit{M}} \) precisely, while \( \text{\textit{G}}^\text{T} \) struggles to render a reading as close as possible to its Hebrew text, even containing several Hebraisms. For instance, \( \text{\textit{G}}^\text{T} \) translates the Inf. Constr. by the grammatical construction \( \epsilon \nu \tau \omega + \text{Inf.} + \text{pronoun} \), which is a Hebraism.

The only relationship between \( \text{\textit{S}} \) and \( \text{\textit{G}}^\text{T} \) is a reading found in \( \text{\textit{G}}^\text{A MS} 239 \) and \( 403' \) as mentioned above, but this can be explained by a mere coincidence of a syntactical arrangement of the text with no further implication.

Ezek 10: 19

\( \text{\textit{C}}^1 \) agrees with \( \text{\textit{M}} \) precisely, while \( \text{\textit{G}}^\text{T} \) struggles to render a reading as close as possible to its Hebrew text, even containing several Hebraisms. For instance, \( \text{\textit{G}}^\text{T} \) translates the Inf. Constr. by the grammatical construction \( \epsilon \nu \tau \omega + \text{Inf.} + \text{pronoun} \), which is a Hebraism.

The only relationship between \( \text{\textit{S}} \) and \( \text{\textit{G}}^\text{T} \) is a reading found in \( \text{\textit{G}}^\text{A MS} 239 \) and \( 403' \) as mentioned above, but this can be explained by a mere coincidence of a syntactical arrangement of the text with no further implication.

Ezek 10: 19

\( \text{\textit{C}}^1 \) agrees with \( \text{\textit{M}} \) precisely, while \( \text{\textit{G}}^\text{T} \) struggles to render a reading as close as possible to its Hebrew text, even containing several Hebraisms. For instance, \( \text{\textit{G}}^\text{T} \) translates the Inf. Constr. by the grammatical construction \( \epsilon \nu \tau \omega + \text{Inf.} + \text{pronoun} \), which is a Hebraism.

The only relationship between \( \text{\textit{S}} \) and \( \text{\textit{G}}^\text{T} \) is a reading found in \( \text{\textit{G}}^\text{A MS} 239 \) and \( 403' \) as mentioned above, but this can be explained by a mere coincidence of a syntactical arrangement of the text with no further implication.
(Trans. of S) “And the cherubim lifted their wings up and they were mounting themselves up from the earth before my eyes, and when they went out the wheels were with them and they stood at the entrance of the eastern gate of the house of the Lord, and the Glory of the God of Israel was above them.”

Analysis of the Variants

S is a close translation of a Hebrew text similar to ℳ. The only exception is the syntactical correction made by S (also ™) regarding the number of the Hebrew verb רכֹבָה, “and it stood.” S renders it by the plural form of the verb אֶתַּכְּפֹא, “and they stood,” probably referring to the cherubim as its antecedent, while ℳ and also ℋ refer back to the singular noun חַבְרוֹ, “and the glory.”

™ has a unique reading (except α’ ανατολικής Cod. 86 θ’ κατ ανατολάς Cod. 86, and 91) that may be due to a misunderstanding of the Adj. κατάνα, “the eastern,” by the preposition διά, “before, in front,” rendered by the Greek τὸς ἀπέναντι, “the front, opposite.” Another possibility is that the scribe was familiar with the geography of Jerusalem and tried to give a better orientation to that gate. S agrees with ℳ in this regard.

™ has an equivalent substitution for the Hebrew idiom לפני עיני, “before my eyes,” that is ἐπί οφθαλμού μου, “before me.” Only Cod. 86 and α’ read similarly to ℳ κατ οφθαλμούς (μου), “to my eyes.”

Ezek 10:21
Analysis of the Variants

S and CJ agree with the Masoretic reading. In this case S is a literal translation of its Hebrew Vorlage; the only difference can be explained by the use of a Syriac literary style. S renders both instances of רָאשִׁי, "each one [had]," by a Syriac equivalent expression that makes clearer the syntactical context of the verse כָּא דָּא אֲחָז, "each of them [had]." The expression כָּא דָּא, "of them," goes back to the cherubim, avoiding any ambiguity between them and the wheels.

BHS suggests a dittographic error for the repetition of the word רָאשִׁי, "four." S and CJ contain it in their text, while it is absent in G*, but present in some MSS of Gא (X Q-Syh) Q-Syh-62 תְּטָטַרָא (א’, θ’, and Qtxt have an asterisk before the first instance of תְּטָטַרָא). These readings are a strong evidence against BHS’s suggestion.

Notice also the unique reading of G*, כָּא דָּא עֲטַרַּעְשָׁא, "and eight wings," for כָּא דָּא, "and four wings." Gא, however, has the Masoretic reading in MSS O, 538, C’ (87txt, 91txt)-534-86-403’. Regarding numerical figures, the Peshitta of Ezek 1-12
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always agrees with מ.

Ezek 10:22

(Trans. of S) “And as for the likeness of their faces [they were] like those faces I saw by the River Kebar, and likewise their appearance, and each one was going straight forward.”

Analysis of the Variants

The Syriac scribe makes some adjustments that make the text more readable without losing its agreement with the Masoretic reading. For instance, S adds as, “like,” before מ, “they [were],” where one would expect the Hebrew preposition כ, “like”; and the awkward word וְָזָא, “and their sign,” is substituted by כֹּלָהוֹת, “likewise,” which fits in the syntax of the verse. This seems an attempt to avoid misunderstanding of the text, for there is no antecedent for the expression וְָזָא, “and their sign,” in the context of the Hebrew verse, or probably the scribe did not find the contextual function of this word in the broad sense of the verse and omitted it from the text. Though Q T omits it completely, it
adds ὑποκάτω τῆς δόξης θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ, “under the glory of God of Israel,” after ἀραρίζει, “I saw.” This might be a harmonization with vs. 19 that contains it. The word ἀραρίζει, “their appearance,” is found in S, but omitted in Ṣ*, though some MSS of ṢA have it, e.g., L-311-V-46 read το εἰδος αὐτῶν; (καὶ Ὁ) τὴν ὄρασιν αὐτῶν rel. (ἠ' + καὶ τὴν ὄρασιν αὐτῶν ό'τε).  

Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 10

1. Even though S has good Syriac style, it reflects a Hebrew text similar to that of Ṣ.

2. S avoids Hebraisms while ṢT does not (10:3, 6, 11, 17).

3. The Syriac scribe avoids ambiguity (10:4, 7, 17).

4. S has several unique readings (10:7, 12, 13, 16).

5. Similarities between ṢT and S can be explained by common translation techniques (10:8, 9).

6. Regarding numerical figures S agrees with Ṣ (10:21).
CHAPTER XII

EZEKIEL 11

Collation

11:1
12a1, 12d1-3 “says the Lord of Authority.”

2° קדס + [תמר] קדס + “eastern.”

Stat. Substit. קדס “and I saw.”

Collective כִּף עַמִּים “men.”

גָּפֹר + קדס “standing” in 8a1.

11:2

מַעֲשֶׂה + קדס “the Lord.”

בַּע + קדס “evil counsels.”

11:3

וַיְהִי "is it.”

Q. Inf. Constr. הבאת + קדס “in her midst.”

Q. Inf. Constr. הבאת Peal Perf. 1 c. pl. קדס “we have built/we are building.”

11:5

אָנָנָא + קדס copula.

7h2, 8a1, 9d1.2, 10d1, 11d1.2, 12al, 12dl-3 “because of that.”

מַעֲשֶׂה + קדס “your killed ones.”

מַעֲשֶׂה + קדס “her market-places.”

Copula.

11:7

וַיַּהֲלֵךְ + קדס “because of that.”

252

11:10

I am bringing.
apositive copula.

11:12

I am bringing.
apositive copula.

11:13

I am bringing.
om.


11:14

and when I had prophesied.
tr.

11:15

they will be anihilated.
mas separated by יִשָּׂרָאֵל + יֵשָׂרָאֵל Substit. [אמלאך] “captivity.”

11:16

with Causal particle  לא “for.”

11:17

small.”


11:19

“and I will bring you.”

11:20

“new.”
Substit. [םָכְנָה] Synonym [בּוֹרְכָה] “in them.”

11:21

in the mind/conscience.”
Idiom [בּוֹרְכָה] [אֵל לֵב] “in the mind/conscience.”

Suf. Pron. 3° pl. [תקבצו אתכם] Gh15

“your images and your abominations.” Chaldeans.”

11:22 “and it departed from me.”

11:24 “to the land of the

Data Analysis

Ezek 11:1

Data Analysis

Ezek 11:1

Data Analysis
(Trans. of S) "And the spirit lifted me up and brought me to the eastern gate of the house of the Lord which looks to the east, and I saw at the entrance of the gate twenty-five men and I saw among them Jaazaniah son of Azur, and Pelatiah son of Benaiah, princes of the people."

Analysis of the Variants

S has a unique reading by adding מֶזָּרָה, "eastern," after the first instance of מִזְרְח, "gate." This is most certainly to avoid confusion in regard to which gate the text was referring to. Another point to be noticed is the consistent translation of יָדֶדָה, "behold," by בָּאָה, "and I saw," which might be an indication of a single translator for this portion of the text (chaps. 9-11). The only deviation among the Peshitta corpus of MSS is MS 8a1, which has מַפַלְפָל (Ptc.), "standing," added to the text after זָאָו, "men" (collective), with the aim of making the text flow smoothly.

ן is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of מ, whereas ג has וָעֶכְכָכָא כֵּלֵיָהָת קָחָה, כְּחַפַּמ עָבָרָה, "about 25 men," indicating that the scribe was unsure of the number of men gathered in the house of the Lord, while מ and S were precise in their figures.

Ezek 11:2

רָאָסָר אֶל, בֶּן אֶבֶּרֶב הָאָמַרְשָם ההָאָמַרְשָם אַנְדָּר לְפָרָג הָאָמַרְשָם אַנְדָּר אָמַר הָאָמַרְשָם מָשָׁאָה (מ)

סֵסָה לְמָשָׁאָה. מָשָׁאָה. סֵסָה לְמָשָׁאָה. מָשָׁאָה (S)
And the Lord told me, ‘Son of man, those are the men who are devising mischief and counseling evil counsels in this city.’

Analysis of the Variants

S is related to S T inasmuch as both employ the same translation technique. Both, especially S, strive to avoid ambiguity. Notice that the subject of the verb קָרָא is in the 3rd m. s., therefore its antecedent cannot be הַרוֹם “spirit” (vs. 1), for that is a feminine noun. Thus S and S T added כֹּל / מְקוֹם, “the Lord,” as the one speaking to the prophet. This is not evidence for a direct relationship between them, but an indication of a shared translation technique to avoid ambiguity.

Ezek 11:3

And saying, ‘Is it not near to build houses in the midst of it [city]? This is
the caldron and we are the flesh’.”

Analysis of the Variants

All three versions make a syntactical arrangement of their text in relationship to that of MT. They try to avoid any misunderstanding of the ambiguous text. Thus the key Hebrew expression is the Inf. Constr. with the prepositional phrase functioning as an Adv. of time and the neg. particle, namely, "Is it not near to build houses?"

It, as well as the relative Ptc. "who were saying," does not have their common subject in this verse but in vs. 1, namely the “twenty-five men.” S recognizes it by rendering the Hebrew Inf. by the Syriac Peal Perf. 1° c. pl. "we are building." In this case, “we” would be the twenty-five men gathered at the house of the Lord. The syntactic construction of the second part of the verse supports the Syriac interpretation, "she is the caldron and we are the flesh." "She" is the city and "we" are the twenty-five men, probably the leaders of the city. The Syriac scribe strived to make a translation that would render not only its Hebrew text but also good Syriac style, avoiding ambiguity as much as possible.

renders the Inf. Constr. by the Perf. 3° pl. "they have built for themselves"; also the subject of the Greek verb is the twenty-five men. Although C1' has several epexegetical additions to the text, it renders the Inf. Constr. by its Aramaic cognate Inf. Constr. without any deviation.
Ezek 11:5

And the spirit of the Lord fell upon me, and he told me, 'Say, thus says the Lord, thus have you desired, sons of Israel, for the reflections of your mind I know'.
Object of the Hebrew הבוחב ("things that come up in your mind"), which is rendered in ס"ת by יֵגלָה יַסְתַּמַּא, "I understand" (MS 62 + ס'), and that the Syriac scribe recognized the casus pendens of the pronoun יִאֶלְגָּי, "sons of Israel."  

