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ABSTRACT
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Date completed: April 1999

Problem

The dilemma of the Syriac version is its mysterious provenance and the direct relationship it may have to the other versions (particularly G and C'). 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 S to the ancient versions, is of extreme importance in the analysis and study of the Hebrew Bible. The awareness of G, C', and IR employed in the textual composition of 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 (ח, and כ) and to ע. The study covers the first twelve chapters of Ezekiel, but only those readings in the ע that indicate a probable relationship to an external source are taken into consideration.

Conclusion

ע (Ezek 1-12) was based on a Hebrew text similar to that of ע, 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 ע 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 ע.
“Humble yourselves, therefore, under God’s mighty hand, that he may lift you up in due time.”
(1 Peter 5:6, NIV)
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj.</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temp.</td>
<td>Temporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ'</td>
<td>Theodotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr.</td>
<td>Transposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Target Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tj</td>
<td>Targum Jonathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.x.x</td>
<td>Targumic Manuscripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Targum Neofiti 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co</td>
<td>Targum Onkelos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Vetus Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Codex Venetus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDMG</td>
<td>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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.1 Some scholars argue that $S$ has some distinctive exegetical features of the
Jewish-Aramaic Targumim ($\mathcal{C}$), especially in the Torah.2 Consequently $S$ would be of
Jewish origin. Examples of possible targumic influence are seen in the following
passages: In Gen 2:8 $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ read "from the east" ($\text{בְּעָר} \text{מָמָר}$), while $\mathcal{C}^O$ 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.3 Targums $\mathcal{C}^I$
and $\mathcal{C}^N$ have a similar exegetical feature.4 Another example is Gen 8:4, where $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{G}$
read "mountains of Ararat" (רֵיָּה אַרְאָרָת), whereas $\mathcal{C}^O$ and $S$ read "mountains of Kardu"
(netinet קְרָדוּ). The Kardu mountains refer to the Korduene mountains in Armenia. "The
updating of toponyms is a common feature of $P$."5

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 14:12-18.6

1 Sheldon R. Isenberg, "On the Jewish-Palestinian Origin of the Peshitta to the
Pentateuch," *JBL* 90 (1971): 69: "A basic problem still unresolved in Peshitta studies is the
question of origin"; Ernst Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction
to the Biblia Hebraica*, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 81:
"Further research is necessary to establish its history and textual importance for all the
books of the Old Testament."

2 Y. Maori, "The Peshitta Version of the Pentateuch in Its Relation to the Sources of
Jewish Exegesis" (Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1975).

3 J. Cook, "The Composition of the Peshitta Version of the Old Testament
(Pentateuch)," in *The Peshitta: Its Early Text and History*, ed. P. B. Dirksen and M. J.

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* (Cardiff: N.p., 1951), 221, quoted in Emerton, 204; and
Based on this premise, some believe that $\mathcal{S}$ 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 $\mathcal{G}$ could have had some influence on $\mathcal{S}$. An example of that is Gen 2:2 where $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ read "by/on the seventh day," while $\mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{S}$, 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 $\mathcal{C}$); even though it comes from a later date its tradition may have had an earlier development) and/or to the Septuagint ($\mathcal{G}$)? In what ways does this relationship show in the text? To which of the texts under study is $\mathcal{S}$ most related?

The large amount of data makes it impractical to study the whole $\mathcal{S}$. 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.


\(^3\)Cook, 159.
Proverbs, Isaiah, and Daniel. Little, however, has been done on the Peshitta book of Ezekiel. 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 (G) and/or Aramaic (C) versions, and to IR, 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.


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 Würthwein 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.”\(^1\) 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.\(^2\)

---


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 $\Phi$, $\mathcal{C}'$, and proto-$\Pi$ 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 $\Pi$.  

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 $\text{MSS}$ are seen as possibly related to external sources, those outside the $\text{MSS}$ 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 $\text{MSS}$, 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 $\mathfrak{G}$ or $\mathfrak{C}$.¹

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 Comill 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. Other scholars, such as J. M. Schoenfelder, A. Baumstark, S. Wohl, and C. Peters, presented different types of literary relations between S and C. A. Voőbus, based on the analysis of S and citations in the Fathers, suggested that S had C as its most probable origin. M. Goshen-Gottstein has accepted Voőbus's opinion. 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.

---

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 Peshitta," *JSS* 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.'" 1

An evaluation of the hypothesis of a Christian origin for S was made by J. A. Emerton.2 He discusses Hirzel's arguments that laxness in the translation of unclean birds, based on Lev 11, is a strong evidence for Christian origin.3 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.4

M. D. Koster preferred to use the terms "midrashic" or "rabbinic" rather than "targumic" for the particularities of S.5 He analyzed Harold Gordon's method of dealing


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

2Emerton, 204-211.

3L. Hirzel, De Pentateuci Versionis Syriaca, quoted in Emerton, 205.

4Emerton, 205.
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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 Ø at some point in the history of transmission. In 1900, W. E. Barnes studied the influence of the Ø 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 Ø and S in Genesis. For Hänel any agreements between Ø 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 Ø and S against III, and also those between S and various groups of Greek MSS.

---


2Koster, 106.


4Johannes Hänel, Die aussermasoretischen Übereinstimmungen zwischen der Septuaginta und der Peschitto in der Genesis, BZAW 20 (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1911).

5Isenberg, 74.
then proceed to consider the origin of these agreements.  

Bloch quoted Marx L. Margolis, saying, "no single method will do justice to the problem."  

Four dissertations have been written on S's relationship to Σ and/or Θ. In 1973 Abraham George Kallarakkal compared the Peshitta of Daniel with Ξ, Σ, and Theodotion. Kallarakkal argued for Jewish authorship for Σ and affirmed that it influenced the Greek Ur-Theodotion. However, he based his study on a Peshitta edition that is now outdated. In his 1988 doctoral dissertation, J. A. Lund studied the influence of Σ on S in Genesis and the Psalms. Lund based his conclusions on 118 variant readings of S which deviate from Ξ. 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 S, the extra-massoretic agreement between S and G must be considered coincidental.  

What appear to be shared variants between S [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 S and G share the same plus, minus, transposition, or difference in words, one must assume that is what they both read, and not that S depended on G, while having H [Hebrew text] = MT before it.

---


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 \( \mathfrak{G} \) 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 \( \mathfrak{M} \). Then he collated all the variations in OG and Theodotion, against \( \mathfrak{M} \), 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 \( \mathfrak{M} \), 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 \( \mathfrak{C} \) and \( \mathfrak{G} \), and that the Syriac of the

\(^1\)Lund, 418.

\(^2\)R. 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 $\Theta$ 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."²

In 1985 Leona G. Running presented a study on the relationship of $S$ to $\text{mt}$, $C^I$, and $\Theta$ in Jer 18. Running concluded that $S$ "seems to be translated quite closely from the MT,"³ 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!"⁴

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. Mulder compared $S$ to $\mathfrak{M}$, and concluded that $S$ is a literal translation of $\mathfrak{M}$, and in those cases where $S$ did not translate literally the Hebrew Vorlage is clearly evident. Therefore, according to Mulder, the value of $S$ for exegetical studies of the book of Ezekiel exceeds that of the other versions except for $\mathfrak{G}$. 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.

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.

\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., 180.
\end{enumerate}
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/J and/or ©.

The data in these chapters are arranged as follows: First of all, the reading of the Masoretic Text (MT) is introduced followed by the readings of the respective versions, namely the Peshitta (S), the Targum Jonathan (C/J), and the Septuagint (©). 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. 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 collectionView and مصر.

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. Lund classified these criteria into two types according to their usefulness for evaluating variant readings in $S$ regarding their direct relationship to $\mathfrak{G}$. The result of his investigation showed that there is only one valid criterion that can certainly indicate any direct relation between $\mathfrak{G}$ 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 $\mathfrak{G}$ agrees with $\mathfrak{C}$. 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 $\mathfrak{G}$ 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 $\mathfrak{G}$. 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.
3. **Translation Technique.** Differences between $S$ and $M$ which can be classified as a translation technique cannot provide evidence of a direct dependence on $\mathcal{G}$.

"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."¹

4. **Doublets in $S$, Where Half of the Doublet Agrees with $\mathcal{G}$ Contra $MT$.** Doublets found in the text of $S$, where half agrees with $\mathcal{G}$ against $M$, do not provide evidence of later interpolations from $\mathcal{G}$. 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."²

5. **Shared Variants/Non-Variants.** Differences between $S$ and $M$, 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 $\beth$, 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 $M$, 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 $\mathcal{G}$. "To suggest direct influence

---

¹ Ibid., 417.

² 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 omissions¹ (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 IS. 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 IS. 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 IS 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.
translating. Exceptions to this would be in cases of Hebraisms found in $\mathcal{G}$ (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 $\mathcal{G}$, 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 $\mathcal{C}$ or $\mathcal{G}$, 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 $\mathcal{C}$ or $\mathcal{G}$, it should have had a manuscript of $\mathcal{M}$ recension to be able to achieve the degree of closeness which we find in the Peshitta version to $\mathcal{M}$ (e.g., Ezek 5:1; 2:2; 2:3; 3:4, etc.).

5. **$S$ Agreement with $\mathcal{M}$ While $\mathcal{C}$ or $\mathcal{G}$ 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 © 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 IR), it is still very valuable; it supports S as a direct translation from a Hebrew text close to 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 nomen 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 ©A almost always contain the reading of IR regarding the nomen 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 masoras 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, $\rightarrow$, is added to the recorded MSS. On the other hand, if the younger MS belongs to a family, no arrow but the symbol $\text{fam}$ 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 9al 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.


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

See bibliography for full bibliographic entry.

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.


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  as representing the Septuagint as a version without taking into consideration a particular witness of its text; except for the symbol  *, 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 $\hat{T}$ represents the original text according to the Göttingen edition and the MSS of the first apparatus of the same edition, and the symbol $\hat{A}$ indicates a reading supported by the witness listed in the first apparatus only. Hexaplaric readings are mentioned according to their respective witnesses, 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 ἐρεις-13 σουκιου; 10:17-11:25 ἐλαλησα προς, and several other portions not applicable to this study.

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


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


613. Patmos, Ιωαννου του Θεολογου, 209, XIII century.

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


770. Athos, Λαυρα 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', σ', and θ' that are sometimes mentioned in early MSS as οἱ γ' = οἱ τρεῖς (ἐρμηνευταί) or οἱ 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 (cl) + 130-233-534 (clII); 198; 86-710 (86''); 239-306 (239''); 380; 403-613 (403''); 611.


---

⁰ Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
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.
   a. MS Or. 2211 of the British Museum.
   b. MS Or. 1474 of the British Museum.
2. Haphtaroth.
   c. MS Or 1470 of the British Museum.
3. Biblical Manuscripts with Tiberian or no vocalization.
   d. MS p. 116 of the Montefiore Library, Jews’ College, London.
   e. Codex Reuchlinianus of the Badische Landesbibliothek, Karlsruhe, Germany.

Sperber, The Latter Prophets, v.
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.1 For methodology and organization of the data please refer back to the Introduction and chapter one of this study.

____________________________________________________
1Mulder, “Some Remarks on the Peshitta,” 181:
p. XII bottom line: xiv 17
   read: xiv 17 (also found in 12a1).
p. XXVI 1.8 from bottom: אָּתְּ תִּסְדוּ
   read: 20 אָּתְּ תִּסְדוּ.
p. XXVIII 1.18/19 from top: לְּרַמְתּוֹן
   read: לְּרַמְתּוֹן.
p. XXX (913) insert as error: xxxvii 14 אָּתְּ תִּסְדוּ for אָּתְּ תִּסְדוּ
p. XXXI 1.7 from top: אָּתְּ תִּסְדוּ
   read: אָּתְּ תִּסְדוּ.
p. XXXI 1.15 from top: preceding xii 28
   read: preceding xxii 28.
p. XXXIV 1.17 from top, col. 1/2: xxxvi 1 אָּתְּ תִּסְדוּ
   read: xxxvi 1 אָּתְּ תִּסְדוּ.
p. XXXIV 1.18 from top, col. 1/2: xxxvii 1 אָּתְּ תִּסְדוּ
   read: xxxvii 1 אָּתְּ תִּסְדוּ.
p. 7 [Ez IV 7]: אָּתְּ תִּסְדוּ read: אָּתְּ תִּסְדוּ
p. 10 [20 appar. ad 3 אָּתְּ תִּסְדוּ]: אָּתְּ תִּסְדוּ 8a1*
   read: אָּתְּ תִּסְדוּ 8a1* 1111

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.
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Collation

The collation prepared for this study has the purpose of indicating the differences between S and MT. The variant readings of S are analyzed against the readings of C and 6. 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., סֵלָלָא, etc., are only collated when they may be relevant to this study).

1:1
�[בָּשָׂלֶשׁ נַשְּׁה] tr.
כְּבָרַיִם בִּמְשָׂא זָכָה

1:2
אי [וְ] om.
כְּבָרַיִם יָוֵן

1:3
“of his captivity.”
כְּבָרַיִם זָכָה [רַלְּלָת]

1:4
“upon me.”
כְּבָרַיִם [רַלְּלָת]

1:5
appearance of, figure of.”
[כָּמֹן] pr. + pr. בָּשָׂלֶשׁ נַשְּׁה

1:6
“like.”
[כָּמֹן] pl. בָּשָׂלֶשׁ נַשְּׁה [רַלְּלָת]

1:7
“sons of men,” MS
[כָּמֹן] pl. בָּשָׂלֶשׁ נַשְּׁה [רַלְּלָת]

1:8
Sing. pl. בָּשָׂלֶשׁ נַשְּׁה [רַלְּלָת]

1:9
“of calves.”

1:10
“shining.”

1:11
“shining.”

1:12
“stretching.”

1:13
“of Judah.”

1:14
“of his captivity.”

1:15
appearance of, figure of.”
[כָּמֹן] pr. + pr. בָּשָׂלֶשׁ נַשְּׁה
1:8
Qere מַסֵּכָה [ךְֶֶֶָָָָוָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָָּ...
Inf. Abs. הָעַלַּת הָעַלַּת ("were running.")

Inf. Abs. קָשַּׁבוּ + Ethpe. Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. מִיָּה חָסְתִּבְתָּךְ, "but they were not returning."

Sing. קָשַּׁבוּ pl. קָשַּׁבוּ "wheels."

Q. Imperf. בָּלַכְתָּה + Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. "they were going."

Q. Imperf. בָּלַכְתָּה om.

Q. Imperf. בָּלַכְתָּה + Ethpe. Ptc. f. pl. +enclit. מִיָּה חָסְתִּבְתָּךְ "they were turning."

Inf. Cstr. בָּלַכְתָּה om. + מִיָּה חָסְתִּבְתָּךְ "and when they were rising."

... and to the place of the region the first of them was to go, they went after him, but without turning.

"and their rims were high."

Verbal root confusion, Peal Ptc. f. pl. מִיָּה חָסְתִּבְתָּךְ "and they were seeing."

"as they were going round about."

... and when they were going.
“with them.”

1:20

and to the place where.”

Q. Imperf. οἰκίζετο Peal Ptc. + enclit.

“they were standing.”


“and when they were rising.”

Q. Imperf. ἔρχεται Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit.

“they were rising up.”

Ni. Imperf. ἔρχεται Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit.

“they were rising.”

Ni. Imperf. ἔρχεται Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit.

“was.”

1:21

Q. Imperf. ἔρχεται Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit.

“they were rising.”

Ni. Imperf. ἔρχεται Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit.

“was.”

“and when they were going.”

Q. Imperf. ἔρχεται Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit.

“they were going.”

Inf. Cstr. ἐπιστεύεται Temp./Circ. particle + Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit.

“of a mighty crystal.”

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
1:23
Piel Imperf. 3° c. pl. אֵלֶּה, פִּיךְ. "under it."
Adj. f. pl. יֵשָׁבָה Peal Pass. Ptc. m. pl. +
enclit. שָׁבַתָּהוּ "stretched."
Idiom הנָשָׁבַת אַל אֲשֶׁר Idiom "toward each other."
Piel Imperf. 3° c. pl. אֵלֶּה, פִּיךְ, שָׁבַתָּהוּ "they were resting."
1:25
דָּל סִילָלָה Subst. פִּיָּהוּ "habitation."
Pl. "their heads."
Q. Inf. Cstr. עַל עַל Peal Ptc. + enclit. מֵשָׁבַתָּהוּ "and when they were standing."
Pi. Imperf. 3. f. pl. אֵלֶּה, פִּיךְ, שָׁבַתָּהוּ "they were resting."
1:26
Inf. Cstr. מֵשָׁבַתָּהוּ Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. מֵשָׁבַתָּהוּ "like."
Inf. Cstr. מֵשָׁבַתָּהוּ Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. מֵשָׁבַתָּהוּ "like the appearance of God."
1°, and 3° pr. לַדָּמָה "like.
2° pr. לַדָּמָה "and upon.
1:27
4° pr. מַכָּה "in the midst of an army."
5° pr. מַכָּה "like the appearance of God."
Piel Imperf. 3° c. pl. אֵלֶּה, פִּיךְ, שָׁבַתָּהוּ "Enclosed in it"
Inf. Cstr. מֵשָׁבַתָּהוּ Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. מֵשָׁבַתָּהוּ "from within round about him."
2° om.
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

(Trans. of S) "On the fifth day of the month in the fifth year of the captivity of Jehoiachim,
king of Judah.”

Analysis of the Variants

In this verse the S reads like the IR with the addition of the last word פֶּתֶּחַת, “of Judah.” The Syriac scribe seems to clarify the background of the event pictured in the narrative for his reader. C in this case is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of IR, and almost all the MSS of א reads like IR, with the sole exception of MS 534 that reads וַאֲבִיאֵם בַּאֲשִׂירֵיהֶם יָוָדָה 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

הזה הוה הבור הוה אל יחֹקַלוֹ בן בוּי חותם באימי (IR)
כָּסְדָּם עַל נַהְרָה בּוּרָה דּוֹלִּי פֶּתֶּחַת דּוּ הוה

S
הזה פָּתַשְׁמוּ נַבְּאָה מִן כָּדָה יַהֹקַלּא בּוּר דוּּוּ מָכָרְאָה דוּרָפָאָה רב מַשְׁתֵּף

Ezekiel 1:3 (C)
והז פָּתַשְׁמוּ נַבְּאָה מִן כָּדָה יַהֹקַלּא בּוּר דוּּוּ מָכָרְאָה דוּרָפָאָה רב מַשְׁתֵּף

אַחַתָּלָם יִםּ הֵמִיתָה בַמְרַתָּה אֵרֵץ כָּדָה עַל נַהְרָה בּוּרָה דּוּ הוה דּוּ הוה
(-scroll) καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου πρὸς Ιελεχιλα νιν Βουζί τὸν ἰερέα ἐν γῇ
Χαλδαίων ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Χοβαρ: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ ἐμὲ χέρι 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

M reads "the word of the Lord certainly came," while S, C, C', C', J, S, and T read: "(T = and) the word of the Lord came." Exceptions are the targumic MSS b, g, o, 1, z, which
have the same reading as M, plus the targumic exegesis and explanations of the text.

The BHS apparatus suggests a dittographic error; for if the Hebrew MS were
unvoweled, 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 C, C, S, and T may have been based on a Hebrew MS
that started with ב (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 C, C, S, and T 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{14}, and culminates in MH. Therefore the S, G\textsuperscript{T}, and C\textsuperscript{5,6,7,8} 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" (יָ֣נָ֫ל). In M the pronoun goes back to its antecedent "Ezekiel." Almost all MSS of S, C\textsuperscript{5,6,7,8}, and G\textsuperscript{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 C\textsuperscript{7} and G\textsuperscript{T} on S. On the other hand, S has the word אֶרֶץ (there) which is present in all the targumic MSS, but absent in some Septuagint MSS (ἐκεῖ is present in MSS A-410, V-449, [X O] ἐκεῖ O [Q mg]-62). S may have been affected by both C\textsuperscript{7} and G\textsuperscript{T}, but more securely by C\textsuperscript{7} 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 אתה. G\textsuperscript{T} has קָאֵל יִגּוֹנֵרּו, 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 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 כנני השמש, "like a figure," in the Peshitta version.

Even the T does not translate it, but keeps the exact Hebrew expression כנני השמש.
The \( \text{\textit{OT}} \) translated it by \( \text{\textit{φιάσις}} \) (except \( \alpha' \) \text{\textit{οφθαλμός}}, \( \alpha' \) and Cod. 86 \text{\textit{εἶδος}}, \( \alpha' \) \text{\textit{ομοιωμα}} \) \( \text{\textit{ηλέκτρου}}, \) "appearance of amber," and adds a whole nominal clause at the end of the verse \( \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \) "and brightness in the midst of it."\(^1\) Thus we cannot argue for any relation between \( S \) and \( \text{\textit{OT}} \). Although \( S \) has the word "figure," which is similar to the one used in \( \text{\textit{OT}} \), it does not have the final additional nominal clause or the word "amber" that the latter contains.

Ezek 1:6

\text{\textit{καὶ \ φέγγος} \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \ \\text{καὶ \ φέγγος} \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \ \begin{align*} \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \\ \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \\ \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \\ \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \\ \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \end{align*} \)

\begin{align*} \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \\ \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \end{align*} \)

\begin{align*} \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \\ \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \\ \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \\ \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \end{align*} \)

\begin{align*} \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \\ \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \\ \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \\ \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \\ \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} & \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ, \end{align*} \)

(Trans. of \( S \)) "And each had four faces and four wings."

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 \( \text{\textit{ךָּנְּנָה}} \) is most probably an additional comment necessary to clarify the text. This "gloss," as he calls it, entered \( \text{\textit{OT}} \) with a further addition, \( \text{καὶ \ φέγγος} \ \varepsilon \nu \ \alphaὐτώ. \) As one can see, only \( \text{\textit{OT}} \) has this reading, consequently it is hard to accept that the Masoretic reading is a gloss. The evidence indicates that \( \text{\textit{ךָּנְּנָה}} \) is the original reading supported by \( \text{\textit{C'}}, \text{\textit{S}}, \) and the only gloss is the extra-Masoretic reading found in \( \text{\textit{OT}}. \)
second לֹא, “every” or “each,” and וְלָדָה, “of/to them,” while Г holds both (דָּעֵת וְלָדָה).

Even though ג contains a partial Masoretic reading except לֹא, 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.¹ S ignores completely this expansionist interpretation.

Ezek 1:12

(מ) וַאֲשֶׁר אֵלֵךְ פָּנַי, וְלָכַּן אֵלֵךְ הָיוּ שַׁמְאָה הָרֹאְה לִלְכַּן, לָכַּן לְא יִשְׁכַּב בְּךָ. (S) מְלַמְלַשְׁכֵּם לִזְלֹם, לֵא-פְּלַשְׁכֵּם לִיְבָם, מִלְּצָה לֵא-פְּלַשְׁכֵּם מִלְּצָה. (ג) בָּרָה לְכָלַּן אֲשֶׁר אָלְמָה לָכַּן, הָיוּ רַעֵם לִיְבָם לָכַּן, לָכַּן לְא יִשְׁכַּב בְּךָ. (ג') καὶ ἐκάτερον κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐπορεύετο· οὐ δὲν ἦν τὸ πνεῦμα πορευόμενον, ἐπορεύοντο καὶ οὐκ ἐπέστρεφον.

(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 מ by omitting the initial Hebrew word לֹא, “each,” while ג and Г read ἐκάτερον, “each of both, both” (ἐκαστὸν “every, each” Ο-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 הֵדֹל, "creature" (sometimes used for "each" like בַּשַֽׁע in Hebrew), respectively.

The relationship of ס to ס* is represented by the omission of the last Hebrew Inf. Cstr., "as they went." However, MSS of סA, e.g., (ח, ת, תב) 0-62 L-311, 410, 86, and also סא contain וְתִ֥בְרְאֵ֥שׁ הָאָ֖ה, which is a typical Septuagintal translation of the Hebrew Inf. Cstr. that can be called a Hebraism (וְתִ֥בְרְאֵ֥שׁ הָאָ֖ה + Inf.). Another point is that ס has the word רוח, "spirit," as in ס and סT, but absent in ס ח. 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

—Levey, 21-22.

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 ζωὰ ετρέχον καὶ ἀνεκαμπτον ὡς εἴδος τοῦ βεζέκ.

(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. ἀδεία, "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. ἀδεία 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 ΥΣ, and on the other hand the complete omission of this verse by S* (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 M that seems to have been added later on to their Greek text. Therefore the Vorlage of rel. could well be the same as of S* (MSS B, 106) but a later hand included a literal rendering similar to that of M. Support for this assumption, even though one may argue the opposite on the same
basis, is that the Hebrew word רָצוֹן, “lightning,” was transliterated as בֵּיהֶזֶק. 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 ἀπορροίας η ἀστραπῆς, “flowing of lightning,” for βεζεκ; σ’ has ἀκτίνος ἀστραπῆς, “beam of lightning”; and θ’ reads ἀστραπῆς (+ ας βεζεκ). This indicates that S is based on a different Hebrew recension than the one used by the majority of the witnesses of ©, and the neg. ἐκδικά may be an authentic reading.

Ezek 1:17

(Μ) ήλ εἰρήνη ἱπτασταμένη ἐκ τῶν ἐνεργῶν ἀποτελεῖσθαι
(데이) ήλ εἰρήνη ἱπτασταμένη ἐκ τῶν ἐνεργῶν ἀποτελείσθαι
(σ) δεν εὖ μεταζευγμένοι ἐστε ἔνας ἐν τοῖς ἐνεργών ἀποτελείσθαι
(θ) δεν εὖ μεταζευγμένοι ἐστε ἔνας ἐν τοῖς ἐνεργών ἀποτελείσθαι
(δ) εἴπα τὰ τέσσαρα μέρη αὐτῶν ἐπορεύεσθαι, οὐκ ἐπέστρεφον ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι 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.”

¹According to Zimmerli “the verse is lacking in © and we must read with D (ibant) instead of the erroneous ἰβαντ, and with Σ (הָרָכ) instead of the mysterious הָרָכ. Jerome is of the opinion that © has deliberately suppressed the verse, which speaks of a return (שָׁם) 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

CJ 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 T has a Hebraism for the second instance of the Inf. Cstr. (בראשית, בלאמה), (בבראשית, גוברת).1 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

(3MT) (הנה שב澄清ו ליראה לנהו ב名牌 מלאת עיני כובד لناهة) (3S) (הנה שב澄清ו ליראה לנהו ב名牌 מלאת עיני כובד لناهة) (3CJ) (הנה שב_clearו ליראה לנהו ב名牌 מלאת עיני כובד لناهة)

1It is a Hebraism; see C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, repr. 1990), 174.
(6*) οὖθ᾽ οἱ νῦτωι αὐτῶν, καὶ ὑψὸς ἦν αὐτῶις: καὶ έλεον αὐτά, καὶ οἱ νῦτωι
αὐτῶν πλήρεις ὀφθαλμῶν κυκλάθεν τοῖς τέσσαριν.

(Trans. of 5) "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 הָפַר, "and fear." In a consonantal text it could well
be read as the verb הָפַר, "to see." Thus a confusion of the verbal root may have taken
place causing the Syriac translator to render it as מֵעָת, "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 5 was based on a consonantal Hebrew text similar to 111.

Even though there is an addition to the targumic reading, the Hebrew word הָפַר is
rendered by the Aramaic מֵעָת, "and fear," as in 111. 6* is related to 5, for the former
reads καὶ έλεον αὐτά, "and they were seeing" (except in some MSS of 88, e.g., καὶ
φοβερῶν ἦσαν 88, L-Z; καὶ φοβερά ἦν 62; καὶ φοβερά ησαν 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 סכיב לְאָרְבֶּשֶׁת, "round about to the four of them," that was translated
in 5 as מֵעָת, "when the four of them were turning round about," and
in  GOD kuklódev tois tésaros, “round about [them] the four,” indicating a non-relationship between them.

Ezek 1:19

בּלֶכֶת הָדוֹחַת יֵלֶּה הָיוֹפִּים אַלּוֹלָה והָוָהְם הָוָהְם מֵעָלֶיהָ הַחֲרִים הַיִּשְׂאִים (S) (S)

בְּכִהֵל ברוֹאָה אֹלוֹלָה לִכְבָּלוֹת וַבַּשְׁחֵם בַּרְוָאָה בָּרָאָה בּוֹרָאָה לִכְבָּלוֹת לִכְבָּלוֹת (S)

καὶ εἰς τῷ πορεύοντα τῇ ζώᾳ ἐπορεύοντο οἱ τροχοὶ ἐχόμενοι αὐτῶν, καὶ εἰς τῷ ἐξαιρέσθαι τῇ ζώᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἠγγίξαντο οἱ τροχοὶ. (S)

(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. S, as usual, tries to smooth the text and avoid ambiguity. For instance, the prep. phrase תְּחַמְּשָׁה, “with them,” was used twice, the first instance for עֲלֶיהָ, “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.

ותנ is a more literal translation than S. The Hebrew Inf. Cstrs. were rendered into
an un-Greek grammatical structure, εν τῷ + Inf. (πορεύεσθαι and ἐξαρπασθ). Instead of
μᾶς, “by their side,” ᾿ΣΣ employs ἐξομεντὶ αὐτῶν, “neighboring them.” The remaining
portion of the verse agrees precisely with Μ. The only clear deviation of Σ is the
additional phrase λέγει δὲ σαμ, “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

(Σ) τὰ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα που τῷ πορεύεσθαι: ἐπορεύοντο τὰ ζῷα
καὶ οἱ τροχοὶ καὶ ἐξήρθη τὸν αὐτοῖς, διότι πνεῦμα ζωής ἦν ἐν τοῖς τροχοῖς.

(Trans. of S) “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 Instituti 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 הרוח is rendered by כותש, “will, wish,” probably because of its ambiguous source. The second instance, however, maintains the Masoretic reading indicating that הרוח is applied to the creatures.

S represents an elaborate editorial work. It omits what could be a dittographic error in הרוח (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, מברוק, “cloud,” and ב' עוז, “creatures.”

Regarding the dittographic error suggested by BHS, © omitted it, adding instead ב' עוז. 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 (ב' עוז instead of התה לולכת). Therefore one may conclude that an early Hebrew recension had the repetition of התה לולכת in its text and not ב' עוז, which could be a late scribal correction. Thus Codex B and S reflect an earlier reading than the other witnesses of ©.

Ezek 1:22

Ezek 1:22

(©) הרותה על ראשиде ראשו יטעי בהררוה הננים על ראשות מלכותה (©)

(©) ימעל ל dalle מה יכתי אתה. יכתי אתה גם אתה כתבה על ויכל אוזמא. (©)

(©) ימד המח על שיש ברוחה רקיעה כלני על בנימין מרכן עליד שלום מלעטהלא (©)
Analysis of the Variants

S contains the word \textit{chrystallus}, which is a Greek loanword and also present in all MSS of \( \text{\textit{G}^A} \) and also in \( \text{\textit{G}^*} \). The verse, however, is completely different in S. It does not contain the additional word \textit{πτερύγων}, \textit{"wings"}, and gives a different rendering for \textit{щит}, \textit{"firmament"} (\( \text{\textit{S}^\textit{A}} \)), while \( \text{\textit{G}^T} \) has both of them. Interesting enough is the omission of the Hebrew word \textit{סנט}, \textit{"awesome"}, in both S and \( \text{\textit{G}^*} \), while MSS of \( \text{\textit{G}^A} \) contain it (\textit{φοβερον} O-147, 46-449\textit{c}, 86, 410, 62, or \textit{φοβερον} L\textsuperscript{1-46} [449\textit{a}]-Z\textit{v}, also o\'l λ\textsuperscript{t}, and o\' read \textit{φοβερον} Codd. 86 and \( \text{\textit{G}} \)). This may indicate that S reflects a Hebrew \textit{Vorlage} similar to the one used by Cod. B.