The Syriac text has a unique reading present in all of its witnesses, namely the rendering of the Hebrew הבוחב by יִאֶלְגָּי, "sons of Israel."

Ezra 11:6

The Hebrew text substitutes the Construct chain יֹתֵב יִי וְיִתַּב, "the spirit of prophecy from before the Lord," probably to avoid anthropomorphism, and by rendering יַתַּב, "and the things that come up in your mind (spirit)," into a more explanatory translation יָדָאוּת, "what you are planning," and the last Hebrew nominal sentence by the Aramaic translation יֵרֵכֶלֶס על לָבוֹן מְרֵפֶן יִלְּלָו, "and the things that come up in your mind (heart) are revealed before me."

(Trans. of S) "You have multiplied your killed ones in this city, and filled her marketplaces with [people] killed by the sword."

Analysis of the Variants

The Syriac translation is an excellent literary translation. For instance, S does not translate the two instances of the noun בֿבָּלוּן, "killed ones, perforated, pieced through," by the same Syriac equivalent, but to avoid monotony in the text the scribe wisely managed to divert it by using synonyms. The first instance is rendered by מַעֲשֶׂה, “your killed ones,” a generic term for a person who is killed no matter the instrument, while the second instance is translated by a more specific term with the same sense of its Hebrew counterpart מְכֹב, “killed by the sword.” On the other hand, the Hebrew verb בֿבָּלוּן may be taken as a case of homonymy between the Hebrew and Syriac languages. The corresponding homonymous Syriac verb is the Pael דָּו, “to purify, wash away, etc.,” with the same consonantatal spelling but with a different meaning; consequently, the scribe used a Syriac verb that conveyed the same sense as the Hebrew counterpart.

S has νεκροῦς, a generic term for the first instance, and τραυματών, “wounded,” a more specific term but still leaving much to be desired in regard to its Hebrew counterpart. The Greek word τραυματών does not convey the exact sense of being killed by an instrument like a sword, which is the weapon implied in the text.

Although Z is related to S by translating הָרְצֹר, “her outside,” with the Aramaic noun אַרְפָּש, “her marketplace, broad street, city quarter,” as it occurs in S אַרְפָּש, “her marketplaces, street,” Z has the same noun for both instances of the Hebrew הָלָפ, which
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is the Aramaic generic term for any type of killing (כֶּלֶל).

Ezek 11:7

(3) Because of this, thus says the Lord of Authority, ‘Your killed ones by the sword whom you have placed in her midst, they are the flesh and she [the city] is the caldron; and I am bringing you out from her midst’.

Analysis of the Variants

The similarity between $S$ and $\Sigma$ is overshadowed by their overwhelming differences. For instance, the Hi. Perf. 3º m. s. וַיְנָשָׁה, “he brings [you] forth” (which may be a scribal error for וַיְנָשָׁת, 1º c. s.), is rendered by the Ptc. plus the first-person independent personal pronoun functioning as the subject of the Ptc. This usage of the Syriac Ptc. may indicate according to Muraoka “what has been going on for some time up
to the moment of speaking,"* "I am bringing [you] out," while Θ translates it by the Fut. Act. Ind. 1° s. εξελεγμένω, "I will lead [you] out." Both versions try to make sense out of the Hi. 3° m. s. εξέλεγκται, for it is in a direct speech in which יזוהי is speaking.

Then who is the antecedent of the person of the Hi. verb form since it is in the third person? Probably the Syriac and Septuagintal scribes corrected the text based on vs. 9 (vs. 9 in מ has the first person for this same verb). Although CJ has an exilic interpretative expansion of the text, it employs a verb in the first person also; it reads אֱלֹהִים, "I will exile [you] out" (see vs. 9 for the same reading).

Also, notice the careful construction of the expression נְדוּד נְדוּד, "they are the flesh." This is a good Syriac construction: "The enclitic forms (אֶלָּא) of the first and second persons, and those for the third person to a lesser extent, are used as weakened subjects in a nominal clause following the predicate." This supports the argument of high literary skills of the Syriac scribe of the Peshitta of Ezek 1-12.

Ezek 11:11

1Muraoka, *Classical Syriac for Hebraists*, § 68.
2Ibid., § 10; Nöldeke, § 64.
(ς) αὐτῇ ὑμῖν οὐκ ἔσται εἰς λέβητα, καὶ ὑμεῖς οὐ μὴ γένησθε ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς εἰς κρέα· ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρίων τοῦ Ἰσραήλ κρίνων ὑμᾶς.

(Trans. of S) “And she will not be a caldron to you neither will you be the flesh in her, and at the border of Israel I will judge you.”

Analysis of the Variants

Several MSS of 5 do not contain vs. 11 at all (B, 46, 534-86). On the contrary all the MSS of the Peshitta version have it as it occurs in 5. C gives again a direct exilic interpretation of this verse by rendering כְּבֵסָרָה בְּבֵשָּׂל בְּנֵי יְרָדָא כְּלָל, “as flesh which is boiled inside of a caldron,” indicating, according to Samson H. Levey, that “Jerusalem will not serve as a protection for those who had remained within it, but the time has come for them to be exiled, as meat fully cooked, is ready to be taken out of the pot.”

Ezek 11:12

1Levey, 41, n. 2.
(Trans. of S) “And you will know that I am the Lord, for in my statutes you have not walked, and my judgment you have not performed, but according to the judgment of the peoples around you have you done’.”

Analysis of the Variants

MSS B, 46, 534-86 omitted the entire verse; G* has only καὶ ἐπιγνώσεθε διότι ἐγὼ κύριος, but GA contains it in several MSS in its entirety, e.g., (⇌ O, 86ms, 449) οτι εν τοις δικαιώμασιν μου ουκ επορεύητε καὶ τα κριματα μου (>147) κατα (>88-147, 86ms, 410) τα κριματα των εθνων των περικυκλω υμων (+ ουκ 62 L’-311) εποιησατε Ο’, L’-311, 86ms, 403’, 410. Also an asterisk appears in θ’ οτι εν τοις δικαιώμασιν(ν) μου ουκ επορεύητε καὶ τα κριματα μου ουκ εποιησατε καὶ κατα τα κριματα των εθνων των περικυκλω υμων εποιησατε Qext. C’ agrees with the Masoretic reading for the entire verse with the sole exception of the word כמשׁס, “and according to the judgments of,” which is rendered by כמשׁס, “according to the practices of.”

S is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of M, based on the Syriac rendering of the Hebrew יי אֲדֹנֵי אֲדֹנָי, “that I am the Lord,” which is יי אֲדֹנֵי אֲדֹנָי, “that I am the Lord.” The consistent use of the pron. אֱלֹהִים as a copula to translate this Hebrew formula (יי אֲדֹנֵי אֲדֹנָי) reveals a possible characteristic of a single hand for this portion of the Peshitta of Ezekiel, because several times it has appeared in the text as a regular pattern of its translation.
Ezek 11:13

The language of $S$ is purely Syriac in syntax and grammar, while $\Theta T$ has some Hebraisms. For instance, the Ni. Inf. Constr. plus suf. pron. "while I was prophesying," was rendered by the Syriac Ethpe. Imperf. with an introductory circumstantial or temporal particle $\text{מַהוּ כֹּכֶלֶת}$, "and when I was prophesying," omitting the Hebrew יְהִי נַעֲרָ אֹתוֹ which was used in a temporal sense. On the other hand, $\Theta T$ has two introductory Hebraisms, פַּרְשָׁה הָיָה and הֵנֵה לֶאֶבָּרָה (הֵנֵה + Inf.) for הֵנֵה לֶאֶבָּרָה. This shows that the Greek translator(s) thought too literally, or there was a purpose in reproduction with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
rendering such a translation tinged by Hebrew influence. This is not the case with the
Peshitta where the scribe, though rendering a translation close to the Hebrew text, struggles
for a good Syriac style, indicating that he had a good knowledge of both languages and that
his goal was the transmission of the content rather than the text per se.

Another point is that ST does not contain the Hebrew word בַּן, having instead the
genitive with a relative particle δ τοῦ Βαναίου, “the one of Banaia” (cf. vs. 1). CJ
introduces an expansion that is unique to its text, “receive my prayer.”
Therefore each version had its own characteristics regarding this verse.

Ezek 11:14

(Trans. of ST) “And the word of the Lord was upon me saying.”

Analysis of the Variants

ST avoids anthropomorphic representation of God by rendering דָּבָר יְהוָה by
“the word of the prophecy from before the Lord.” S and ST translate
it literally.

Ezek 11:15

(C)"Amit אָבֶד אַחֲרֵיכָם אָנַשׁ נָאֲלָךְ נַעֲלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כֹּלֶה אָמֶר (M)
Analysis of the Variants

The S and Σγ versions have both instances of ἡμῖν, "your brothers," which is suggested to be a dittographic error in Μ, thus deserving to be deleted according to BHS App. Though Μ* omits it, Μα contains it in some of its MSS. Μο οὐν + ἄδελφοι οὐν Μο-88-62; and 88 + καὶ ἄδελφαι οὐν. 1 Also οἱ ζ and Cod. 86 Π have both instances introduced by an asterisk *. Therefore, the majority is in favor of Μ against BHS’s suggestion of a dittographic error, perhaps recognizing its value as emphasis.

1 MS group 147 contains a unique reading, καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ πατρὸς σου.
The similarity in the rendering of רֵצָה, "your kindred," which is translated as קְרוֹבִי, "close relative," in C' and also by α', σ', θ' αγνιστέων, "close relative, heir at law," was rendered as αἰθίμενα, "of your captivity," in S and τῆς αἰθίμενας σου, "your captivity," in ST. This can be easily explained based on a common interpretation of the unvocalized Hebrew text and on the context of the passage. The context is on the imminent exile of the nation and the Hebrew expression רֵצָה, "your kindred," has a similar spelling to רַסִילָה, "your captivity/exile," which is the spelling suggested by BHS.

The additional words ἐρρημωσῦναι, "they will be annihilated," and υἱωθετεῖσθαι, "[they] will be put to an end," are found in S and ST respectively. One can take this as a direct relationship between both versions, or as an independent translation based on a common translation technique of contextual exegesis. The second possibility seems the more plausible one, because the translation pattern of S is one that strives to smooth and simplify the text adding words to make the text clearer in the Syriac language (see: + αἰθίμενα, "of Judah" 1:2). The Syriac translator may have added the extra word based on the context of this verse, thus indicating that all those who were removed away from the Lord would be destroyed (ἐρρημωσῦναι, "they will be annihilated") including those of the house of Israel. All the witnesses of S and ST have this addition except Cod. 86, Qtxt, and σ1 γ'.

The Hebrew word פָּדָה, which can be an Imper. or a Perf. 3° c. pl., was rendered by the Syriac scribe as Ethpa. Perf. 3° c. pl. אַמְּדַרְךָ, "they have been removed far away." The change from active to passive voice is more a choice of the translator than an actual
translation of S’s Vorlage. Regarding this type of variation Lund stated that “both text and translation technique adequately account for such differences, so much so that it is impossible to decide between them as to the raison d’être for most cases.” \(^1\) (See from passive to active voice change in the collation of verses 1:20, 21; 3:4; 10:11, 13, 16; 12:25, 28.).

C\(\prime\) has a similar reading, but it adds an expansion to the text, "you have gone far from the worship of the Lord.” \(\text{G}\(\text{T}\), on the other hand, has M\(\text{a}\)κ\(\text{r}\)αν ἀπέχετε, “far have you gone,” a Pres. 2\(\text{nd}\) pl., which is a translation based on a contextual exegesis. Furthermore, the N\(\text{i}\). נָתָה, “has been given,” was translated by the Ethpe. form in \(\text{S}\) and in the Perf. Act. in \(\text{G}\(\text{T}\), indicating a substantial difference between these two versions regarding translation.

The Syriac scribe seems to have understood that the elite of Jerusalem’s inhabitants said to those who had gone into exile, לֹֽאֵת הָאָרֶץ יָנוּשָׁה לְמָרֵה יָרֵה, “to us the land has been given as an inheritance.” Then he introduced a resulting particle כִּי, “as a result,” to support this interpretation, indicating that now the people who remained in Jerusalem were more pious than those taken into captivity. This shows again the skillful ability of the Syriac scribe in handling both languages, Syriac and Hebrew.

Ezek 11:16

לָכֵן אָמַר כְּ הַאֲמֶר עַדְּן יָדָו כִּ הָרְחוֹקָה בָּנֵיה נַחֲרֲפָתוֹת (M)

בָּאֶרְאוּתָה זַוֶּה לְתָלֶה לְמִקְדָּשׁ טְמוּ בֵּאְרוֹתָה אָמֶר בַּעֲשָׁה מִסְגָּל

\(^1\)Lund, 418.
(S) "Because of that, thus says the Lord of Authority, 'I will drive them far away among the nations and I will scatter them among the countries, yet I will be to them a small sanctuary among the countries where they have gone'."

Analysis of the Variants

S omits the imperative רמא, "say," which is found in celona, except MS 26; 6 6 also has it, except MSS b, g. The Hebrew syntactical construction of the two subordinating clauses (concessive clauses) and the syndetic clause with an adversative waw, "yet, nevertheless," is reformulated in the process of translating it into Syriac. The Syriac scribe prefers the paratactic construction instead of the hypotactic as found in celona. S presents two independent short clauses and the last of them is joined by the adversative waw, רמא , "I will cast them . . .", רמא , "I will scatter them . . .," רמא , "yet I will be to them . . ." Thus the introductory Syriac expression רמא , "because of this, therefore," indicates that the preceding verses are the cause of the following three independent clauses. This indicates the literary ability of the scribe in handling the text.
contains a very interesting reading that most probably indicates a theological reason behind this translation. This is one of the first instances, if not the first one, of a written source to mention מרגע, "synagogue," in relationship to the Babylonian exile. According to מ, God would be to them a sanctuary for a while in the exile, yet the targumic interpretation sees the synagogue as a substitution for the sanctuary which had been destroyed. It may support L. I. Rabinowitz’s assumption that the origin of the synagogues was during the Babylonian exile. The targumic translation is imbued with an exilic flavor; it seems that the targumic interpreters did not want to miss any opportunity to mention something related to the exile. For example, see the last portion of the verse מ "where they have been exiled."

The following chart shows how close each version is to the Masoretic reading with respect to three Hebrew words of vs. 16:

| מ | S | כ | ת
|---|---|---|---
| ממרומא | ממרומא | ממרומא | ממרומא
| ממרומא | ממרומא | ממרומא | ממרומא
| ממרומא | ממרומא | ממרומא | ממרומא

This comparison shows a clearer picture of the closeness of the Peshitta version to מ. Although this is a small sample, it reflects the reality of the twelve chapters under study. The Syriac version may not be a word-for-word literal translation of a Hebrew text.

Thus the closeness of \( S \) to \( \text{HI} \) increases the \( S \)'s value for the study of the Old Testament.

**Ezek 11:17**

\[ \text{Trans. of } S \] "Therefore, thus says the Lord of Authority, 'I will gather you from among the nations and I will bring you from the countries where you have been scattered, and I will give you the land of Israel'.”

**Analysis of the Variants**

\( S \) has its usual rendering for the *nomina sacra*, while \( G^* \) (MSS B, 538, 233) omits \( \text{אָדָם} \); \( G^A \), however, has it in all of the remaining witnesses of \( G \). \( S \) again, as in the preceding verse, omits the Imper. \( \text{אמר} \), “say,” probably to avoid redundancy. \( C' \) and \( G^T \) have the imperative; exceptions are MSS A and 233 of the Greek version.
The key point among the versions is the rendering of three Hebrew verbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>קְפִּיָּרָה</td>
<td>קָפִּיָּרָה</td>
<td>קָפִּיָּרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מָסָה</td>
<td>מָסָה</td>
<td>מָסָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>גָּדְהַם</td>
<td>גָּדְהַם</td>
<td>גָּדְהַם</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that S and C have the same cognate verbs for the first two, but in an inverted position. G is related to C, regarding the second verb, and to S, which has it in the first position. All of them employ the verb that gave origin to the term "synagogue" in their respective languages, except S. Notice that G has the three direct objects, αὐτοὺς, "them," in the 3rd pl., while S and C have them in the 2nd m. pl. in agreement with S. This may be more a choice of the translator than a reflection of the G's Vorlage. The use of the third or second person conveys a different degree of proximity that may have been the cause of this deviation of G.

The Hebrew word הַרְבִּי, "land of," was rendered in S and C by synonymous, but not cognate, words מָּנָה, "land of," and מָּנָה, "land of." Both the Aramaic and Syriac languages have a cognate word that spells just like their Hebrew counterpart; the scribes, however, chose to use another one. This is not evidence for a difference from their Vorlagen, for the semantic sense of the terms may have developed in the course of history in such a way that מָּנָה would not convey in the Syriac and Aramaic languages what the scribes were expecting for their communities. On the other hand, the expressions מָּנָה and מָּנָה may have had a more specific function in delimiting a geographical and
political piece of land.

**Ezek 11:19**

(III) "1273

Ezekiel 11:19

(IV) "1273

Analysis of the Variants

Two deviations from III make the difference among the versions. First, the Hebrew word הָאָדָם, “one,” is rendered by מַעַן, “new” (S), by יִתְרֵךְ, “faithful, reverent” (C1), and by εἰρήναν, “another” (ST except MS 26 that reads στεφανόν, “strong,” and α’, θ’, θ’, Cod. 86, 88 have μαν, “one”).

This variety in translation shows a contextual exegesis rather than a literal translation. All the versions try to render a good interpretation according to what each scribe understood. The Targumic scribe explains the unfaithful heart that caused the exile
of the nation, and καρδιαν ἑτέραν, "another heart," of the Septuagint would imply a better or different attitude than what they, the people, had at the time of the exile (besides reading α in instead of α in, a common scribal error). The Syriac scribe may have harmonized the translation of εἷς καρδια, "one heart," with νέος ψυχήσ, "and a new spirit," probably to make more emphatic the complete transformation of the people, or he understood the Adj. νέος "new," being applied to both "heart and spirit," and omitted καρδια "one" as superfluous for the understanding of the passage (cf. Ezek 18:31; 36:26 where one finds "new heart" in ה). ¹

The second deviation is the translation of the suffixed pronoun of the prepositional phrase ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, "within you, in your inside." S has ἐν αὐτοῖς, "within them," ᾿Ω reads ἐν αὐτοῖς, "within them," and only Cods. 86, 88 and α' have a reading similar to ק, εἰς τὰ εγκατα βασιλείαν, "in your inmost part." Although ᾿Ω agrees with the Masoretic text with some additions ² (בְּבשֶׁר), "in your inmost part"), some of its MSS support the usage of the third-person plural, e.g., MSS b, g, o, c, "in their inmost part." Even though some similarities may exist in this verse, these variations are strong evidence for a nonrelationship among the versions all together.

¹ According to Greenberg "S goes in another direction, assimilating 'one' here and in Jer 32[:39] to 'new' in Ezek 18 and 36, reading hdt' in all cases: this seems to be a deliberate attempt to assimilate all these closely allied passages." Greenberg, 190.

² ᾿Ω expands the text by reformulating the Hebrew text in the following manner, אֲוֹרֵב לִבְּבוֹ רָדָה רָדָה וּזְכָרַי, "I will break the heart of evil which is hard as stone."
Ezek 11:20

**Analysis of the Variants**

The only point to be noticed here is the additional ending found in \( \text{G}^\text{A} \) at the conclusion of the verse, which is foreign to \( \text{M}, \text{S}, \text{G}^*, \) and \( \text{C}', \) end] + λεγει κυριος in MSS A`-410-147, 36-538-46, C`-86`-239`-393-403`, 14, 29.

Ezek 11:21

(Trans. of S) “And they will walk in my statutes, and keep my judgments, and perform them, and they will be my people and I will be their God.”
καρδία αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο, τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν εἰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν δέδωκα, λέγει κύριος.

(Trans. of S) “For in the mind their heart is going to their images and abominations. Their ways upon their heads I will repay,” says the Lord of Authority.”

Analysis of the Variants

The contrasting difference here is the rendering of the introductory prepositional phrase בְּלֵֽבָּם, “and to the heart.” Even though BHS suggests that this may be a corruption of the text and that a better reading for it is בָּאָם, “and these after,” this Prep. Phr. makes perfect sense in the syntax of the verse by taking it as an emphatic Prep. Phr. ס substitutes it by בְּלֵֽבָּה, “for in the mind/conscience.” Probably the Syriac scribe uses “mind” instead of “heart,” which is a normal equivalent for mind, to make the point that the idolatrous behavior of the people was a voluntary and conscious act.

C reads בָּאָם, “after,” supporting the BHS suggestion. ס (MSS B, O-62’, L”) has a reading similar to מ, καὶ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν, “and toward the heart,” whereas ס (rel.) reads kata τὰς καρδίας, “according to the hearts.” Regarding the nomina sacra ס translates them consistently, and ס (MSS B V) has, as usual, only its typical κύριος, while ס has both αὕωνατ κύριος (rel.).

Ezek 11:22

Ezekiel is reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Analysis of the Variants

S has a peculiar reading by lacking the last Hebrew prepositional expression, "upward," but using an equivalent expression, מַלְכָּעַל. This may be an endeavor to avoid redundancy in the text. C has it as מלמעלה, which is the cognate for the Hebrew expression, and Θ, ὑπέρανω αὐτῶν, "above them."

Ezek 11:23

(Trans. of S) "And the Glory of the Lord went up from the midst of the city and stood on the mount, which is on the east side of the city."
Analysis of the Variants

C has a theological interpretation of the text. Instead of "mount" it has a very interesting, specific translation, "and rested upon the Olive Mountain."

According to the tradition, the Shekinah would make a journey of ten stops; one of them was the Mount of Olives.¹ All the other versions support the Masoretic text and ignore the targumic interpretation.

Ezek 11:24

(Trans, of S) “And the spirit lifted me up and brought me to the land of the Chaldeans to the exile, in the vision and with the Spirit of God; and the vision which I had seen departed from me.”

¹Levey, 43, n. 11.
Analysis of the Variants

$S$ has a reading related to $CJ$, but the rest of the verse indicates an independent translation for both. For instance, $S$ adds $אֹגָּה הַמַּעֲלָה, “to the land,” of the Chaldeans as found also in $CJ$. This may be to avoid ambiguity, making clear that the prophet was sent to the country/land of the Chaldeans where the Jews were exiled, and not toward the people called Chaldeans nor toward that country as one may superficially deduce on the basis of the paragogic $הֶא$ in וַיִּלָּי (כָּפְרֵיה).

The rendering of $וַיֵּלָּי מַעֲלָה, “and it went up from me,” is unique to $S$. $CJ$ also has a unique reading by expanding the text: $וַיִּלָּי מַעֲלָה, “and it went up from me.” This reads against any relationship to the Syriac or Greek versions. $G*$ has a unique reading too, $וַיִּרְאֶה הַמַּעֲלָה מֵאָליָדְתֵּנ, “and I rose up from the vision,” for the Hebrew $וַיֵּלָּי מַעֲלָה, “and it went up from me.” Only Cods. 86, 88, and $G*$ have a reading close to $CJ$, e.g., $וַיִּרְאֶה הַמַּעֲלָה מֵאָליָדְתֵּנ, $וַיֵּלָּי מַעֲלָה מֵאָליָדְתֵּנ.

Ezek 11:25

אָבָרֵב אֵלָה אֶל כָּל דְּבָרִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָרָאָנִי (S)

אֵלָה הָא בֶּעְשַׁה, מַעֲלַה מֵאָליָדְתֵּנ (CJ)

אָבָרֵב אֵלָה אֶל כָּל דְּבָרִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָרָאָנִי (CJ)

אָבָרֵב אֵלָה אֶל כָּל דְּבָרִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָרָאָנִי (S)

אָבָרֵב אֵלָה אֶל כָּל דְּבָרִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָרָאָנִי (CJ)

אָבָרֵב אֵלָה אֶל כָּל דְּבָרִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָרָאָנִי (S)

אָבָרֵב אֵלָה אֶל כָּל Дְּבָרִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָרָאָנִי (CJ)

אָבָרֵב אֵלָה אֶל כָּל Дְּבָרִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָרָאָנִי (S)

אָבָרֵב אֵלָה אֶל כָּל Дְּבָרִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָרָאָנִי (CJ)

אָבָרֵב אֵלָה אֶל כָּל Дְּבָרִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָרָאָנִי (S)
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(Trans. of S) "And I spoke with [those of] the captivity all the words that the Lord showed me."