S could have employed the Syriac equivalent for the Hebrew word \textit{щит}, \textit{"firmament,"} which is \textit{k\textae}, but it uses a verbal noun \textit{κρατάω} (pass. Ptc. of \( \textit{k\textae} \) to stretch out, elongate, prolong). \( \text{\textit{M}} \) and \( \text{\textit{G}^T} \) have \textit{щит} and \( \text{\textit{G}^T} \) the Greek correspondent \textit{στερέωμα}.

The coincidence of one word (\textit{chrystallus}), which is a Greek word, does not indicate an influence coming from \( \text{\textit{G}^T} \). 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 \textit{סנט} by an explanation.
“like the figure of the appearance,” whereas the Greek version reads ὡς 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: נמי על ראשיהםحملותלו, “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

(II) ויהיה הרקיע כנףיהם ישרתו ראש אל אבותיה לבש (S)
שש及び מחסן לתחתל אליהם מחסנים עלי בנם

(E) ויהיה הרקיע נפז JADXך מבנים לבלי חזה לב

(III) ויהיה חסן לתחתו ובנים מבנים לבנים לתחתו

(5) ויהיה הרקיע Чедףמבנים לבנים לתחתו לבש (S)

(6°) καὶ ὑποκάτω τοῦ στερεώματος αἱ πτέρυγες αὐτῶν ἐκτεταμέναι,
πτερυσσόμεναι ἐτέρα τῇ ἐτέρᾳ, ἐκάστῳ δύο συνεζευγμέναι ἐπικαλύπτοντοι τὰ
σώματα αὐτῶν.

(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.”
Analysis of the Variants

The idiomatic expression מַעֲמַצְתָּהּ אֲלֵי אָלֻם מְשַׁדְּקָה, “to each other,” is rendered according to the nature of the language of each version. The similarity between S and CJ regarding the idiomatic expression is due to their language relationship and not to a direct dependency between versions. מַעֲמַצְתָּהּ לֶכֶס הַדָּד מְשַׁדְּקָה, which means literally “one opposite to the other.”

S contains a unique reading by adding מֵלָאָה לָעָל מְשַׁדְּקָה, “from above and from below,” instead of לַאֹר. BHS suggests a dittographic error for the repetition of the Hebrew מַעֲמַצְתָּהּ, “and to each two covering them.” S and CJ contain this reading as in מ with the exception of group א-א, which contains it in an asterisk, א ב א ל מַעֲמַצְתָּהּ מְשַׁדְּקָה. ב א א א מַעֲמַצְתָּהּ מְשַׁדְּקָה.

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

אֵלֶם אָחָל מֵלָאָה לָעָל מְשַׁדְּקָה (מ)

בַּלְכְּחָה קִלֵּלָה כַּלֶּלָה מַעֲמַצְתָּהּ מְשַׁדְּקָה (ס)
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 $\Theta^T$ employs the un-Greek structure εν τῷ plus Inf. $\text{i}$ for the Hebrew Inf. Constr. The omission of υἱὸν ἰδιός in $\Theta^*(B)$ 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., $G^A$ reads (το Τ Q) ὡς φωνήν (νην 62mg-147, 710) ικανον (θεου σαββαὶ [σαββαικανον 36, 534; σαββαι ικανου 106] 62mg, Λ7 [226x, 3116x, 538x, 449x]-ZV, 534, 106) εν τω πορευονται αυτα φωνη (νην 62 L*36 763-V-449-ZV; ως φ. 86'; ως φωνην 763) του (>763) λογου ως φωνη (νην 62 L*36 46; νην 198) παρεμβολης (νων 407) rel. In addition, θ' has an asterisk, χως φωνην ικανον (α' and σ' ικανον; οι λοιποι read θεου σαββαϊ and Cod. 86) εν τω πορευονται αυτα φωνη του λογου ως φωνη παρεμβολης Κικτ. $S$ reads οριστεμεν ολος, "like the voice of God." The Syriac reading seems to be more a clarification

---

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

C' avoids anthropomorphism by translating כְּפָלַת שֵׁיךְ, "like the voice of Shaddai," as כְּפָלָה מִן כְּפָלֲת שֵׁיךְ, "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:

"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

[Hebrew text follows]
(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. TJ transliterates the Hebrew expression הַשְּׁמָלָה, 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).1

S contains a singular reading not found in any version: מִזְמוֹר לֹא מִזְמוֹר מְזָהַב, “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 (הַשְּׁמָלָה), 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 מ (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 מ.
3. The scribe did not understand, or purposely avoided, some Hebrew words, e.g. עניי יהוה (1:4, 27).

4. It avoids the paraphrasing and additions of G (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: אֲמַשָׁלַחַד in 13, and אַלְכָּרְסָס in 22).

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

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

2:1 "rise up."  
2:2 "with me."  
2:3 "against me."  
2:4 "their heart."  
2:5 "say."  
2:6 "do not tremble."
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**

(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 III with the sole exception of the word "to stand." $S$
uses the synonym נא, “to rise up,” which can be just a synonym. This is the verb used in כַּ and is the correspondent verb for the Hebrew דָּרֶך. The usage of the verb דָּרֶך can be explained by the lexical characteristics of a language in particular. This verb is peculiar to Early Biblical Hebrew (EBH), while the verb דָּרֶך is employed more in the context of Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH). Therefore the Syriac and Targumic versions reflect a more ancient lexical development and not a relationship between כ and כַ.

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's concerning the usage of the verb ποταίμενος, “to rise up,” instead of ποντικίζεσθαι, “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 ἅνελαβέν με καὶ ἔκτισέν με). MS 407 omitted this addition, probably by homoioteleuton.

Ezek 2:3

(Trans. of S) “And he told me ‘son of man I am sending you to the sons of Israel, to a...
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 its text than to any of the ancient version under study. It avoids the Targumic Memra and further accommodation of the text and the variations ofיתר (אֲנָחָי — בֵּית בֵּית “sons”) and its omissions (יתר > אל נֶגֶף > “to a people,” and “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 “bone, substance (?)” which is a difficult idiomatic usage of this word (“this very day”). The verb וכש, “they rebelled,” is explained rather than translated by the verb מָלַךְ from כָּנָא, “do wrong, injustice.” Therefore, S seems to have been based on a Hebrew text similar to for this passage; S, however, smooths the text, making it easier to read.

Ezek 2:5

וַהֲקָם אִם תֹּמַר אֶת בֵּית יִהוּדָה כִּי בִּתְיָה הַמַּה רָדָּה כִּי בֵּתְיָה הָיָה בֵּיתוֹרָכָה (מ)

וְהָיְתָה שְׁמִית וְהָיָה שְׁמִית מַלְכָּה וְהָיָה שְׁמִית שְׁמִית וְהָיָה שְׁמִית שְׁמִית (ס)

אַנְנָא יִקְבֶלָה אוֹלַף וַאֲשֶׁר יִשְׁמַעְתָּם מַלְמַדֵּךְ וַאֲשֶׁר יֵשֶׁב אַחֲרֵיהֶם וִיהֵשׁ הָרוֹדֵג וְנִבְיֵהֶם הָיוּ בְּנֵיהֶם (ג)

(ד') Еάν ἢρα ἀκούσωσιν ἤ πιστεύσωσιν, διότι οἶκος παραπικραίνων ἔστιν, καὶ γνώσονται ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σὺ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.

(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.”

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Analysis of the Variants

At first glance S seems to be related to T. Both omit the introductory word "and they," and both avoid the redundant repetition of the second instance of νῦν. The difference is that S employs ἢπα, "perhaps, maybe," for νῦν, while T employs its Greek equivalent Εἰν αἴρα, "if, whether." Thus the construction of this clause is different in each version:

T Εἰν αἴρα (whether) . . . ή (or) . . .

S ἢπα (perhaps) . . . α (and) . . .

Furthermore apparently related to T is the clause καὶ γνώσονται ὅτι προφήτης εἰς ὑμᾶς μέοψ αὐτῶν, "and they will know that a prophet you are among them" (the Syriac version renders מחהָבָה יָבָה חָפָה, "and they may know that a prophet you are among them"), while T has ידָוָה יָדָוָה בַּהַדָּה חָפָה, "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 nun (ן) for the yod (י) in the process of copying דָּוָה, "you," for it can be easily confused with דָּוָה, "there was/is," as in MSS 7a1, 12d2. Therefore some S MSS support the T reading while others contain this confusion between the personal pronoun and דָּוָה, "there are/is." This shows that S is without any relationship to T.

---

1Zimmerli, 90: "nom was lacking in the Hebrew Vorlage of T." 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 שלדיה, “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" (םלועי מיסול) . ני reads "even if they rebel and argue against you" (ז"ב מיסול יבזק). The ס ת has диודι παραοιτήσουσι καὶ ἐπιστάσονται επὶ οὲ κύκλῳ, "for they will entice and rise against you" (א' reads עימיו יאש וק אפוא). The ס ת has ס ת δυσκόλοι καὶ απείθεις μετὰ σου, "hard and disobedient with you" Cod. 86. 2 This indicates that S was based on a Hebrew text similar to מ. More evidence for a careful translation based on a Hebrew Vorlage is the chiastic structure found in מ [א'] [ס] [ו ת] [ב'] [ד] [א'] [כ] א, "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 [ס] [ד] [כ] א, 'their words do not fear and before them do not be dismayed." ס and ני agree with the Masoretic reading, while ס, instead, has [ס'] [ס] א, "do not fear their words and at their faces do not be


2 According to Zimmerli the Hebrew phrase כ ס ת is unsatisfactory. He stated that "the kuklwo points to an occurrence of the root כבב in the Hebrew original. Scribal considerations permit us to conjecture in כבב a scribal error for כבבם." 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 \( G \) are not found in \( S \) (2: 1, 2).

2. \( S \) uses synonyms, e.g., for מָשָׁא it employs the Syriac verb for מְשָׁא. \( S \) is related to \( C' \) 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 \( H \) as its Vorlage.

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

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

6. There are signs of careful editorial work in the Syriac version of a Hebrew text similar to \( H \) 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).
3:1 Imperf. עָשַׁה Aphiel Ptc. + pron. יָמִית “you are finding.”
3:3 Hi. Imperf. 2° m. s. Juss. יִשָּׁהֶל] om. מָלֵא “fill.”
3:4 לָעַסְעֵהוּ לָאָל “to the captivity to . . .”
3:5 אָל “it is.”
3:6 עָשַׁה “you are not going to understand.”
3:7 הָעַר “for.”

CHAPTER IV
EZEKIEL 3

Collation

3:1 Imperf. עָשַׁה Aphiel Ptc. + pron. יָמִית “you are finding.”
3:3 Hi. Imperf. 2° m. s. Juss. יִשָּׁהֶל] om. מָלֵא “fill.”
3:4 לָעַסְעֵהוּ לָאָל “to the captivity to . . .”
3:5 אָל “it is.”
3:6 עָשַׁה “you are not going to understand.”
3:7 הָעַר “for.”
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Q. Inf. Cstr. [Peal Ptc. m. pl. הָשַׁמֶּה] "listening."

3:8

Q. Perf. [om. נָתַן] "I cause to be strong."

3:9

Piel Imperf. [Peal Ptc. + pron. נָאַס יָרְבָּר] "which I am speaking."

3:10

Perf. w. waw cons. Imper. sense [Peal Pass. Ptc. + copula נַעֲמָה] "blessed is."

3:11

"I have made."

3:12

"perhaps they will listen and tremble."

3:13

Ambiguity [om. מַרְאֶה] "from before them."

Ambiguity [om. מַרְאֶה] "each other."

Ambiguity [om. מַרְאֶה] "with them."

Ambiguity [om. מַרְאֶה] "with them."

Ambiguity [om. מַרְאֶה] "with them."
3:15
Spell. לִפְקֹךְ הָעֵדֶֹ֗ו [לִפְקֹךְ֔וּ הָעֵדֶֹ֗ו] "to Tel Aviv."
Q. Ptc. m. p. רָדְסָבָּם [רָדְסָבָּם] Peal Ptc. m. s. הָאָכָלָה "that is located/situated."
Ambiguity אָמֶרֶֹ֔ו נְיַחְתָּהּ שְׂמִֽיִּ֔ו [אָמֶרֶֹ֔ו נְיַחְתָּהּ֔ שְׂמִֽיִּ֔ו] Circumst. part. + Pass. Ptc. + pron. הָיָֽה "as I was speechless."

3:16
With the sense of "if" הָיָֽה [יִי] שֵׁם הַפְּרַגַּמַּת "if.

3:17
Q. Perf. 2° m. s. הָאָכָלָה [סֶפַּרֶֹ֔ו הָאָכָלָה] Peal imperf. + Peal Ptc. הָאָכָלָה "for you are listening."
Sing. רָדָֹּ֔ו [רָדָּּ֔ו] Pl. מֶטֶּהֶּ֔ו "words."

3:18
Inf. Cstr. + Imperf. הָאָכָלָה [סֶפַּרַּ֔ו] Hebraism, Inf. > מֶטֶּהֶ֔ו Peal Imperf. הָאָכָלָה "you will surely die."

3:19
With the sense of "if" הָיָֽה [יִי] שֵׁם הָאָכָלָה [סֶפַּרַּ֔ו] Peal Imperf. "and live."

3:20
om.

3:21
Redundancy, om.

3:22
Substi. הָאָכָלָה [סֶפַּרַּ֔ו] "the righteous."
Q. Inf. Abs. + Imperf. יִי הָאָכָלָה [סֶפַּרַּ֔ו] Imperf. הָאָכָלָה "he will live."

3:23
om.
“and there was standing the glory.”

“of the God of Israel.”

“and when I am going to speak.”

“I am going to open.”

“they are going to put.”

“and [they] are going to bind.”

Data Analysis

Selected portions of Ezek 3 are analyzed below. Those verses which have readings similar to הִי without any major deviation were not considered for this investigation. Exceptions to this are those readings in ס that, though similar to הִי, are not supported by the version(s). In other words, those extra-Masoretic readings of צ and ג which are against ס and הִי were also taken into consideration.

Ezek 3:4

(ם) וַיִּמְרָא אֵלִי בֶן אָדָם לָךְ אֲלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְרָבָּה בּוֹרָבָּר עַל יָדוֹ (ם)

(ס) מְחַמֶּה לֹא מִשְׁכָּנָה לֹא חָלֶה לֹעֲכָה לֹא מְצַמֶּה לֹעֲכָה לֹעֲכָה חֲפִילָה (ס)

(צ) וַיְמַסְּרֶה לֹא בֶּר אֵלִי בֶּר אֵלִי אֲרִיָּהל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וְרָבָּה בּוֹרָבָּר בְּשֵׁם בְּנֵהֵב (צ)
(Sr) καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς με τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, βάδιζε εἴσελθε πρὸς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ καὶ λαλήσον τοὺς λόγους μου πρὸς αὐτοὺς.

(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 "children of Israel," as in C', while C' MSS z and f are similar to M having "house of Israel." Sr agrees with M (οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ). S, however, has a unique reading by adding the prepositional phrase λαλήσον τοὺς λόγους, "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 C', it is more related to M than to the targumic text. S omits several interpretative words found in C', e.g., וְהָשָּׁמֵר נָבָאִי, "and proclaim my prophetic words." Furthermore, S did not try to harmonize with 3:1; S and 7, which contain מָקֵם "house of Israel." Probably the S Vorlage had this reading.

Ezek 3:6

(ח') לאอาלעקרמיבמקםוםברילכוסןאשראלעטמסת

(ע)ותבריהוםאםלאאליהםשלחיחתםמהשםברילך

(ס)למךלאלחתמקריותאלתמלעשת
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Analysis of the Variants

S seems to be an elaborated version of a Hebrew text similar to Π. The particle 
indicates a continuation from the preceding verse. Consequently S omits the
redundancy of Π: "of foreign speech and difficult language," in vs. 5
and again in vs. 6. Both GΤ and Π agree with Π, 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 κλαμ instead of the imperfect.1

Ezek 3:8

1T. Nöldeke, Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche
Buchgesellschaft, repr. 1977), § 263; Takamitsu Muraoka, Classical Syriac for Hebraists
(Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1987), § 71: "The highly frequent structure (Ptc. act +
enclitic κλαμ) signifies an on-going, repeated or habitual action in the past."
(S) "Behold I make your face strong against their faces and your forehead hard against their foreheads."

Analysis of the Variants

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 C that is a partial literal translation. For instance, the Hebrew adjective הָעָשָׁת, "strong," was conveyed by the verb וְהָעָשָׁת, "I caused to be strong," for the first instance, and in the second instance by the verb וְהָעָשָׁת, "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.

C, 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 הָעָשָׁת in the sentence הָעָשָׁת תָּנִיס שָׁתָת שָׁתָת שָׁתָת, "I gave/made your face strong," as in M. On the other hand, the second part of the verse has a different literary style, a Greek style, e.g., קָטָיב, "I will make strong," instead of the simple Hebrew adjective הָעָשָׁת, "strong." In this regard C agrees with the Masoretic text.

The Hebrew word קָטָיב, "forehead," was interestingly conveyed by an idiomatic
expression that does not support any relationship between \( T \) and \( S \), but only a common linguistic feature due to their related languages. \( T \) reads \( בִּין עֵינֶיךָ, "between your eyes," for \( T \), and \( S \) contains the same idiomatic expression. \( G \) rendered it by \( ναῦκος \) (\( μετωποῦ "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

(CJ) \( בִּין עֵינֶיךָ 10 \) נוֹמָה כְּבֵית תֶּבֶן תָּבֹא לְכָל עַמּים \( אֶל הַיָּהָה מְדִימְנָה \) כְּבֵית מִרְיָם (M) "between your eyes," for \( II \), and \( S \) contains the same idiomatic expression.

(CJ) \( בִּין עֵינֶיךָ 10 \) נוֹמָה כְּבֵית תֶּבֶן תָּבֹא לְכָל עַמּים \( אֶל הַיָּהָה מְדִימְנָה \) כְּבֵית מִרְיָם (M) "between your eyes," for \( II \), and \( S \) contains the same idiomatic expression.

(CJ) \( בִּין עֵינֶיךָ 10 \) נוֹמָה כְּבֵית תֶּבֶן תָּבֹא לְכָל עַמּים \( אֶל הַיָּהָה מְדִימְנָה \) כְּבֵית מִרְיָם (M) "between your eyes," for \( II \), and \( S \) contains the same idiomatic expression.

(CJ) \( בִּין עֵינֶיךָ 10 \) נוֹמָה כְּבֵית תֶּבֶן תָּבֹא לְכָל עַמּים \( אֶל הַיָּהָה מְדִימְנָה \) כְּבֵית מִרְיָם (M) "between your eyes," for \( II \), and \( S \) contains the same idiomatic expression.

(CJ) \( בִּין עֵינֶיךָ 10 \) נוֹמָה כְּבֵית תֶּבֶן תָּבֹא לְכָל עַמּים \( אֶל הַיָּהָה מְדִימְנָה \) (CJ) "between your eyes," for \( II \), and \( S \) contains the same idiomatic expression.

Even though \( S \) agrees with the \( M \) reading, the Syriac scribe evades the use of the verb \( מָנָה \) with the sense of "to make" by employing another verb that conveys a more...
specific sense, in this case the verb חָלַךְ, "to make." 6* has a minus, namely, מְצַרְצִיר רָצִים, "I have made (given) your forehead." Some MSS of 6A contain this Hebrew portion, e.g., 410 (δεδωκα το προσωπον σου), O', L'-Zv (δεδωκα το μετωπον σου), and ε' (δεδωκα το μετωπον σου Qlx) contain a reading similar to that of Μ. The introduction of 6T is different; it reads καὶ ἔσται διὰ παντὸς κραταῖότερον πέτρας, "and it will be continually stronger than a rock," which is a unique reading among the versions.

Although 6T has all the Μ reading, it contains an expansion to the text that 5 ignores completely: δὲ γὰρ ἅτις μὴ δραμήτων, "do not break in pieces before them," and instead of γυνὴ Targum reads γυναῖκα, "people." Therefore 5 seems to be based on a Hebrew text similar to Μ.

Ezek 3:11

(III) nēl ba ala hnhl ala ben tmeet vrbht el'ldhm mvpht

(5) nēl dhl lhtsmk hmn mlh hmn mlh hmn

(6*) kai bádizē eiôslhē eli tēn akhmwlwhn pròs tou' uioû tou' laou' sou kai

λαλήσεις πρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτοῦ Τάθε λέγει κύριος, εὰν ἀρα

ποιησοῦσιν, εὰν ἀρα ἐνδοιασίν.
(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 ἀκούω clauses, ἀκούω ἀκούω, “perhaps they will hear and tremble,” probably to harmonize with 2:7 in which the same type of clause appears. S* reads ἀκούω ἀκούω ἀκούω, ἀκούω ἀκούω, “whether they will hear, or whether they will give up.” S* has MS 147’ that reads πεντηκοσίων (“be terrified”) for ἀκούω, which is a reading similar to the Syriac one. S* reads παιδοφθαλματικά, “they will cease,” while 6’ and Cod. 86 have κοπροφθαλματικά, “they will cease.” S is completely alien to both versions. It reads ἔστω ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τῆς δικαιοσύνης, “whether they would heed the instruction or whether they would cease from sinning.”

S has a consistent way of translating the name of God.1 It uses the words Κύριος, “Lord of Authority/Lordship,” for יהוה יהוה, whereas S has Ἄρχης Ἀρχῶν. Although S* has only κύριος, “Lord,” MSS L’- 449 Zv of S* have ἅγιον prior to κύριος, and MS 62 has θεὸς. 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 5.

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 nominasacra 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 יהוה. There are many variations among the Greek witnesses of S concerning the translation of the nominasacra, 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 sacrum*, all of them have the same alternative ס clause found in $\mathfrak{m}$ but substituted in $S$.

Thus $S$ 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.

**Ezek 3:12**

(\textit{IR}) $\text{tDipno mrr too mj n bn: o n bip n ss ucom i} \text{om xom} \text{(S) tD} \text{a u rt-u X} \text{X 1} \text{X - T IT-n reua t l X m.n.} \text{(CJ) tDmDo rmm inso m Kip' jna p e} \text{w j-nnom ':o or bp n ra mono: kitt, rmba:} \text{(\textit{G}* th) tD} \text{ev X a f ev 4 € 4 e 4 T|Kovaa K aTo m oG ev g o v a)vr|v a e ta g o u g e y a X o u EuX oytigevTi f) S o f a tcupiov €K tou totouav.} \text{(Trans. of 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'."} \text{Analysis of the Variants} \text{S adds the Peal Ptc. \textit{tD}, "saying," in the beginning of the direct speech to smooth the flow of the sentence. \textit{G}* does not have it. However, some MSS of $\mathcal{G}^A$ have a participle \textit{legeontwv}, "saying"; A', 147, 535-46, C' -86 710-239 -403, and MSS 86mg, 410 have the participle \textit{legeontos}, "saying." This may indicate a possible later addition in $\mathcal{G}^A$. Therefore the relationship between some MSS $\mathcal{G}^A$ and $S$ 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 רֵי, "bitter," as 6* does in their texts. α' has πυκρος and θ' has πεπυκραμμενος, both words having their roots from the word "bitter." Several other MSS of 6A (rel.) contain the word μετεφρας, "anxious." The omission of רֵי, "bitter," in S and 6* 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, C' has a reading similar to IR.

The idiomatic expression בָּהַמָּה רָדוּי, "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 חֵם, "heat, rage," is a case of polysemy in the Hebrew language. And, as it is in this verse, the expression חֵם רָדוּי can be considered the only
The Syriac language possesses a form cognate to the Hebrew קָוָה that is סָעַה. Perhaps to avoid the strong sense implied in the Syriac word סָעַה, "to burn with anger, be enraged, angry," ס employs another word (סַעַה "in the eagerness") instead of its cognate one. LXX reads ἐν ὀρμή τοῦ πνεύματός μου, “in the impulse of my spirit,” while צ reads סְעַה רְחֵם, “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 נַעַה וּמַגְנֵי יְהוָה תַּעֲלֶה הַיֶּשֶׁבֶת "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

κατοικούντας ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ τοῦ Χαβαρ τοὺς ὄντας ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐκάθεν ἐκεῖ ἐπτὰ ἡμέρας ἀναστρεφόμενος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.

(Trans. of S) “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 עָיוֹן, “Tel Aviv,” which is rendered by S and כז as בֵּית אָיוֹן “Telakiv” (probably a scribal error at some stage) and בֵּית אָיוֹן respectively, whereas כז substituted בֵּית עָיוֹן by μετέφερος καὶ περιβληθον, “and I went anxious round about” (α’, σ’, θ’, and Cod. 86 contain θελ αββ). This indicates that כז was based on a different Hebrew recension from the one employed by S and כז, or the translator of כז 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 רָאוּא 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 homoiooteleuton as the cause for this deviation; since the Masora Parva of כז suggests a Qere reading for רָאוּא, that is, בֵּית עָיוֹן, the Syriac scribe may have jumped from

¹“כז did not recognize the place name בֵּית עָיוֹן and renders it at random. . . . μετέφερος καὶ περιβληθον appears to presuppose in לָלָל a derivation from לָלָל ‘to be high’ and to have read in the form הב in the form הב or הב.” Zimmerli, 94.
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making this common translation error. םי rendered the relative nominal clause by רועי ויד אֵּלֶה, “who were there” and צז by עֵּרוּשׁ אֵל, “and I went down among them where they where dwelling.” These variant readings indicate that although all versions had a similar Hebrew Vorlage, their translations were not related at all.

Ezek 3:16

(ם) מַנְּחֶה שָׁכַעְתִּי יִמְשְׁרִי דְּבָרָיו וַדַּוַּד אֱלֵי אָלִים (ם)

(ס) מָשַׁח חֲבֵרוֹ מַכֶּהֶם דַּל הַפְּרָסָה יַסְּחָה לְמַכֶּהֶם;

(צז') הזה נסח משכה ימושר והיה פסכה באה פן קדש יוסמ למסר

(די') קַאֲלָא ἕγενετο μετὰ τὰς ἐπτὰ ἡμέρας λόγος κυρίου πρὸς με λέγων.

(Trans. of ס) “And after seven days the word of the Lord was upon me saying.”

Analysis of the Variants

S avoids Hebraisms, thus it omitted the introductory רְויָ יִזְרֶאֶל that is translated by an un-Greek expression קַאֲלָא ἕγενετο in די. Even the second instance of רְויָ יִזְרֶאֶל is translated by די as קַאֲלָא ἕγενετο in rel. (דס' O), and in צז', צז', צז'.

A normal characteristic of צז' is the avoidance of any anthropomorphic feature applied to God. Thus the last portion of this verse was translated as והיה פסכה באה פן קדש יוסמ רו יזרא, “and the word of the prophecy from before the Lord was with me.” S is completely alien to this tradition.
Ezek 3:18

באותו לשמע את הדבר ולא ותרשה ולא י랗יהו להורר רשע

מִרְכָּבָה הַרְשָׁעָה לֹא יְרַשֵּׁהוּוּ וְאֵין טַעֲנָה יחט יודא וָיתְרָךְ

((S))

בָּאֹתָו לְשָׁמֶהוּ לֹא וַתִּרְשַׁעְתוֹ וְלֹא יֵאָשׁוּבָהוּוּ בְּאֹתָו לְשָׁמֶהוּ

(© T)

בָּאֹתָו לְשָׁמֶהוּ לֹא וַתִּרְשַׁעְתוֹ וְלֹא יֵאָשׁוּבָהוּוּ בְּאֹתָו לְשָׁמֶהוּ

מְאֹרָהָה הַרְשַׁעָה לֹא יְרַשֵּׁהוּוּ וְאֵין טַעֲנָה יחט יודא וָיתְרָךְ

((C'))

בָּאֹתָו לְשָׁמֶהוּ לֹא וַתִּרְשַׁעְתוֹ וְלֹא יֵאָשׁוּבָהוּוּ בְּאֹתָו לְשָׁמֶהוּ

(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 רשע, “wicked,” in the phrase רשע מדריך, “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. נגשה יד, “he will surely die,” conveyed into S and © T as a non-Syriac
and an un-Greek form, which is usually called a Hebraism (θανάτῳ and θανατωθήσῃ 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 ᾿ΣΤ has ἀποστρέφειν, “to turn” (ἐπιστρέφειν 239’), against the Syriac reading ἰσραήλ, “that he might take heed,” and the Masoretic reading לֹוהֵו, “to warn” (סְדָרוֹנ), and the word ψάρα, “wicked one,” is rendered by σινή, “sinner,” in the Syriac version (see also vs. 19 for this same reading), and by τῷ ἁρμόω, “lawless,” in ᾿ΣΤ. If both S and ᾿ΣΤ were somehow related, the verb ἀποστρέφειν, “to turn,” which is found in ᾿ΣΤ, would be expected to be found in S instead of the verb ἵστατο, “that he might take heed,” which is closer to the Masoretic reading לֹוהֵו, “to warn.”

**Ezek 3:21**

1“A bare infinitive, namely without Δ, 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.” Murraoka, *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 θανάτῳ 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 ©T (except MS 62) is the rearrangement of the text by lacking the ambiguous second instance of מ"ש present in the Hebrew text, and the substitution of the pronoun אָדָם, “and he,” by the actual noun מ"ש, which makes more sense than the awkward reading of מ"ש. 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 S) “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 מ"ש while ©* probably contains an editorial work omitting אָדָם, “there,” from the first sentence, whereas MSS (ק ב) מ"ש-
62 of ᾿A contain it. MS 12a1 of S has ἀπέρριψεν, “again,” probably to harmonize with the preceding statement (3:14) which is similar to it.

翟 reads ἀπέρριψεν, “the spirit of prophecy from before the Lord rested upon me there” for ἀπέρριψεν, “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

Analysis of the Variants

This verse reflects a careful rendition by supplying a specific reference to God, in
this case לְאָדָם, “of the God of Israel,” instead of יְהֹוָה, “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)אנף יוהד המסמט המסה ותחלו יחלו כי בו מר המה

(5)כפיו כלים קשים חשים חשים חשים קשים חשים קשים קשים

(1)בכלהים טמק שבכר קינך י/release והبير חולם כולם אאמר יسلام

(6)כני את הלטינ_at the 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. *G* employs ἀριστος, "Lord," for the whole expression [אדונא ייוהו], while the Peshitta of Ezekiel always uses רְשֵׁת הָעָם, "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 אֶלֶךָ וּנְשֵׁת, "incline your soul," הַחַגַּה, "instruction," and מָלַעֲפָה, "from sinning," and instead of בֵּית, "house," it reads פִּי, "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 G* (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 \( \mathcal{G}^T \) 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. waw consec. Peal Imper. "make."
Q. Perf. waw consec. Peal Imper. "and build."
Q. Perf. waw consec. Aphel Imper. "and cast up."
Q. Perf. waw consec. Aphel Imper. "and set."
Q. Imperf. waw consec. Peal Imper. "and place."
Q. Perf. waw consec. Peal Imper. "and set."
Q. Imper. waw Peal Imper. "and make."
Q. Perf. waw consec. Peal Imper. "and make it."

4:3
"and make it."

4:4
Pr. "this."

4:5
Sing. waw Pl. "days."

4:6
om.

4:8
Q. Perf. waw Aphel Perf. "I have laid."
Pi. Inf. Cstr. + pron. 2° m. s. [םלוע לעו] Peal Imperf. 3° m. pl. [םלועי] "they will be completed."

4:9

םלועו [om.]

4:10

םלועו [pr. מֵּעֶּשֶׂה מַעְּשֶׂה "will be."

םלועו [om.]

במסכָלֵל מַעְּשֶׂה tr.

מַעְּשֶׂה [שָׁכֵל] "weight."

םלועו [om.]

4:11

םלועו [הָכֵל מַעְּשֶׂה מַעְּשֶׂה] [םלועו תָּוִית] "one of the sixth part of a hin."

4:12

םלועו [om.]

םלועו [בִּכְלָל ההינ] tr.

םלועו [om.]

4:14

םלועו [om.]

םלועו [אָהֵי הָיְנֵי הָכֵל מַעְּשֶׂה] [אָהֵי הָיְנֵי הָכֵל מַעְּשֶׂה] "God Lord of Authority."

4:15

םלועו [om.]

Pual Ptc. f. s. [םָּכֵל מַעְּשֶׂה] Verb + noun מָּכֵל מַעְּשֶׂה [םָּכֵל מַעְּשֶׂה] "it was not defiled."

םלועו + [םָּכֵל מַעְּשֶׂה] "by beast."

םלועו [ומַלָּב מַלָּב] "unclean."

4:16

םלועו [ומַלָּב מַלָּב] "behold."

םלועו [ומַלָּב מַלָּב] "dung."

םלועו [ומַלָּב מַלָּב] "dung."

םלועו [ומַלָּב מַלָּב] "of sons of man."

4:17

םלועו [ומַלָּב מַלָּב] "Staff of bread" מָּכֵל מַעְּשֶׂה מָּכֵל מַעְּשֶׂה "staff of food."

םלועו [ומַלָּב מַלָּב] "and they will be lacking."

םלועו [ומַלָּב מַלָּב] "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

(\textit{M}) תומתה עלה ונתה עלה ויק שפכת עלה סכלת נחת העלה מותה ושם עלה עלה כחי סנהב

(\textit{S}) מַעְבֶּד הַלֵּךְ מַסְיַרְתָּה מַעְבֶּד הַלֵּךְ מַסְיַרְתָּה

(\textit{C}) הבֵּית בֵּית עֲלֵה כּוֹכֶב וּבּוֹבֶר עֲלֵה מַלְתָּה מְלַתָּה

(\textit{C}) וְמָצִית עֲלֵה מְסָרֵי וּמָצִית עֲלֵה אֶפְרָה הַמֶּרֶם

(\textit{S}) καὶ δύσεις ἐπὶ αὐτὴν περιοχὴν καὶ οἰκοδομήσεις ἐπὶ αὐτὴν προμαχόνας καὶ περιβάλεις ἐπὶ αὐτὴν χάρακα καὶ δύσεις ἐπὶ αὐτὴν παρεμβολὰς καὶ τάξεις τὰς βελοστάσεις κύκλῳ.

(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

\textit{S} * and \textit{S} omitted the fifth עלה, “against her.” \textit{S} however has a synonymous prepositional phrase עליה instead of עליה, while \textit{S} * does not have anything. Some MSS of \textit{S} A contain it; see MSS 88 1'-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. * and * 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 has them in the Imperative mood, understanding the Hebrew idiom.

employs the verb תַּחֲנוֹן, “you place, give, put,” in this verse. translates the first instance by תָּמַך, “and make,” and the second by נָטַע, “and set.” renders both instances with a more literal translation δωσεις, “you will give,” which sounds more like a Hebraism than a Greek usage of this verb. reads “and lay siege” and “and pitch,” respectively.

There is a very interesting deviation in , “and appoint guards round about it,” that seems to be related to MS 538 of . The latter one reads ταξις επ αυτη φυλασσοντας και ταξις επ αυτη, “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.

Ezek 4:3

תָּקַע חַכָּל מִסְבָּחֹת בָּרוֹל נַחֲזָה אֲשֶׁר בָּרוֹל בִּינֵךְ עַל הָעִיר (מָז)

תקון חַכָּל מִסְבָּחֹת הוֹיָה חַרְלָה בָּרוֹל עַל הָאָיו אֲשֶׁר לָבָן שִׁירָא (נָז

This may indicate the existence of a Hebrew recension that may have had it in its text as an actual reading.

Ezek 4:3

תָּקַע חַכָּל מִסְבָּחֹת בָּרוֹל נַחֲזָה אֲשֶׁר בָּרוֹל בִּינֵךְ עַל הָעִיר (מָז)

This may indicate the existence of a Hebrew recension that may have had it in its text as an actual reading.

Ezek 4:3

This may indicate the existence of a Hebrew recension that may have had it in its text as an actual reading.
(Trans. of §) "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 111 concerning the phrase בָּנָיָיָה יִשְׂרָאֵל, "house of Israel," while 6T has בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל, "sons of Israel," harmonizing with 3:1. Furthermore, to avoid redundancy, S omitted the second בֵּין, "between." 6T, however, contains both instances of the preposition בֵּין.

Ezek 4:4

אָבַהְתָּ מַכֵּבּ עַל זָּרְדִּים תְּמַמְּלֶקֶת אֶת נָעְמָת בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל (6*)

עַל יְלִי מַכֵּבּ חַזְּרֵמָה אֶת מַכֵּבּ עִלְיוֹנָה חַזְּרֵמָה אֶת עַנְבָּה

(§) אֶת מַכֵּבּ עֲלֵי חֶסֶךְ חַזְּרֵמָה מִשְׁמֹא רְחָמִים

הַלֵּךְ חַזְּרֵמָה יַד חַזְּרֵמָה חַזְּרֵמָה חַזְּרֵמָה

אָבַהְתָּ מַכֵּבּ עַל טְמֵאִים דְּשַׁמְּלִי חַזְּרֵמָה יִתְבָּחֵן בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל (CJ)

עַל חַזְּרֵמָה עַל נָעְמָת דְּשַׁמְּלִי חַזְּרֵמָה חַזְּרֵמָה חַזְּרֵמָה

(6*) וַיְקָעַר נְפֵשׁ יָשָׂרָאֵל דְּשַׁמְּלִי חַזְּרֵמָה חַזְּרֵמָה חַזְּרֵמָה חַזְּרֵמָה חַזְּרֵמָה

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
τοῦ οἴκου Ἰσραήλ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῦ κατὰ ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἡμερῶν πεντῆκοντα καὶ ἕκατῶν, δές κοιμηθήσῃ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καὶ λήψῃ τὰς ἀδικίας αὐτῶν.

(Trans. of $) “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

$ agree with M by omitting the addition of $T (πεντῆκοντα καὶ ἕκατῶν).

Manuscript group C' omitted it as in $T, CJ, 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 ἐνενήκοντα καὶ ἐκ., and MS 410 has ἐνεκοντα καὶ τριάκοσιας.

For $ to have had a Vorlage related to $T, $ should have had a recension similar to manuscript group C', which is the catena group. Therefore the chance is minimal for a relation between $ and $T.

Ezek 4:5

(M) ἀκούσας μήτε λέγεις μύθος σου μεθαύνεις καὶ μεθαύνεις στὴν οἰκουμένη τῆς σου.

(S) ἀκούσας μήτε λέγεις μύθος σου μεθαύνεις καὶ μεθαύνεις στὴν οἰκουμένη τῆς σου

(C') ἀκούσας μήτε λέγεις μύθος σου μεθαύνεις καὶ μεθαύνεις στὴν οἰκουμένη τῆς σου

(Θ*) καὶ ἐγὼ δεδοκά σοι τὰς δύο ἀδικίας αὐτῶν εἰς ἀριθμὸν ἡμερῶν ἐνενήκοντα
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καὶ ἐκατὸν ἡμέρας. καὶ λήμψῃ τὰς ἁδικίας 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 III (살ש ומאז תשמת), whereas ḤT has its own reading (ἐνενήκοντα καὶ ἐκατὸν “a hundred and ninety”) against III, I, and S (שלש ומאז תсмер, “three hundred and ninety”). Manuscript group C’, MSS 403’ and 410 hold the reading τριακοσίων for ἐκατὸν. Also α’ σ’ and θ’ contain the reading τριακοσίων καὶ ενενήκοντα (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 ḤT as a whole.

Ezek 4:6

וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi (המיתן סינה) (III)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (S)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (C)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (C’)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הס coma על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
וכילה את אלת הסכמה על צדך הדemi ומסכמה על צדך הדemi (钬)
cocilla el  at el t o s c m a a o u t o e n t o  p o l e u o v o u t o  d e x i o n k a i l h m p t a s a d i k i a s t o u o i k o u I o u s a t e v o r a k o n t a h m e r a s h h m e r a n e i s
(Trans. of 5) “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 נְשָׁנָה, “second,” and the repetition of the Hebrew phrase וַיִּשְׁתַּחַר, “a day for a year.” Some MSS of 6A, e.g., (X) O-62, 147 δευτερον, and L'-311 εκ δευτερον, contain a reading similar to that of 6. The omission of the repetition of וַיִּשְׁתַּחַר is a general reading in all the witnesses of 6 even in the Hexaplaric witnesses of 6. C' agrees with 6 in this regard (וַיִּשְׁתַּחַר “a day for a year”).

There are two possibilities for the reading of the Syriac version, first that 5 was based on some Greek MSS that did not contain this reading, such as 6*. Second, although 5 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

אתה כל כך חלים בישראל המלוך והכתר והכספים (6)
ותconsume את כל כך חלים על המשה את כל כל מה מספר
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Analysis of the Variants

S and ℃ agree with ™ concerning the reading of the number שלש מאות ותשעים (390 days). Although ℃* reads ἐνενήκοντα καὶ ἵκατὸν (one hundred and ninety), some MSS of ℃ (ἐνενήκοντα καὶ τριακοσίας ℃’-403’) contain the same reading as ™. Regarding numerical figures, S agrees with ™ 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 ʕת, ʕ, and ʕ, 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.
(Trans. of S) “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 $C_I$, $S_T$, 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 "dung of the discharge" appears again translated by the same Syriac word. Therefore to avoid any difficult expression that was unnecessary for the understanding of the text, it was simplified for the sake of clarity.

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

**Analysis of the Variants**

\( \text{S} \) and \( \text{C} \) are literal translations of a Hebrew text similar to \( \text{M} \), while \( \text{G} \) contains some additions and some omissions to the text, e.g., the additions \( \text{καὶ ἐπεἶς Τάδε} \) and \( \text{ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ισραήλ} \) (Cod. 86 and 01 γ' read \( \text{καὶ εἶπεν κυρίος πρὸς με, "and the Lord told me,"} \) instead of the addition found in \( \text{G} \)), and the omissions of \( \text{τὸ λίθος ἡς, "their bread,"} \)
and "where I will drive them" (6*). A contains some MSS that have a reading for the first omission that reads τον ἀρτον αὐτῶν (εαυτῶν Q, L-46) ἀκαθαρτὸν (τον ἀρτον αὐτῶν under a *)-62', L', and some MSS with a reading for the second omission [fin] + ou διασκορπίω (-πισω 88-62', L'-46-311) αὐτοῦς εκεῖ O', L', C'-233-86'-239'-403', while οἱ γ' and Cod. 86 have an obelus, which might be a damaged asterisk with the final reading ou διασκορπίω αὐτοῦς εκεῖ.

Consequently, if S had any relationship to 6*, S should contain those additions and omissions, or at least part of them.

Ezek 4:14

(6*) καὶ εἶπα Μηθαμὼς, κύριε θεέ τοῦ Ισραήλ: ἰδοὺ ἡ ψυχή μου οὐ μεμίνῃ ἐν ἀκαθαρτῷ, καὶ θησαμᾶν καὶ θηριῶτων οὐ βεβρωκα ἀπὸ γενέσεως μου ἐὼς τοῦ νῦν, οὐδὲ ἐσελήνυθεν ιεῖ τὸ στόμα μου πάν κρέας ἔσων.

(Trans. of S) "Then I said; 'O God 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'.”
Analysis of the Variants

Each version has its unique reading regarding the rendering of the nomen sacrum. $J$ reads $\text{God Lord of Authority,}$ whereas $T$ has $\text{God Lord of Authority,}$ whereas $T$ has $\text{then I said 'not so, Lord God of Israel', which is a reading not found in any other version. Probably $T$ harmonizes with the preceding verse that has the same reading ($\text{then I said 'not so, Lord God of Israel'}$ see vs. 13). The additional words of $T$ and the unique rendering of the nomen sacrum show that $S$ did not have any relation to $T$ and to $J$ 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 nomen sacra are consistently translated.

Ezek 4:16

$T$ reads $\text{then I said 'not so, Lord God of Israel', which is a reading not found in any other version. Probably $T$ harmonizes with the preceding verse that has the same reading ($\text{then I said 'not so, Lord God of Israel'}$ see vs. 13). The additional words of $T$ and the unique rendering of the nomen sacrum show that $S$ did not have any relation to $T$ and to $J$ 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 nomen sacra are consistently translated.
(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

$S$, $T$, and $\Theta$ give slightly different translations for מָכָה לָעָל, "staff of bread." $T$ reads מָכָה עֲלֵיהֶם, "food supply,” $S$ מָכָה מַעֲלֶהֶה, "cane of food,” and $\Theta$ מָכָה מַעֲלֶהֶה יַפְרוּ תָּו, "firmness of bread." MS 46* is a exception to that; it reads מְעֻטָּרָה מַעֲלֶהֶה, "destruction of bread.” The Hexaplaric witnesses have Cod. 86, and $\alpha'$ reading רְבִּיהוּ מַעֲלֶהֶה תָּו, "rod, staff of bread,” which is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of $\Pi$, while $\sigma'$ and $\theta'$ read מְעֻטָּרָה מַעֲלֶהֶה תָּו, "firmness of bread,” a reading similar to $\Theta$.

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 $T$ and $\Theta$ (4:2).

2. $S$, in several passages, is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of $\Pi$ (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 $\Pi$, which were kept in $T$ and $\Theta$ (4:3, 6).
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4. $S$ ignores the additions of $C'$ and $G$ (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 $M$ 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

“like, as”

Q. Perf. w. consec. "and divide them.”

Pi. Perf. + Obj. pron. “and divide them.”

Fin] + “into three parts of them.”

5:2

“and one of the third part of them.”

Prep. + Q. Inf. Cstr. + Perf. “when they are completed.”

5:4

Prep. 3° m. s. Prep. + 3° m. pl. “of them.”

5:5

“all the cities round about her.”
5:6
Hi. Imperf. Peal Perf. 3° f. s. perf. "she has exchanged."

5:7
Q. Inf. Ctr. 2° m. pl. sufl. Ethpe.
Perf. 2° m. pl. "you have regarded."

5:8
om. redundancy.

5:9
tr. "all of them."

5:10
tr. "their sons."

5:11
"he says."

5:12
"one part of you."

5:13
"and I will fulfill."

5:14
"before."
5:15
Perf. 3° f.s. נדהנה Peal Imperf. 2° f.s. נלהנה
“you will be.”
among the nations

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

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

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

הזה בן אדם כל אחד שלטור תודע התורה והערכות חקונה לכל
וה਼ borough על רמש על ודכאר לכלחת לכל מסאני מסכל והלך

(ה) "והבר בן אדם כל אחד שלטור תודע התורה והערכות חקונה לכל
והבר בן אדם כל אחד שלטור תודע התורה והערכות חקונה לכל

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

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

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.
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 ἐπαρχομένος, “like,” between “sword” and “barber’s razor.” In 3 these two phrases are in apposition without any particle between them. Furthermore, S adds the phrase ἐν τρίσχοις, “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

κτήσῃ αὐτὴν σεαυτῷ καὶ ἐπάρχομεν αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν σου καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν παγωνά σου. καὶ λήψῃ γυνὴν σταθμῶν καὶ διαστήσεις αὐτοῦς.

(Trans. of S) “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.”
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(S) τὸ τέταρτον ἐν πυρὶ ἀνακαύσεις ἐν μέσῃ τῇ πόλει κατὰ τὴν πλήρωσιν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ συγκλείσμου· 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 σω αὐτῶν.

(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 "those who slay by the sword I will send after them," and the distributive particle with a preposition, "to every." Syntactically the Syriac version strives to render the clearest sense; note for instance the additional specification for the possessive pronoun “her” in "her environs/round about her," with the additional word added to that phrase "the environs/round about of the city."

Θ reads τέταρτον, “fourth,” instead of τρίτον, “third,” with exception of some MSS of Θ, e.g., τρίτον 91 and Codex 86, 87, and α’ α’ θ’.

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

S avoids picturing God sending a sword after the Israelites, as in the other versions; instead it changes the person of the verb προῖν, “I will unsheathe,” from the first to
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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 מְדַלֶּשׁ, “third,” in ℨ was substituted by בָּהֵם, “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 $^T$ are not present in S (καὶ κατακαύσεις 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

 womb Uri the prophet to the house of Israel

Ezekiel 5:4

(Israelites)

The Lord shall slay it in the midst of her (Syriac)

and you shall burn it in the midst of her (Septuagint)
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κατακαύσεις αὐτοὺς ἐν πυρί· ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐξελεύσεται πύρ. Καὶ ἐρεῖς παντὶ οἶκῳ Ἰσραήλ,
(Trans. of S) “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

ς' and S are literal translations of a Hebrew text similar to Μ, while Θ added at the end of the verse Καὶ ἐρεῖς, “and you shall say.” Manuscript group Ο and Cod. 86 indicate this reading with an obelus showing its dubious origin.

Ezek 5:5

(Μ) καὶ ἀπέραντη ἡ γῆ ἡ Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ ἡ γῆ κατὰ τὸν θάνατον τῆς Ἰσραήλ.

(ς) καὶ ἀπέραντη ἡ γῆ ἡ Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ ἡ γῆ κατὰ τὸν θάνατον τῆς Ἰσραήλ.

(ς') καὶ ἀπέραντη ἡ γῆ ἡ Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ ἡ γῆ κατὰ τὸν θάνατον τῆς Ἰσραήλ.

(Θ) Τάδε λέγει κύριος Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ιερουσαλήμ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν θεῶν τῆς Μέθυθας αὐτὴν καὶ τὰς κύκλους αὐτῆς χώρας.

(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 ἡ γῆ κατὰ τὸν θάνατον τῆς Ἰσραήλ, “and lands/countries
around her,” as “and all (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 GA, however, read κύριος] + αἰωναὶ 36° (+κύριος) 46, 130°; + αἰωναὶ κύριος 407, 410; pr. αἰωναὶ rel. = M. S has consistently rendered the nomen sacra by the same terms ἀνέπλεξεν κύριον, which correspond to the Hebrew terms

Ezek 5:6

(Trans. of S) “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

S reworked some portions of the subordinate clause introduced by כ. The use of the preposition ב in IR seems awkward; see נִשְׁמָת מֵאֶלוֹ הַכֹּהֵן לָא הַלָּל בָּהֶם, “for [in that] my judgment they have rejected and as for my statutes, they have not walked in them.” S corrects the use of the preposition based on the context of this verse. S places the preposition ב with כֹּהֵן, “my statutes,” so it became הֵכָל בָּהֶם, “and in my statutes.” Notice that in vs. 7 IR has the same clause with a slight variation, and the preposition ב is present there in the expected place before כֹּהֵן (ב), “in my statutes.” Therefore it might be a contextual harmonization of the text with the purpose of avoiding syntactical ambiguity.

C) makes better use of the direct object mark found in the Masoretic reading. C) reads וַתִּתְנַשֵּׁא לָהֶם בָּהֶם, “she altered my judgments to sin by them.” Thus the targumic scribe changed the intransitive Hebrew verb מָלַשׁ, “she has rebelled,” for a transitive verb that requires a direct object. In this manner C) avoids any syntactical blunder in its text.

Regarding גT, it has a reading on its own. It reworked the text presenting a different interpretation: כֹּלָהֵן תַּא דִּקְאָלֵמָה מַעְיֹת גֵּרֵנָה וְכֹלָהֵן תַּא דִּקְאָלֵמָה מַעְיֹת גֵּרֵנָה כֹּלָהֵן תַּא דִּקְאָלֵמָה מַעְיֹת גֵּרֵנָה; וְכֹלָהֵן תַּא דִּקְאָלֵמָה מַעְיֹת גֵּרֵנָה כֹּלָהֵן תַּא דִּקְאָלֵמָה מַעְיֹת גֵּרֵנָה, “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 גT presents this verse as the purpose God had
for Jerusalem, "to declare His statutes" to the nations; on the other hand, $S$ and $C'$ 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 $\Pi$ regarding the translation of the *nomina sacra* (see 3:11), while $\Phi^*$ has its typical κύριος, "Lord." The difficult Inf. Cstr. plus the third person plural suffix
“you are turbulent?” appears only once in מ. It was translated by the verb לָם, “to think, regard, count,” in the Ethpeel verb form. The cognate root of רָפַת, “to be turbulent,” in the target language is the noun רָפַת, “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 מְלַל, “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 מְלַל to a positive one, from “disregard” to “regard.” This shows that מ did not have at its disposition any MSS of ג, or י recensions. For if מ had access to ג or to any MS similar to the latter, the Hebrew verb לָם would probably be translated by מ based on the Greek translation (ה ἀφορέτα), “pretext, occasion, opportunity,” from the verb ἀφορέται, “to separate, excommunicate,” MSS 62, L-449-613 read μορφή). If a targumic tradition were behind its Vorlage, then מ would agree with the reading of י that translated מְלַל by מְלַלוֹ (particle ל plus Peal Perf. 2° masc. pl. of the verb רָפַת, “to sin, be guilty”). Therefore, for translating difficult words מ did not recur to any other version, but depended on the context of the passage. Furthermore, מ lacks the ambiguous אֵל found at the end of the מ, while ג, except MS 613) and י have it.

Ezek 5:8

לָם כִּחְדָּו אָמָר אֲדֹנֵי יְהֹוהֵה נַעֲלֹתִי נְעָלִים מֶטֶרֶפְּסִי בְּטָרֵפָּה מֵתִיתָן (מ)

םָלֶל מָלֶל בְּלַעַמְּלִי מָלֶלָה מָלֶלָה מָלֶלָה מָלֶלָה (י)
Analysis of the Variants

On the one hand, S is related to \( \Theta^T \) for both lack the emphatic phrase 'also I/ I myself' (only MS 63 of \( \Theta^A \), and \( \alpha' \), \( \theta' \) \( \kappa\alpha\gamma\varepsilon \) \( \epsilon\gamma\omega \), Cod. 86 and \( \sigma' \) \( \kappa\alpha\omega\tau\omicron\sigma\varsigma \) \( \epsilon\gamma\omega \) contain it). S, however, agrees with \( \Theta \) concerning the translation of the nominasacra as we have seen before (some MSS of \( \Theta^A \) contain \( \kappa\rho\upsilon\omicron\theta\omicron\) \( \alpha\delta\omicron\nu\omicron\alpha\omicron, \) 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 \( \Theta^T \) 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

\[(\text{Trans. of } S) \text{ "Therefore thus says the Lord of Authority, 'Behold I am against you and I will perform in your midst judgments in the eyes of the nations.'"} \]
(Col) διὰ τὸ τοῦτο Ἰησοῦ κύριος, εἰ μὴ ἀνθ' ὄν τὰ ἡγία μου ἐμήνας ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς βδελύγμασίν σου, κἀγὼ ἀπώσομαι σε, οὐφείστει μου τὸ ὀφθαλμὸς, κἀγὼ οὐκ ἔλεησον.

(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."

Analysis of the Variants

Although Ȼ, Ʌ, and Զ are similar to Ը, one word seems to be difficult for them to translate. It is the verb ἀνάβα, "I will diminish, withdraw," in the Imperf. from the root ἀν. The Syriac and Aramaic languages have a homonymous verb. It is the verb ḫts and ṣin: "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—ḵts and sin:—does not fit the context of the sentence. Therefore, there was a need for another verb, which was supplied by ἐπεράη in Ȼ, and ἐστημ in Զ, "to cut, break off" and "drive you out/ reject you," respectively. One may suggest that this is one of the few cases where Զ seems to be related to Ը. The latter has the verb ἀπώσομαι, "I will reject," from ἀπωθέω, similar in meaning to the Syriac verb ḫts, "drive you out/ reject you" (σ' συγκλάσω σε, "I will shatter you"). On the other hand, one word is not a proof for a direct relationship, for coincidence might be involved. Զ simply substituted a Syriac homonym for its Hebrew.
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 אֲדֹנָי אֱלֹהֵי, while in 6* (B, 927) by κύριος (MSS in 6*A rel. have αδώναι). Also the Hebrew prepositional phrase מַעְרָפָא אֶלֶף, “with all your detestable things,” was omitted in 6* (B) but it is present in 6*A, e.g., (ו, 86) en πασὶ τοῖς προσωπισμασί (ν) (θημασίαν V) sou καὶ en πασὶν (ν) (> cI) rel “with all your offenses,” and in σ τοῖς μασμασί sou, “your stain/defilement,” θ εν πασὶ τοῖς προσωπισμασίν sou καὶ en πασίν Qxt. Therefore, if the Syriac version is related to 6, the Syriac scribe had access to some of the MSS of 6*A that had the entire nominasacra and the reading omitted by 6*. 6 is also alien to the addition אַכֶּשֶׁהוּ תַּכְּךָ דַּרְעֶנָּךְ דַּלֶּא יִשְׂרָאֵל מַעְרָפ, “I will cut off the might of your arms for my Memra,” found in 6'.

**Ezek 5:12**

 Milano Ber. יָמְשִׁיכֶכֶם בְּדַבְּרֵי יֵלֵּדֶךָ, וְחַשְׁלִיתֶכֶם בְּבָרֶכֶם יִשְׂרָאֵל
 הבובתיות המלישיות לכל ויהי ימותך אריך אוריית kcal

(C) שֹׁלֵם לְמָעָלִים יַשְׁלַל בְּכָל עַסְכּוּא בְּבָרֶכֶם יִשְׂרָאֵל מַעְשֶׁה
 הבובתיות המלישיות לכל ויהי ימותך אריך אוריית kcal

(E) וְהָאֶלֶףְכּוּ יַשְׁלַל בְּכָל עַסְכּוּא בְּבָרֶכֶם יִשְׂרָאֵל מַעְשֶׁה
 הבובתיות המלישיות לכל ויהי ימותך אריך אוריית kcal

(6*) וְהָאֶלֶףְכּוּ יַשְׁלַל בְּכָל עַסְכּוּא בְּבָרֶכֶם יִשְׂרָאֵל מַעְשֶׁה
 הבובתיות המלישיות לכל ויהי ימותך אריך אוריית kcal
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Remarks on the Translation

The main point in this verse is the rendering of the ordinal number ῥοβῶν, “the third,” which is most of the time omitted in Ὁ due to its redundant usage in the Hebrew text. Ὁ reads τέταρτον, “the fourth,” for ῥοβῶν (except Cod. 86mγ that has μονον for the first instance and for the second μονον τρίτον; α’, Qεξι and θ’ read καὶ το τέταρτον σου). Probably the reading τέταρτον 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 (חֲרֵד בֵּית אֱלֹהִים, “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 τέταρτον, “fourth,” before ירה, “and by famine,” which fits the sense of this verse even though it is not in the original.

Ὕ is also similar to Ὁ, but it reads for the last part ἀριστερά αὐτοῖς, “and those who slay by the sword I will incite after them.” Therefore regarding this verse Ὁ is an independent translation based on a Hebrew text similar to Ὁ with a unique reading without any relationship to any version.
Ezek 5:14

(Trans. of S) “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 C agree with the reading of IR word by word. 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 (καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας σου) round about you, before all that pass by.” Only MSS 407 and 106 omitted this reading concerning θυγατέρας. See also vs. 15 where G has additions that are not present in the other versions, while S has a reading similar to that of IR.
(64) “I will send upon you famine and fierce beasts and they will destroy you, and pestilence and blood will pass through you, and I will bring a sword upon you. I the Lord have spoken.”

Analysis of the Variants

S has its own translation concerning the verbal sentence הָבַז, “and you will be bereaved.” It reads סָדַר, “and you will be deprived/destroyed/slain.” The Syriac language has a cognate word for the Hebrew verb הָבַז that is סֶדְר. The Hebrew ס corresponds to ס in some Semitic languages. This is a normal linguistic phenomenon. S, however, did not use its cognate verb but a completely different one. T employs the corresponding cognate verb, while T has a different reading: כָּלַח שְׁבֵּלָם ס, “and I will take vengeance upon you.” This may indicate that this verb (סֶדְר) 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 \(\mathfrak{M}\) regarding numerical figures (5:2).

4. Pluses and minuses of \(\mathfrak{G}\) and \(\mathfrak{C}'\) are alien to \(S\) (5:2).

5. \(S\) agrees with \(\mathfrak{M}\) concerning the translation of the \textit{nomina sacra}, while \(\mathfrak{G}^*\) has its typical \textit{kupios} (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 \(\mathfrak{G}\) that are against \(S\) (5:2, 14).
CHAPTER VII

EZEKIEL 6

Collation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:3</td>
<td>הָקִיאָהָהָהָה</td>
<td>&quot;and say.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:5</td>
<td>הָקִיאָהָהָהָה</td>
<td>&quot;and I will cast.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:6</td>
<td>הָקִיאָהָהָהָה</td>
<td>&quot;house&quot; (יַעֲנֵהֲנֵהֲנֵה &quot;sons&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:8</td>
<td>הָקִיאָהָהָהָה</td>
<td>&quot;of you.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:9</td>
<td>הָקִיאָהָהָהָה</td>
<td>&quot;and they will be scattered.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. Perf. w. waw consec. [הָקִיאָהָהָה] Peal Imper. הָקִיאָהָהָה "and say."  
N. m. s. הָקִיאָהָהָה Ethpe. Imperf. 3° m. pi. הָקִיאָהָהָה "who have escaped."  
N. Inf. Cstr. הָקִיאָהָהָה Ethpe. Imperf. 3° m. pi. הָקִיאָהָהָה "and they will be scattered."  
Q. Act. Ptc. f. pi. הָקִיאָהָהָה "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.
“Son of man, set your face against the mountains of Israel and prophesy against them.”

Analysis of the Variants

S is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of ו. Although ),$ is very similar to ו, it omits the idiomatic expression ספב, “set your face,” which is present in S and ג. This is a classical example of Hebraism in ג (อง המקום ציוו). ),$ reads כב, “receive the prophecy.”

Ezek 6:3

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
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 II; the only exception is with the form of the first verb of the verse. II has מָלַשׁ, “and (you will) say,” Qal Perf. 2° pers. sing., which with its waw consecutive is equal to the imperative, while S reads נִשָּׂא, “say,” Peal Imper. 2° m. s. CT and GET have the verb in the future tense: “and you shall say,” as יִשָּׂא, “and you shall say,” respectively. The Syriac version is a literal translation of the idiom of its Hebrew Vorlage. CT has also a unique reading regarding the Hebrew sentence אֶרֶץ מָלַשׁ חֶרֶב, “I am bringing against you a sword” (S and GET read similarly to II regarding this sentence); CT reads דַּאָמְנָתוּ יִלְעֵס עַל כְּפֶלֶם בּוֹרְבֵה, “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, אָדָן יְהֹוָה, “Adonai Yahweh,” GET keeps its usual way by omitting יְהֹוָה, and translating only יהוה by κυρίῳ. There are, however, some MSS in 6A that contain the Masoretic reading, e.g., 36, 763, and rel.