Analysis of the Variants

CJ has a peculiar reading that is ignored by all the other versions, namely תָּנָכָה "and I prophesied." This can be due to an interpretative approach to the text; the targumic scribe may have avoided the assumption that Ezekiel spoke by himself as implied in MP, by writing "prophesied," conveying the notion of a divine revelation.

Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 11

1. S has several unique readings (11:1, 16, 22, 24).

2. The Syriac scribe strives to make a translation that conforms to good Syriac style. This can be noticed in almost all the verses.

3. S agrees with MP regarding the nomina sacra (11:17, 21). There is only one instance where MS 7a1 deviates from that (11:5).


5. S avoids Hebraisms (11:13).

5. S does not avoid anthropomorphisms (11:14).
CHAPTER XIII

EZEKIEL 12

Collation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:1</td>
<td>דבר יהוה אל</td>
<td>[ אול</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:2</td>
<td>כוהן ישב</td>
<td>tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:3</td>
<td>נב נומ</td>
<td>om.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:4</td>
<td>הסת</td>
<td>tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:5</td>
<td>ראה כן</td>
<td>tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:6</td>
<td>苜לח</td>
<td>tr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12:4 Hi. Perf. w. consc. \[ אקול \] Aphel Imper. "and bring out."

12:5 Q. Perf. \[ זרנ | Peal Imper. "go out."

12:6 s. \[ מסכמכ | om. "like one in captivity."

12:7 Hi. Imperf. \[ מסכמכ | Peal Imper. "and lift up the burden on your shoulder."
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go out."

Q. Imperf. 3° m. pl. [יָלַכְנ] Peal Imperf. 2° m. pl. הָאוֹלִק you will go."

12:7

Prp. + 3° m. pl. suf. [בִּזְתַכֶּנ] rel. + prep. + 2° m. pl. suf. מַחְמֵנ "who is among you."

Q. Imperf. 3° m. pl. [יָהֲרָנ] Peal Imperf. 3° m. s. מַפְּלֵנ "and he will break through.


12:9

Q. Perf. [אָמֵר] Peal Ptc. m. pl. מָסֵכָנ + Poss. suf. "your.

Q. Imperf. 3° m. pl. מַמְלֵנ "you will go."

12:10

Noun "prince" קִנֵנ +深加工א "he will carry."

Prp. + 3° m. pl. suf. [בִּזְתַכֶּנ] rel. + prep. + 2° m. pl. suf. מַחְמֵנ "who is among you."

12:11

Noun [אָמֵר] Peal Ptc. m. pl. מָסֵכָנ + suf. מַמְלֵנ "and all of them."

Noun [אָמֵר] Peal Ptc. m. pl. + Prep. Phr. מַמְלֵנ "who are surrounding him."

Noun + suf. מַמְלֵנ "who are helping him."

12:13

Simplif. מֶה "in it."

12:14

Noun [כְּלָל] Peal Ptc. m. pl. + D. O. מַמְלֵנ "and all of them."

Noun [כְּלָל] Peal Ptc. pl. m. + D. O. מַמְלֵנ "who are helping him."

Noun [כְּלָל] Peal Ptc. m. pl. + D. O.
“and strengthening him.”

“I will send.”


“quaking.”

Q. Perf. [Peal Imper.]

“to the land of Israel.”

Substit. “on account of the iniquity of.”

Substit. “and all of them.”

“So I am bringing to an end.”

Q. Perf. [Imperf.]

Noun Clarification, Peal Imperf.

Substit. “of deception.”

Substit. “sons of.”

1° Pi. Imperf. [Peal Perf.]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Data Analysis

Chaps. 1-12 comprise one fourth of the total number of chapters in the book of Ezekiel (48 in total). This entire portion is homogeneous in style, vocabulary, and translation techniques. Thus it seems a good indication of a single translator for this entire portion.
(Trans. of S) “And the word of the Lord was upon me saying.”

Analysis of the Variants

S and 6T have a reading similar to that of IR, while T tries to avoid any hint of anthropomorphism applied to God. In this case, T has a unique reading, rendering the entire verse as “And the word of prophecy from before the Lord was with me saying” (see vs. 8 for the same type of translation).

Ezek 12:2

(Trans. of S) “Son of man, you are dwelling in the midst of a rebellious house. For they have eyes, but they are not seeing, and they have ears, but they are not listening, because they are a rebellious house.”
Analysis of the Variants

The extra-Masoretic reading of $S$ is not evidence for a difference in the Vorlage. It indicates only that $S$ underwent an excellent syntactical and linguistic arrangement of its text in the process of translating or transmission. For instance, observe the use of the Syriac אֵל, "there is/ are," which is a common particle used to indicate an existential clause, location and also used as a linking verb in tripartite nominal clause. In $M$, the existential element is implicitly understood by the context. The Aramaic construction of $C$ is closer to that of $M$, for though the Aramaic language possesses a similar existential particle like the Syriac one ויהי, $C$ does not make use of it in this particular instance.

$G^T$ is related to $S$, because the former employs the Pres. Act. 3 pl., μεταστηλοῦν, "they have," which conveys the similar sense of the Syriac existential particle אֵל. In spite of that relationship, $S$ has a unique reading that makes any attempt toward seeing a direct relationship between the Syriac version and $G^T$ an impossibility. The Syriac language uses for both instances of the Hebrew word יְהֹוָה a cognate adjective יְהֹוָה מְשָׁמַר, "rebellious, contentious," while $G^T$ holds δίκαιον, "unrighteous," for the first and παραπεπράφων, "rebellious, embittered," for the second instance. Only MSS L-311-V-449ms are similar to $M$ having παραπεπράφωνος for the first occurrence as well. $C$ employs the word יְהֹוָה, which has the same semantic sense of the Hebrew יְהֹוָה. $C$ also has a unique reading; it

---

exchanges the Hebrew word בֵית, "house," for מְבָנִי, "people." Only MS 1 reads as in מְבָנִי, having מְבָנִי for the first instance of the Hebrew counterpart (בֵית).

The clearest Syriac element that indicates a very careful translation for $S$ is the manner in which the verbal constructions were rendered. Both Inf. Constrs. were omitted by $S$, and it seems to have been done on purpose in order to avoid redundancy, for the functions of the eyes and ears are of a common sense. Therefore there is no need to indicate them explicitly in the text. $S_T$ keeps both Infinitives as Articular Inf.1 τοῦ βλέπειν and τοῦ ἀκούειν.

In addition, $S$ translates the Q. Perf. 3rd m. pl. ראין and ראין by the Peal Ptc. נָרָה and נָרָה, respectively. The careful Syriac translation shows that the scribe knew both languages very well and strives to make his translation into good Syriac literary style without losing the content of his Hebrew basic text, which is not the case for $S_T$. Thus the Syriac deviations from מְבָנִי have more to do with the accommodation of its Hebrew text into a good Syriac style, rather than to an actual reading of its Vorlage.

Any relationship between $S$ and $S_T$ in this verse may be explained by the use of a common sense in literary accommodation that can be shared by two or more languages, instead of a direct contact between them.

Ezek 12:3

מי יRecvֹת את המauses לך כל ימֹלֶל ויספָנָה (מְבָנִי)

1Zerwick, § 382; "Infinitive with article is widely extended in Hellenistic Greek . . .”; § 383: "Especially frequent is the infinitive with τοῦ, not so much in dependence upon a substantive as independently, with final or consecutive sense.”
Analysis of the Variants

Although S has some accommodations of its Hebrew Vorlage into Syriac style, it does not lose its closeness to מ. מ, however, substitutes the word רע by רע as in the preceding verse. Although the Aramaic language has a cognate counterpart to the Hebrew word רע, "rebellious," מ employs instead a noncognate but synonymous word, רע, "rebellious." S renders רע by its Syriac cognate רע, which has the same semantic and etymological relationship to its Hebrew counterpart.

S* omitted the imperative רע, "go into exile." BHS App. suggests that a dittographic error took place in מ, thus רע should be deleted. In reality, only MSS B, 967, 106 (S*) omitted it; all the remaining (א) contain it (רע) with some slight
differences. _CODE and 5 have this imperative (מוּטבל, and "go into exile," respectively), indicating that their Vorlagen were related in this point against 6.

_CODE has an interesting reading in two of its MSS, namely g and o. They read ¥ב$ב, "they may fear," instead of the Aramaic יב$ב, "they may see." This is a good indication that the confusion goes back to the consonant period of מ. The translator may have confused the Hebrew Imperf. of the verb שָׁרֵא, "to see," with the Imperf. of the verb שָׁרֵי, "to fear."

5 has a distinctive reading that can be due to a careful editorial translation that strives to render its Hebrew text into good Syriac style. One of the most common features of the Syriac of Ezek 1-12 is the effort to omit all redundancies without altering the sense of the text itself. This can be achieved only by a person who has mastered both languages, in this case the Hebrew and Syriac languages. The verb לְמָצֵא, "and you shall go into exile," is redundant in the Hebrew text, therefore it was omitted in 5; and the second instance of the Hebrew adverbial Prep. Phr. of Manner מִפְּנֵי, "before their eyes," can be easily classified in the same category of redundancy; thus it was omitted from the Syriac text.

Ezek 12:4

הוֹצֵאָתַהוּ כָלֵֽה יִתְּנֵהֻּ לְעֵינֵיהָו אֲנָהָ תְּנַבְּרַ לְעֵינֵיהָו קָמְצֵךְ נֹלֵה (M)

(5)

לֵכְכֵךְ מִפְּנֵי לְעֵינֵיהָו כִּלְמַחְּרַ וְלֵכְכֵךְ מִפְּנֵי לְעֵינֵיהָו (C)

(6*)

καὶ ἔξελευσεν τὰ σκέψιν σου ὡς σκέψιν αἰχμαλωσίας ἡμέρας κατ᾽ ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὡς ἔξελευσεν ἐσπέρας ὡς ἑκατοσταὶ αἰχμαλωτοῖς.
(Trans. of S) "And bring your baggage as a baggage of exile by day before their eyes, then by evening go out as one in captivity'."

Analysis of the Variants

By reading the BHS's App. one may assume an erroneous deduction that S has a direct relationship to ©*. The only extra-Masoretic variant noted in the BHS App. is that both versions omitted the second instance of the Adv. Prep. Phr. יָצָא עִדָּנְא, "before their eyes" (only ©* [MSS B, 967, 410] omits it; all the remaining, however, contain this Prep. Phr., see ©A). The analysis of the entire verse shows that any direct relationship is not tenable for this verse.

S renders both the Hi. Perf. נָשְׂמָה, "and you shall bring out," and the Q. Imperf. קָנֵה, "you will go out," by the Imperatives Aphel יָשָׂמֵא, "and bring," and Peal חָפֵם, "go out," respectively. This indicates that the Syriac scribe felt that the imperatives would convey a more emphatic sense to the narrative of the text, or he understood that the syntactical implication of these two Hebrew forms conveys the imperative sense. ©T literally translates both Hebrew verbs in the future tense, thus conveying a lesser emphasis to the narrative.

The relationship between S and ©* can be explained by a common translation technique. Sometimes the ancient scribe felt the need to update the linguistic style of his translation by arranging his translation in such a manner that all redundancies, which are a normal feature of biblical Hebrew, were omitted without compromising the reliability of his translation. In this case, the omission of יָצָא עִדָּנְא does not affect the meaning of the text. In
the preceding verse, 5 omits it too, while 67 contains it.

The rendering of the comparative Hebrew construct chain, "like those of exile," is key evidence for a noninterrelationship among the versions. 5 has a distinctive construction against the Hebrew plural construct chain, namely צָרָיִם, “like the one in exile,” while 6 reads, "like those who have gone into exile," and 67 has ὁσ ἐκπορεύεται αἰχμαλώτως, “as one going into exile.”1 This seems more a freedom in translation rather than the reflection of their Vorlagen.

Ezek 12:6

(Trans. of 5) “And lift up the baggage on your shoulder and go out in the darkness, and

1 An interesting and unique reading is found in MS 62. It reads, εἰς ὁφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ σὺ νεε ἀνθρώπου for ὁσ ἐκπορεύεται αἰχμαλώτως, “before their eyes and you son of man.” This reading probably introduces the next verse.
cover your face, so that you may not see the land, because for a sign I have given you to the house of Israel’.”