Ezek 6:4

(III) יָסְרָה מָכְרוֹזֶכֶם תַּשְׁבִּיכְנֶכֶם וּמָכְרוֹזֶכֶם תָּמִילִכֶנֶם לְפָנָיו נַלְיוּלִים

(5) מְרִים נֵבֹאָהוֹת וְמְבִיאָהוֹת חָפֵץ חָפֵץ מִכָּבוֹזֶכֶם תָּמִילִכֶנֶם וְסִיחֲנוֹת מַעֲשֵׂים שִׂיחֲנוֹת (5)

(5') וּצְגוּרָא אֲוַיְרִיכֵן וּתְבוּרְיוֹן תְּכוּנָּס בּוֹרְבֵיהוּ כָּפַר פִּינוֹר מַעֲשֵׂים (5')

(6') קַיִּי וַעֲדוּר וַעֲדוּר וַעֲדוּר וַעֲדוּר וַעֲדוּר מַעֲשֵׂים וַעֲדוּר מַעֲשֵׂים וַעֲדוּר מַעֲשֵׂים (6')
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τραυματίας ὑμῶν ἐνώπιον τῶν εἰδώλων ὑμῶν,

(Trans. of Σ) “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

Σ has its reading identical to Π, while at first glance Θ* seems to have omitted the Hebrew verb וַעֲשֵׂבָה, “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 (וַעֲשֵׂבָה) in the Greek text. In other words, Θ* substitutes the introductory verb וַתִּשְׁמָר, “and they will be desolate” by καὶ συντριβήθησονται, “and they will be broken into pieces,” or it seems that Θ* dislocates backwards the second Hebrew verb (וַעֲשֵׂבָה) and omits the first one. Notice, however, that some MSS of Θ* contain the Masoretic reading, e.g., αφανισθήσεται (-σονται 46, 106) τα θυσι. υμῶν καὶ συντριβήσεται (-σονται 211; > 106; καὶ συντριβ. sub 0 Ω) Ο' Λ'-311, 106 “your altars will be destroyed and broken.” The Hexaplaric witnesses read, init. -2° καὶ] α', θ' καὶ αφανισθήσεται (π' καὶ αφανισθησονται 86) τα θυσιαστήρια υμῶν καὶ συντριβήσεται QX; α', θ' καὶ συντριβήσουσαι 86; ω καὶ συνκλαίσθησονται, “they will be shattered,” 86.

The only possibility for Σ is to have been based on a Hebrew text similar to Π.

Another deviation of Θ* is the rendering of εἰδώλη ὑμῶν, “your pillars/incense altars,” by the phrase τὰ τεμένη ὑμῶν, “your sacred things” (α' ἔσονα “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. $\mathcal{C}$ contains some explanatory additions, e.g., “your decaying idols,” and $\mathcal{C}^*$, “your heathen altars.”

Ezek 6:5

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 הַעֲרָתִים, “house of Israel,” for the Hebrew בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, “sons of Israel,” whereas $\mathfrak{M}$ 12a1 has the Masoretic reading בֵּין. $\mathcal{C}$ 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 וְהָעְרָתִים, “and I will set, put, lay,” by רָעָתִים, “and I will cast.” Even though the main sense of רָעָתִים 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 $\mathfrak{G}$ containing the Greek verb ἀνέγραψεν, “I will give,” which sounds more like a Hebraism than a good Greek translation.

$\mathfrak{G}^*$ (B, 106) omits the entire first clause from הַעֲרָתִים. On the one hand MSS of $\mathfrak{G}$ contain it, e.g., καὶ διάδοται τὰ πτωματα (pars. 233) τῶν (> 62m, C¹-87,
86*-239', 26) ἵνα Ἰσραήλ κατα (καὶ το 407) προσώπου τῶν εἰδώλων αὐτῶν, rel. On the other hand they read ἵνα Ἰσραήλ in the same way as ἴνα. Consequently S has a unique reading concerning Ἰσραήλ, "sons of Israel."

Ezek 6:6

S and Σ mostly agree with ἴνα with the exception of ἐξαραστέας, "and they will be made guilty." They substituted this verb, probably based on contextual exegesis, by ἅρπαξ and
“and they will be desolate.” Another possibility is that the Syriac scribe may have confused the radicals of the verbs רוש, “to ruin,” and חסא, “to make guilty,” as well as the verb from vs. 4, לוד, “to become desolate.” Thus the Syriac scribe decided to translate all of them by the same Syriac verb רוש, “to become desolate.” 7 also deviates from IR by omitting this verb (לוד). Further Septuagintal minuses are ולכHon, “and they will be destroyed,” and ומיוער מקיע, “and wipe out your works,” and plus are קאא אקארהאשפא רח בקעמ, “and your sacred things be abolished.” Some MSS of 7A contain a reading corresponding to ולכHon, “and they will be destroyed,” with slight variation, e.g., קאא אקארהאשפא, “they will cease” (X O, -88), O-407, L-51-311, also a X in 7Q, 7Q, and 86.

The unique reading of 7א קאא אקארהאשפא רח בקעמ, “and your sacred things/areas will be abolished,” is rendered by בואנה, “wooden image,” in 7’s version as in the preceding verse. The final omission (ומיוער מקיע, “and your works will be wiped out”) of 7 (MSS B, 233) is present in some MSS of 7A, e.g., (X O, 449) קאא אקארהאשפא ומיוער מקיע, “and your works will be wiped out.” 7 contains the Hebrew reading regarding the last portion ומיוער מקיע, “and your works will be blotted out,” as also occurs in some MSS of 7A.

Ezek 6:8
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(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 CJ agree mostly with the reading of Ṣ. CJ has the same word order, while S rearranged the text avoiding a construct chain (בִּלְדָה יֵרְדֵּם). S is closely related to Ṣ regarding its vocabulary. Ṣ* (B C'1-87-86'-393, 106), however, omits the first Hebrew word, "and I will leave." Several MSS of ṢA have υπολευκομαί, "I will leave a remaining portion," e.g., (ψω 147) rel. Also θ' and Qtxt have an asterisk with this reading indicating that their Vorlagen had it.

The Hebrew idiomatic expression, Inf. Cstr. + לְכָּבָה, was rendered as סכִיחַ, "a part/some of you," in the Syriac version. Note the Hebraism in ΘΤ ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι ἓξ ὑμῶν, except in MS L'1-311 that reads του γεν, and in MS 62 (I°) that has ἐν τῷ εἶναι.

Ezek 6:9

(aseña) מִכְּלָב מַעֲלִים בָּנָיִם כְּאֶֽרֶץ בָּשָּׁם נִכְּשֵׁהוֹת אֶֽרֶץ רַחֲבָּה צְרִיכָה כָּר מֶטֶל

זֶהָֽה תְּעִיֵּנְתִּי יְמִינוֹת אֶלְּלָה יְהוֹת אֶלְּלָה יְנוּמָהוֹת אֶלְּלָה יְמִינוֹת אֶלְּלָה יְנוּמָהוֹת

(엽) מִכְּלָב מַעֲלִים בָּנָיִם כְּאֶֽרֶץ בָּשָּׁם נִכְּשֵׁהוֹת אֶֽרֶץ רַחֲבָּה צְרִיכָה כָּר מֶטֶל
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 V with some editorial rearrangement of the text, e.g., construct chains are avoided, and the redundant repetition of the Participle ἀνέπαφος, “adulterous,” is substituted by the Peal Perf. 3° pl. verb הָלַכְתֵּנָּם, “they have gone astray,” probably to avoid monotonous repetition. ס has some interpretative substitution, e.g., בֵּדְלָעָמָּם, “my worship,” for רֹאשׁ, “me,” probably indicating that the people were worshiping strange gods, idols, as is implied in the context.

ג is very different from S, צ, and V. It has several substitutions which are supported by almost all its MSS. Concerning the sentence אָמַרְתִּי לְךָ, “when I have
broken for myself" (Ni. form with middle voice sense), OT reads δμωμοκα, "I have sworn"; the only exception is MS 62 that has συνεστρυμα, "I will shatter." The Hebrew word behind δμωμοκα is ἡσθῃμα, "I have sworn," which is also present in OT. BHS suggests ἔφυξα (Qal cf. α', θ' συνεστρυμα, and α' συγκατεκαζα, "I will bring down/destroy") as an alternative reading for the Hebrew Ni. perf. 1 c. sing. ἔφυξα "when I have broken for myself." S reads ἔφυξα, "when I have destroyed," in the active form (Peal) as the vocalization suggested by BHS (Qal form). It does not mean, however, that the S’s Vorlage had it (ττττττ ττττττ) in the active voice (θ' συνεστρυμα) 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, 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.

OT translates both instances of the participle ἔφυξα, and it has general support of its MSS (see Σ in Göttingen edition), while S substitutes for the second instance of it as

---


2Lund, 418.
mentioned above. In addition, $\text{ XI}$ reads εντελεχώς απαντάν, “their practices,” for “their idols.” The only MS similar to $\text{ XI}$ is MS 62 that reads εμβλέψων.

The Hebrew verb 'יָּפָּרָה from כָּל, “and they will abhor, be unwilling, be reluctant, be loathsome,” seems to have been difficult to be understood by all the versions. $\text{ XI}$ has κόσμων ῥίμα, “they will mourn,” instead of this verb (only MS 62 1° reads καὶ προσοψθείωσι, “and they will be angry, provoked/offended”); $\Sigma$ reads μεταξομετιχόντα, “they will be contracted [as in pain, wrinkled]”; $\text{ Τ}$ reads τοιχωμένοις, “they will feel remorse, regret.” This verse is clear evidence supporting a noninterrelationship of $\Sigma$ to any other version, but to a Hebrew Vorlage similar to $\text{ XI}$.

Ezek 6:10

(\text{ XI}) יִדְעוּ כִּי אֵלָי יְהוָה לֹא אֶל תֹּבֵּךְ בְּרָדְתְךָ לַעֲשָׂתָה לִשְׁרֵךְ הָעָה

($\Sigma$) וְיִדְעוּ אֵלָי נְאָה וֹיִכְתַּב אֵלָי בְּרָדְתְךָ לַעֲשָׂתָה לִשְׁרֵךְ הָעָה

($\text{ Τ}$) וְיִדְעוּ אֵלָי נְאָה וֹיִכְתַּב אֵלָי בְּרָדְתְךָ לַעֲשָׂתָה לִשְׁרֵךְ הָעָה וְזֶה בִּשְׁמָוֶה הָאָד

($\text{ XI}$) וְיִדְעוּ אֵלָי נְאָה וֹיִכְתַּב אֵלָי בְּרָדְתְךָ לַעֲשָׂתָה לִשְׁרֵךְ הָעָה וְזֶה בִּשְׁמָוֶה הָאָד

(Trans. of $\Sigma$) “And they will know that I am the Lord, and that I have not said in vain that I would do this evil to them.”

Analysis of the Variants

$\Sigma$ agrees with the reading of $\text{ XI}$ with a single modification of a nonfinite form of the verb (לעשתה “to make”) to a finite one (לעשוה I will do”). The only targumic addition is “my Memra,” which is a common targumic characteristic. Although $\text{ XI}$ 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 $\text{\textit{G}}$ that read like $\text{\textit{M}}$, e.g., ouk eis òwrear tou (tou\n 311) ποιησαι αυτοίς απαντά (παντά 538) το κακά ταύτα (αυτών 410), and rel.
The same reading is present in $\delta$ and $\text{\textit{Q}}$ marked by a * ouk eis òwrear tou ποιησαι
αυτοίς απαντά το κακά ταύτα. In this case $S$ is an independent translation avoiding the
targumic interpretation and the omission of $\text{\textit{G}}$.

Ezek 6:11

(\textit{M}) (I) ςαμάρι υποθετεῖ τι πρόκειται το νάμον του αίματος.\
καλεῖ λατρεύει αυτή την υποθέση.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμίνος αυτής δεν μπορεί να είναι τύπος.\
καμί

(\textit{S}*) τάδε λέγει κύριος Κράτησον τή χειρί καὶ ψώφησον τῷ ποδί καὶ εἶπόν Εὖγε
εὖγε ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς βδελύγμασιν οἰκον Ἰσραήλ· ἐν ρομφαίᾳ καὶ ἐν θανάτῳ καὶ
ἐν λιμῷ πεσόνται.
(Trans. of $S$) “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 Π, while Φ has a transposition between נמר, “by famine,” and נמר, “and by pestilence,” namely זאואאאא, “pestilence,” and לםא, “famine.” Some MSS of φA contain the Masoretic word order, e.g., O’, L’-
534-403’. Ε agrees mostly with Π in its rendering of the text. The only deviation is the verb רשה, “they will fall,” which was translated by וְהָשָּׁם, “they will be removed.” S translates both proper names מְשָׁרָה as usual, while Φ renders only נַעַרָה. Some MSS of φA read like Π regarding nomina sacra, e.g., A, O’, L’-46-311, C.

Ezek 6:12

ור_totals בדבד ימות זכרים בחרב יפים ותapro יגור וגו וגו והנה כי אחד וגו כי הוא בק
(Π) A 1


([Π] A 1)

ור_totals נהתנה מתמהנה, נשתנה מתנה מתנה, נשתנה מתנה מתנה, נשתנה מתנה מתנה (כ encore)

דרודק בדיחא ימות זכרים בחרב יפים ותapro יגור וגו וגו (Ε)

ויועל לארץ צירא בךמא ימות ויהול רמי בynch
(Φ) ο γεγονός ἐν βαρμαία πεσείται, ο δὲ μακρὰν ἐν θανάτῳ τελευτήσει, καὶ ο
περιεχόμενος ἐν λεύψι συντελεσθήσεται, καὶ συντελέσω τὴν ὀργήν μου ἐν
αὐτοῦς.

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

$S$ is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of $\Pi$ with only a different word order (transposition) regarding the two words $\text{מִרְעָה}$, "by pestilence they will die." $CJ$ may have had a different recension or undergone some epexegetical interpretation based on the context; for it reads $\text{מִרְעָה}, "he who enters the besieged fortification/fortified cities will perish by famine," following the $\mathfrak{G}^*$ reading, καὶ ὁ περιεχόμενος ἐν λιμῷ συντελεσθεῖται, "and he who is in the siege will be consumed by famine." Some MSS of $\mathfrak{G}^\text{A}$ contain the Masoretic reading, e.g., A 22, O-62', 538-449, 239'-403' καὶ ὁ ἀπολειφθεὶς, "and the one who remains," and MSS L-311-V-46-ZV, 410 read καὶ ὁ περιεχομένος, and the Hexaplaric witnesses are ς' ὁ πολιορκούμενος, θ' has an asterisk marking its reading ἄπολειφθεὶς Q\text{ext}, Cod. 86 and λ' καὶ οἱ περιεχθέντες.

Ezek 6:13

(\Pi) וּדְרַעְתָּם כְּאֶזְיֹת בְּתוּלִיָּה בְּתוּלִיָּה נָלְחָלוֹת נָלְחָלוֹת מְבִית מֹבִית (S) וּדְרַעְתָּם כְּאֶזְיֹת בְּתוּלִיָּה בְּתוּלִיָּה נָלְחָלוֹת נָלְחָלוֹת מְבִית מְבִית

(CJ) προσεκλὴσαμένος, διὰ τοῦτο μεσάρες, διὰ διαθέσεως τοῦ τελευταίου μεσάρες. προσεκλὴσαμένος, διὰ τοῦτο μεσάρες, διὰ διαθέσεως τοῦ τελευταίου μεσάρες. διαθέσεως τοῦ τελευταίου μεσάρες. προσεκλὴσαμένος, διὰ τοῦτο μεσάρες, διὰ διαθέσεως τοῦ τελευταίου μεσάρες.

(\Pi) וּדְרַעְתָּם כְּאֶזְיֹת בְּתוּלִיָּה בְּתוּלִיָּה נָלְחָלוֹת נָלְחָלוֹת מְבִית מְבִית

(CJ) προσεκλὴσαμένος, διὰ τοῦτο μεσάρες, διὰ διαθέσεως τοῦ τελευταίου μεσάρες. προσεκλὴσαμένος, διὰ τοῦτο μεσάরες, διὰ διαθέσεως τοῦ τελευταίου μεσάρες. προσεκλὴσαμένος, διὰ τοῦτο μεσάρες, διὰ διαθέσεως τοῦ τελευταίου μεσάρες. προσεκλὴσαμένος, διὰ τοῦτο μεσάρες, διὰ διαθέσεως τοῦ τελευταίου μεσάրες. προσεκλὴσαμένος, διὰ τοῦτο μεσάρες, διὰ διαθέσεως τοῦ τελευταίου μεσάρες. προσεκλὴσαμένος, διὰ τοῦτο μεσάρες, διὰ διαθέσεως τοῦ τελευταίου μεσάרες.
146

(Trans. of S) "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 מ. While ג* (B) omitted some key phrases, e.g., בְּכָל רָאשֵׁי הָרָהְרֵים, "on every top of the mountains," and מֹשֶׁה כְּלָל אַלָּל עָבָה, "and under every leafy oak," there are some MSS of ג* that contain these two minuses. A group of these MSS have the first part, e.g., (X O) כְּלִי (מ' 311, 239, 403') πασαίς (+ ταῖς V-449) κωπαίς τῶν (> 26) ὀρεών rel, "and in every top of the mountains." The second minus is present in (X O) καὶ ὑποκάτω πασᾶς (> C' 393, 26) δροος δαο(ε)ιας rel, "and under every bushy tree."

Another interpretative translation that does not change the original sense is the rendering of נַחֲנַה נַחַר, "pleasing aroma." S translates it by רָשָׁם, "incense," כ has קָרַבִּין לְפָלַח, "sacrifice for the worship of," and ג* ὀμῆν εὐωδίας, "sweet savor."
Ezek 6:14

Then 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 habitation. 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 דבלת, “Diblath.” This \( he \) is a he locale indicating direction “toward, to.”\(^1\) 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. \( \text{See} \) transliterated it as part of the word itself, \( \Delta\epsilon\beta\lambda\alpha\beta\alpha \). \( \mathbf{C}’ \) has “from the wilderness of Diblat,” or “more than the wilderness of Diblat.” \( \mathbf{S} \) reads similarly to \( \mathbf{C}’ \)

indicating delimitation or comparison. Scholars have recognized that the *hapax legomenon* Diblah probably involved the common scribal error, י for י, 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" (רַבֵּרלָה).

Concerning $\mathcal{C}'$, it avoids anthropomorphism by substituting "my hand" by "my destructive power." $\mathcal{S}$ completely ignores this interpretative translation.

Another deviation of $\mathfrak{G}^*$ is that it has ἐπιγνώσεσθε, "you will know," instead of the Hebrew רוּדְע "and they will know," while $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{C}'$ agree with $\mathcal{M}$ regarding this reading. Some MSS of $\mathfrak{G}^\text{A}$, however (L'-311-ZV), read ἐπιγνωσονται as in $\mathcal{M}$. These nonshared readings of the versions indicate a dynamic process in their translations.

### Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 6

1. $\mathcal{S}$ is most of the time a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of $\mathcal{M}$.

2. Concerning *nominasaecula* $\mathcal{S}$ is always consistent and in agreement with $\mathcal{M}$, while $\mathfrak{G}^*$ has its deviations (6:3, 11).

3. $\mathcal{S}$ has some unique readings, e.g., סך for סכת (6:5).

---

1. ֵאֲרֵיא תִּרְבּות רְבִּרְלָה cannot = 'from the wilderness of Diblathah,' as the punctuation intends, because the second word is an accus. = 'to Diblah,' not a gen.; 1. "מְסֵרָר רַבֵּרְלָה. $\mathfrak{G} \Delta eβλάθα (so Jer. 529.26.27, 4 Regn. 2333 cod.$\text{A})$ follows $\mathcal{M}$, 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. $\mathcal{S}$ 'desolate more than the land of Dablath,' but in the Ambr. and other MSS 'and I will make the land a destruction and an astonishment from the wilderness of Dablath.'" 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 $S^T$.

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
וַיִּשָּׁמַעֽוּ שְׁמַעֽוּ הָאָשֶׁר יָשַׁרְתָּהּ // saying, they heard the things that she had heard // tr.

7:6
וַיִּשָּׁמַעֽוּ שְׁמַעֽוּ הָאָשֶׁר יָשַׁרְתָּהּ // om.

7:3
וַיִּשָּׁמַעֽוּ שְׁמַעֽוּ הָאָשֶׁר יָשַׁרְתָּהּ // tr.

7:7
וַיִּשָּׁמַעֽוּ שְׁמַעֽוּ הָאָשֶׁר יָשַׁרְתָּהּ // homonym בֶּן דְּסֶדֶר “dawn, day-break.”

7:4
וַיִּשָּׁמַעֽוּ שְׁמַעֽוּ הָאָשֶׁר יָשַׁרְתָּהּ // sy. Peal Perf. 3° m. s. “has come.”

7:5
וַיִּשָּׁמַעֽוּ שְׁמַעֽוּ הָאָשֶׁר יָשַׁרְתָּהּ // om.

7:8
וַיִּשָּׁמַעֽוּ שְׁמַעֽוּ הָאָשֶׁר יָשַׁרְתָּהּ // כִּבָּל “for, instead, because, on account of.”

לָלֹא וּרְבִּימָּה // I will pour.”

םֶלֶמֶךְ // upon you.”

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
7:9
pr. נָאָל "but."
ומַשָּׁל om. (MSS 6h15, 7h2, 8al6, 9d1.2, 10d1, 11d1.2, 12a1, 12d1-3 have it after "my eyes.").
Q. Perf. 1º c. s. נָאָל Peal Perf. 1º c. s. + Object pron. נָאָל נָאָל "I will repay you, reward you."
2º f. s. נָאָל נָאָל "and you will know."
Hi. Ptc. m. s. נָאָל נָאָל Peal Ptc. m. s. + 2º f. s. נָאָל נָאָל "who have smitten."
7:10
20 om.
7:11
"and injustice."
"disorder, tumult."
"from their works."
7:12
Hi. Perf. 3º m. s. נָאָל נָאָל Adj. נָאָל נָאָל "and near."
"their purchase, possession."
7:13
om.
"now they have smitten / לא ישב] tr.
Q. Imperf. נָאָל נָאָל Peal Perf. נָאָל נָאָל "in their lives."
7:14
Hi. Inf. Abs. נָאָל נָאָל Peal Perf. 3º pl. נָאָל נָאָל "they got ready."
"their purchase, possession."
7:15
"in the house."
"I will not rest on them."
7:16
Q. Perf. 3° pl. וסלק ל השנה [Peal Imperf. 3° pl. מחלקלק "and they will escape."
those who escape from them."
□ r p c r b s m a m i ^ * ^ -a A o s.i ^ A n f
"those who escape from them."
□ om.
valleys" נדנדה "crags, ledges."
Q. Ptc. f. pl. והנה "to moan"
Peal Imperf. 3° m. pl. מחלקלק "they will die."
שנילסמנס, בותיה "in his sins."
7:19
Prep. + n. f. s. + Q. Imperf. והנה יוהי [Aphel Pass. Ptc. m. s. חסלי נמש "they will be despised."
ם [pl.
דם [ר "torment."
וי om.
7:20
Q. Perf. [tr. לָצָאתם מָזוֹה "they made."
□ om.
because of this."
Q. Perf. 1° c. s. + suf. בֶּנְאָי Peal Perf. 1° c. s. + suf. חסלי מ "I have made it."
Prep. + n. f. s. לעדו [Aphel Pass. Ptc. חסלי "despised."
7:22
"My treasure place" קפלא [דֵּת "my watchtower."
7:23
Q. Imper. 2° m. s. הָשָׁה [Peal Imperf. 3° m. pl. מחלקלק "and they will cross, invade."
דם [ר "with bricks, mud, mixture."
דם [חמה "iniquity."
Chapter 7 of Ezekiel is one of the most important chapters for establishing the relationship, if any, of $S$ to any other version, especially $G$. Notice that the verse order of $G^T$ 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**

תואם בן אדום本国 אריות יתייחס לארץ ישראל כל ב ואוקי על ארצות כנופת הארץ (M)

$S$)

ככל עד היום התמיד אחזת מכסה, אחזת כץ, מכסה, מכסה, מכסה, מכסה, מכסה, מכסה (S)

אש בר אדום本国 אפרים את אלוהים לארץ ישראל (G)
(०*) Kai σὺ, υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου, εἶπον Τάδε λέγει κύριος τῇ γῇ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ 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 ०* share the same extra-Masoretic variant regarding the addition of the Imper. ०° s. of εἴη, "say," and εἶπον, "say," respectively, before καὶ οὖν, γῇ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ λέγει, "thus says the Lord. . ." On the other hand, several MSS of ० ल do not have this plus in their texts, e.g., MSS ॐ-ॐ, ॐ-ॐ. Regarding this addition ॐ agrees with ॐ'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 λέγει—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 ०* 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 nominasacra as usual against the minus of it in ०*’s reading (‘❉). Notice that most of the MSS of the latter version contain the Masoretic reading ‘❉.

---

1R. 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 "will send." Instead S has ἐπιθέω, “and I will cast, throw, pour.” It seems more an interpretative rendering, rather than an actual reading. On the other hand, MS 9a1 of S reads ἔστημεν, “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 MT 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 ἀγέρ, “my anger,” but some MSS of 6A contain the phrase τοῦ
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Regarding the preposition "in" (in \(^{n-3}\)), \(\textit{S}^\star\) omits it, while MSS L'-311-ZV read \(\text{κρατω} \ \text{σε κατά τὰς οδους}\.\) Although MSS L'-311-ZV read close to the Masoretic reading, they have the same verse order of \(\textit{S}^\star\). Therefore if \(\textit{S}\) had any relationship to \(\textit{S}^\star\), \(\textit{S}\) would not be able to have the same verse order as in M. Although \(\textit{\Upsilon}\) has its paraphrases, it agrees with the verse order of M.

Ezek 7:5

(\(\text{M}\)) হে যার গোপনীয় উপদেশ এবং স্বর্ণ জাতীয় বহু বিশ্বাস

(\(\text{S}\)) সেখানে আরো চিন্তা করে সেই স্বর্ণ জাতীয় বহু বিশ্বাস

(\(\text{\Upsilon}\)) সেখানে আরো চিন্তা করে সেই স্বর্ণ জাতীয় বহু বিশ্বাস

(9 of \(\text{\Upsilon}'\)) διαταγή τάδε 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 \(\text{\Upsilon}\) agree mostly with the Masoretic reading. Their only deviation is the rendering of the numerical noun নন্ন, “one.” Instead they have সলাম, “for, instead, because, on account of,” and বসত, “after,” respectively. \(\textit{S}^\star\) lacks the entire clause regarding নন্ন. Several MSS of \(\textit{\Upsilon}\), however, contain a reading similar to the Masoretic regarding নন্ন, e.g., MSS 410, 534, L-311-V-46-ZV κακία μη κακία ηδον παρεστάνω της or ερχεται.

Regarding \textit{nomina sacra} \(\textit{S}\) has its usual Syriac counterpart \(\textit{Lord of Authority},\) while \(\textit{S}^\star\) reads only κύριος. Several MSS of \(\textit{\Upsilon}\) read αδωνατ, e.g., L-311-V-...
46-ZY, etc., while others have twice κυριος, e.g., O-Q C’-87-130-233-86-403’. α’, α’, and θ’ have άδωναι prior to κυριος, and also have the missing clause of Φ

(וְזָה) Ezek 7:6/7

Analysis of the Variants

These are very controversial verses regarding their composition. All three versions—Φ, 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 סן and 'ר הת, and one homoioteleuton type of error by jumping the eyes from the first אלי to the second אליא, and continuing from there on.

S, however, contains vs. 6 with some minuses regarding פ. It omits the phrases והנה הבאה סן and renders הקים, “awakened,” by מָתָא, “wearying, annoying, distressing, afflicting.” Regarding vs. 7, S has a substitution as in ג, but both differ in vocabulary. Both omit the last nominal sentence והנה רד רד, “and not of joyful shouting mountains,” and substituted המהמה, “tumult,” by מָתָא, “of destruction, trouble,” and מָתָא פָּתָא ספָּת אֵלֶּה, “not with tumult, nor with pangs,” respectively. ג has an interpretative reading by reading סלואז מְלָכָה, “the kingdom has been revealed,” and היה לָאָשֶׁר יָבִא מִזְמַר מְסָר. It shows that if a scribe (whether of ג, or S, or ג) had at his hand another version to consult, some similarities between the versions would be observed in this verse.

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

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

(Trans. of S) "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

ST renders a translation similar to that of מ, and also is similar to the latter one despite its interpretative additions. Although S has a reading very close to that of מ, it contains a unique reading. This extra-Masoretic reading is the rendering of the Hebrew verb הְשֵׁבָה, "and I will accomplish," by סְפֹּרַנְו, "and I will pour." סְפֹּרַנְו is the same verbal expression used before in the same verse for the Hebrew word וְשִׁיבֶה, "I will pour." Probably S harmonizes the text rather than being based on a different Vorlage from that of מ.
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 abomina\t\t\tion 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 תָּֽן, “I will give,” is rendered by תָּֽןָּֽןָּֽן, “I will pay you back.” S gives its characteristic identificatory1 expression, almost with the same sense of a copula (Syriac copula idiom) כִּי אָנִי יִהְיֶה, “that I am the Lord,” for the Hebrew כִּי אָנִי יִהְיֶה, "that I am the Lord," and the addition of the suffixed pronoun as the direct object of the relative participle כִּי אָנִי יִהְיֶה, “who has smitten you.”

---

1 Muraoka, § 105, b.
S has a similar reading to that of ֗י regarding the number of the verb ֗ה. 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.

֗י has ֗s. “you will know,” and ֗ reads ֗s. “and you will know.” The Syriac feminine suffixed pronoun (֗) 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 (֗) may refer back to the inhabitants of the land. ֗ has several targumic additions which are completely absent in ֗, ֗, and ֗.

Ezek 7:10

(֗) 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 ֗ indicates that its Vorlage had a text similar to that of ֗. ֗ smooths...
the flowing of the text by omitting the redundant repetition of the 2° הָבָה, "behold," while
כָּלָה has an entire additional sentence לוֹדַע הָפָסָה הַכָּלָה, "behold the end has come,"
before the 1° הָבָה. Some MSS of כָּלָה, however, contain an additional reading prior to the
aforementioned addition, לוֹדַע הָפָסָה הַכָּלָה] וְהָפָסָה הַכָּלָה אֲדֹנָי קָרֵי הָלָהְךָ לְ-311-
זָע; וְהָפָסָה הַכָּלָה אֲדֹנָי קָרֵי אֲדֹנָי 62 and 770. It shows the diversity existent among the
witnesses of כָּלָה.

כָּלָה (B) omits the entire clause הָבָה הָפָסָה הַכָּלָה, "behold it comes, has gone out,
the diadem/doom?/plait?," whereas several MSS of כָּלָה (rel.) contain it as נֶבֶל הַכָּלָה נֶבֶל כָּלָה, "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 כָּלָה and its
different rendering by some MSS of כָּלָה are clear evidence that all of them—כָּלָה and
cָּלָה—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 כָּלָה is a case of polysemy. כָּלָה translated it by its Syriac cognate
word, which has only one sense, "dawn, early morning, daybreak" (see 7:6/7). כָּלָה
translated it by נֶבֶל, "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").

כָּלָה renders the Hebrew כָּלָה, "behold the day of
retribution," which is an acceptable rendering, and substitutes כָּלָה with כָּלָה.

---

“the kingdom has been revealed,” which seems to be an interpretative translation. Consequently, S, on its own, has nothing to do with 6 and C'.

Ezek 7:11

(Trans. of S) “Injustice has grown up on the 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, S is similar to M concerning the first part of the verse מִדְּנָה לִפְתָּא לְא הַתּוּ הָא לִסְמוֹת הָא לִסְמוֹת הָא לִסְמוֹת הָא לִסְמוֹת הָא לִסְמוֹת הָא לִסְמוֹת הָא לִסְמוֹת הָא לִסְמוֹת הָא לִסְמוֹת H, “injustice has grown up upon a wicked staff,” which is very close to Aquila’s version too. Whereas 6T reads καὶ συντρίψει στήριγμα ανόμου καὶ οὐ μετὰ θορύβου οὐδὲ μετὰ σπουδῆς, “and he will break the firmness of the lawless,” a’ has αὕτη ανέστη εἰς ραβδὸν αθεσίας, “injustice has grown into a faithless staff,” and o’ as well as Cod. 86 have Ὑπενέξεια εστάθηκεν εἰς προσκλίσιν (-κλεον 86) ἀνομίας, “avarice has grown up into a lawless inclination.” C'}
has an interpretative translation, "violent men have arisen to support the wicked ones." $S$ and $\alpha'$ have the closest reading to that of $\text{IR}$.

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 [none?] 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 [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 נָנָה into a more understandable word נָה, "to rest." $\text{ST}$ renders it by καὶ οὐ μετὰ θορύβου οὐδὲ μετὰ σπουδῆς, "neither with tumult, nor with haste," which is also an interpretative rendering. $\text{C}$ also resorted to the same translation technique, rendering it into a highly interpretative

---

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


3 Although some MSS of $\text{G}^\text{A} (G^\text{*} B)$ have a rendering of this section, they are all with a different sense, e.g., καὶ οὐκ εῖ ἀυτῶν εἰσίν οὐδὲ ὀφαλμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, "none of them, nor there will be adornment among them," rel. $\text{a'}$, and Cod. 86 οὐδὲ εἰ ἀχορτασίας αὐτῶν οὐδὲ εἰ τοῦ καλλοῦς αὐτῶν, "neither from their ravenous hunger, nor from their beauty," and $\theta'$ has a *καὶ οὐκ εἰ ἀυτῶν εἰσίν οὐτε ὀφαλμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, "none of them, nor will there be adornment among them,* Q$\text{Q}$. 
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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**

(יר) בַּאֲשֶׁר הָעָיִן דְּהוֹן הַדָּקָה אֶל יִשְׂמָה הַמְּדָרָר אֵל יַעֲבְלוֹל כִּי חוֹרָה אֵל כִּיִּיחְדֵּה (S)

(ס) מֵעַל אֶחָד מְסַפֵּר מְסַפֵּר מִמֶּךָ, לֹא מְסַפֵּר מְסַפֵּר

(ת) לֹא מְסַפֵּר לֹא מְסַפֵּר בְּשָׁבָת מְסַפֵּר.

(א) מְסַפֵּר עָלָיו חָסִיל יִשְׂמָה הַמְּדָרָר אֵל מְרוּשָׁה הַפָּה (ד')

לֹא מְרוּשָׁה לֹא מְרוּשָׁה לֹא מְרוּשָׁה לֹא מְרוּשָׁה לֹא מְרוּשָׁה (פ')

(Trans. of S) “The time has come, the day draws near. Let not the buyer rejoice nor the seller grieve for it, because wrath is upon all their possession.”

**Analysis of the Variants**

S agrees mostly withיר; deviations are the predicative attributive adjective (near, close”), instead of the verb, “it draws near,” and the substitution of the noun multitude, “their purchase/belonging/possession,” which might be an exegetical interpretation of the Hebrew word multitude, implying the totality of...
their possessions, since the context is about sellers and buyers. \( \text{T}^* \) lacks the entire subordinate nominal clause. \( \text{The following MSS of } \text{T}^A, \text{ though with some minor variants from each other, read similarly to that of } \text{MT (X O and } \theta^* \text{) Cod. 88, L'-311-ZV, 147', 534, 538, 130 etc., } \text{late } \sigma \tau \theta \rho q \varepsilon \nu \pi \alpha \nu \nu \tau o \tau o \\text{to } \pi \lambda \nu \theta o s ("multitudes") \text{ aor. } \text{C1 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."}^1 \text{ }

By the substitution of } \text{בָּדָה, } \text{S makes a contextual exegetical harmonization. The word } \text{מיָּשֶׁה, "their purchase, belonging," may be a contextualization with } \text{משנה, "buyer," and } \text{משנה, "seller." Regarding the possessive pronoun of } \text{משנה ("their-“) } \text{S is related to } \text{T}^A (\sigma e o r o n e o) \text{ and } \text{T}^I (\sigma e o r o n e o "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.}

\( \text{S does not have the explanatory additions of } \text{T}^I \text{ nor the omission of } \text{T}^*. \text{ On the contrary, } \text{S has a unique reading that supports its independent translation and transmission.} \)

Ezek 7:13

כִּי הַמְּמָכְר עַל הַמְּמָכְר לֵא תִּשְׁמַר עַד בּוֹזֵי חֲזָצֵי כָּי (MT)

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."
Because neither will vision return on all their possession, nor will a man in his iniquity retain his life.”

Analysis of the Variants

Despite its different word order, S agrees mostly with L. δ' renders the first subordinate clause by διότι ὁ κτώμενος πρὸς τὸν πωλοῦντα οὐκέτι μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃ, καὶ ἀνθρώπος ἐν ὀφθαλμῷ ζωῆς αὐτοῦ οὐ κρατήσει.

(Trans. of S) “[As] the seller returns not to [his] sale, so also life in their life span.

Concerning the second subordinate (circumstantial nominal) clause (τῷ "while

1"For 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 (גא"כ, “for vision...”), Ḥ* omits them, while several MSS of ḤＡ contain them with some variations among its witnesses, e.g., (🗯 Օ 86) καὶ ετὶ (ουκετὶ 46, C-534; 106) ἐν (+ τὴ 147, 106) ζωὴ τοῦ ζῆν αὐτῶν (-του 147') ὀτὶ ὁμοῖος εἰς παν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῆς (+ καὶ 46 534-86’m) οὐκ ἀνακαμψει (ἀναστρέψει 26), “still in life, their lives, because vision will not return to her multitudes,” rel. The last part of the verse is translated by Ḥ* as καὶ ἀνθρωπὸς ἐν ὀφθαλμῷ (ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς Λ’-311-ZV, C’-403’) ζωὴς αὐτοῦ οὐ κρατήσει, “and a man will not grab with the eye his life,” against the גבר and S readings. Ḥ’ has an exilic connotation in the interpretation of this verse by introducing, “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 ḤＡ 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
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Analysis of the Variants

$S$ renders as it is in $M^m$ with a few alterations that can be justified by translation techniques. An example of contextual exegesis is the word רחננה, "multitudes," translated by מֵסָמֵב, "their possession, purchase." Notice the instrumental usage of the preposition ב ("with trumpet"). BHS suggests it be omitted, but it is present in $S$.

Since the motif of the verse is "war," $H$ 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 אֲרֵי רָנַת נְדֵמ, "for there is anger from before me," was used instead for כִי חָרִים, "for my anger/wrath." Some MSS of $G^t$ have their unique readings concerning the coordinative and subordinate disjunctive clauses רַעַב בָּדַלׇי נַשָּׁה, "get ready all, but none goes to battle." They read ($G^*$ (B) καὶ κρίνατε τὰ σύμπαντα, "and pass judgement on all together"), fin.

Also $G$ has an asterisk with the Masoretic reading. Although $G^*$ omits that last part, כִי חָרִים אֲלֵיה הַמִּלְחָמָה, "for my anger is upon all of her multitudes," several MSS of $G^t$ contain it; see above. The Greek omission in its original reading ($G^* B$) may be due to a misunderstanding of the Hebrew expression כִי חָרִים, "for my anger." Note that in the preceding verse a similar clause appears but with a different noun; instead of חָרִים,
“anger,” it has ἠργή, “vision.” Therefore the Septuagintal scribe may have tried to solve this problem by omitting it—the ἀργή clause—in both verses. S has a reading similar to that of Μ.

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

Ezek 7:15

(Trans. of 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 
S T and C have their respective adverb of place εσωθεν, “inside,” and מְלֶאך, “from its 
midst/inside.” S T has a different word order, and the last verb, συντελέσει, “he/it will 
destroy,” is without the object pronoun “them” or “him” as in אֶל, “it will devour it.” 
MS 62 reads αυτον, “him,” which is its object pronoun; it is the same person as M “him,” 
C “him,” and S “him.” Despite its relation to C, S depends on a Vorlage closer to that of 
M, because the additional targumic interpretations and the word order of S T 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 מלתה, "all of them are groaning," as מלתה, "all of them will die." The Syriac scribe might have confused the Hebrew verb מלתה (Q. Ptc.), which comes from הפתה, "to groan, uproar," with the verb מלתה, "to die." גת reads יָאִם אַגְזָה, "I will kill all," for מלתה. Both versions may have had the common misunderstanding of the verb הפתה, "to groan, uproar." Thus, it shows that they were based on a similar Hebrew text.

The entire phrase כָּנַיָּים הָהֵרַיִים, "like a dove of the valley," is lacking in גת (B). Several MSS of גת, however, contain it with some deviations from מ, e.g., × O, 0', and rel., טַוָּרִיאַר מַלְכָּרַיִים, "like doves meditating." S holds a unique reading by rendering it כָּנַיָּים, "like doves meditating"—as כָּנַיָּים הָהֵרַיִים, "like doves of the valley"—is closer to the Masoretic reading than S.

Ezek 7:19

בֵּית בֵּיתוֹ הַיַּהֲדוֹת אָנָה מַכְסַה וַהֲבָבָה לְהָדוֹת יִדְוָה מַכְסַה וַהֲבָבָה לֵךְ לְדוֹדוֹ (מ)

בֵּי בֵּיתוֹ הַיַּהֲדוֹת אָנָה מַכְסַה וַהֲבָבָה לְהָדוֹת יִדְוָה מַכְסַה וַהֲבָבָה לֵךְ לְדוֹדוֹ (מ)

בֵּי בֵּיתוֹ הַיַּהֲדוֹת אָנָה מַכְסַה וַהֲבָבָה לְהָדוֹת יִדְוָה מַכְסַה וַהֲבָבָה לֵךְ לְדוֹדוֹ (מ)

בֵּי בֵּיתוֹ הַיַּהֲדוֹת אָנָה מַכְסַה וַהֲבָבָה לְהָדוֹת יִדְוָה מַכְסַה וַהֲבָבָה לֵךְ לְדוֹדוֹ (מ)

לָשַׁנְיָהוּ בָּרוֹא רָאָה דָּרֶךְ נַפְשָׁה לָא סְפֻּנַּה מֵעֲדַיָּה לֵךְ לְדוֹדוֹ (מ)

כָּסַּה בֶּזְצַרַת יִרְשׁוּת הָדוּבָהּ לְסַנֵּר יִרְשׁוּת הָדוּבָהּ לֵךְ (י')

לָשַׁנְיָהוּ בָּרוֹא רָאָה דָּרֶךְ נַפְשָׁה לָא סְפֻּנַּה מֵעֲדַיָּה לֵךְ לְדוֹדוֹ (מ)
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(Θ*) τὸ ἀργύριον αὐτῶν μιθήσεται ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις, καὶ τὸ χρυσὸν αὐτῶν ὑπεροφθήσεται. οἱ ψυχαὶ αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ ἐμπληθῶσιν, καὶ οἱ κοιλίαι αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ πληρωθῶσιν· διότι βάσανος τῶν ἁδικίων αὐτῶν ἐγένετο.

(Trans. of S) “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 Θ* lacks, “silver and gold will not be able to deliver them in the day of the wrath of the Lord,” several MSS of Θ contain it, e.g., (ὁ, Ω, Ὡ', Λ-449) τὸ (καὶ τὸ 62, 1-311, 410) αργυρίον αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ χρυσὸν αὐτῶν (>233, 410) οὐ δυνησταί (δυνησταί Α’-410, 130-233-239’; υπεροφθησταί prob. οὐ δυνησταί. 106) εξελευθαί (του εξελ. 62) αὐτοὺς εἰν ημερὰ ὀργῆς κυρίου (κυρίου ὁργῆς prob. ο. κυρίου 233) rel. S and Θ have this clause as it is in Μ.

S renders the subordinated causal clause, “for it was the stumbling block of their iniquity,” by the subordinated demonstrative nominal clause, “this is the torment, the reward for their iniquity.” Notice that S has a unique reading by adding, “reward, retribution,” as an apposition to, “torment.” Θ seems to be related to S, because both have the same reading for the
Hebrew word בַּכָּשֵׁל, "stumbling block," namely בָּשֵׁם, "torment," and רֶגֶז, "torment."

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

Ezek 7:20

בָּשָׁמֹן וַתָּסַר מִשְׁמֶרֶת הָעָלָם וַתָּסַר מִשְׁמֶרֶת הָעָלָם

זֶהוּ נָפִי לְכַפֵּר נְשָׁמָהּ וַתָּסַר מִשְׁמֶרֶת הָעָלָם וַתָּסַר מִשְׁמֶרֶת הָעָלָם

(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 $\text{MT}$ as $\text{CJ}$ and $\text{CJ}$ do, it has some unique readings by rendering the Hebrew $\text{nas'ah}$, "they placed, put, or used," by $\text{hayyaseh}$, "they have made," and by using the same Syriac verb to translate the Hebrew $\text{naseh}$, "I have made it." It is probably an editorial work with the aim of avoiding a Hebraism as in the case of the verb $\text{nas'ah}$ with the extended sense of "to give." $\text{CJ}$ read $\text{hayyaseh}$, "they have placed," for $\text{nas'ah}$, and $\text{SeSwtca}$, "I have given," for $\text{naseh}$; both are exact renderings of the Hebrew counterpart. $\text{CJ}$ has in both instances the verbal expression $\text{haddash}, "I will give/make it," probably with the same extended sense of its Hebrew counterpart.

Another unique reading of $S$ is the noun $\text{nas'ah}$, "unclean thing," translated by the Aphel Ptc. $\text{hayyaseh}$, "despised." The noun $\text{nas'ah}$ has its correspondent Greek counterpart in $\text{St}$, which is $\text{akadathia}n$, "uncleanness" ($\sigma\tau\kappa\chi\sigma\tau\sigma\varsigma$ "fastidious person, disgusting, loathsome"), and in $\text{CJ}$ it is substituted by $\text{bester}$, "contempt."\(^1\)

$\text{CJ}$ omits $\text{hayyaseh}$, "their detestable things," but some MSS of $\text{SA}$ hold it, e.g., ($\text{O}$) $\text{kaI} (>\text{O-407, CJ-403'})$ $\text{prosochoimaata}$ (-$\text{matov L-V}$ $\text{auwv O-62'}$, $L'\cdot46-311-Z\text{v C'}-403'$. Although BHS suggests that the last part of this verse is probably a gloss, the witnesses all together, including $S$, support the Masoretic reading.

---

\(^1\)Levey, 35, n. 12. Regarding the $\text{nas'ah}$, Levey states that "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 $\text{sefuni}$ (My treasure place) as the 'abode of My Shekinah.' Rashi and Kimhi 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 T have similar readings to that of MT. The only two problems are the rare Hebrew word נ"ס, "my treasure place, hiding place," translated by מ"ס, "my watch-towers," from נס, "watchman, one who observes," and by ἐπισκοπὴν, "visitation," of a divine power or "office of an overseer"; and the Hebrew noun ג"ש, "robbers," rendered by the Syriac equivalent noun ג"ש, "robbers," and in T 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 T underwent a more elaborate editorial work than S in this verse. The two instances of the Hebrew verb לָלֶת, "to profane," are translated in S by the same Syriac verb Pael עֶלֶבָּם, "to defile," while T has מָאָה, "defile," for the first instance and בָּטֶלֶוָה, "to profane," for the second.

C has a completely different rendering for פה מָה הָעֵדָה, "and I will turn my face
I will make my Shekinah depart from them.” C renders it by אֲשֶׁר קָצַנְתָּא מִצָּאוֹת, “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 וָאָד, “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 $T$ and $S$ are similar to $M$, they are different from each other, showing an independence in matters of translation and transmission of their texts.

Ezek 7:23

(Ⅲ) וַיְזָמְמוּ הָרַעְיוֹן מִכְּהַר מִלְּחָקִים דֶּרֶךְ הָעָיוֹן מִלְּחָקָה הָמְלָכָה

(S) וַיְזָמְמוּ הָרַעְיוֹן מִכְּהַר מִלְּחָקִים דֶּרֶךְ הָעָיוֹן מִלְּחָקָה הָמְלָכָה

($C^1$) וַיְזָמְמוּ הָרַעְיוֹן מִכְּהַר מִלְּחָקִים דֶּרֶךְ הָעָיוֹן מִלְּחָקָה הָמְלָכָה

($G^*$) καὶ ποιήσουσι φυςμον, διότι ἡ γῆ πληθὺς λαῶν, καὶ ἡ πόλις πληθὺς ἀνομίας.

(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 $M$ regarding some of the key words of the text.

---

1Levey, 34.
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$ reads מָסַפְּרָה, “and they will cross, invade,” for the imperative חָשָׁב, “make” (אֲנָה לָשׁוּב, “they will make”) and מָסַפְּרָה, “in/with bricks, mud, mixture, dough,” for לָשָׁב, “the chain.” $ may refer to the invasion of the walled cities. The latter word is rendered in $ as φυμόν, “confused mass, mixture” (in MS 407 φυμόμον from φυμόμα “wanton behavior,” $' $ have εποίησαν καθηλώσαν “they have made a revetment”), probably referring to the intermarriage with foreign nations (λαῶν).

The Hebrew expression מָסַפְּרָה דִּרוּם, “bloody judgment,” is substituted by λαῶν, “foreign people, nation,” in $. Some MSS of $ contain a reading similar to that of $, λαῶν] κρύσεως αἰματων $א ; αἷματων 62 ; $+ αἷματων 403 $; and a conflate reading κρύσεως αἷμα των λαῶν in MS 534. $ is similar to $ regarding מָסַפְּרָה דִּרוּם.

$ agrees with $ by translating מָסַפְּרָה דִּרוּם, “the chain,” with its Aramaic equivalent מָסַפְּרָה דִּרוּם, “chain.” The phrase מָסַפְּרָה דִּרוּם, “bloody judgment,” however, is substituted by קִסְרֶל דִּיוֹרֵב, “those who deserved to be killed.” This may be due to the exilic interpretation of the context. According to $ many would die during the invasion and exile.

The Hebrew word חָשָׁב, “violence,” is substituted by חָשָׁב, “iniquity,” in $, and ἀνομίας, “lawlessness,” in $, while $ has ἀνθρώπους, “robbers.” It seems likely that $, $, and $ were based on Vorlagen similar to $, without any direct relationship among themselves.

Ezek 7:24

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Analysis of the Variants

S has two unique readings: for the phrase רע נשים, "evil peoples," it reads רע נשים, "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 כְּפָר, "to keep, shepherd, feed," and its pl. Act. Ptc. כְּפָר, "shepherds," with only one sense. The Syriac word for רע, "evil, misery, distress," is completely different in spelling (כְּפָר).

(6) (B) lacks the entire Hebrew clause רע נשים ואיתם משך. "I will bring evil peoples and they will take possession of their houses." Some MSS of (6), however, have the Masoretic reading πουρως ἑβνων "evil peoples," e.g., (X O, X θ, 449) καὶ αξω (αξω 147) πουρως ἑβνων καὶ 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 נחל.
"and they will be profaned," by ἀνεβάζονται, "and they will possess." It seems a careful editorial work due to some theological reasons, for ἀνεβάζονται, "and they will possess," is the same verbal form as the Hebrew הער, "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."

folios employs the singular passive form μακρυγιάζεται, "it will be profaned," for the Nifal form ἔρχωνται, "and they will be profaned." The word μόσχος, "their holy places, or sanctuaries," is in the singular in S, while in the plural in folios and CJ. 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 folios and CJ 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.

folios has a unique reading for μεταναίονται, "and I will put an end to their pride," by rendering it as καὶ ἀποστρέφω τὸ φυσικὴ τῆς θυσίας αὐτῶν, "and I will turn back the boasting of their strength." Only α’ καταπανωθεὶ τὴν ὑπερφερείαν, ὑπερφανείαν Qms and ὑπερφανείαν α’, Cod. 86 have their readings similar to M, "I will put to an end to the pride." The rendering of folios seems more an interpretative translation of a Hebrew text, while α’, α’, and Cod. 86 are more literal translations.

Ezek 7:25

(ki) 31806 7:25
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The Hebrew word כעס, 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, S renders it by זעם, "wrath," ΕΤ εξιλασμος, "propitiation," ο' and θ' have αθυμιαξ, "discouragement," and Cod. 86 reads συνοχη, "distress, anguish." The clue for a better translation is found in CJ that translates it by its cognate form חרטס, "destruction," and its MS o by חבטה, "anger, indignation." Therefore, this is another clear evidence for a non-interrelationship among them all together.

Ezek 7:26

1Holladay, 321.
Analysis of the Variants

6T, S, and T' seem to be based on Hebrew texts similar to M. None of them, however, are dependent on each other regarding this verse. S has Ethpeel מַעְלָה, "will be heard," for the Hebrew הָאַלֹהִים, "will be" (Q. Imperf. 3° 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 מַעְלָה, "to hear," better fits the context of the verse where "rumors" were to be heard instead of the Hebrew הָאַלֹהִים, "will be." 6T has בְּשַׁדָּא, "there will be," for both Hebrew verbs הָאַלֹהִים fem. "it will be," and גֵּדָא fem. "it will come." T' agrees with M in both instances.

S seems to have undergone an editorial work during its translation, for it renders all three Hebrew nouns in the plural, נֵצֶות, "prophets," פָּסָכ, "elders," and פָּסָכ, "priests," probably to make a syntactical agreement with פָּסָכ עַל הָאַלֹהִים, "elders." 6T agrees with M having the same number for these nouns, except MSS L'.46-311-ZV, which are in agreement with S and M most of the time, but in this case they have פְּלֹאֵר וְעַל הָאַלֹהִים, "of the elder," in the singular.

There is an interpretative addition in T': בְּשַׁדָּא מַעְלָה מַעְלָה מַעְלָה מַעְלָה מַעְלָה מַעְלָה מַעְלָה מַעְלָה מַעְלָה מַעְלָה, "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 G* can be explained by a common Semitic influence (Hebraism, verbal hendiadys, etc.) (7:2).

2. S translates the nomina sacra as usual against G*, though G has it as in M (7:2).

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

4. Although there are similar renderings between S and G, 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 בְּכָשֶׂם יְהֹוָה לְעֹתָם [tr. pr. Peal Ptc. מְצַכַּת “standing.”]

8:2 נָסַטִּית + לָמָּעָלָה Substit. מָצָאתָה לְלָמָּעָלָה “I saw.”

8:3 לֶעַשֵּׁה [בֵּן הָשָׁם 2°] Substit. מִצָּאתָה “like the appearance of God.”

8:4 לֹעַשֵּׁה [בֵּן הָשָׁם 2°] Substit. מִצָּאתָה “of the angle, corner.”

noun מֲרָשֶׁב Peal Ptc. מְצַכַּת “standing.”

8:5 הַכָּפֹן Substit. מְצָאֵתָה “of trouble.”

Hi. Ptc. מְשַכֵּךְ om.

8:6 נֶסַטִּית Substit. נָסַטִּית “to heaven.”

Q. Inf. Constr. לֶרֶחָה Ethpe. 3° m. pl. מִצָּאתָה “they have been gone away.”

8:7 אַנֹכּוּ Substit. הָנָּבוּ “which [they] were doing.”

8:8 הָנָּבוּ Substit. Peal Perf. מִצָּאתָה “and I found.”

8:9 הָנָּבוּ Substit. הָנָּבוּ “secret, hiding place.”
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8:14 Substit. סנה "and I saw."
pr. ח "as, when."
8:16 Substit. סנה "and I saw."
lּחصة "to the altar."
מנח + א "standing."
לָחָصة קְרֵהוּ "toward the east."
2° tr. קְרֵהוּ // מְשַׁוְתַּוֶּה סָנָה

adj. תַּלְלוּוֹת וְנִמְשָׁא "Is it a small thing?"
Q. Perf. 3° c. pl. נש "which [they] are doing."
pl. חֲפֶךְיָא om.
[כ] Substit. חֲפֶךְיָא "iniquity."
hַלָּס הָאִיתָמִרה ואָסֶם "put the branch to their nose"
Substit. חֲפֶךְיָא סָנָה סָנָה "breaking asunder with their nostrils."

Data Analysis

Ezek 8:1

יוֹה יְבֵשָה בֵּשָׁה בֵּשָׁה בֵּשָׁה לְחַמָּה לְחַמָּה אֶנֶנְיָה בֵּבֵית (S)

(R) Ка̀л ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἔκτῳ ἔτει ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ μὴνι πέμπτῳ τοῦ μηνός ἐγὼ
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 ܐܡ. ܓٹ substitutes ששב, “on the sixth (month),” by ܐܢ ܬܘ ܕܠܐܪܬ ܡܬ, “on the fifth month.” Further deviations (of ܓ*) are the omissions of the possessive pronoun of ܝܛܘ, “my house,” rendered by ܬܘ ܘܬ, “the house,” and the omission of the demonstrative particle ܕ, “there.” ܓܠ contains the latter two readings omitted by ܓ* in some of its MSS, e.g., ܬܘ ܘܬ ] + ܡܘ ܐ-62, ܠ-311-46-Zv; ܕܐ ܐܠܐ ] + ܐܟܐ after ܕܐ ܐܠܐ (ܠ O) O-62, L-311-46-Zv; pr. ܐܟܐ V. The nominasacra are translated as usual, ܟܝܦܘ in ܓ* (ܒ 26, 403', 544, ܐ') and + ܐܕܘܢܐ in ܓܡ MSS e.g., pr. ܟܝܦܘ ܐܕܘܢܐ 36; ܢpr. ܐܕܘܢܐ rel.

ܓܐ agrees with ܐܡ more closely than ܓ*, but it contains an additional reading ܐܢܐ, “the prophet said,” and as a normal targumic characteristic anthropomorphism is avoided. Therefore ܒܠܝܐ ܒܠܝܐ ܝܕܝܐ, “and the hand of the Lord God,” is rendered by ܒܠܝܐ ܒܠܝܐ, “the spirit of prophecy from before the Lord God.” Consequently S agrees with ܐܡ more than with any other version regarding this verse.
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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

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

The Hebrew word ἀπειράσις, "brightness," though absent in ş, is present in several
MSS of $\textit{GA}$, e.g., MS B renders the $3^\text{rd}$ instance by $\textit{oparw}$, $\textit{Qms}$, L-311-V-46-Z$\textit{v}$ substitute the third instance of $\textit{nmar}$ ($\textit{oparw}$) by $\textit{phugw}$, "radiance, light," while rel. render $\textit{aurax}$ and $\textit{eidox}$, "a breeze like the appearance of."

The last Hebrew comparative nominal phrase, "like gleaming bronze (??)," is rendered by $\textit{chme} \textit{nemel}$, "like the appearance of God," in $S$, and $\textit{oparw} \textit{heklepw}$, "appearance of amber," in $\textit{G}$, $\alpha'$, $\sigma'$ and $\textit{eidox}$ of $\textit{phugw}$ of $\textit{heklepw}$ [$\alpha'$, Cod. 86 $\textit{ophalw}$]; $\theta' \times \textit{aurax}$ and $\textit{eidox}$ of $\textit{heklepw}$, and it is transliterated by $\textit{C}$, "like the appearance of hashmal." This is support for an independent translation and transmission of the text among the versions.

The two instances of $\textit{vino}$, "his loins," are avoided by $\textit{C}$ as an anthropomorphism. It renders "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 ($\alpha'$, Cod. 86 $\textit{ophalw}$). $S$ ignores the unique reading of $\textit{G}$ ($\textit{anphw}$) and the targumic interpretation.

\textit{Ezek 8:3}

(III) וָשָׁלַחְתָּ הָבָהָה יְהוֹיָהִי בְּצֵי יְרוּשָׁלָּם אֶלָּחָא חַיָּה וּרְחֵי בּוֹתָא וּבֹקֶשׁוּת וּבּוֹקֶשׁוּת חָצְיָה (C)

יִשְׁרָאֵל הָבָהָה אָלֶּת אֶלְמָא רַחְיָא וּרְחֵי בּוֹתָא וּבּוֹקֶשׁוּת וּבּוֹקֶשׁוּת חָצְיָה (5)

(4) אָוֹשָׁב בְּרוֹנָה יְהוֹיָהִי בְּצֵי יְרוּשָׁלָּם אֶלָּחָא חַיָּה וּרְחֵי בּוֹתָא וּבּוֹקֶשׁוּת וּבּוֹקֶשׁוּת חָצְיָה (C)
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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 ל, which conveys the same syntactical sense of the former ה, “to the north,” לארשון, “to Jerusalem”). Therefore it is not a deviation from ס. Some portions, however, of this long verse seem to be confusing to the versions all together.

Though the Hebrew word הדריה, “inner court,” is omitted by ג(א, 407), it appears in some MSS of גא, e.g., תקע אוטראס, “the inner place, inside,” 106, Cod. × 88, and rel. ס has a unique reading for this Hebrew word (efully, “inner court”) that is קדשכ, “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.

1Jtoijon and Muraoka, § 93.
The Hebrew phrase 'by the hair of my head,' is rendered similarly by S, but as κορυφής μου, "by my extremity," in Σ* implying the extremity of the prophet's head. ΣA has several MSS that are explicit by reading κορυφής τῆς κεφαλῆς, "the extremity of the head," as in Σ, e.g., Qm, L'-311-Zv, 26', 544, 62. Notice, however, that some of these MSS, though in this case related to Σ and S, add to the text an extr-Masoretic reading not found elsewhere, αὐθεντῶν after χειρος (L'-311-Zv). Therefore it is hard to conceive that Σ is related to them at all.

The last Hebrew nominal clause ἡ κατὰ τῶν προφητῶν ἡ τοιοῦτος ἀγάπη "where was the seat of an image of jealousy which provokes jealousy," is very debatable, particularly the last two words. Σ* renders ἡ κατὰ τῶν προφητῶν τοιοῦτος by τοῖς κτωμένους, "of the purchaser." Probably Σ* understood that the Hi. Participle κτωμένος came from the root κήπ, "to get, acquire, buy," from whence the meaning τοῖς κτωμένους, "purchaser," instead of the similar Hebrew root קַפּ, "to be jealous." (S has ἡ κατὰ τῶν προφητῶν "an image of trouble"). The Syriac language has the verb κού to buy, acquire," which has the same spelling of the Hebrew קַפ, "to be jealous." Thus the Syriac translator seems to avoid any ambiguity by substituting the last two Hebrew words by the interpretative Syriac term κού, "of trouble." This may have been due to the confusion or misunderstanding of the Hebrew verbal root קַפ for קָפַס as it occurred in Σ* rather than to an actual reading of S's Vorlage.

---

1 Emmanuel Tov, The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research, 2d. ed., Jerusalem Biblical Studies no. 3 (Jerusalem: Simor, 1997), 172: Regarding Σ, 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."
Σ has some MSS with a reading closer to the Masoretic one, e.g., στήλη + τής εἰκόνος τοῦ ζηλου (-λους Ο, ξυλου 147) Ο', Λ'-311-ZV, 407' or * εἴδωλου τοῦ ζηλους in 86, and * τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ ζηλους in Qixi. Τ has a unique reading that substitutes the Hebrew בָּרָאתָא αָלְדָיָנ, “in visions of God,” by the interpretative rendering בָּרָאתָא אָלְדָיָנ הַבּוֹזָר נֶבַה מִן כָּפֶד יִדְרָשׁ עַל, “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

(Μ) Μενας Μενας Αλτς Σιραελ Χμαιτα Χαιρετ Χαριτι

(Σ) Μενας Μενας Αλτς Σιραελ Χμαιτα Χαιρετ Χαριτι

(Τ) Μενας Μενας Αλτς Σιραελ Χμαιτα Χαιρετ Χαριτι

(Ο') καὶ ἤδην ἐκεῖ ἦν δόξα κυρίου θεοῦ Ισραήλ κατὰ τὴν ὑπαγορα, ἦν ἐλθὼν καὶ τῷ πεδίῳ.

(Trans. of Σ) “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 Μ, while Τ adds θεου after κυρίου. This is a unique reading supported by all of its MSS, and may be evidence for a different Vorlage of Τ in regard to S. Τ agrees with the Masoretic reading without any addition or interpretative expansion of the text.
Ezek 8:5

(3) רָאָם אֵלֶּה בַּעֲרָבָּה כְּאֶחָת דָּרֶךְ צָפֵנָה אִמָּה יְתַנּוֹן קַר הָבָּה

dark, Zaphne, and he made an image of trouble standing at its entrance.

(S) מָצָאָה לָדוֹתָה, דָּרֶךְ דָּרֶךְ לָדוֹתָה לָרְאוּתָה, מַעֲשֶׂה-דִּינְכָּה לָדוֹתָה.

(C') וַעֲרָבָּה כְּאֶחָת דָּרֶךְ כְּאֶחָת דָּרֶךְ לָדוֹתָה, מַעֲשֶׂה-דִּינְכָּה לָדוֹתָה.