Analysis of the Variants

Although S is not a literal translation of its Hebrew text, it renders an excellent version of a Vorlage similar to ם. Nevertheless, S has a different word order and some pluses and minuses not found in ם. The Syriac scribe masterfully avoids the normal redundancies and the ambiguity of his basic Hebrew text. Furthermore, as we have seen before, the elimination of redundancies and ambiguity is a characteristic feature of the Peshitta of Ezek 1-12. Consequently, this is not due to any relationship to another version or to a difference in their, probably, similar Vorlagen.

The introductory Prep. Phr. כניעת was omitted by S since it is not needed in the text, and to avoid any possible ambiguity a suffixed pronoun was added to the noun כניעת, “shoulder” (ךניעת, “your shoulder”), indicating whom the text was referring to. In addition, the cognate word כניעת, “baggage,” was placed after כניעת, “you shall lift up,” with the aim of specifying what was to be lifted up. ס renders an interpretative or corrupt translation for the Hebrew כניעת נטש, “upon shoulder you will carry”; the subject of the verb כניעת became the object of it in the Fut. Pass. כניעת נטש את כניעת נטש, “upon shoulders you shall be carried.” This might be more an interpretative translation indicating the manner the people would be carried out to exile, rather than an actual reading of its Vorlage.

Another key difference between S and ס is the translation of the Hebrew Prep.
Phr.  "in the darkness." The former renders it by its Syriac equivalent, while the latter gives an interpretation of it, namely καὶ κεκρυμμένος, "and in secret." ε' in all respects is a word-for-word literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to III.

The Hebrew Imperfects were translated by the Imperatives, which seems to be a decision of the Syriac translator and not a reflection of the its Hebrew basic text. The Imperatives convey a stronger emphasis on the prophet’s message, and in this case they are perfect renderings of the Hebrew Imperfects, which imply an imperative sense.

The word order was changed to a more Syriac style. Despite all of these modifications and accommodations of the Syriac text, the Syriac scribe was capable of producing a skillful literary translation that reflects its Hebrew Vorlage, which seems to be very close to that of III.

Ezek 12:7

אָמַ֑ן כִּמְךָ צֹרְחָה כָלָ֖ה חָצְאֵ֑ת כָּלָ֖ה נֶלְחֵ֑ת וּמֵת בֵּ֖יהֶרֶב (I)

תָּברִ֥י יִל בּוֹדַ֖ו בַּלְעַלָּ֑ה חָצָאֵ֖ת על כָּלָ֑ה נֶלְחַט אֶלְכָּתָ֖ה (S)

מַכְּלֶה אֶלְכָּתָ֖ה אָסַ֣מֵּכָה שֶׁיָּךְ שֶׁמֶךָ֖ה לַכְּעַטָּה (C)

וְעָבְרֵ֥ה כִּמְךָ זָרַ֖ה וַעֲבָדָ֑ה מֵי מַעֲשָׂה כֵּ֣מִי נָלַ֔חַת כֶּמֶ֖נֶס וְרֲפֵ֑א (I)

אָסַ֥מֵּכָה יִל בּוֹדַ֖ו בַּלְעַלָּ֑ה כֵּ֣מִי נָלַ֔חַת אֶלְכָּתָ֖ה (S)

(כֶ֥) כָּלָ֖ה אַלְּכָ֣ת עַֽל כָּלָ֖ה נֶלְחַ֣ט אֶלְכָּתָ֖ה (C)

אָסַ֥מֵּכָה יִל בּוֹדַ֖ו בַּלְעַלָּ֑ה כֵּ֣מִי נָלַ֔חַת אֶלְכָּתָ֖ה (S)

(כֶ֥) כָּלָ֖ה אַלְּכָ֣ת עַֽל כָּלָ֖ה נֶלְחַ֣ט אֶלְכָּתָ֖ה (C)

καὶ ἐποίησα ὁ ὑπότος κατὰ πάντα, δόα ἐνετείλατό μοι, καὶ σκέφτη ἔξηνεγκα ὡς σκέψη αἰχμαλωσίας ἰμέρας καὶ ἐσπέρας διώρυξα ἐμαυτῷ τὸν τοίχον καὶ κεκρυμμένος ἤξιδον, ἐπὶ όμοι ἄνεληφθήν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν.
(Trans. of S) "And I did so as he had commanded me; my baggage I carried by day as the baggage of exile, and the wall I broke through in the evening and in the darkness I went out and upon my shoulder I carried (the luggage of exile) before their eyes."

Analysis of the Variants

S is related to ©* (MS B; all the remaining MSS have it as in מ, תמי חת Contributor) by omitting רָבָה, "by hand." Notice, for instance, that some MSS of ת (1, 2) translated it by רכ, "as though or when."

It would be more a conjecture to take the Hebrew רָבָה as a defective portion of the word רָבָה, "fortress."

The text does not support this reading, for the prophet should make a hole in the wall of the city to go out into exile, and not in the wall of the fortress in order to indicate the urgency of his message. Consequently, it can simply be an effort on the part of the translators (of S, ©* and ת) to avoid any ambiguity and to harmonize it (vs. 7) with the preceding verse (vs. 5), where the same expression occurs without רָבָה, rather than a defective reading in their Vorlagen. Therefore it is not enough to support a direct dependency of a version upon the other, even though a shared variant may exist between S and ©*, for translation technique (harmonization, contextual exegesis) can adequately account for differences such as this.

The verb Pual 1° s. רָבָה, "I was commanded," was translated by the Peal 3° plus the suffixed pronoun מָצֵא, "he had commanded me," as it occurs in © ת. This may indicate that S's reading goes back to a fourth-century Hebrew recension similar to the one used by MS B. They are not directly related—MS B and S—because there are several
indications of that in the text. For instance, Ṣ omitted יב, "my baggage," and added כל, "all," after עשתו, "I did so according to." These pluses and minuses are not present in Ṣ.

The verb פשא, "I lifted up," was understood in the passive voice (Niphal) by Ṣ, which translated it by the Aor. Pass. 1° s. לֹ֭אֶנֶמֶּשֶּפָּה, "I was lifted up," as in the preceding verse. This may have happened because in a consonantal Hebrew text both forms, Niphal and Qal, would look alike. To avoid this problem Slinky added a suffixed pronoun to the noun מְלֶאָה, "shoulder" (מְלֶאָה מְלֶאָה "and upon my shoulder"), indicating that the prophet was lifting something and not that he was being lifted up by somebody else.

The word הַבָּשָּׁלֶא, "in the darkness," also plays a key role in this verse as in the preceding one. Ṣ renders an equivalent to the Hebrew word (מְשַׁכְּחֶה, "and in the darkness"), while Ṣ gives an interpretation to that Hebrew word, namely και κεκρυμμένος, "and in secret," as in the preceding verse. This rules out the possibility of relationship between the versions regarding this verse. Only Cod. 86 (σκοτει) and 80 (ἐν σκοτίᾳ) have a reading similar to that of Ṣ.

The word order of Ṣ is different from that of Ṣ, whereas Ṣ has the same order as the latter. This, however, does not commend Ṣ as having a better reading, for Ṣ is closer to Ṣ regarding vocabulary. It only indicates that the Ṣ version struggles to render a literal translation, and Ṣ strives to render a translation that presents the exact sense in the style of the Syriac language.
Ezek 12:10

(ML) אֲפַר אֲלָדוֹת בָּהּ אָמָר אֵלֶיהָ יְהֹוהַ יִתְנָשָׁא יְהֹוהַ בְּרֹסָלְתָא יְהוָה בְּרֹסָלְתָא כָּל בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל יִתְנָשָׁא יְהוָה בְּרֹסָלְתָא.

(S) נַגֵּשׁ לְאַעֲרַבְתָּא אֶתֶּנָא לְאַעֲרַבְתָּא מַלְסַלְתָא לְאַעֲרַבְתָּא לְאַעֲרַבְתָּא.

Analysis of the Variants

One of the key words of this verse is the polysemic Hebrew noun קָשִׁים, which can have the meaning of “burden” or “oracle,” etc. Each version presents a different translation for it without having any relationship to each other. The Peshitta of Ezek 1-12, as we have seen before, avoids ambiguity. Consequently, S adds אָמָר־י, “he will carry,” to the text indicating that the prince of Jerusalem would go into exile and he would carry his own baggage of exile, as the prophet was a sign. Thus S understood the word קָשִׁים as “burden, baggage.” Notice that א’ has a reading very close to that of S, namely ἵνα ἐπιθυμήσῃ τοῦ αἵμα τουτοῦ, “the carrier of this burden/baggage.” Since קָשִׁים, “prince,” has a similar root to קָשִׁים, “to carry, lift up,” α’ may have misunderstood it. Thus, instead of prince, he wrote “carrier” and then “burden” (for קָשִׁים, “oracle”). Η, however, takes קָשִׁים, “oracle,” as an
apposition to κσαν, "prince," or as part of the list of prospective prisoners going into exile. 

igeria renders it as a social political rank, "ruler," instead of "baggage or oracle."

The list of people to be carried into captivity is, according to ©T, composed by the prince (Ὁ ἀρχων), the ruler of Jerusalem (ὁ ἀδἐγγευμένος ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ), and the house of Israel (καὶ παντὶ ἀγων Ισραήλ). This implies that these nouns go back to their common antecedent, εἰπὸν πρὸς αὐτῶν, "say to them"; the prophet should tell to these leaders and to the house of Israel (probably referring to the king's lineage) what is narrated in vs. 11. On the other hand, vs. 10 has a complete idea in S; it contains part of the actual message for the leaders: the prince would carry his baggage and the house of Israel would go with him into exile. The syntactical arrangement of vs. 10 in S is specific, while in ©T it is arranged as an introduction to the coming message of vs. 11.

S also avoids the confusing ἔξα clause at the end of the verse, "who are among them." The question that made the Syriac scribe accommodate this clause is, Who are the antecedent of ἔξα? Is it the house of Israel or the leaders, as in ©T? So S substituted the entire clause and rendered for it a translation based on contextual exegesis, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς γονίας, "and all of the house of Israel with him," thus eliminating any ambiguity.

θ' gives a very good interpretative translation concerning τὸ αἰτία τοῦ θαύματος, "the prince this oracle/baggage." It reads similarly to that of ©T (adds ἐν, "concerning, about," before καὶ, thus with the reading "this prophetic commission concerns the prince..."), namely, περὶ τοῦ ἀρχωντος ὑπὲρ οὐκ ἔχουσα τοῦτο, "this burden concerns the chief leader...") 0', Cod. 86, 88 agree with the reading of ©T.
Analysis of the Variants

This verse is strong evidence for a nonrelationship among the versions. The syntactic arrangement of ה is difficult and even awkward. First the prophet would say אני מפגשך תבש י版权归ך ומכותך לנדון במשליל (3) "I am your sign," then אני מפגשך "thus will be done to them," and then הם ישבעים, "they will go to exile." Notice the persons used in each case: it is "your" (2°) and "them" (3°) and "they" (3°). To avoid this syntactical ambiguity, ס adds אתם, "to them," after אני מפגשך, "say," giving a more specific sense to the command of God. Then the Syriac version introduces a direct speech using only the second person: "I am a sign to you; as I have done so will it be done to you, and into captivity you will go." In this way the Syriac scribe eliminates any possible misunderstanding of the text. ע reads as it is in ה, word-for-word for the entire verse. ע uses pronouns similar to the Masoretic text, with the exception of the first one, which is omitted in ע (MSS B, O-62', L'-36', 46-311) and
substituted in \( \text{G}^* \) by (ποιῶ ἐν μέσῳ) αὐτής, "(performing in) her (midst)."

\( \text{G}^* \) has a unique reading that seems more contextual exegesis than a translation: ἐγὼ τέρατα ποιῶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτής, "I am performing a wonder in her midst" (>B O-62', L'-36. 46-311 = \( \text{S} \)). The pronoun "her" may go back to the city of Jerusalem of the preceding verse. The nouns are transposed in \( \text{G}^T \), whereas in \( \text{S} \) the second one is omitted to avoid superfluous repetition of the same idea.

Consequently, this verse shows that \( \text{S} \) holds a reading with a higher level of literacy than \( \text{G}' \) and \( \text{G}^T \). The Syriac scribe seems more preoccupied with communicating the message than with transferring a literal translation of its Hebrew Vorlage.

Ezek 12:12

(Trans. of \( \text{S} \)) "'And the prince who is among you will carry [it] upon his shoulder and he
will go out in the darkness and he will break through the wall and go out through it, and he will cover his face so that he will not see the ground'.”

Analysis of the Variants

All three versions are not literal translations, but somehow free renderings of their similar Hebrew Vorlagen. Reasons for this assumption are as follows: The deviations of S seem to be based more on the stylistic arrangement of the text, rather than on deviations of its Vorlage regarding the Masoretic standard. First let us start with the syntactical accommodations of the Hebrew language into the Syriac. The Syriac scribe tries to make the narrative of the text closer to the prophet’s audience. Thus instead of וְנַעֲרוּא אָסְרָא דַּוְּתָא, "and the prince who is among them," as it is in IR, S reads נַעֲרוּא אָסְרָא דַּוְּתָא, "and the prince who is among you." Notice the change from the third to the second person, which would make any listener more aware of the impending catastrophe. S adds a possessive suffixed pronoun to כְּנַחַר as it did in the preceding verse with the aim of avoiding any possible ambiguity in the mind of the reader. Thus S reads כְּנַחַר, “his shoulder”; the leader of Jerusalem would carry his own baggage into exile. Another syntactical ambiguity of IR is the 3rd person pl. of the verb וְנַעֲרוּא, “they will break through,” implying that some people would break the wall for the prince to go out of the city through the wall, but S modifies it to a better reading נַעֲרוּא, “and he will break through,” indicating that the prince himself would make the breach in the wall.

One can notice some deviations in S that reflect its own Vorlage’s features. The preposition דַּוְָתָא was rendered by דַּו, “upon,” which might be the one used in its Hebrew
Vorlage (טִמְנָה); this reading is supported by כ (תִּמְנָה) and by ו (טִמְנָה).

Since one of the features of the Syriac translation (Ezek 1-12) is the simplification of the text by omitting redundancies, the omission of לָעֵי לְאָמָר אָצְמוּ, "by that eye," by ס can be classified as one of those cases, rather than being an actual reading of its Vorlage. כ has it, but in a transposed position after an interpretative addition that indicates the cause of the prince's doom, which is דָּבָר הַלַּיְלָה, "because he sinned." Several targumic MSS, b, g, o, f, c, omitted כ from their text indicating the existence of a Hebrew recension without it in support of the Syriac reading. Therefore if כ comes from an oral tradition, this shows that there was one of these traditions that was based on a text, or at least on the knowledge of a Hebrew manuscript, without כ. ¹

ט also has its own particular readings that seem more like a redaction or editorial work performed right at the outset rather than a reflection of its Vorlage. They are the rendering of the verbs אַשְׁרֶה, "he will carry," into the Fut. Pass. תֹּהוֹסְרְתָא, "he will be borne," upon somebody else's shoulder, and the entire negative sentence לָא רָאָה לְעֵי לְאָמָר אָצְמוּ, "by that eye, he will not see the land," was rendered in a passive manner, בְּתוֹנָה וַגֶּהְמֶה הָאָמָר, "so that he will not be seen by any eye." The last deviation is the translation of הַשָּׁבָשָׁה, "darkness," by קְבִּרְיָמְנָא, "secret." They seem more interpretative renderings than an actual translation.

Therefore one may argue that when a scribe faces a difficult passage he may opt to

¹Kimhi has a unique reading: חֲלֹק דָּבָר נַכֵּר הָלְאָמָר אָצְמוּ, "because he sinned they will put out his eyes so that he may not see the land," probably indicating that the invaders would make the prince blind by taking his eyes out, which was a common act in those days toward rebellious kings. See Sperber edition for this verse.
use all the literary possibilities available to make the text more readable for his audience, including some syntactical modifications. It is generally accepted that a translator will never omit a word from the text, except when it is absent from his original text. Based on this passage, however, I may state that a translator will never omit a word from the text, except when it is absent from his original text or when his translation style is to avoid redundancies.

**Ezek 12:13**

(III) הַפַּרְשֵׁהָ אוֹתָהּ עַל יְהוָה, נָחַס בְּמַעְרָדָיו, וּבַבָּרוֹא (S) הַפַּרְשֵׁהָ אוֹתָהּ עַל יְהוָה, נָחַס בְּמַעְרָדָיו. (Trans. of S) 

'And I will spread my net upon him and he will be caught in it and I will bring him to Babel to the land of the Chaldeans, yet he will not see it and he will die there'.
Analysis of the Variants

The main deviation of this verse concerns the Prep. Phr. תָּשִׁים, “in my net.”

This shows that there was not a direct relationship among them. E J inverted the order of the two synonymous Hebrew words תֶּשֶׁת, “my net,” and תָּשִׁים, “in my net.” ง T uses the Greek word δίκτυον, “net,” for the first instance and an interpretative rendering for the second, ἐν τῷ περιτοίχίῳ μου, “in my enclosure,” probably to signify “snare” or “trap,” as if God was placing an ambush to catch those rebellious people. For περιτοίχίῳ, α’ reads αμφιβάλλοντω, “casting net,” ς’, and Cods. 86, 88 have σαυρακθήσω, “dragging net.” $ on the one hand reads הִכָּה, “my net,” for the first Hebrew word תָּשִׁים, which is the Syriac cognate form for the Aramaic and Hebrew counterpart (רָמִים/סַרְמָא) in the same transposed order as it occurs in $ $. On the other hand, $ has a Prep. Phr. into, “in it,” for the second instance of the Hebrew word for “net.” The most plausible explanation is that the Syriac scribe saw the repetition of two synonymous words close to each other as a type of redundancy, thus eliminating the second instance from the text, which would make smoother reading without losing the overall sense of the verse.

E J has some pluses in its text due to an interpretative exegesis. After תָּשִׁים, $ adds אֲנִי, צֶרֶף לָבֶל לַפִּיר הַמּוֹדָה אֵדְעָה סֶפֶר אָדָם, “I will exile him to Babel to the country of the land of the Chaldeans.” $ completely ignores this translation. Consequently $ has its own reading; it is not related to any version regarding this verse.

Ezek 12:14

וכל אשע סָבַּב עָנָאָו עָנָאָו עֲנָאָו, לַלָּבֶל לָבֶל לַפִּיר הַמּוֹדָה אֵדְעָה סֶפֶר אָדָם (3)
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And all of them who are surrounding him and who are helping him and strengthening him, I will scatter to all the winds and I will send a sword after them.'

Analysis of the Variants

The Syriac version is an excellent literary work in a Syriac style, without betraying its Hebrew Vorlage. \( S \) agrees with \( \text{IR} \) closely, even though additions and substitutions are present in its text. \( \text{IR} \) has the most difficult text among the versions, while \( S \) tries to smooth it by making it more understandable in a Syriac style. To avoid ambiguity and syntactic confusion, \( S \) adds a suffixed pronoun to the first \( \text{וּכְלָה} \), namely \( \text{כְּלָהּ מַסִּמֵשׁ} \), "and all of them," then lists to whom the pronoun "them" was referring. The nouns of the Syriac list were rendered in the relative participial form, which implies a sort of noun in action, instead of the simple noun as in \( \text{IR} \), thus making the flow of the text more dynamic.

Difficult linguistic elements were substituted, like the apposition "who were around him, his help," which was separated into two distinct elements in the list, "who were going about him, and who were helping him."

The second \( \text{וּכְלָה} \) might have been omitted for the sake of literary beauty to avoid redundancy. The difficult Hebrew verb Hi. Imperf. 1° c. s. p" (from \( 
\text{לְרָץ} \), "make empty,
empty out, pour forth”), “I will unsheathe,” was substituted by another verb that carries a
different connotation, namely the verb in the Peal Imperf. יָשָׁח, “I will send.” This
rendering may be explained by differences in idiomatic expression, rather than by an actual
reading in the S’s Vorlage.

The key word in this verse is רַגְּפָּה, “his troops, wings,” which seems to be a case
of homonymy. This word is unique to the book of Ezekiel, and seems to be Assyrian loan
word ageppu.¹ C rendered it not by its Aramaic cognate word כַּף, “wing, poultry, arms,
shoulder,” but by a more meaningful term יָשָׁחֶש, “his camp, troop, army.” This
shows that the targumic scribe understood it as a military term. S may have had some
difficulties in understanding it, due to the fact that the meaning “wing” would not fit the
context. Thus it was rendered by a participial form that would supply a meaningful sense
in the context of the verse וַעֲשָׂרָה, “and who are strengthening him.” The Syriac
scribe opted to substitute for it instead of transliterating it into the Syriac language, for the
latter would make the text meaningless for his Syriac audience.

S uses nouns for the first two elements of the list as in II and not participial forms
like S. The Greek version has the same apposition as in the Masoretic text, τοὺς κύκλῳ
αὐτοῦ τοὺς βοηθοὺς, “those around him, his helpers.” Despite these similarities, the
Greek version had the same problem in the rendering of the last element of the list, רַגְּפָּה,
“his troops, wings”; thus it was rendered by ἀντιλαμβανόμενος, “his helpers,” indicating

¹Miguel Civil, Ignace J. Gelb, A. Leo Oppenheim, and Erica Reiner, “Kappu,” The
Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago (Chicago: Oriental
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that both the Syriac and the Septuagint scribes did not understand the rare usage of the Hebrew word בהר, probably due to their lack of knowledge of the Aramaic and Assyrian cognate words.

Ezek 12:15

(III) מִמְּנָה יִשְׁרָאֵל מֵאָמוּר הַאֲוִיר אֵלֹהִים אָלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים.

(S) נִשְׁרַה וּלְעֹלָם לֹא תִזְרַע לְעֹלָם לֹא תִדַּע.

(C') וְיִשְׁרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר אֵלֹהִים אֵלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים.

(6*) καὶ γνώσουται διότι ἐγώ κύριος ἐν τῷ διασκορπίσαι με αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεῖσιν, καὶ διασπερῶ αὐτοὺς ἐν ταῖς χώραις.

(Trans. of S) ‘And they will know that I am the Lord, for I will disperse them among the peoples and scatter them among the countries’.

Analysis of the Variations

6* is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to III. It has διότι for the Hebrew particle כ introducing “I am . . .” and both convey the same syntactical sense “that.” The Hi. Inf. הביא עב with its suffixed subject and the temporal preposition was rendered by a non-Greek linguistic structure, ἐν τῷ + Inf. + Subject pronoun (ἐν τῷ διασκορπίσαι με, “when I have scattered”), which is a clear Hebraism in the Greek text.

Even though C' has an almost literal translation, it introduces into its text an interpretative translation based on the exilic motif of the context of the verse. The sense of the Hebrew Inf. is conveyed through the Aphel יִשְׁרָאֵל, “I will exile,” and the noun for
“lands or countries,” was substituted bysnrm, “countries,” or probably “province” as Esth 1:1, 3 may imply.

On the one hand S has a degree of relationship to C' in terms of translation technique, for both avoided the Hebrew infinitive construction. On the other hand, they are different, because C' translated by rentals, an Aramaic particle that can convey a temporal sense like its Hebrew counterpart, while in S the most common and versatile Syriac particle was used to convey a causal sense instead of the Hebrew temporal one. The rendering of the Hebrew Inf. is also different in both versions. S renders it by a Peal Perf. 1° s. אֹלַל, “for I will scatter,” while C' has an interpretative substitution as mentioned above (Aphel 1° sing. אָלַל, “I will exile”). Regarding the last Hebrew word, S supports the Masoretic reading, ארץ, against the targumic reading, מְדִינָה, Based on all of these differences, one cannot assume any direct relationship among the versions.

Ezek 12:18

(Israel) אֵלֶּה חַיָּיו לְעָם יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּעָפָר וּבְכָרָה וּבְאֲדָמָה (S)

(5) בֶּן-אֲדָמָה לְעָם יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּעָפָר וְלְכָרָה וּבְאֲדָמָה (C')

(S) אֵלֶּה שְׁמֹנָה חַיָּיו לְעָם יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּעָפָר וּבְכָרָה וּבְאֲדָמָה (Trans. of S) “Son of man, your bread you will eat with quaking and your water you will drink with quaking and fear of scarcity.”
Analysis of the Variants

The main linguistic structures to be observed in this verse are בְּרִשוּת, “in quaking,” and בְּדַאָנָה, “in trembling,” and בְּדֹרְשָׁה, “and in fearfulness.” They were rendered respectively in S by בְּרִישָׁה, “in quaking,” בְּדַאָן, “in trembling,” and בְּדֹרְשָׁה, “and in fear of scarcity.” C reads בְּדַאָנ, “trembling,” בְּדוֹרְשָׁה, “in despair,” and בְּדֹרְשָׁה, “and in desolation.” © translates them as μετѣ ὀδύνης, “with sorrow,” μετὰ βασάνου, “with torment,” and θλίψεως, “affliction.” These variations among the versions are not reflections of their differences in Vorlagen, but merely a word-choice decision made by the respective translator who was trying to convey the best sense of the Hebrew text that each of them had at hand.