Analysis of the Variants

(C') reads like (3) without any deviation. (6*) and S, however, show a reading against the Masoretic reading: "to the gate of the altar was an image of this jealousy." It is rendered by S as רָאָם אֵלֶּה קָר הָבָּה לָדוֹתָה כְּאֶחָת דָּרֶךְ, "... of the eastern gate stood an image of trouble," and by (6*) (Ra.) כְּאֶחָת דָּרֶךְ אֱמֶּה מַעֲשֶׂה-דִּינְכָּה, תִּבְרָאָה קָר הָבָּה כְּאֶחָת דָּרֶךְ,"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. $\Theta^A$ has several MSS that support the Masoretic reading, e.g., τὴν (πρὸς Β) πρὸς ἀνατολάς Ρα.] τοῦ θυσιαστήριου η (544) εἰκὼν τοῦ ζηλοῦς τουτοῦ (του 239) εν τῷ εἰσπορευέσθαι (+ σὲ Α*-544) αὐτὴν τὴν βλεποῦσαν πρὸς (κατ 233) ἀνατολάς (ομ. τὴν βλ. πρὸς ἀνατ. 26*, 86*) Α˝-106*, 46, cII-86*-239*; and + (κ Ο) τοῦ θυσιαστήριου οὐ (5 Ο- Ο-147*, C´-403*;+ εν Υ) η (ουκ prob. ου η 62) εἰκὼν τοῦ ζηλοῦ (-λοὺς Ο) τουτοῦ εν τῷ εἰσπορευέσθαι αὐτὴν (+ τὴν πρὸς ἀνατολάς 538) Ο´, L˝-46, C´-403*; θ´ and α´ also contain it as (κ θ) τοῦ θυσιαστήριου η εἰκὼν (α´ εἰδωλον Cod. 86) τοῦ ζηλοῦς τουτοῦ εν τῷ εἰσπορευέσθαι αὐτὴν.

The Hebrew expression נקודת יסנה, “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 $\Theta T$ all together, because half of the Syriac’s verse agrees with $\Theta^*$ against $\Theta^A$, and the second part has a unique reading closer to $\Theta^A$, but against $\Theta^*$.

Ezek 8:6

(III) נארם אל בן ארבעراتא וההוא מהמה תמי התמכות נשלח אファー ביה ישראל ושם פה

לתרחש ועל 먹קרש עדה תשב תרחא תמכות נשלח

(5) מארס מראס שמן חטא חטאת חלמה פאתם חטאת (S)

בכם ומענה שלחכם על חטאת חטא חטאת חלמה פאתם חלמה

(3) וארס על בר ארבעה התו אום דארם תפרים

ותחברו רבדה ביה ישראל ועדרן את לאחרותא על 먹קרש עדה תשב
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(5) 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 return 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 υπέρ, "great," the relative participle μείζονας, "which they are doing." This seems rather a careful editorial work than a different Vorlage from 𝓜. The only minus of S is υπέρ, "here." Although $\Theta^*$ (B) lacks

Amur biyin yisrael, several MSS of $\Theta^A$ have it, e.g., (X O. Q¹, a', o', θ'). ας o ounocos

(+ του 147', 46) ισραη rel. The Hebrew הקבר, "you will return, or turn" (jussive?), is omitted too in almost all the witnesses of $\Theta^T$; only MSS 62 and 403' have it, επιστρέψος.

$\Sigma$ renders its Hebrew text, which is similar to 𝓜, as it is without any deviation. S is an independent translation, and is carefully translated in comparison to the versions.

Ezek 8:8

(5) And he said to 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 return again and you will see great abominations which they are doing".
(S*) καὶ ἐλπεὶν πρὸς με Γι'ε ἄνθρωπου, ὄρυξον καὶ ὄρυξα, καὶ ἴδον 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 ἀπείρημα, “and behold,” by ἀπείρημα, “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 ἀπείρημα conveys a stronger sense and action in the narrative than the simple Hebrew נהיה.

S* omits both instances of the prepositional phrase βορρᾶ, “in the wall.” S* has a MS with a completely different reading for the first instance of βορρᾶ, e.g., ἀναβλέψεων τούς ὀφθαλμοὺς σου προς βορρᾶν καὶ, “you will turn your eye to the north”; and (α’ + ι δὴ εν τῷ τοῖχῳ Q²) rel. reads as M εν τῷ τοῖχῳ, “in the wall.” For the second instance of βορρᾶ some MSS read as follows: καὶ ἴδον θύρα μία] + L'-311-zv εν τῷ τοῖχῳ; pr. O-62, 538, C'-534-86'-403', 26', 410. S* agrees with M as it is.

Ezek 8:12

And he said to me, ‘Son of man, dig in the wall,’ and I dug in the wall and I found a door.”
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 מְשַׁלְּכָּה, “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.” S has מְשַׁלְּכָּה, “secret, hiding,” place or thing.

Although Σ reads τῷ κοινωνίᾳ τῷ κρυπτῷ αὐτῶν, “in their secret chamber,” similar to S, the Syriac scribe might have committed a mistake of the eyes, by transposing the Hebrew letters מְשַׁלְּכָּה in the word מְשַׁלְּכָּה, as it occurs in the linguistic phenomenon called metathesis. Then one has the word מְשַׁלְּכָּה or מְשַׁלְּכָּה, which is an Aramaic Pass. Ptc. of מְשַׁלְּכָּה “to hide, conceal,” and the Syriac language has the same Ptc. מְשַׁלְּכָּה. Ἄ has a unique reading: מְשַׁלְּכָּה, “his sleeping quarters.”

S could well be related to Σ, for the former has מְשַׁלְּכָּה and the latter διότι, 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 (אֶלָּא אַף וַהֲוָה חָפְצוּת נְדַלְתָּה אַשָּׁר הָיוּ נְשִׁים) into a relative participle (אֲשֶׁר טָפַע נְשִׁים, “which they are doing”), which is an equivalent Syriac style. $^6$ lacks והCorreo, while $^6^A$ contains it in MSS O (Qmag)-62 ($X O$) ἐπιστρέφειν; $^6^A$ has a unique reading in two of its MSS, e.g., προς μετά + κυρίος 46, pr. ZV. $^C$ has the same reading as that of $^M$.

Ezek 8:14

(Ezek 8:14)
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 ἡγήσατο for κοίμησε, “and I saw.” T also has a unique reading that seems to be a harmonization with vs. 3. It reads, ἐκαίνια βλέποντος πρὸς βορρᾶν, “which looks/faces toward the north.” T reads like M.

Ezek 8:16

(就会) 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 ἡγήσατο for κοίμησε, “and I saw.” T also has a unique reading that seems to be a harmonization with vs. 3. It reads, ἐκαίνια βλέποντος πρὸς βορρᾶν, “which looks/faces toward the north.” T reads like M.

Ezek 8:16

(Would) 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 ἡγήσατο for κοίμησε, “and I saw.” T also has a unique reading that seems to be a harmonization with vs. 3. It reads, ἐκαίνια βλέποντος πρὸς βορρᾶν, “which looks/faces toward the north.” T reads like M.

Ezek 8:16

(Would) 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 ἡγήσατο for κοίμησε, “and I saw.” T also has a unique reading that seems to be a harmonization with vs. 3. It reads, ἐκαίνια βλέποντος πρὸς βορρᾶν, “which looks/faces toward the north.” T reads like M.

Ezek 8:16

(Would) 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 ἡγήσατο for κοίμησε, “and I saw.” T also has a unique reading that seems to be a harmonization with vs. 3. It reads, ἐκαίνια βλέποντος πρὸς βορρᾶν, “which looks/faces toward the north.” T reads like M.
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θυσιαστηρίου ὡς εἴκοσι ἀνδρεῖς, τὰ ὀπίσθια αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν ἀπέναντι, καὶ οὗτοι προσκυνοῦσιν τῷ ἥλιῳ.

(Trans. of $S$) “And he brought me to the inner court of the house of Yahweh and I saw at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, about twenty-five men standing, with their backs toward the temple of the Lord and their faces toward the east, and they were worshiping the sun toward the east.”

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 מַהֲרֵי, as also in verse 14, and a synonym for the 1st instance of נִכְפָּה, "to the east," לְמֶרֶת, "to the east."

$G^*$ has a loan word, or a transliteration for the Hebrew word לַחֹלֶה, "the porch," that is, ἀλαμ. Furthermore, it reads twenty men instead of twenty-five, and lacks the second נִכְפָּה, probably to avoid redundancy. $G^+$ has several MSS that read like מ, e.g., εἰκοσὶ $B$ + καὶ πεσθε rel. The second נִכְפָּה is present in some MSS, e.g., (※ Ὠ) κατὰ ανατολάς rel.

$C^I$ has an interpretative addition to the text καὶ ἰδὼν ἄσμα βρῶν, "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 מ.
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 theונָה, "to do," in the participial form, תָּקִיָּה is omitted and the perfect תָּקִיָּה, "they did," was rendered by its participle form תָּקִיָּה, "which [they] were doing." The word עַזְזָה, "violence," was substituted by עָשָׂה, "iniquity," perhaps to fit it in the context of idolatry.

The last clause was a crux interpretum for the versions והם שליחים לא תומרים אלא...
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 הָנַע is the rendering of נִפְהל Niphal of נָעַל, "to trifle, to consider in a slight manner," by the adjective מֵעַמַּה, "small." All the differences, however, make it—the similarity—look like a mere coincidence.

חַלּוֹנָה translates the first instance of the verb קָפַּב by פָּרָגְם and the second by פָּרָקְגָּס as in מ. which is missing in ס. כ, which is missing in ס, is rendered by סִינָו, and the entire sense רַכּו הָלָבְכָנִי, "and they return to provoke me to anger," is lacking in ס. In ס, the last sentence appears as כַּג קֵסָר (כַּג קֵסָר. ל"-311) יָט (ס) פָּרָקְגָּס נָא רַכּו. Also the sentence נוֹס בּ רָפָם נָבְרַט, "Lo! they sent forth a branch to their nostrils," is translated as it is by ס, e.g., (ס. ס) בְּשֵׁהוֹנָו, "to stretch out" (ס. ק. 147; אֲפָלְקַא 46) יָט (ס. 62) כְּלָמִי, "branch" (כְּלָמִי, "dispute, judgment," 410; + אֲפָלְק 407) rel. Ms 130 reads מִכְמָרּוּס, "scorners," for the last Hebrew nominal clause.

חַלּוֹנָה personalizes the word סִיסֶה, "violence," into גָּסִיס, "violent men," and renders the last nominal sentence by חַלּוֹנָה כָּרְמַל לָבְרַט, "behold they are bringing disgrace right in front of their faces." Therefore, conclusively ס is not related to any of the versions concerning its translation.

**Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 8**

1. ס does not avoid anthropomorphism (8:1, 2).
2. S has some unique readings (8:2, 3, 6, 8, 14, 16).

3. S is alien to several renderings of G translation (8:2, 3, 14, 17).

4. S is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to M (8:4, 13).

5. Similarities between S and G* 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 M than to any other version (8:16).

8. Redundancy is omitted by S (8:17).
CHAPTER X

EZEKIEL 9

Collation

9:1     Q. Inf. Constr. [יְפָאֵר] Peal Perf. נָטַשׁ “and he said.”

         [grass] Synonym נְאָמָה “her avengers.”

         [substitute] Substit. נַעֲמָה “her retribution.”

9:2     [substitute] Substit. Peal Perf. 1° s. נָתַשׁ “and I saw.”

         [substitute] Substit. נַעֲמָה “her retribution.”

         נָטַשׂ נַעֲמָה נְאָמָה נְאָמָה נְאָמָה נְאָמָה “and he girded his loins with a girdle of sapphire.”

9:3     Q. Perf. 3° m. נָטַשׂ הַלֶּאֱשֶׂת Peal Ptc. + enclit. נָטַשׂ נָטַשׂ נָטַשׂ נָטַשׁ נָטַשׁ N הַלֶּאֱשֶׂת “who were standing.”

9:4     Q. Imperf. 2° m. pl. הָבֹא] Peal Imper. 2° pl. מָלַל “kill.”

         [there is, exists.]piel נָטַשׁ נָטַשׁ נָטַשׁ נָטַשׁ נָטַשׁ נָטַשׁ נָטַשׁ נָטַשׁ נָטַשׁ N הָבֹא] Hi. Imperf. 2° m. pl. הָבֹא] Peal Imper. 2° pl. מָלַל “begin.”
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Besides several other characteristic features of chap. 9, the consistent way of rendering the Hebrew "behold," by "and I saw" (vss. 2, 11) leads us to assume a single translator for the entire chapter.

Data Analysis

Ezek 9:1

יורקָא בָּאוֹנִי קָלָּנוּ לַאֲמָר קָרְבַּנְתָּ דְּגוּר יָאָשׁ כֶּלֶמֶת בַּעַד (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, הֹרָה, “to avenge,” for the Hebrew words מִסֵּפוֹן, “visitation, punishment,” and לֹאֵנָו, “his destruction,” while all the versions have their own rendering for each Hebrew word. For instance, T reads ἐρώπεσις, “judgment,” for מִסֵּפוֹן, and ἔξοδοθεομίσθεσις, “utter destruction,” for לֹאֵנָו. T and ᵒ have the same reading for מִסֵּפוֹן; they read ἄρμασσαν, “who are in charge of,” and ἐπισκοπή, “overseer.” MS 46 changes the Infinitive Construct לֹאֵנָו of the simple past יָכְבָּה, “he said,” as it shows in S. Probably the repetition of the same root זָכָה, “to avenge,” is an attempt to smooth the flow of the text, avoiding rare Hebrew words.

The Infinitive Construct לֹאֵנָו 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.
Ezek 9:2

(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 6^T, while the first part
contains a unique reading in harmonization with the preceding verse. $S$ substitutes מָתָא, “and behold,” by a more specific term מָחָל, “and I saw,” and for a better harmonization of the text, which is a normal translation technique, the Hebrew word מָשָׁרִי, “his slaughter,” is rendered by מַשָּׂה, “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 רָעָב, “and an inkpot/inkhorn of the writer/writing.” On the one hand, it seems that the Vorlage of $S$ (מָשָׁרִי וַתָּשָׂה, “and he bound his loins with a girdle of sapphire”) was related to $\Theta T$, because the latter reads כַּל בַּשָּׁר עֵשֶׂבֶת עֻזֶּן עַל קָו אֶחְטַר, "and a girdle of sapphire was upon his loins." $\alpha'$ and $\theta'$ and MS 86 read close to $\Theta < (c a o k a v u, < a n d > t h e r e e d o f a s c r i b e ; o e b ' r e a d s k a v καλαμος γραφεως επι της οοφυος αυτου, "and the reed of a writer was upon his loins.” On the other hand, the Hebrew word מָשָׂה, “writing, writer,” could well be a misunderstanding of an unvocalized text containing the word מָשָׂה, “lapiz lazuli” (see Exod 24:10). Thus it indicates that even though $S$ and $\Theta T$ 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.

$\Xi'$ agrees with $\Xi$, but the only interpretative phrase is מַשָּׂה, מַשָּׂא, “with his instrument of scattering,” as is found in MS 62 of $\Theta^A (\pi\upsilon\lambda\upsilon\varepsilon) + του οκρηπισμου αυτου, “his scattered ones”.
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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 T, than vs. 3 denies that assumption, because the same phrase אָדָם אֲשֶׁר חָיוֹת אֶל הָעִנָּדָד אֵיךְ אַף וֹתִי אֲנִי וְיִשְׂרָאֵל "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 T. It has, however, only בֵּית קֹדֶשׁ הַמַּכַּת, "girdle," instead of בֵּית קֹדֶשׁ הַמַּכַּת. This is strong evidence for an independence of translation between S and T.

S has a unique reading in its translation by substituting the verb הוהי by the
grammatical structure אָמַר יְהֹוָה, “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 עַל מָשָׁחַת, “threshold,” was rendered by עַל מָשָׁחַת, “corner, angle,” whereas JT has עַל מָשָׁחַת, “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 מ is similar to that of מ; the only addition is מ, “holy of holiest,” after מ, 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

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

\( \text{C} \) is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of \( \text{MT} \). There is a minus in \( \text{C}^* \) and a plus in \( \text{S} \), namely the omission of the Hebrew prepositional phrase בותי נון "in the midst of the city," in \( \text{C}^* \), which is present in some MSS of \( \text{MT} \), e.g., O-62', L-46-Zv, and the addition of רעב, "evils," in \( \text{S} \). This shows that \( \text{C} \) did not copy from any version but did its own editorial work, improving the sense of the verse.

The idiomatic expression עיניהם המותמסות, "between their eyes," which is also the same Aramaic expression (בַּעֲדָם עַיִן), was used to render the Hebrew word מצח, "forehead." This is just a case of a cognate expression between related languages rather than a relationship between \( \text{S} \) and \( \text{C} \).

Ezek 9:5

(\( \text{MT} \)) אֱלֹהֵי אֶפְרָאִים בְּעַמָּם בְּעַמָּם רֹאִים עַל חַס הַבָּשָׁם אֶלָּא הַשָּׁמֶשׁ (S)

(\( \text{C} \)) מִצְחֵי עַיִנֶיהָ מְנַהֲגִים מְנַהֲghanוו כוועוועוועוועוועוועוועוועוועוועוועוועוועוועוועוوعוوعוועוועוועוوعוועוועוועוועוועוوعוועוועוועוועוועוועוועוועוועוועוועוوعוועוועוועוועוועוועוوعוوعוועוועוوعוועוوعוועוوعוועוועוועוועוועוועוوعוועוوعוועוועוوعוوعוועוועוوعוوعוועוועוوعוوعוועוועוوعוوعוوعוوعוوعוوعוوعוوعוوعוوعוوعוوعוوعוوعוوعוوعוوعo

(\( \text{S} \)) "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 יָרָאֵל, "and to those he said," is rendered by the Syriac מָלַעְשְׁךָ, "and to those who were with him, he said to them," and the Hebrew idiom יָשָׁא "in my ears," is translated by a Syriac idiom לַחֵזֵק, "in my sight/eyes." Probably לַחֵזֵק, "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 $T$, for the latter keeps the Hebrew Idiom (Hebraism) in the phrase καὶ μὴ φέρεσθε τοῖς ὄφθαλμοῖς ὑπνών, “do not spare with your eyes.” Though $S$ has מָלַעְשְׁךָ, "let not your eyes have pity" which seems to be an editorial work, substituting מָלַעְשְׁךָ, "spare," by מָלַעְשְׁךָ, "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 לַחֵזֵק, "in my sight/eyes," while $T$ reads אֲקַוְעָה, "in my hearing," which is a closer reading to that of $T$.

Ezek 9:6

 restaכנור וב麑ה יפך נועש תורותר ($S$)
למסהיה על כל איז אומר עלי, והיה על יפשו ומקדיש עולם
ويرלו באנטימ הוקים אמיר לופי ליאנה
מלשה, מלשה, מלשה, מלשה, מלשה, מלשה, מלשה, מלשה, מלשה ($S$)
томקה, לו נמסה,مش חכמים, נמסה, מלשה, מלשה, מלשה, מלשה ($S$)
ככ שלחיה וב参与到 ו_dirty, ו_dirty, ו_dirty, ו_dirty, שדיה, ו_dirty, ו_dirty, ו_dirty ($S$)
The text is in Hebrew and Greek.

**Hebrew Text**

(וָ) "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 Ṣ by the use of the Imperative instead of the Hebrew Imperfect, "you will kill," and ṣῆ, "you will begin." Ṣ renders them by imperatives, namely ἀποκτένατε, "kill," and ἁρξασθε, "begin," respectively as in S.

This, however, does not support a direct relation between them for the following reasons: Ṣ lacks ἐν, "elders," but Ṣ has it in (X ὅ) τῶν πρεσβύτερων rel. Notice, however, that Ṣ reads ἐν ἐν, within, in, for ὧν, before of, in front of. Therefore if one takes S as being based on some MSS of Ṣ regarding the Imperatives, then S corrected the usage of the preposition ἐν, before, in front of, in agreement with a Hebrew text similar to ἦλθα, otherwise, S should have a reading similar to that of Ṣ ἐν ἐν, "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 (מלך "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 \( \lambda \) before each object of לארשי, "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

(III) ריאמר אליהם סמכא את הביתה ומלא את החצרות הלילום זא ו İz מגד בוני

(S) אאמר להון סמב זא ייבא ומלא זא דרהו קאפלן פיס תפז קאפל בחרה אiosk

(CJ) xmpn ipEji ipis pb'ap sn n nn xno xno xno prft -;dxi

(©*) Kai eitev rrpos' auTou? M iavaT e

(K) vecpuiv

(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 יצאו והחת צא, "go, and they went and smote," is rendered by מגד מдержан, "go and kill," two
imperatives, while ἔτεος ἐκπεπευμένοι, "while going out," is related to the preceding sentence πλησατε τὸς ὀδοὺς, "fill the ways," and to the last imperative καὶ κόπτετε, "and smite." Though the Syriac version omits "and they went," it has "go, kill," both imperatives conveying an emphatic sense stronger than that of the Hebrew "and they went out." The two Imperatives carry their action toward the word קֶסְגָּלָה, "city." The Prepositional Phrase קֶסְגָּלָה, was omitted in א, while א contains it in MSS (א O) καὶ παταχατε τὴν πόλην Ο (Qtxt) 410; (א Qmg) καὶ εξελοντες έτυπον (εκτυπον 22ς) τὴν πόλιν Qmg-62, L:'.

The Hebrew word הרערת, "courts," probably related to the temple, is rendered by ὀδοὺς, "ways," in Β, whereas S has it as in Μ, רמא, "court" (Cod. <86>, 91 and <01 γ>` read similarly to Μ τὰς αὐλας, "courts").

To accept S as being a translation based or directly related to Β as a whole, one would have to assume that the Syriac translator had at hand a critical edition of Β to create the actual reading of S.

**Ezek 9:8**

(ΙΒ) ίοι, εὐχαθος τομπρατο αιτοσελη ἐν οτεμ άντα κατερ θαυ (ΙΒ)

(5) ουν εὐχαθος τευματε θατ καταλαι ισαξα καταλαι άντα ακοσ απαν της τευματ

(9) ιοι εὐχαθος τομπρατο αιτοσελη ἐν οτεμ άντα κατερ θαυ

(9) ιοι εὐχαθος τομπρατο αιτοσελη ἐν οτεμ άντα κατερ θαυ

(9) ιοι εὐχαθος τομπρατο αιτοσελη ἐν οτεμ άντα κατερ θαυ
Analysis of the Variants

S has a unique reading by rendering מְזַכֶּהּ כֹּהֵן, “while they were smiting them,” by the Syriac מְשָׁם שלמה כֹּהֶן, “and when they were slaying them.” ｳ ト and ｳ agree with ｩ in this respect. Another unique reading is the addition of אֶדֶרֶד, “in a loud voice,” after וַיַּכְכֵּל, “and I cried,” which is absent in the other versions all together. ｳ ト has אֶבֶּדֶנָה and ｳ וַיְכִּכֹּל, “I cried out,” for וַיַּכְכֵּל, “and I cried.” Regarding the nomina sancta, ｳ*(B) always lacks וַיִּשְׁאָלֵנִי כֹּהֶן, כֹּהֵן וַיַּכְכֵּל, “receive my petition”; this is a reading completely absent in the other versions. Although (#) 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

(Heb) 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'.

(Trans. of S) "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 III, having nothing to do with the textual expansion of C' and the additions and substitutions of G. A consistent characteristic of S is its avoidance of Hebraisms, which is not a concern of G as a whole. Notice that the emphatic repetition of נָּ֣שָׁנָ֖נָּנָ֖נָּנָ֖נָּנָ֖נָּנָ֖נָּנָ֖ (exceedingly great) is found in GT "офְּדוּרָא  офְּדוּרָא," but S has its customary...
combination of two adjectives לָשָׁם to render the same Hebrew sense, thus avoiding a Hebraism. The two Hebrew words עִמּוֹת, “iniquity,” and מַסֵּמ, “injustice,” are rendered by the same Greek word αἰσχος, “injustice,” in ST (S has its Syriac counterpart).

Furthermore, this version adds ἁκαθαρσίας, “uncleanness,” after ἁκαθαρσίας, which is a unique reading. Another peculiar reading of ST is the substitution of πολλά, “blood,” for λαῶν πολλά, “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 αἰμάτων, “blood,” instead of πολλά. Only οι and οι ι read αἰμάτων instead of λαῶν πολλάν. Τ' contains some targumic interpretation for this reading. It has יִבְרֵי קְשֵׁל, “those who deserve to be killed,” after יִבְרֵי קְשֵׁל, “and the land became full of.” This verse is strong evidence for an independent translation and transmission of S.

Ezek 9:10

(ם) התו אל תוחז עיני ולא א хотел דרכם ברמאז נתי unve
(S) עפות לא סאות מלחים א雒 אסיגות קזרבבצ
(ח'') וּאֲנָךָ אֵין אֵלֶּךָ מָדָרָא וָאִלְּאָס פְּרֻעֲתָא אַרְוַותְא בּרֵעֲתָא יְבִּיחַה (S"") קַאִי אוֹ פֶּסֶטָא אֵל אָפָאָלְהוֹס מְלַע, אוֹנְהֶה מִי אֵלְהֵיָא: שָׁזֵא אוֹדוֹשׁ אוֹטוֹנֶהָ אִלִּיָא קַפְּאָלְהוֹס אוֹטוֹנֶה דֵּדְוָה.
(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 T, καὶ οὖν φείδεται ὁ ὀφθαλμός μου, "and my eyes will not spare," and the use of the verb δέδωκα as the Greek equivalent for הָנַה, while S has ἔσωμαι λέγω τὸν ὄφθαλμόν μου, "I will not have mercy upon them," and Tερέμω, "I will recompense," for רָע. C avoids anthropomorphism by substituting for the Hebrew idiomatic usage of עיני, "my eye," its targumic term מפר, "my Memra."

Ezek 9:11

(י) הָנַה הָזֵאָשׁ לֵבָשׁ מַדִּים אֵשֶׁר אָמָר מַדִּים דֵּבַר לָאָמָר מִסְיָר נָסִיא (י)

(ט) הָנַה הָזֵאָשׁ לֵבָשׁ מַדִּים אֵשֶׁר אָמָר מַדִּים דֵּבַר לָאָמָר מִסְיָר נָסִיא (ט)

(ז) הָנַה הָזֵאָשׁ לֵבָשׁ מַדִּים אֵשֶׁר אָמָר מַדִּים דֵּבַר לָאָמָר מִסְיָר נָסִיא (ז)

(ח) הָנַה הָזֵאָשׁ לֵבָשׁ מַדִּים אֵשֶׁר אָמָר מַדִּים דֵּבַר לָאָמָר מִסְיָר נָסִיא (ח)

(ט) הָנַה הָזֵאָשׁ לֵבָשׁ מַדִּים אֵשֶׁר אָמָר מַדִּים דֵּבַר לָאָמָר מִסְיָר נָסִיא (ט)

(ט) הָנַה הָזֵאָשׁ לֵבָשׁ מַדִּים אֵשֶׁר אָמָר מַדִּים דֵּבַר לָאָמָר מִסְיָר נָסִיא (ט)

(ט) הָנַה הָזֵאָשׁ לֵבָשׁ מַדִּים אֵשֶׁר אָמָר מַדִּים דֵּבַר לָאָמָר מִסְיָר נָסִיא (ט)

(ט) הָנַה הָזֵאָשׁ לֵבָשׁ מַדִּים אֵשֶׁר אָמָר מַדִּים דֵּבַר לָאָמָר מִסְיָר נָסִיא (ט)

(ט) הָנַה הָזֵאָשׁ לֵבָשׁ מַדִּים אֵשֶׁר אָמָר מַדִּים דֵּבַר לָאָמָר מִסְיָר נָסִיא (ט)

(ט) H reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
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 רָאוֹת, "behold," by אֶתֶן, "and I saw," as occurs in this verse. It might be also an avoidance of Hebraism on the part of the Syriac scribe, while 5T has קָאָלָדְוֹ, "and behold," which seems to be a clear Hebraism.

The relative clause רָאָשׁ הָאִישׁ בָּשָׂר בְּמַעֲרֵי, "who [had] the inkrhorn on his loins," is lacking in S as in previous verses where the same phrase appears (9:2, 3 מַעֲרֵי). 5T reads קָאָלָדְוֹ: זַחַל עַל רְחֹמֶסְו מַעֲרֵי, "and his loins were girt with a girdle" (α', and Cod. 86 read ζαλανδοδοξειον του γραμματεου εν νωτω αυτου, "who had a scribe's inkrhorn on his back," and σ' has ζαλυ πυθακιδα εν θη οοφυ εχων, "who had the writing tablets in his loins"). Another difference is the rendering of the Hebrew word מַעֲרֵי, "linen." It is translated as בְּמַעֲרֵי which is the Syriac word for linen, and מְדַנְּךְ, "long robe," in 5T. Only σ', Cod. 86 (τα λινα), and θ' (το βασδίν) read in a way similar to that of 5T and S.

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. S has several unique readings (9:2, 4, 5, 8).

3. Similarities between S and 5T 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 anthropomorphisms as $T'$ does (9:10).

7. $S$ avoids Hebraisms, which is not a concern for $S$ as a whole (9:10).
CHAPTER XI

EZEKIEL 10

Collation

10:1

1° "of God" (MS 1111) רהמ איה [repeated] “appearance.”

מרא[ om.

10:2

1° Substit. Peal Perf. מָנָא סֶה “and he called.”

2° ָל + יָאָמ[ om. "to him.”

בְּכִרְב[ Pl.  "cherubim.”

10:3

Inf. Constr. בְּכִרְב[ Temp. particle + Peal Ptc. ֵָּנָא סֶה "when he was entering in.”

וֹדִיע[ tr. "of God.”

Q. Perf. 3° m. s. מֵָּנָא סֶה Ethpe. Perf. 3° f. s. "it was filled.”

חָוַש[ tr. "of the Lord.”

10:4

1° "of the Lord.”

בְּכִרְב[ "inner court.”

2° ֵָּנָא סֶה “of the Lord.”

10:5

Ni. Perf. מְשָׁמִים Ethpe. Ptc. מַמְלִית “was being heard.”

לָב[ Temp. particle + Pael Ptc. מַמְלִית “while speaking.”

10:6

וֹדִיע[ om.

לָב[ Temp. particle + Peal Ptc. מַמְלִית “and when he had commanded.”

וֹדִיע[ tr. “to him.”
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Q. Inf. Constr. {לָאָזָר} Peal Ptc. מְשַׁלַּקֶה
“saying.”

[Harmonization {חָזַזֶה} “whirling wheels.”]

10:7
יָנִיר + [יִנְדָיר] “of the man.”

10:8
Ni. Perf. 3° m. s. וַרְאוּא] Peal Perf 1 c. s.
סְנַנְנֶה “and I saw.”

10:9
יראנד] om.
סְטֶנֶה 3° m. עָשַׁמֶּה] [אָנַיֶּל] עָשָׁמֶה “each wheel.”

{ואָנַיֶּל} עָשָׁמֶה הָעָשָׁמֶה אָשָׁמֶה 2° om.
Dittography.

10:10
{עֶרֶאָאָהָהוּ דְּרוֹה הַשָּׁדָה לָאָרְבָּעָה} Q. Inf. Constr. 2° m. כָּלְעָה + [כָּלְעָה] 3° m. מְשַׁלַּקֶה “and one was their appearance (MS 1111 pl. מְשַׁלַּקֶה) and their image.”

{וַיְהִי} om.

10:11
Qal Inf. Constr. + 3° m. pl. suf. מְשַׁלַּקֶה Temp. particle. + Peal Ptc. + enclit. מְשַׁלַּקֶה “and when [they] were going.”