Ezek 12:19

(309) nann* in inik n

(S) r< sa A

(C) irri3' in intz inn sparra nabnc Kina '32m b'13 line' morota pn'ncQi p*73" m

(©*) teal epets' Trpos' tov Xaov i%-7% Ta6e \
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καὶ τὸ ὑδρὸν αὐτῶν μετὰ ἀφανισμοῦ πίνεται, ὅπως ἀφανισθῇ ἡ γῆ σὺν
πληρώματι αὐτῆς, ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ γὰρ πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ.
(Trans. of S) "And tell to the people of the land, "Thus says the Lord of Authority to the
inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the land of Israel, they will eat their bread with fear, and
their water in terror they will drink, because of the desolation of the contents of the land on
account of the iniquity of all her inhabitants'."

Analysis of the Variants

Each of the versions possesses a unique reading. S translates the nomina sacra
with the corresponding Syriac expression, while Θ (B) reads as usual, omitting עורות; all of
the remaining MSS have עורות as part of their reading (Θ€). The preposition לאר is rendered
by the Syriac ל against the targumic translation לאר and the Septuagint reading לאר. The last
two versions seem to reflect a Vorlage that had a reading slightly different from И and Є.

The order of the two prepositional phrases לאר עורות, "in fearfulness," and לאר בָּשָׁלְמָן "in
dismay," in relation to the preceding verse, which contains a similar reading, plays an
important role in the differentiation of the versions. Since И does not agree with the order
of the preceding verse regarding these two Prep. Phrs., but uses a new term not present in
the preceding verse, לאר עורות, the Syriac scribe seems to translate them more freely than we
normally would expect: לאר עורות, "in fear," and לאר בָּשָׁלְמָן, "in terror." The targumic scribe,
on the other hand, harmonized it with his preceding translation (vs. 18), having the same
order and the same Prep. Phr. Θ€ introduces a completely different set of expressions. It
employs μετ' ἐνδείας, "with scarcity," for לאר עורות, and μετὰ ἀφανισμοῦ, "with
desolation.” Notice however that in the preceding verse the same Hebrew expression was translated by a different Greek expression, namely μετὰ βασάνου, “with torment.”

The only relationship between S and ST is the rendering of the Q. Imperf. Subjunt. ἔσται, “That [she] it may be stripped” (ל莨ן + Imperf. = Subjunt.). Both versions substituted it in their respective translations, namely מטיל יומאת, “because of the desolation,” and ὅπως αὐθανασθῇ, “that [it] may be desolate.” One should not consider it as an actual reading in their Vorlagen, but only that their scribes chose to render it by a synonymous idea that would express a better sense. Any apparent relationship between them vanishes when the Hebrew Prep. Phr. מִפְּהַוָּה, “on account of the violence,” is taken into consideration. S has מִפְּהַוָּה, “on account of the iniquity,” while ST reads ἐν ἀθεσθείᾳ, “in ungodliness” (only ST and Cod. 86 have a reading similar to ST, διὰ αὕτην, “because of the injustice”).

Ezek 12:20

(ם) "וַהֲיוֹתָהּ מִקְשֹׁת וּקְרָעַת הָעָרִים מְשָׁמֶת חַהֵה וּרְדֻשָּׁה כְּאֵין יְהוָה."

(ס) "מַכְסָמָתָהּ הַגָּלֶל הַמִּשְׁמַרְרָה לְקַלָּהָ, יָרְדֻשָּׁה מַכְסָמָתָהּ כֵּסָמַיָּהוּ."

(ת') "כֹּרֶנֶה דְּהַםְת אִיבַּה נֵרַבּוּ אֶלֶף עֲקַפתּוּ נַפּוֹלָה נִסְתְּרָה כְּאֵין יְהוָה."

(ח') "וְאִלּוּ הַמֶּרֶס אָנוּצִים אֵלֶּה אוֹמֵרָה הַרְוֹשׁ עֵדָה הַרְוֹשׁ אֶלֶף אֵלֶּה."

(R) "καὶ ἐὰν πόλεις αὐτῶν αἱ κατοικούμεναι ἐξερημωθήσονται, καὶ ἡ γῆ εἰς αὐθανασθεὶ έσται: καὶ ἐπιγνώσεσθε διότι ἐγώ κύριος."

(Trans. of S) “And the cities which are inhabited will be laid waste and the land will become a desolation and you [plural] will know that I am the Lord.”
Analysis of the Variants

Notice the word choice of S; the Hebrew term סֶפֶם, which was translated by לָשׁוֹן, "terror," in the preceding verse, is now rendered by כָּשָׁם, "desolation." It indicates that the Syriac translator knew very well the Hebrew language, for the Hebrew word סֶפֶם may convey both meanings ("desolation and terror") depending on the context of the passage where it is located. T departs from its rendering in vs. 19; T keeps the same word שֶפֶם, "desolation."

Ezek 12:22

(Trans. of S) “Son of man, what is this proverb that you have which is figuratively being spoken in the land of Israel, and saying, ‘The days are prolonged and every vision has perished’?”

Analysis of the Variants

The Hebrew reading seems to be awkward in its syntax concerning the antecedent
of ḥeb, “belonging to you [pl.],” but it might indicate that the prophet Ezekiel was included among the people who were aware of this saying. The Syriac scribe recognized that and added an interpretative explanation in the text riim Ḥba "what is this proverb that you [pl.] have which is figuratively being spoken?"

C did not have a problem translating this verse. The last Hebrew word ʾāmən, "vision," was rendered into an interpretative substitution, ṭb̄a "prophecy," probably to harmonize with some preceding interpretation, e.g., 12:21, n r ʾn

“and the word of prophecy from before the Lord was with me.” The only significant deviation of C ʾb is the substitution of the verb n n x "they will grow longer," by the adjective μακράν, "long," which is not evidence for a difference in the Vorlagen.

Ezek 12:23

(3) لكل אפר אליהם כי אפר ארני יוהוה המביח את המשל הזהلاعب

ימשה ראש מצה בישראל כי את ריה אליהם קרבה וימי ודבר כל צדוק

 culo syriaca recense ʾe ʾbš ṭb̄a ṧj ʾbš bšb n n r ṭb̄a ʾbš

וכן אפר לכל אפר ימי אליהם מביחת את המשל הזהلاعب (C)

מקהל זה על בישראל אלהים את כל צדוק ימי וחברים וימי ומשלו כל דבר

(6*) דיב תועדו איפון פרשים אפרוש תבּה ירבעキー אפנוספיאו בת ה

הפרבולהו תן הט, ומי איפון תְּנ הַפְּרָבּוֹלוֹת תָּנְט בֵּיתוּ אָסִיָּהו, אֲשֶׁרเ
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(Trans. of S) "Therefore tell them, 'Thus says the Lord of Authority, I am bringing to an
end this proverb and they will no longer proverbialize it in Israel,' but say to them, 'the
days are drawing nigh and each vision will take place'."

Analysis of the Variants

Each one of the versions has its own unique reading on this verse, and it seems
clear enough that any relationship among them is merely coincidental. S translates the
nomina sacra consistently as in the preceding chapters. ©* (B, 534) lacks הָרָּתְנָה, which is its
normal feature, even though the remaining MSS have it (©†).

The Hi. Perf. 1 c. s. תָּשְׁבֵּרָה, "I will put to an end," which seems to be a prophetic
Perf., is conveyed through the participial (Pael Ptc. + pron.) construction הָלַכֶּל, "I
am bringing to an end," which is good Syriac style. The verb הָרָּתְנָה is a typical case of
homonymy; thus the translator opted to use the verb בָּאֵשׁ, "say," instead of the Syriac בָּאֵשׁ,
"to lead, drive, guide, etc," that has the same spelling as the Hebrew but with a different
semantic sense. Notice that in an unvoweled text the noun הָרָּתְנָה and its verbal form would
be identical. Thus the construct noun הָרָּתְנָה, "word of," was omitted and replaced by the
Imperf. הָרָּתְנָה, "and it will be," and, in an extended sense, "and it will take place, come,
etc.," to avoid any ambiguity in the text. ©, Cods. 86, 88, and some MSS of ©A L’-46-
311 had the same problem in rendering this noun; they read קָאָרֶכֶס (λόγος in ©*). The
omission of הָרָּתְנָה in the Syriac version seems more an accommodation than a translation of
an actual reading.

©† stays closer to II by rendering a literal translation (except MSS L’-46-311). The
Septuagint translator understood the Hebrew Prophetic Perf. "I will put to an end," implying future meaning by rendering it in the Fut. Act. 1° c. s. Ἀποστρέφω, "I will set aside, repudiate, turn away."

C has a reading that seems a more traditional way of interpreting the Hebrew text than an actual reading in its Vorlage. Instead of אסף טזץ, "say to them," it has דבר אלהים (Ithpa. Imper.), "prophesy to them," and for דבר כל חוף, "word of every vision," it reads תכומ דפי נבואה, "the words of each prophecy." The use of the term "prophesy" seems very important to the targumic translator; it might be a tradition that permeates the entire section of Ezekiel under study (Ezek 3:14, 16, 22; 6:1, 2; 8:13; 11:14, 25; 12:1, 8, 17, 21, 23, 26). Most of these instances, however, are due to the avoidance of anthropomorphism.

S does not take into consideration any interpretative substitution of C, nor the literal translation of  תכומ, but has its own rendering. Consequently, it shows the non-relationship among them altogether concerning this verse.

Ezek 12:24

(Trans. of S) "And there will be no more any false vision or deceitful divination among the children of Israel."
Analysis of the Variants

The key element in this verse is בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל, "house of Israel." ג' has דְּתָנִין צֹאֵל, "the sons of Israel," but MSS g, o, c have בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, "children of Israel," while S has בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, "children of Israel." There are several possibilities for this variant reading. First, those MSS and versions that contain the extra-Masoretic reading may reflect a recension different from that of ג'; second it could have been a scribal error in ג'; third, it may have been a contextual interpretation of the passage, implying that there would not be any prophet among the people of Israel, rather than among/in the house of Israel. Notice that house may imply the king's house, his family, instead of the entire nation. Thus, to include the whole nation, translators may have opted to use "children of Israel," including S's translator.

I would personally support the third possibility, because it follows the normal pattern of translation of S (Ezek 1-12), which avoids constructions that, based on the context, would bring ambiguous interpretation of the passage.

In addition, there are some differences that make any attempt for a direct relationship impossible. For instance, the Hebrew word חזון, "vision," was translated by חזות, "prophecy," in ג', and the words מְכַסְכִּים נָחְלָם, "and flattering divination," by καὶ μαντευόμενος τὰ πρὸς χάριν, "and graceful divination." Thus the similarities among the versions are an indication that they are related inasmuch as they were based on Hebrew texts that shared a variant common to all of them.
Ezek 12:25

Therefore I am the Lord, I have spoken, and I am going to speak the word, and I am going to perform it, and I will not delay, and in your [plural] days, O rebellious House, [I am going to] speak the word and I will perform it, says the Lord of Authority."

Analysis of the Variants

Although S has a translation in a very stylistic Syriac manner, it seems to have been based on a Hebrew text similar to that of T. T, on the contrary, even though having a literal translation, contains a reading that may indicate a difference in its Vorlage against that of S. The targumic text uses מנה, “people,” for אח, “house,” which might be a rendering conveying a broader sense than אח, “house.” These are the rebellious “people” rather than the house of Israel, which could imply only the house of the king. If one
considers the entire verse, besides the mere coincidence between $CJ$ and $S$ by translating רֵעַ by רֵעַ/אמרים, "He says, or said," the two are not related at all.

$S$ has a very stylistic Syriac flavor. Notice the rendering of the Hebrew verbs into the participial construction with the enclitic pronoun. Also, $S$ avoids any possibility of ambiguity by translating the verbs רֵעַ, "and it [m.] will be performed and it [f.] will not delay," into מַעֲשֶׂהּ לֹא תִּשָּׂא מַעֲשֶׂהּ וְלֹא תָּבֹא, "and I will perform it [m.] and I will not delay." This shows the preoccupation of the Syriac scribe for producing a readable version for his audience. He tries to make sense out of the difficult reading found in his Hebrew text, probably similar to $M$, namely אֲדַבָּר אֶזֶר אֱבַרְבָּר דֶּבָּר, "I will speak what I will speak a word," by giving a clear rendering that is nothing more than an accommodation of the text as אֲדַבָּר אֶזֶר אֱבַר פְּרָשָׁהּ פֶּרֶשֶׂהּ אֱבַר פְּרָשָׁהּ, "I have spoken, and I am going to speak the word." This arrangement, which implies an effort to make the text readable, is also found in $T$. It translated this difficult Hebrew sentence by λαλήσω τούς λόγους μου, "I will speak my word." This similarity cannot provide proof of a direct relationship between $S$ and $T$, since common translation technique may explain this similarity, and the word-choice is different in each version. The targumic reading agrees mostly with that of $M$.

$S$ keeps the nomina sacra as in $M$, while $G^*$ (MSS B, 967) omitted אֵדַבָּר, as we have seen in all instances in which the nomina sacra appear. The remaining (rel.) MSS of $G^A$ contain אֵדַבָּר in their text. $CJ$ is also consistent like $S$ in its rendering of the nomina sacra, always having אֵדַבָּר for its Hebrew counterpart.
Ezek 12:27

Son of man, behold, those of the house of Israel are saying, “This vision which he saw belongs to a distant future [is for many days], and about distant times he was prophesying.”

Analysis of the Variants

C is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of MT. S and T, however, have some deviations from the Masoretic text. S renders a translation with a strong Syriac literary flavor. It omits the two instances of the Hebrew pronoun וה. The first Hebrew Ptc. (וה וה, “he is visioning”) was kept as a Ptc. (והוה, “which this one is seeing”) and the second Ptc. (וה וה, “he is prophesying”) was turned into its corresponding Syriac Ethpael Ptc. (והוה, “[he] is prophesying”) without the personal pronoun. The Ptc. indicates that the prophet had that vision before or at the time when the “house of Israel” would be saying “this vision belongs to a distant time.” The participle in the Syriac version (והוה, “[he] is prophesying”) indicates that the act of prophesying was simultaneous.
with the Ptc. (אֲלוֹ, “which this one is seeing”).

\(\mathfrak{G}T\) has a unique reading that seems more a harmonization with the preceding verse where the same expression אֹיֶכָּס יִשְׂרָאֵל appears with the Attributive Participle \(\text{παραπτωκαίνων}, “rebellious,” thus it (Attributive Participle) was added in vs. 27. Another
characteristic feature of \(\mathfrak{G}T\) is that it contains many Hebraisms against \(\mathfrak{S}\), which seems to avoid them. For instance, in the Greek of the Septuagint a Participle plus a finite form of the same verb is used to convey the emphatic force of the Hebrew cognate dative (Inf. plus a finite form of the same verb).\(^1\) Then \(\text{λέγουν} \text{λέγον} \text{can be classified as a Hebraism and may be a reflection of an actual reading of its Vorlage. Thus no evidence for any relationship among the versions can be based on this verse.}

Ezek 12:28

(\(\mathfrak{M}\))

כְּלָלָה אֱלֹהִים הָיָה אָדָם וַיֵּדַע אֱלֹהִים לֵאמָר עַד (M)

כְּלָלָה אֱלֹהִים הָיָה אָדָם וַיֵּדַע אֱלֹהִים לֵאמָר עַד (S)

בִּכְנָן אָדָם לֹא יַעֲבֹד אֱלֹהִים אָדָם לֹא יַעֲבֹד (\(\mathfrak{G}\))

כְּלָלָה אֱלֹהִים הָיָה אָדָם וַיֵּדַע אֱלֹהִים לֵאמָר עַד (\(\mathfrak{E}\))

(\(\mathfrak{G}\)) \(dιά\ τοῦτο εἶπον πρὸς αὐτούς Τάδε λέγει κύριος Οὐ μὴ μηκύνωσιν οὐκέτι πάντες οἱ λόγοι μου, οὗ ἵνα λαλήσω· λαλήσω καί ποιήσω, λέγει κύριος.

\(^1\) F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, Grammar of Septuagint Greek (Peabody: Hendrickson, rep. 1988), § 81.
Therefore say to them, "Thus says the Lord of Authority, my word will not delay. The word which I am going to speak I will perform, says the Lord of Authority."

Analysis of the Variants

This verse has a reading parallel to vs. 25, which is found in all the versions. S has a similar reading but with a different word order from the corresponding Masoretic reading of vss. 28 and 25. The Syriac structure אַנָּה יִשָּׂא אֶל, "there will not be delay" (vs. 28), was used to render the Hebrew יִשָּׂא אֶל, "it will not delay," but in vs. 25 the same Hebrew expression was translated by יִשָּׂא אֶל, "and I will not delay." This arrangement of the text (vs. 25) might be a literary effort on the part of the Syriac scribe to convey a greater urgency into the message, which is a characteristic feature of the Peshitta of Ezek 1-12, rather than an actual reading of its Vorlage. C translates this verse as it did verse 25 without any deviation.

S* (B) seems to have been based on a different text or the scribe made a mistake of the eyes. It has a probable dittographic error by repeating the verb יָשָׂא יָשָׂא, "I will speak I will speak" (except for MS 538, the remaining MSS have יָשָׂא instead of the second repetition of יָשָׂא). The scribe of S* (B) may have misread the Hebrew word יָשָׂא as being a verb or due to its similarity with the preceding verb he might have repeated the verb instead of the noun. The scribe of S* (B) did not go back to vs. 25 where he could find the same reading and correct his mistake, while the Syriac and targumic scribes seem to have done that. Regarding the nomina sacra, S* translated by omitting both instances of יָשָׂא against S, C, and MT.
Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 12

1. $S$ does not avoid anthropomorphisms (12:1).

2. $S$ has several unique readings (12:2, 3, 11).


4. The Syriac scribe strives to avoid ambiguity (12:6, 10).

5. The interpretative additions of $C^I$ and pluses and minuses of $\mathcal{S}^T$ were altogether absent in the Syriac version.

6. Passages where extra-Masoretic readings are found in all three versions can be explained most of the time by a common translation technique.

7. $S$ shows an excellent Syriac style without losing its similarity to $\text{MT}$.

8. $S$ tries to avoid Hebraisms while $\mathcal{S}^T$ does not (12:15, 27).

9. $S$ consistently translates the *nomina sacra*. 
CONCLUSION

It is assumed that the reader will refer back to the preceding chapters for a complete presentation of the evidence supporting the outcome of this investigation, for in this concluding chapter I will present only a summary without any unnecessary repetition of specific data. The outcome of this investigation answers the question raised in the introduction regarding the relationship between $S$ (Ezek 1-12) and the other versions (including its relationship to $\text{HI}$).

First, the general characteristics of $S$ are taken into consideration. Second, a summary of its relationship with other versions is presented, and last, the assessment by the methodological criteria of the relationship of $S$ to the other versions is introduced. This assessment confirms the value of the criteria defined in the General Guidelines of chap. 1.

**General Characteristics of $S$**

Even though differences exist between $S$ and $\text{HI}$, their similarity is so evident and strong that the only conclusion one may draw out of the data is that the Syriac version of Ezek 1-12 had a Hebrew text similar to that of $\text{HI}$ as its *Vorlage*. The textual features of the Peshitta of Ezek 1-12 support that conclusion.

**Textual Features of $S$**

The Syriac version of Ezek 1-12 is not just a literal translation of a *Vorlage* similar to $\text{HI}$ (as is the case most of the time with $\text{GT}$), neither is it a paraphrase (as in several
places in C), but it is a translation that strives to render its Hebrew text into good Syriac literary style. In other words, the Syriac scribe strives to convey the best rendering of his Hebrew text into an excellent piece of Syriac literature:

1. He avoids redundancies (e.g., Ezek 8:17; 12:3, 14), Hebraisms (e.g., Ezek 6:5, 14; 7:2; 10:3; 11:13), and syntactical ambiguities (e.g., Ezek 10:4, 7, 17).

2. He smoothes the text (e.g., Ezek 5:1, 6; 6:9; 10:2), adding some words to clarify the passage, never to modify it (e.g., Ezek 5:1, 2), but rarely omitting any portion of the text (e.g. Ezek 1:4, 27 om. קֵצָת הַשֵּׁמֶל; 8:6 om. כֹּסֶף; 9:2, 3, 11 om. בַּזְּרֵי מַעֲלָה).

3. He substitutes for some Hebrew expressions or words Syriac ones that would make the text more readable for a Syriac-speaking community (e.g., Ezek 2:1, 2; 9:5), and he seems to strive to keep as close as possible to the content of his Hebrew text (e.g., Ezek 1:22, 27; 6:9).

4. Avoidance of anthropomorphism is not an issue for him (e.g., Ezek 1:22, 27; 7:22; 8:1, 2; 11:14).

5. The same textual features of chaps. 1-11 are found also in chapter twelve.

It is clear from the text that the Syriac scribe does not sacrifice beauty of literary style and clearness of the text in favor of keeping a difficult reading. He seems more preoccupied to render a good readable text than to preserve the original text as it is in his basic text. His aim is the communication of the message contained in the text and not the transmission of the text as a means in itself.
Textual Affinities of \( S \) in Relationship to the Versions and to \( \mathfrak{M} \)

Based on the main characteristics of each specific chapter, it is clear that \( S \) agrees mostly with the Masoretic reading even though differences exist between both. Most of these differences, however, can be explained by translation techniques or by mere chance.

The affinities between \( S \) and \( \mathfrak{M} \) are so few (e.g., Ezek 7:7, 9, 19; 9:2; 11:5, etc.) that coincidence in using the same translation technique or the same linguistic device may be the best explanation for them. The differences, however, are so numerous that to make sense out of them to support a common relationship is unreasonable. Thus Ezek 1-12 has no direct relationship with \( \mathfrak{M} \) except when they share the same translation techniques and when coincidence is at play.

A Grecism which violates the Syriac idiom was not found in any of the twelve chapters. This would be a valid criterion for a direct relationship between \( S \) and \( \mathfrak{M} \). On the other hand, presence of Greek words in \( S \) is not a valid criterion, for it can only show a relationship between languages rather than versions (e.g., Ezek 1:13 \( \alpha\epsilon\chi\iota\kappa\alpha\lambda\mu\tau\alpha\delta\omega\nu \) and 22 \( \chi\nu\iota\tau\sigma\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega\nu \)).

\( S \) does not agree with the expansions and interpretations of \( \mathfrak{C} \), except in a few exceptions where similar words and expressions may be due to their akin languages, rather than to a direct relationship between both versions (e.g., Ezek 2:1, 2; 3:7, 8). Therefore Ezek 1-12 in Syriac has nothing to do with the targumic tradition.
Methodological Criteria for Evaluating the Relationship of $S$ to the Other Versions

The criteria for evaluating the relationship among the versions were defined in the General Guidelines (see chap. 1). Based on those criteria one may state that $S$ is an independent translation, even though similarity to another version, or to $\Pi$, may exist. These criteria support the main findings of this investigation that the Syriac version is a translation based on a Vorlage similar to $\Pi$. Notice, for instance, that no Grecism, which is a strong criterion to support a direct relationship between $S$ and $\Theta$, was found in this section of the book of Ezekiel. This result confirms Lund’s conclusion that “the description of $S$ as a daughter version of $G$ or as dependent on $G$ or as later influenced by $G$, as found in secondary literature is unjustified.”¹

Conclusion

Summing up, $S$ is directly related to a Hebrew text similar to $\Pi$ and any relationship to the versions can be explained as a mere coincidence or by the use of a common translation technique. In this case, $S$ (Ezek 1-12) is useful as a tool in textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, for it is a valuable witness of a Hebrew consonantal text very similar to $\Pi$.

Further study should be done to cover the remaining portion of the book of Ezekiel and the entire Old Testament (those books of the Peshitta version which were not yet

Lund, 416.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
studied). Probably only after this will we have any definite answer concerning the
transmission of the Peshitta text, the characteristic features of its Vorlage, the direct
relationship of the Peshitta text to other versions, and its provenance and authorship.
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