1° and 2° Qal Imperf. יָלְכוּא] Peal Ptc. + enclit. מְשַׁלַּקֶה “[they] were going.”

1° Ni. Imperf. יָם] Peal Ptc. + enclit. מְשַׁלַּקֶה “they were not turning.”

“except to.”

Q. Imperf. יָם] Peal Ptc. + enclit. מְשַׁלַּקֶה “where [they] were going.”

Q. Inf. Constr. 2° מְשַׁלַּקֶה Ethp. Ptc. + enclit. מְשַׁלַּקֶה “and [they] were not turning.”


10:12
{חֶלֶלֶק} Substit. הָאוֹרֶפָּה “whirling wheels.”

{חֶלֶלֶק} חָלָה חָלָה] מְשַׁלַּקֶה “they were full of eyes.”
“when they went (Peal Ptc.) round about to their sides.”

10:13

Pu. Perf. הֵלָּדוּ קָרָא [Holy] Peal Perf. מָכָּר “he called.”
Subst. מַכָּר “before me.”

10:14

“belonging to each one of them.”

10:16

Ptc. + enclit. הָעָבִּד הֵלָּדוּ “and when they were going.”
“they were going.”

+ 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. [ yoter ] Peal Perf. 3 m. pl. “and they stood.”

10:20

Data Analysis

Ezek 10:1

אֲדֹנָי אֲנָחַת הַנַּחַל הָבֹקֶץ אָסְרֶה עַל רָאָם הָהֲרוֹבִים (3)
כֵּן טְפִיר אֲדֹנָיךָ דֶּמְתָא כֵּסָא נָרָא עַלְיוֹדָה
סְרַעַת חָלָלָהּ לֹא לָכַי לֶאָסְרֶה לְאָסְרֶה לֶאָסְרֶה (5)
כֵּן טְפִיר אֲדֹנָיךָ דֶּמְתָא כֵּסָא נָרָא עַלְיוֹדָה
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(C') καὶ ἐδοὺ καὶ ἐπάνω τοῦ στερεώματος τοῦ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς τῶν χερουβίν ὡς λίθος σαφείρου ὀμοίωμα θρόνου ἐπ' αὐτῶν.

(Trans. of S) “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 $S^*$ and $S$ in terms of the common omission of the verb παρα, “it appeared,” or for a relationship with $S^A$, for the latter contains a group of MSS that has the reading found in the Syriac version and $\text{M}$, but lacking in $S^*$, ὅμοιωμα] pr. ὦς ὀρασίς x O; pr. ὦς εἴδος 62; + εἴδους L*46. These, however, are not sufficient proof to establish a direct relationship between them. The reason is that if $S$ was based on a MS or recension similar to $S^*$, how does it also have the reading of $S^A$? On the other hand, if $S$ is related to $S^A$, then the question is which group of MSS $S$ is it related to? for $S$ has half of its reading similar to group O or L, whereas group O has the equivalence for the Syriac omission of παρα, “it appeared,” that is, ὠφθη (O-62, and also σ', θ', x 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. C' agrees with $\text{M}$ 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 CT regarding their agreement in both instances of the Hebrew word לְכַרְבוֹת (לְכַרְבוֹת, לְכַרְבוֹת) (1° לְכַרְבוֹת, 2° לְכַרְבוֹת). S and CT translate both in the plural form. CT has both as they occur in III, with the sole exception of MS c that has them in the plural (לְכַרְבוֹת). 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 $\mathcal{G}^T$.

Against a direct relationship between $S$ and $\mathcal{G}^*$ is the presence of the second instance of the verb יראתי ($y'z^3$) in $S$, which is absent in $\mathcal{G}^*$ (some MSS of $\mathcal{G}^A$ contain it; O-62 kai επεξε). Furthermore, the substitution of the introductory verb יראתי ($y'z^3$) by $y'z^3$, "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 לעיני, "before my eyes," was translated by its Syriac cognate idiom הзамן, "before my sight/eyes"; on the other hand $\mathcal{G}^T$ renders it by a preposition and the enclitic pronoun ενώσαν μου, "before me." This indicates that $S$ did not base its translation on $\mathcal{G}^T$.

Ezek 10:3

(III) $\text{רֵ֣שׁ בֵּ֣ית בֵּ֣י

(S) $\text{כִּֽהְנָּה בֵּֽי бֵּי

(\mathcal{G}^*) $\text{και τα χερουβιν ειστηκε εκ δεξιων του ουκου εν τω εἰσπορευομαι των ανωτω, και η νεφελη ξηπησεν την αυλην την εσωτεριν.}$

(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., "when he entered," by the Peal Ptc.
with the temporal mark אֶלֶּךָּ הָאָ, “when entering,” which is the consistent way Syriac renders the Hebrew Inf. Constr. structure. ST renders it by the form הָיְתָתֵךְ קִבֵּרֶךְ יַואַד (Dep. Inf.), “while entering,” probably a Hebraism. Notice that the word order is different between S and ST. The latter agrees with the order of IR, 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 מָלַל, for instance the Q. Perf. מָלַל, “it filled,” was rendered by מָלַל (Ethpe.), which can have the same time reference as the simple Perfect, but in the passive voice, “it was filled.” L adds מָלַל, “dark misty, dense,” after the word מָלַל, “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

1Moule, 174: “הָיְתָתֵךְ קִבֵּרֶךְ יַואַד 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.
(Sp) καὶ ἀπήρεν ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἀπὸ τῶν χερουβίων εἰς τὸ αὐθρον τοῦ οἴκου, καὶ ἔπλησεν τὸν οίκον ἡ νεφέλη, καὶ ἡ αὐλὴ ἐπλήσθη τοῦ φέγγους τῆς δόξης κυρίου.

(Trans. of S) “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 μήν as κυρίος, “God,” and the second by κυρίος, “Lord.”” (only MS 1111 has both instances as κυρίος). Sp translates both by κυρίος, “Lord.” A further reading peculiar to S is the addition of αἷμα “inner,” to qualify τὸ χερουβὶν, “and the court,” as in the preceding verse (“inner court”).

Another clear difference between S and Sp 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 Sp 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 χερουβὶν, “cherub,” in the singular by S indicates that the Syriac version has a closer relationship to the reading found in Μ than to that in Sp concerning this verse, for the latter has a Hebrew transliteration χερουβὶν in the plural (only MSS Q-88 read χερουβὶν as in Μ).
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 II.

The only significant deviations are the rendering of the Ni. Perf. "to be," namely "[it] was being heard," whereas ST has the Imperf. 3° s. "it was heard," and the rendering of the Pi. Inf. Constr. "when he speaks," by the Pael Ptc. "speaking," preceded by the temporal particle "when." Notice that ST has a participle also, "speaking," without the temporal marker "when." The crucial difference, however, is the rendering of the nomen sacrum "God." S reads, "God," while ST has transliterated it with an additional explanatory apposition of it, namely "speaking." T's also has, but it avoids

---

Nöldeke, § 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 T. 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, "when he
commanded," by a Syriac equivalent, a temporal particle plus the Peal Perf. 3 m. s. ἔτη τῷ ἐντελεχεσθαι αὐτὸν, "when commanding him," a non-Greek form of expression, a Hebraism. Notice that the Syriac scribe strives to avoid Hebraisms by using skillfully all types of literary devices, showing his high literary knowledge of both languages (Syriac and Hebrew). The Hebrew introductory temporal mark ἔτη, "and it happened," is present in Ἑτ (καὶ ἐγένετο, 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," policeman and vehicle. S translates both using the same Syriac word ἄλας “wheels," since the text is about the same wheels. Probably this was done to avoid misunderstanding or ambiguity. Ἑτ and C also translate both instances by the same correspondent Greek or Aramaic word, τροχῶν and ἄλας.

The usual Hebrew introduction of a Direct Speech, the Inf. Constr. ἔθεε, "saying," is translated by a more direct expression in S, the Peal Perf. plus the Ind. Obj. ἔθεε, “he said to him,” while Ἑτ and C keep the Hebrew expression conveyed in their Participle and Infinitive respectively, ἔγενε and ἔγενε, “saying,” which can be considered a Hebraism in the case of Ἑτ.

Ἑτ contains an extra-Masoretic reading, which is not shared by any other ancient version. It is the addition of ἅγιαν, “sacred,” after στολήν, long “robe,” that can be considered an explanatory gloss rather than an actual reading of its Vorlage. Furthermore,
Deal reads a Ptc. of place ἐξομένος, “neighboring, close, near,” for the Hebrew הצל, “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, ס 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) רוחלולה המב דא וא מברנה לכרובים אלא המב א뒤
בכנת הכרובים יהא ירוחא אלא ת porte מקבר יהוד ויהי זיא
 justified as accurate
to sidetext (S)
 justified as accurate
to sidetext (C)
attribution for the translation of ס
 justified as accurate
(Trans. of ס) “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 ST, CJ, and M. Notice that the Hebrew verbs "and he took," and "and he took," are rendered by the same Greek verb ἑκάτερα and the Aramaic verb "and he took," whereas S uses synonymous verbs (i.e., "and he took") for the instances as they occur in M.

The unique reading found in the Syriac version can be explained by its characteristic feature of avoiding ambiguity; S adds אָרָם, "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.

S* has several omissions which are ignored by S (e.g., מְבֵיתת הַמְּכַרֶּר and כיורוֹבֵי), but none of them gives any indication for a Syriac relationship. S* contains רֹפֵן פֹּרֵכָה רֹפֵן "a long sacred robe." The last part (רֹפֵן אָנָן) 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

(מְבֵיתת הַמְּכַרֶּר וְאָנָן)
Analysis of the Variants

In this case S is similar to $^\text{6T}$ (except MS A). Both versions read סֵנָמ and קָאָּד אֵין הוּא, "and I saw," against the Masoretic reading נִמ. ו. מ. ה. א., "and it was shown, or appeared." This can be explained based on the unvoweled Hebrew text, or based on the preceding chapter where סֵנָמ, "and I saw," was used instead of וְזָאָה, "and behold" (9:2, 11), and here (10:8) for the verb תָּרָד. 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. $^\text{C}$ agrees with the reading of $^\text{IR}$.

Ezek 10:9

אֶרֶנָה הָדַה אֲרָבֵהֶה אֲפֵּנֵא אֲפֵלָה הָכְרָבָּה אֱפַּמְּאָה הָאֵל הָכְרָבָּה (IR)

אֱפַּמְּאָה הָאֵל הָכְרָבָּה אֲרָבֵהֶה אֲפֵּנֵא אֲפֵלָה הָכְרָבָּה (S)
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(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 GS (B, 147, 311-46, 764-130-233) omitted the second instance of the
Hebrew nominal sentence "ויא nº לזרע חרב ידיד חרב, "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 GA contain it, e.g., (O, Cod. 86) εἰσὶν τροχοίς εἷς
ἐξόμενος χερουβ (πρὸς χ. Α; τούτων χερουβιμ τοῦ 62; Β[εθέμ L-36-538, 87-239-613, 26; τῶν
χερουβιμ 410) ἐκάπετ (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 Jotton-
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 $\mathfrak{T}$ because there are several key differences that do not allow for that conclusion. For instance, $S$ omits דנה, whereas $\mathfrak{T}$ has it, and the rendering of the two instances of the prep. פאר, "beside," is by a long verbal sentence Pluperfect 3° pl. plus the Ptc. of $\varepsilon\chi\omega$ in its participial adverbial usage, namely $\varepsilon\iota\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\iota\varepsilon\iota\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$ $\varepsilon\chi\mu\varepsilon\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\nu$, "stood close," for the first instance, and for the second by the Ptc. used as an Adv. of place $\varepsilon\chi\mu\varepsilon\nu\omicron\iota$, "close, near." $S$, on the contrary, uses its Syriac noun $\pi\nu\lambda\sigma$ "side," in a construct state, and $\mathcal{C}$ has בּסֶם, "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 Ñגּ, which is transliterated by $S$, while $\mathfrak{T}$ interpreted it as being לָיתוּי מַדְרָאָס (א' χρυσολιθοῦ; σ' υακιμοῦ; ἐφ' and θ' θαροῖς), and $\mathcal{C}$ reads מִסָּה, "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**

The next evidence for an independent translation in $S$ is the rendering of the last Hebrew word Ñגּ, which is transliterated by $S$, while $\mathfrak{T}$ interpreted it as being לָיתוּי מַדְרָאָס (א' χρυσολιθοῦ; σ' υακιμοῦ; ἐφ' and θ' θαροῖς), and $\mathcal{C}$ reads מִסָּה, "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**

בַּלְכָּהָא אֵלָא אָרְבִּעַת יְבֵיעָהָא יֵלֶכֶת לְאֵל הַבְּלָכָהָא

הָמַכְּכֶמָא אָשֶׁר יְפֹּר הָרָאשָׁא אָחוּרִי יֵלֶכֶת לָא יֵכֶּּכֶּ לָכָהָא

מַכָּכֶמָא יֵבִיאֵלָא שָׁקָא הֵלָא שָׁכָכָהָא שָׁזָא שָׁכָזָא מַכְּכֶמָא (S)
Analysis of the Variants

The main point to be noticed here is the “Syriacization” of the text of $S$, whereas $\delta^T$ 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 $\pi\nu\alpha\kappa\omicron$). $\delta^T$, however, employs a non-Greek form for translating these Hebrew Inf. Constr., namely $\nu\tau\circ$ plus Inf., which is considered a Hebraism in Greek.2

Notice the closeness of $S$ to $\text{IR}$ by the use of the Syriac cognate word $\pi\nu\alpha\kappa\omicron\tau\omicron$, “first (head) of them,” for the Hebrew counterpart $\nu\tau\circ\pi\nu\kappa\alpha\omicron$, “the head,” while $\zeta^T$ has an

---

1Muraoka, § 71.

2Ibid.; Moule, 174.
Aramaic synonym, but not cognate word, קרמל, "the first." GT reads two nouns in apposition, ה יְּשָׁרֵי חַרְּשֵׁי, "the first one (the first, the one in the beginning)"; only Cod. Q has נִכְּלָה (α' νευε κεφαλή; ο' αρχήνος; θ' πρωτός). Therefore one may conclude that the Syriac version was a very skillfully translated version based on a Hebrew text very similar to that of ה.

Ezek 10:12

(ה) וכל בכמה ירידה ובנפיחות והואופים מלואים מעינו כביש לארבעתא אפורית

(ג) סיה כלב מסוייס סמויים ואסורים ואסורים לא יסורים

(צ) כל בכמה ירידה והאפורית והואופים עליליא מעינו מעינו סוחר סוחר לארבעתא הניליא

(ש') כיוון היוו א맛ין קאוי איפירע אמותין קאוי איפירע אמותין קאוי איפירע אמותין

(ס') "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 "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 מָרַת, “to go round about,” in a composite tense implying a continual, habitual action in the past, for the Hebrew Adv. זָרַע, “round about,” and by substituting the last two Hebrew words that seem to be syntactically misplaced, by a clearer Syriac prepositional phrase לַחֲצֵנָה, “toward their sides.” Another possibility is that the Syriac scribe harmonized it with vs. 11, which reads, “as they went toward their four sides.”

*G* omits, “and their whole body,” while *G A* has it in (× O) καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ σαρκες (πᾶσα η σαρκ prob. π. σ. III) αὐτῶν Ο’ III. Notice that α’, ο’, and θ’, Cod. 87-91 contain it as in Μ, init. pr. × καὶ (> Cod. 91) πᾶσαι αἱ σαρκες αὐτῶν (-του 87-91) Q1xt 86 (without ×) 87-91 (both are without ×).

*C* agrees with Μ, its only deviation being the repetition of ἐπεκλίθη, “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**

(Μ) Λαφάπτυς λέει καὶ θεατρῦει ζωήν

(*S*) Μηδενάρια μετὰ τὴν κατήλυσα Μετέχον.

(*C*) Λαφάπτυς λέει καὶ θεατρῦει γεγονέναι Μετά μόνον.

(*G*) τοῖς δὲ τροχοῖς τούτοις ἐπεκλίθη Γελγελ ἀκουόντος μου.

(Trans. of *S*) “As for the wheels, he called them whirling wheels before me.”
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 כָּרָה, "it was called," by the active Peal כָּרָה, "he called" (Gal T has a passive reading as in מ), and by substituting the Hebrew idiom בָּעָל, "in my ears," by a Syriac prepositional phrase with a similar sense כָּרָה, "before me," indicating proximity, whereas ס T has אָדוֹנָיָּא, "in my hearing," which is closer to the Hebrew expression "in my ears," and can be a Hebraism.

C′ agrees with מ, while ס T transliterates the Hebrew word מִלָּל, "whirling [wheel]," as מִלָּל, even to the point that מ S 62 transliterates the Hebrew article מִלָּל. א reads מִלָּל, "wheel," א, Q, and Cods. 86, 87 have מִלָּל, "whirling," and Cod. 91 reads מִלָּל, "proclaiming/interpreting wheel."

This verse shows that though the reading of S is closely related that of מ, the Syriac scribe strives to render his translation into good Syriac style, which is not the case of ס T into Greek.

Ezek 10:14
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(om. in \( \textbf{G}^* \) but present in \( \textbf{G}^A \)) καὶ τεσσαρα προσώπα τῷ εἷς τὸ προσώπον τοῦ εἷς προσώπον τοῦ χερουβ καὶ τὸ προσώπον τοῦ δευτερου προσώπον ανθρώπου καὶ τὸ τρίτου προσώπον λεοντος καὶ τὸ τέταρτον προσώπον αετου.

(Trans. of \( S \)) “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 τοῦ εἰς, “belonging to each one,” into a clearer idiom in the Syriac language שְׂמֵשׁ וּקְנֵי, “belonging to every one of them,” thus making the Syriac syntax of the sentence smoother to its reader, avoiding ambiguity; whereas \( \textbf{G}^A \) contains what seems to be a Hebraism τῷ εἷς, “of each” (\( \textbf{G}^* \) omits vs. 14 altogether).¹ 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 שְׂמֵשׁ וּקְנֵי, “second, third, and fourth,” respectively, by the same Syriac word שְׂמֵשׁ וּקְנֵי, “and the next,” which

¹Vs. 14 reads as follows in \( \textbf{G}^A \): καὶ τεσσαρα προσώπα τῷ εἷς (+ καὶ 534) το προσώπον τοῦ εἷς (εἰς εἰκάστον τῷν καὶ προσώπον τοῦ εἰς \( L^* \)-46-311 et εἰς εἰκάστον τῷν εἰς τὸ πρός τοῦ εἰς \( L^* \)-46-311) προσώπον (>544) τοῦ (τῷν 26, 410; > A, \( L^* \)-710) χερου (-βι 147; -β(ε)μ 62, 48c-II, 87-εII-613, 26, 410) καὶ το (>62', \( V \)-46) προσώπον τοῦ δευτερου (το δευτερου προ το δευτ. \( L^* \)-311) προσώπον ανθρώπου καὶ το τρίτου (το προσώπον τοῦ τρίτου προ το τρίτου \( A \)) προσώπον λεοντος καὶ το τέταρτον προσώπον αετου rel., see Apparatus of the Göttingen Edition. This verse also appears in Cod. Qtxt.
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reflects more of an editorial work than its Vorlage. A reads τοῦ δευτεροῦ, τὸ τρίτον, and τὸ τετράτον, similar to the Masoretic reading.

Ezek 10:16

(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 ἐν, “when,” and the Imperfect by the same grammatical structure without the temporal particle. As was mentioned before, the composite tense
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(Ptc. + enclitic) is the normal Syriac feature to express a habitual action in the past. 6 renders the Inf. Constr. by a Hebraism, namely $\epsilon\nu\tau\omega +$ Inf. 1

S substitutes the Hebrew expressions $\pi\lambda\varsigma\alpha\kappa\varsigma$, “beside them” (prep. of place), and $\pi\lambda\varsigma\alpha\kappa\varsigma$, “from beside them” (of source), by two simple Syriac expressions $\kappa\delta\mu\varepsilon\mu\nu\nu$, “with them” (of accompaniment), and $\kappa\delta\mu\varepsilon\mu\nu\nu$, “from them” (of source), respectively. 6 translates the first instance by the participle of place plus the pronoun $\epsilon\chi\omicron\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\omicron\alpha\omicron\tau\omega\nu$, “near them,” and the second instance is omitted in 6, but present in $6^A$, e.g., $\lambda\iota\nu\eta\nu + (\times\ O)$ $\kappa\alpha\gamma\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\iota\alpha\omicron\tau\nu\nu$ (at $\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\nu$ or probably at $\alpha\omicron\tau\nu\nu\ 106$; om. at $\alpha\omicron\tau\nu\nu\ 46$) $\epsilon\chi\omicron\omicron\nu\alpha\nu\nu$ (-\omicron\nu\nu\ 147. L`.`-449*, 764-233-613, 544) $\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\nu$ (-\omicron\tau\ 233) rel., and also in an asterisk in Cod. Q\textsuperscript{tex}* $\kappa\alpha\gamma\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\iota\alpha\omicron\tau\nu\nu$ (a $\nu\nu\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\omicron\iota\nu\nu$ Cod. 86) $\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\nu$. 6 agrees with the reading of $6^A$; its sole deviation is the substitution of the word $\eta\rho\rho\alpha\omicron\nu\nu$ by $\kappa\alpha\gamma\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\iota\alpha\omicron\tau\nu\nu$, “heavens.”

Ezek 10:17

$6^A$  $\kappa\alpha\gamma\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\iota\alpha$ $\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\nu$ $\epsilon\chi\omicron\omicron\nu\alpha\nu\nu$ $\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\nu$ $\eta\rho\rho\alpha\omicron\nu\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\gamma\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\iota\alpha$ $\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\gamma\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\iota\alpha$ $\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\nu$ $\eta\rho\rho\alpha\omicron\nu\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\gamma\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\iota\alpha$ $\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\nu$ $\eta\rho\rho\alpha\omicron\nu\nu$

$6^*$  $\epsilon\nu\tau\omega$ $\kappa\alpha\gamma\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\iota\alpha$ $\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\gamma\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\iota\alpha$ $\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\nu$ $\eta\rho\rho\alpha\omicron\nu\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\gamma\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\iota\alpha$ $\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\nu$ $\eta\rho\rho\alpha\omicron\nu\nu$

(C\textsuperscript{tex}) en tā ḫētānāi aūtā ēistīkēsān kai ēn tā metēwreižesōhāi aūtā ēmetēwreižōnto met' aūtōn, diōtī πνεύμα ᾑως ēn aūtōs īnw.

1Muraoka, § 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 εν τοις τροχοις; 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.

\(\text{C}^I\) agrees with \(\text{M}\) precisely, while \(\text{G}^T\) struggles to render a reading as close as possible to its Hebrew text, even containing several Hebraisms. For instance, \(\text{G}^T\) translates the Inf. Constr. by the grammatical construction \(\epsilon\nu\;\tau\omega\;+\;\text{Inf.}\;+\;\text{pronoun, which is a Hebraism.}

The only relationship between \(S\) and \(\text{G}^T\) is a reading found in \(\text{G}^A\ MS\ 239\) 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**

\(\text{C}^I\) agrees with \(\text{M}\) precisely, while \(\text{G}^T\) struggles to render a reading as close as possible to its Hebrew text, even containing several Hebraisms. For instance, \(\text{G}^T\) translates the Inf. Constr. by the grammatical construction \(\epsilon\nu\;\tau\omega\;+\;\text{Inf.}\;+\;\text{pronoun, which is a Hebraism.}

The only relationship between \(S\) and \(\text{G}^T\) is a reading found in \(\text{G}^A\ MS\ 239\) 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**

\(\text{C}^I\) agrees with \(\text{M}\) precisely, while \(\text{G}^T\) struggles to render a reading as close as possible to its Hebrew text, even containing several Hebraisms. For instance, \(\text{G}^T\) translates the Inf. Constr. by the grammatical construction \(\epsilon\nu\;\tau\omega\;+\;\text{Inf.}\;+\;\text{pronoun, which is a Hebraism.}

The only relationship between \(S\) and \(\text{G}^T\) is a reading found in \(\text{G}^A\ MS\ 239\) 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**

\(\text{C}^I\) agrees with \(\text{M}\) precisely, while \(\text{G}^T\) struggles to render a reading as close as possible to its Hebrew text, even containing several Hebraisms. For instance, \(\text{G}^T\) translates the Inf. Constr. by the grammatical construction \(\epsilon\nu\;\tau\omega\;+\;\text{Inf.}\;+\;\text{pronoun, which is a Hebraism.}

The only relationship between \(S\) and \(\text{G}^T\) is a reading found in \(\text{G}^A\ MS\ 239\) 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 מ. The only exception is the syntactical correction made by S (also גט) regarding the number of the Hebrew verb רוחם, "and it stood." S renders it by the plural form of the verb עמדה, "and they stood," probably referring to the cherubim as its antecedent, while מ and also י refer back to the singular noun חבורה, "and the glory."

גט has a unique reading (except α ανατολικης Cod. 86 κατ ανατολας Cod. 86, and 91) that may be due to a misunderstanding of the Adj. הקדMOST, "the eastern," by the preposition לפני, "before, in front," rendered by the Greek της απεναντια, "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 מ in this regard.

גט has an equivalent substitution for the Hebrew idiom לפניי, "before my eyes," that is עמדה ν ημου, "before me." Only Cod. 86 and α read similarly to מ κατ οφθαλμου (μου), "to my eyes."

Ezek 10:21

ארבותה ארבותה פיס לזרוח ארבות ניסים לזרוח ודום זה ארם התח פיסים (מ)
Analysis of the Variants

S and C 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 רוח, “each one [had],” by a Syriac equivalent expression that makes clearer the syntactical context of the verse רוח מיהו, “each of them [had].” The expression רוח, “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 וְרָאָשָׁה, “four.” S and C contain it in their text, while it is absent in ג*, but present in some MSS of גא (× O-Syh) Q-Syh-62 τέσσαρα (α’, θ’, and Qtxt have an asterisk before the first instance of τέσσαρα × τέσσαρα). These readings are a strong evidence against BHS’s suggestion.

Notice also the unique reading of ג*, καὶ ὀκτὼ πτέρυγες, “and eight wings,” for וְרָאָשָׁה כַּפֶּת, “and four wings.” גא, however, has the Masoretic reading in MSS O, 538, C (87txt, 91txt)-534-86-403’. Regarding numerical figures, the Peshitta of Ezek 1-12...
always agrees with מ.

Ezek 10:22

(מ) always agrees with מ.

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 וַיְהִי, “like,” before מָהָה, “they [were],” where one would expect the Hebrew preposition כ, “like”; and the awkward word וַיִּמְשָׁה, “and their sign,” is substituted by וַיָּשָׁה, “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 וַיָּשָׁה, “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 ט omits it completely, it
adds ὑποκάτω τῆς δόξης θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ, “under the glory of God of Israel,” after רַאֲיָתִי, “I saw.” This might be a harmonization with vs. 19 that contains it. The word מָצָאָה, “their appearance,” is found in $S$, but omitted in $Q^*$, though some MSS of $Q^*$ have it, e.g., L-311-V-46 read το εἰδος αὐτών; (Κ Θ) τὴν ορασίν ουτων rel. (Θ + Κ τὴν ορασίν ουτων $Q^{ext}$).

**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 $P$.

2. $S$ avoids Hebraisms while $Q^{T}$ 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 $Q^{T}$ and $S$ can be explained by common translation techniques (10:8, 9).

CHAPTER XII

EZEPKIEL 11

Collation

11:1
...eastern.
Q. Perf. Subst. Peal Perf. "you have desired."

11:2
...the Lord.
Pron. + Q. Perf. + Suf. 3° f. s. "sons of."

11:3
...evil counsels.

11:4
...is it.
[Pron. + Q. Perf. + Suf. 3° f. s. "sons of."

11:5
...we have built/we are building.

11:7
...because of that.
Pron. + Q. Perf. + Suf. 3° f. s. "you killed ones."
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Hi. Perf. [Aphel Ptc. + Pron.] 

11:10

- "I am bringing."

11:12

- copula.

11:13

- om.

Ni. Inf. Constr. + suf. 1° c. s. 

Temp. particle + Ethpe. Perf. 1° c. pl.

- "and when I had prophesied."

11:14

- tr.

11:15

- "they will be annihilated."

11:16

- om.

1° and 2° [om.]

Adv. [Adj.] "small."


- "I will assemble you."


- "and I will bring you."

Substit. [Substit.]

- "land."

Substit. [Substit.]

- "new."

Synonym [Peal Perf.]

- "in them."

[Peal Perf.]

- tr.

[tr.]

Idiom [Idiom]

- "in the mind/conscience."

Suf. Pron. 3° pl. [Suf. Pron. 2° pl.]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
“your images and your abominations.”

11:22 "Chaldeans."

“with them.”

11:24 "to the land of the

Data Analysis

Ezek 11:1

(Π) θυμάσαι ὅτι ἐρχόμενοι ἐντοπίζοντες μὴ ἔχῃς βάθος ἢ ἡ τοιχία

τοῦ ναοῦ κρυφήν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἀναθέα

βούρζος ἂν εἶναι καὶ νῦν ἐκ τῶν πλευρῶν μοι βατών πρὸς τὸν

μετέχεις τοὺς σώματα τῶν ἁπάντων, καὶ συνεργάζονται (§)

διὰ τοῦτον τὸν ἀνθρώπον, συνάδευσαν τὰ σώματα τοις ἀνθρώποις, ἐποιεῖτε τὰ σώματα (§)

τοῦτον ἄνθρωπον μεταφέρετε συνάδευσαν τὰ σώματα τῶν ἁπάντων, καὶ συνεργάζονται (§)

(Ε*) Καὶ ἀνέλαβεν μὲ πνεῦμα καὶ ἤγαγεν μὲ ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην τοῦ οἴκου κυρίου τὴν κατέναντι τὴν βλέπουσαν κατὰ ἀνατολάς· καὶ ἵσον ἐπὶ τῶν προθύρων τῆς πύλης ὡς ἐύκοσι καὶ πέντε ἀνδρεῖς, καὶ ἤδειον ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν τὸν Ἱεζονίαν τὸν τοῦ Εξερ καὶ φαλτιάν τὸν τοῦ Βαναίου τοὺς ἀφηγογημένους τοῦ λαοῦ.
(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 בֵּית הָאוֹר, “eastern,” after the first instance of שֶׁם, “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 רָאָה, “behold,” by סנה, “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 מָתַי (Ptc.), “standing,” added to the text after עָשַׂר, “men” (collective), with the aim of making the text flow smoothly.

$T$ is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of $M$, whereas $G$ has דְּוָאָבָא כָּאָרוּפָא קַטּוּפָא, כָּלִּּיָּווֵּר אָשֶׁרֶס, “about 25 men,” indicating that the scribe was unsure of the number of men gathered in the house of the Lord, while $M$ and $S$ were precise in their figures.

Ezek 11:2

רָאָה אלֶה בֶּן אָבִי אֲלֵה אָמָסִים הָעִנּוֹס אֶנֶּה עִנִּישׁ עִדֵּה מִנִּיהָ בָּאתָ (M)

$M$

$S$ן וַחֲמִית יִפְטֵר מָשָּׁא, קָלֵיהּ מְלַכָּה, קָלֵיהּ מְלַכָּה, קָלֵיהּ מְלַכָּה, קָלֵיהּ מְלַכָּה (S)

דְּבָרָה מֵכְלָה, מֵכְלָה, מֵכְלָה, מֵכְלָה, מֵכְלָה.
(CJ) tnr? ampis era _ 
(CJ) 

(Trans. of 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 רע א is in the 3° m. s., therefore its antecedent cannot be זור, "spirit" (vs. 1), for that is a feminine noun.

Thus S and S T added כעמעוי / זורוס, “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

(Trans. of S) “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 II. 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.

S 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 C' has several epexegetical additions to the text, it renders the Inf. Constr. by its Aramaic cognate Inf. Constr. without any deviation.
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Ezek 11:5

(Trans. of S) “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’.”

Analysis of the Variants

Some MSS of S read ἡτερισμός χυρίου, “Lord of Authority” (7h2, 8a1, 9d1.2, 10d1, 11d1.2, 12a1, 12d1.3), for the two instances of מְרִיא in H (7a1 has only מְרִיא).

S contains a reading similar to that of S in several of its MSS, e.g., αἰώνιος κύριος L'-311, C'-86’-393 (κύριος αἰώνιος 36). Though both seem to be related, their relationship is not strong enough to support a direct dependency upon one another for the following reasons: (1) The last Hebrew verb ידְעַת, “I know it,” is rendered in the Syriac version by ידְעַת, “I know them,” indicating that the Syriac scribe corrected the syntactical disagreement of the Masoretic reading (number agreement between the Direct
Object of ięć  and its antecedent עֵדֶת, “things that come up in your mind”), which is rendered in 金价- by יָדָעְתָּם, “I understand” (MS 62 + אִשָּׁה), and that the Syriac scribe recognized the casus pendens of the pronoun אֵלְיוֹנִי; (2) S has a unique reading present in all of its witnesses, namely the rendering of the Hebrew מֵאָדָם, “sons of Israel.”

Ezek 11:6

| הֶרְבוֹת הַתָּלְמִידִים | בֵּית הַיָּהּדָה | מֵאָדָם | מַה-דָּבָר | מֵאָדָם | מַה-דָּבָר | מַה-דָּבָר | מַה-דָּבָר |
|-----------------|-------------|-------|-------|
| הֶרְבוֹת | כָּל-עָדָם | מֵאָדָם | מַה-דָּבָר |

(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 בְּבִין, "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 מְמוּלִים, "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 מְמוּל, "killed by the sword." On the other hand, the Hebrew verb בִּבִין may be taken as a case of homonymy between the Hebrew and Syriac languages. The corresponding homonymous Syriac verb is the Pael דָּוֶּה, "to purify, wash away, etc.," with the same consonantal spelling but with a different meaning; consequently, the scribe used a Syriac verb that conveyed the same sense as the Hebrew counterpart.

Ge' has νεκροὺς, a generic term for the first instance, and τραυματῶν, "wounded," a more specific term but still leaving much to be desired in regard to its Hebrew counterpart. The Greek word τραυματῶν does not convey the exact sense of being killed by an instrument like a sword, which is the weapon implied in the text.

Although Ge is related to S by translating הַחַדָּר, "her outside," with the Aramaic noun אַרְפָּא, "her marketplace, broad street, city quarter," as it occurs in S אַרְפָא, "her marketplaces, street," Ge has the same noun for both instances of the Hebrew בּוֹלֶן, which...
is the Aramaic generic term for any type of killing (כְּפִלָּה).

**Ezek 11:7**

בְּכֵן קָדָם אָמְרֵי לְאַלְדָּה יַסְדִּיק יָדָיו וְלֹא יָסִיר וּבְאַמְּלָה הַרְכָּז הַפָּרָשָׁה מַחְיֶה (S)

(5) _ £I^. -i. T jj .rAaHin rtftoi 'Isartf rCuai \j-n \j-n \j-n

(5) "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 $S^t$ is overshadowed by their overwhelming differences. For instance, the Hi. Perf. 3° m. s. אִבָּרָה, “he brings [you] forth” (which may be a scribal error for אֵדֶרֶת, 1° 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,"¹ "I am bringing [you] out," while GT translates it by the Fut. Act. Ind. 1° s. 安全保障, "I will lead [you] out." Both versions try to make sense out of the Hi. 3° m. s. (resourceName), for it is in a direct speech in which (resourceName) 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 וַיִּקְצֹּל 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 אֲנִי אֶבּוּל, "I will exile [you] out" (see vs. 9 for the same reading).

Also, notice the careful construction of the expression תִּנְהַל תִּנְהַל, "they are the flesh." This is a good Syriac construction: "The enclitic forms (אֹתוֹ) 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."² This supports the argument of high literary skills of the Syriac scribe of the Peshitta of Ezek 1-12.

Ezek 11:11

⁴Muraoka, *Classical Syriac for Hebraists*, § 68.

²Ibid., § 10; Nöldeke, § 64.
(S*) αὐτή ὑμῖν οὐκ ἔσται εἰς λήθα, καὶ ὑμεῖς οὐ μὴ γένησθε ἐν μέσῳ αὐτής εἰς κρέα· ἐπὶ τῶν ὄριων τοῦ Ἰσραήλ κρίνω 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 A 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 11. C gives again a direct exilic interpretation of this verse by rendering כבשא דבשיל נמי דרזה כיון "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

(1) ורְדֵעַתָּה כִּי אֶינָּה אֵשֶׁר בָּעָכָר לֵאָלְכֶתָ‏ַ‏הַמַּעְפָּמָה (B)
לא שׁ СШ וסוספה או נָמָרֶם נַעֲרָבִיתֵכֶם שׁשׁשָּׁה (S)
מַעֲפָמָה, כִּי בָּעָכָר לֵאָלְכֶתָ‏ַ‏הַמַּעְפָּמָה (C)
לֵא שׁ СШ בָּעָכָר לֵאָלְכֶתָ‏ַ‏הַמַּעְפָּמָה (S)
וְרְדֵעַתָּה כִּי אֶינָּה אֵשֶׁר בָּעָכָר לֵאָלְכֶתָ‏ַ‏הַמַּעְפָּמָה (C)
לא שׁ СШ וסוספה או נָמָרֶם נַעֲרָבִיתֵכֶם שׁשׁשָּׁה (S)
לֵא שׁ СШ בָּעָכָר לֵאָלְכֶתָ‏ַ‏הַמַּעְפָּמָה (S)
(1) וְרְדֵעַתָּה כִּי אֶינָּה אֵשֶׁר בָּעָכָר לֵאָלְכֶתָ‏ַ‏הַמַּעְפָּמָה (C)
כִּי אֶינָּה אֵשֶׁר בָּעָכָר לֵאָלְכֶתָ‏ַ‏הַמַּעְפָּמָה וּכְּרִיכָנָה (S)
לֵא שׁ СШ וסוספה או נָמָרֶם נַעֲרָבִיתֵכֶם שׁשׁשָּׁה (S)
לֵא שׁ СШ בָּעָכָר לֵאָלְכֶתָ‏ַ‏הַמַּעְפָּמָה (S)
(1) וְרְדֵעַתָּה כִּי אֶינָּה אֵשֶׁר בָּעָכָר לֵאָלְכֶתָ‏ַ‏הַמַּעְפָּמָה (C)
כִּי אֶינָּה אֵשֶׁר בָּעָכָר לֵאָלְכֶתָ‏ַ‏הַמַּעְפָּמָה וּכְּרִיכָנָה (S)
לֵא שׁ СШ וסוספה או נָמָרֶם נַעֲרָבִיתֵכֶם שׁשׁשָּׁה (S)
לֵא שׁ СШ בָּעָכָר לֵאָלְכֶתָ‏ַ‏הַמַּעְפָּמָה (S)
(6*) καὶ ἐπιγγέγετο διότι ἐγὼ κύριος.

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; 6* has only καὶ ἐπιγνώσεοθε διὸτι ἐγὼ κύριος, but 6¹ contains it in several MSS in its entirety, e.g., (X O, 86ms, 449) οτι εν τοις δικαιώμασιν μου ουκ επορεύθητε καὶ τα κριματα μου (>147) κατα (>88-147, 86ms, 410) τα κριματα των εθνων των περικυκλω εμων (+ ουκ 62 L’-311) εποιησατε Ο’, L’-311, 86ms, 403’, 410. Also an asterisk appears in θ’ οτι εν τοις δικαιώμασιν μου ουκ επορεύθητε καὶ τα κριματα μου ουκ εποιησατε καὶ κατα τα κριματα των εθνων των περικυκλω εμων εποιησατε Κ’τι. 5’ agrees with the Masoretic reading for the entire verse with the sole exception of the word כִּי אִי נְתָנָה, “and according to the judgments of,” which is rendered by רָפָא אִי נְתָנָה, “according to the practices of.”

S is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of 3, based on the Syriac rendering of the Hebrew כִּי אִי נְתָנָה, “that I am the Lord,” which is כִּי אִי נְתָנָה, “that I am the Lord.” The consistent use of the pron. כִּי as a copula to translate this Hebrew formula (כִּי אִי נְתָנָה) 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

And when I had prophesied, Palatiah the son of Benaiah died, and I fell upon my face and cried in a loud voice and said, 'Ah Lord of Authority, will you make an end to the remnant of Israel?'

Analysis of the Variants

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. כָּנָבָא, “while I was prophesying,” was rendered by the Syriac Ethpe. Imperf. with an introductory circumstantial or temporal particle מֵתוָה, “and when I was prophesying,” omitting the Hebrew יָדֵּה used in a temporal sense. On the other hand, $\Theta T$ has two introductory Hebraisms, כָּנָבָא for יָדֵּה and הנֶּבֶא וְיִֽהְיָה for הנֶּבֶא וְיִֽהְיָה (הַנֶּבֶא וְיִֽהְיָה + Inf.) for כָּנָבָא. This shows that the Greek translator(s) thought too literally, or there was a purpose in
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 $\Theta$ does not contain the Hebrew word $\text{יִבְנָא}$, having instead the genitive with a relative particle $\delta$ τοῦ $\text{Βαβαίου}$, “the one of Banaia” (cf. vs. 1). $\Theta$ introduces an expansion that is unique to its text $ρμν\text{ β}'\text{π}, "receive my prayer."
Therefore each version had its own characteristics regarding this verse.

Ezek 11:14

(מ) וְיִדְרֶדֶר חֵדָּה אֲלֵי לַאֲמֵר

(ס) וְהָאָמְרָה אֶל הָאָמְרָה לָמָּה

(ך) וְהָעַד בֵּטַחְתָּא מְכָה יִי טַפְּרָמָר

(ס') קαὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου πρός με λέγων.

(Trans. of $\Theta$) “And the word of the Lord was upon me saying.”

Analysis of the Variants

$\Theta$ avoids anthropomorphic representation of God by rendering $דְּבֵר יְהוָה$ by $זַכָּה פָּתַחְתָּא מְכָה יִי$ “the word of the prophecy from before the Lord.” $\text{S}$ and $\Theta$ translate it literally.

Ezek 11:15

(מ) בֵּן עַמוֹד אָתִיק אֶשֶּׁר נָאָלָה הַכָּל בְּתֵי יְשָׁרְאֵל כִּלָּה אֶמְר (מ)
Analysis of the Variants

The S and CJ versions have both instances of ἡ ἀνθρώπου, oi ἄνδρες τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ Ἱουδαϊκοῦ καταλληλοῦς, which is suggested to be a dittographic error in Ε, thus deserving to be deleted according to BHS App. Though Ε* omits it, ΕA contains it in some of its MSS. 1ος οὐ + ἀδελφοὶ οὐν O-88-62; and 88 + καὶ ἀδελφοὶ οὐν.1 Also οἱ γ’ and Cod. 86 Qext have both instances introduced by an asterisk *. Therefore, the majority is in favor of Ε against BHS’s suggestion of a dittographic error, perhaps recognizing its value as emphasis.

1MS group 147’ contains a unique reading, καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ πατρὸς σου.
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The similarity in the rendering of רָחִים, "your kindred," which is translated as קִבְרֵי, "close relative," in CE and also by א', א', אָנָּחַים, "close relative, heir at law," was rendered as אָנָּחַים, "of your captivity," in ST and אִלְּחָמַלְשָׁא, "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 רָחִים, "your kindred," has a similar spelling to קִבְרֵי, "your captivity/exile," which is the spelling suggested by BHS.

The additional words אָנָּחַים, "they will be annihilated," and אָנָּחַים, "[they] will be put to an end," are found in ST 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 ST is one that strives to smooth and simplify the text adding words to make the text clearer in the Syriac language (see: אָנָּחַים "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 (אָנָּחַים, "they will be annihilated") including those of the house of Israel. All the witnesses of ST and ST have this addition except Cod. 86, Qικ, and ST.

The Hebrew word קִבְרֵי, which can be an Imper. or a Perf. 3° c. pl., was rendered by the Syriac scribe as אָנָּחַים. Perf. 3° c. pl. אָנָּחַים, "they have been removed far away." The change from active to passive voice is more a choice of the translator than an actual
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.)

C⁷ has a similar reading, but it adds an expansion to the text, "you have gone far from the worship of the Lord." ⁶T, on the other hand, has ἀπέχετε, “far have you gone,” a Pres. 2° pl., which is a translation based on a contextual exegesis. Furthermore, the Nî. נ實ת, “has been given,” was translated by the Ethpe. form in ⁷ and in the Perf. Act. in ⁶T, 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, "to us the land has been given as an inheritance." Then he introduced a resulting particle הוא, “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

1Lund, 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 ṢT, except MS 26; Ṣ also has it, except MSS b, g. The Hebrew syntactical construction of the two subordinating נ 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 .strokeStyle. S presents two independent short clauses and the last of them is joined by the adversative waw, הלהק ק"ו, "I will cast them . . .," הלהק ק"ו, "I will scatter them . . .," הלהק ק"ו, "yet I will be to them . . ." Thus the introductory Syriac expression הלהק ק"ו, "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 בְּרֵאשִׁית קִרְכָּד, "synagogue," in relationship to the Babylonian exile.

According to IR, 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.\(^1\) 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 נַאֲרַע, "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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>סְמָא</td>
<td>שְׁמַעְתָּא</td>
<td>בֵּרֵאשִׁית</td>
<td>בְּרֵאשִׁית קִרְכָּד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בִּזְרַע</td>
<td>קָרִיקְא</td>
<td>קֶרְכָּד</td>
<td>קִרְכָּד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בִּזְרַע</td>
<td>קָרִיקְא</td>
<td>בֵּרֵאשִׁית קִרְכָּד</td>
<td>בֵּרֵאשִׁית קִירַכָּד</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comparison shows a clearer picture of the closeness of the Peshitta version to IR. 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

---

similar to that of \( \text{M} \), but neither is it a paraphrase full of additional interpretative ideas.

Thus the closeness of \( S \) to \( \text{M} \) increases the \( S \)'s value for the study of the Old Testament.

Ezek 11:17

(\( \text{M} \))

לכן אמר ויהי סוכמת הכהנים ומיכל וע población

חכם ונתון אשר ספג ו.bam הכהן לכו את אמר ישראל

(\( S \))

וכן ציון כנה כנה נושא שונים מנסברני.

ובכן אמר כלן אמר ויהי אלוהים ואקריבים הגדולים ממעמיו.

(\( C \))

וזכרו כן всем מהperingיו וறוה בנות כלן ואת אמר ישראל

(\( \text{G}^* \))

dìa touto elpós Tàde légei kúrios Kai eisodèmena autous ek twn ënwn

kai sunáw autous ek twn xwpón, ou dièspere aútous en aútás, kai dàwsw

aútous tìn gín tòu Isræl.

(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 \textit{nominasacra}, while \( \text{G}^* \) (MSS B, 538, 233) omits ירא; \( \text{G}^A \), however, has it in all of the remaining witnesses of \( G \). \( S \) again, as in the preceding verse, omits the Imper. אמר, “say,” probably to avoid redundancy. \( C \) and \( \text{G}^T \) 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></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>קבוצת</td>
<td>קבוצת</td>
<td>קבוצת</td>
<td>קבוצת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קדך</td>
<td>קדך</td>
<td>קדך</td>
<td>קדך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קדך</td>
<td>קדך</td>
<td>קדך</td>
<td>קדך</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that S and C have the same cognate verbs for the first two, but in an inverted position. T 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 T. Notice that T has the three direct objects, αὐτούς, “them,” in the 3° pl., while S and C have them in the 2° m. pl. in agreement with T. This may be more a choice of the translator than a reflection of the T’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 T.

The Hebrew word שֶבֶר, “land of,” was rendered in S and C by synonymous, but not cognate, words מָעַם, “land of,” and מָעָם, “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 שֶבֶר would not convey in the Syriac and Aramaic languages what the scribes were expecting for their communities. On the other hand, the expressions מָעָם and מָעַם may have had a more specific function in delimiting a geographical and
political piece of land.

**Ezek 11:19**

(תְּחַת לָבֶּן לְבָן וְרָאָה וְרָאָה אַתָּה בַּכּוֹר בַּכּוֹרָה לְבָן אֶבְטֹר הַיָּהוּ לְבָן לְבָן)

משה לְמַעְלָה לְמַעְלָה וְרָאָה רָאָה בַּשָּׁמָּה מַעְלָה מַעְלָה (י)

לְמַעְלָה לְמַעְלָה מַעְלָה מַעְלָה לְמַעְלָה מַעְלָה.

(273) "And I will give them a new heart and a new spirit; I will give them,
and I will remove the stony heart from their flesh and I will give them a heart of flesh’.”

**Analysis of the Variants**

Two deviations from ה make the difference among the versions. First, the
Hebrew word רָאוּ, “one,” is rendered by נַפֶל, “new” (S), by הָדוֹד, “faithful, reverent”
(ת'), and by מְדַמֵּם, “another” (ת' except MS 26 that reads מְדַמֵּם, “strong,” and α', θ',
θ', Cod. 86, 88 have מְדַמֵּם, “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 καρδιάν 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 αὶ instead of α, ἐρασμός instead of ἐρασμός, a common scribal error). The Syriac scribe may have harmonized the translation of ἕν ἑκάστῳ, “one heart,” with ἑνὸς νότος ἑνὸς, “and a new spirit,” probably to make more emphatic the complete transformation of the people, or he understood the Adj. ἕνος “new,” being applied to both “heart and spirit,” and omitted ἕν “one” as superfluous for the understanding of the passage (cf. Ezek 18:31; 36:26 where one finds “new heart” in יָאָה). \(^1\)

The second deviation is the translation of the suffixed pronoun of the prepositional phrase ἐν ἑράνθεσθι, “within you, in your inside.” S has ἐν ἑρασμοῖς, “within them,” \(\Theta\) reads ἐν αὐτοῖς, “within them,” and only Cods. 86, 88 and α’ have a reading similar to \(\Pi\), εἰς τὰ εγκατά βοσων, “in your inmost part.” Although \(\alpha\) agrees with the Masoretic text with some additions\(^2\) (בַּמְספּוֹן, “in your inmost part”), some of its MSS support the usage of the third-person plural, e.g., MSS b, g, o, c, בַּמְספּוֹן, “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.

\(^{2}\) \(\alpha\) expands the text by reformulating the Hebrew text in the following manner, אָשֶׁר לְפָנֵי דָּרָשָׁה דָּרוּ דָּרוּ כָּלָא, “I will break the heart of evil which is hard as stone.”
Ezek 11:20

(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.”

Analysis of the Variants

The only point to be noticed here is the additional ending found in 6A at the conclusion of the verse, which is foreign to III, S, 6*, and C', end] + λεγει κυριος in MSS A`-410-147, 36-538-46, C`-86`-239`-393-403`, 14, 29.

Ezek 11:21

(RS) and el υμών καθά τόν κύριον των βδελυγμάτων αυτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομίων αυτῶν, ὡς ἂν
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καρδία αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο, τὰς οδοὺς 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 בַּלָּא, “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 בָּא, “and these after,” this Prep. Phr. makes perfect sense in the syntax of the verse by taking it as an emphatic Prep. Phr. S substitutes it by בֵּית, “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.

Cı reads בֵּית, “after,” supporting the BHS suggestion. 8* (MSS B, O-62', L') has a reading similar to מ, καὶ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν, “and toward the heart,” whereas 8 (rel.) reads kata τας καρδιας, “according to the hearts.” Regarding the nomina sacra S translates them consistently, and 8* (MSS B V) has, as usual, only its typical κύριος, while 8 (rel.) has both αὐτῶν κύριος.

Ezek 11:22

רֵשָׁא דַּעֲרֵי-בֵּית אֲרוֹם וַאֲרוֹם לְעָשֵׂה יְהוָה אֲלָדֵי יְשָׁרָאֵל עַל-יְשָׁרָאֵל מִלְצֹאלָה (M)

(S)
And the cherubim lifted up their wings and the wheels with them and the Glory of the God of Israel was above them.

Analysis of the Variants

S has a peculiar reading by lacking the last Hebrew prepositional expression, "upward," but using an equivalent expression, המלעל. This may be an endeavor to avoid redundancy in the text. ｴ has it as מחלק, which is the cognate for the Hebrew expression, and ｶ, מ Territories, "above them."

Ezek 11:23

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.
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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. 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 C', but the rest of the verse indicates an independent translation for both. For instance, S adds אֲדֹנָי, “to the land,” of the Chaldeans as found also in C'. 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 he in 01 (כָּהֵרְדָם).

The rendering of יָשַׁל מְעַלְיוֹ, “and it went up from me,” is unique to S. C' also has a unique reading by expanding the text: תָּנָפָשׁ מִן הָאָדָם, “in the spirit of prophecy which rested upon me from before the Lord.” This reads against any relationship to the Syriac or Greek versions. C* has a unique reading too, καὶ ἀνέβην ἀπὸ τῆς ὁράσεως, “and I rose up from the vision,” for the Hebrew יָשַׁל מְעַלְיוֹ, “and it went up from me.” Only Cods. 86, 88, and o' have a reading close to 01, e.g., καὶ ἀνέβην απὸ τῆς ὁράσεως θυν <εἰπόν>.

Ezek 11:25

אָדוֹרֵב אֲלֵהֶם אַחֵי דְּבָרֶי יְהוָה אִשֵּׁר הָרָאִים (01)

מַלְאָךְ חַי מִסָּךְ. מַלְאָךְ הַקְּצִיָּה, מַלְאָךְ חַי (S)

אַּשְׁרֵי בֵּית נֶחֱמָה כָּלָתָם רֵיחָי דָּוִד הַרְשָׁיִית (C')

(C*) καὶ ἐλάλησε πρὸς θύρα ἀκημαλωσίαν πάντας τοὺς λόγους τοῦ κυρίου, οὓς ἔδειξέν μοι.
(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 $T.'znnK$ “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 $IR$, 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 $IR$ 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

12:1

'bs // mrr - qt [tr.]

12:2

אֶזְכָּה יַשְׁבֶּה [tr.]

12:3

'bs // nis + tr.

12:4

no' nns [tr.]

12:2

n'rud + [tr.]

Q. Inf. Constr. [om.]

Q. Perf. 3° m. pl. Peal Ptc. m. pl. סֶמֶם + [tr.]

“seeing.”

Q. Inf. Constr. [om.]

Q. Perf. 3° m. pl. Peal Ptc. m. pl. סֶמֶם + [tr.]

“there is.”

Q. Inf. Constr. [om.]

Q. Perf. 3° m. pl. Peal Ptc. m. pl. סֶמֶם + [tr.]

“listening.”

12:6

Hi. Perf. w. consc. waw [Aphel [om.]

Imper. מְשָׁה “and bring out.”

Q. Imperf. נָצָא Peal Imper. מְשָׁה “go out.”

Q. Inf. Constr. [om.]

2° nn'rcb [om.]

nbiJ 'SSiD D [s. Peal Ptc.]

“like one in captivity.”

12:8

□rrrsb [om.]

son cjro b .i? [add tr.]

“burden”)

12:3

מְשָׁה [tr.]

Hi. Imperf. מְשָׁה Peal Imper. מְשָׁה “and
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go out.”

Pi. Imperf. [Pael Imper. מָצַּח] tr. and cover.”

12:7

cכָל הָעֵמֶק // tr. (נִל אֵל om.).

[tr.] יָד + Poss. suf. ֶחַ “your.”

12:9

Q. Perf. [Pael Ptc. m. pl. מָצַּח] tr.

12:10

Noun “prince” קָנָה + וְזֶרֶשׁ יָד “he will carry.”


12:11

לֵךְ + Copula אַל + 3° m. pl. [Pael Ptc. m. pl. מָצַּח] 2° m. pl. לָדוֹת “to them.”

12:12

Prp. + 3° m. pl. suf. [Pael Imperf. 2° m. pl. מָצַּח] rel. + prep. + “who is among you.”

Noun + Poss. suf. ֶחַ “your.”

12:13

Simplif. מַלִּיח “in it.”

12:14

[Copula נָמִים] Peal Ptc. m. pl. + Prep. Phr. “who are surrounding him.”

Noun Peal Ptc. pl. m. + D. O. לָדוֹת “who are helping him.”

“and strengthening him.”

“which is figuratively being spoken.”

“I will send.”

“I am bringing to an end.”

“for I will disperse.”

“They are drawing nigh.”

“quaking.”

“They are saying.”

“to the land of Israel.”

“and it will be, take place.”

“of deception.”

“sons of.”

“and all of them.”

“on account of the iniquity of.”

“and strengthening him.”

“I will send.”

“quaking.”

“say.”

“They are saying.”

“say.”

“to the land of Israel.”

“and it will be, take place.”

“sons of.”

“of deception.”

“and strengthening him.”

“which is figuratively being spoken.”

“I will send.”

“I am bringing to an end.”

“for I will disperse.”

“They are drawing nigh.”

“quaking.”

“They are saying.”

“to the land of Israel.”

“and it will be, take place.”

“of deception.”

“sons of.”

“and strengthening him.”

“which is figuratively being spoken.”

“I will send.”

“I am bringing to an end.”

“for I will disperse.”

“They are drawing nigh.”

“quaking.”

“They are saying.”

“to the land of Israel.”

“and it will be, take place.”

“of deception.”

“sons of.”
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.

Ezek 12:1

הרי דברי הוה אליך לאמור (מ)  
(5) ויהיו דבריו נבואה מכם לעשות בהם (ד')  
(5') קא וּֽאֲבָּרֶנֵו לָֽוֹאֵשׁ קֻֽרְיָו קַֽרְעַם יִבְּשֵֽׂשׂ מָֽאָּאֵנֵו  

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
(Trans. of S) “And the word of the Lord was upon me saying.”

Analysis of the Variants

S and _FILL_ have a reading similar to that of _FILL_, while _FILL_ tries to avoid any hint of anthropomorphism applied to God. In this case, _FILL_ 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 $\text{אֶetheless}$, "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 $\text{M}$, the existential element is implicitly understood by the context. The Aramaic construction of $\text{T}$ is closer to that of $\text{M}$, for though the Aramaic language possesses a similar existential particle like the Syriac one (יְנִי), $\text{T}$ does not make use of it in this particular instance.

$\text{T}$ is related to $S$, because the former employs the Pres. Act. 3 pl., $\text{ῑχουσιν}$, "they have," which conveys the similar sense of the Syriac existential particle $\text{אֶtheless}$. In spite of that relationship, $S$ has a unique reading that makes any attempt toward seeing a direct relationship between the Syriac version and $\text{T}$ an impossibility. The Syriac language uses for both instances of the Hebrew word יְנִי a cognate adjective $\text{נָבִיא אֶtheless}$, "rebellious, contentious," while $\text{T}$ holds $\text{ἀδικόων}$, "unrighteous," for the first and $\text{παραπικραῖων}$, "rebellious, embittered," for the second instance. Only MSS $L-311-V-449$ are similar to $\text{M}$ having $\text{παραπικραῖωνος}$ for the first occurrence as well. $\text{T}$ employs the word יְנִי, which has the same semantic sense of the Hebrew יְנִי. $\text{T}$ also has a unique reading; it

---

exchanges the Hebrew word בֵית, "house," for מְבָנִים, "people." Only MS 1 reads as in מָלָע, having בֵית 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. ס rolls both Infinitives as Articular Inf. יָדַעְתָּ הַיַּמִּין and יָדַעְתָּ הַגָּזַע.

In addition, S translates the Q. Perf. 3° m. pl. רָאָה and קָשִיט by the Peal Ptc. יָדַע, 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 ס. Thus the Syriac deviations from מָלָע 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 ס 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

1Zerwick, § 382; “Infinitive with article is widely extended in Hellenistic Greek . . .”; § 383: “Especially frequent is the infinitive with יָדַע, 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 M. C', however, substitutes the word רבי by רע as in the preceding verse. Although the Aramaic language has a cognate counterpart to the Hebrew word רבי, "rebellious," C' employs instead a noncognate but synonymous word, ברב, "rebellious." S renders רבי by its Syriac cognate רבי, which has the same semantic and etymological relationship to its Hebrew counterpart.

S* omitted the imperative רבי, "go into exile." BHS App. suggests that a dittographic error took place in M, thus רבי should be deleted. In reality, only Mss B, 967, 106 (S*) omitted it; all the remaining (C') contain it רבי with some slight
differences. \( \text{CJ} \) and \( \text{S} \) have this imperative \( \text{היליה, 'go into exile,'} \) respectively), indicating that their Vorlagen were related in this point against \( \text{G} \).

\( \text{CJ} \) has an interesting reading in two of its MSS, namely \( \text{g} \) and \( \text{o} \). They read יוחל, “they may fear,” instead of the Aramaic יוחל, “they may see.” This is a good indication that the confusion goes back to the consonantal period of \( \text{g} \). The translator may have confused the Hebrew Imperf. of the verb ראה, “to see,” with the Imperf. of the verb ירא, “to fear.”

\( \text{S} \) 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 נהלת, “and you shall go into exile,” is redundant in the Hebrew text, therefore it was omitted in \( \text{S} \); and the second instance of the Hebrew adverbial Prep. Phr. of Manner לפני, “before their eyes,” can be easily classified in the same category of redundancy; thus it was omitted from the Syriac text.

Ezek 12:4

(\( \text{III} \)) הָשָׁהְוַתָּבֵל כָּכָל, נַהֲלָה יִמְסָרָתָם וּמָתָה הָטָה בֵּית עֵין יַנְשָׁהָ כְּסָרָא נַהֲלָה

(\( \text{S} \)) נַהֲלָה יִמְסָרָתָם וּמָתָה הָטָה בֵּית עֵין יַנְשָׁהָ כְּסָרָא נַהֲלָה

(\( \text{G} \)) הָשָׁהְוַתָּבֵל כָּכָל, נַהֲלָת יִמְסָרָתָם וּמָתָה הָטָה בֵּית עֵין יַנְשָׁהָ כְּסָרָא נַהֲלָה

(\( \text{CJ} \)) כָּכָל, נַהֲלָת יִמְסָרָתָם וּמָתָה הָטָה בֵּית עֵין יַנְשָׁהָ כְּסָרָא נַהֲלָה

(\( \text{G} \)) καὶ ἐξεύθετος τὰ σκέψθη σοι ως σκέψθη αἰχμαλωσίας ἡμέρας κατ᾽ ἀπαθεῖαν αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐ ἐξέλευσθη ἐσπέρας ὡς ἐκπορευέται αἰχμάλωτος.
(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 $\varphi^*$. The only extra-Masoretic variant noted in the BHS App. is that both versions omitted the second instance of the Adv. Prep. Phr. לְעֵינָיו, “before their eyes” (only $\varphi^*$ [MSS B, 967, 410] omits it; all the remaining, however, contain this Prep. Phr., see $\varphi A$). The analysis of the entire verse shows that any direct relationship is not tenable for this verse.

$S$ renders both the Hi. Perf. נָסָה, “and you shall bring out,” and the Q. Imperf. כָּאָר, “you will go out,” by the Imperatives Aphel קָאָר, “and bring,” and Peal חָאָר, “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. $\varphi T$ literally translates both Hebrew verbs in the future tense, thus conveying a lesser emphasis to the narrative.

The relationship between $S$ and $\varphi^*$ 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 לְעֵינָיו does not affect the meaning of the text. In
the preceding verse, $\S$ omits it too, while $\S^T$ contains it.

The rendering of the comparative Hebrew construct chain, "like those of exile," is key evidence for a noninterrelationship among the versions. $\S$ has a distinctive construction against the Hebrew plural construct chain, namely $\cong$ $\tens$, "like the one in exile," while $\C^I$ reads $\cong$ $\tens$, "like those who have gone into exile," and $\S^T$ has $\\odot$ $\\ekporeu\eta\tau\a$ $\alpha\chi\mu\alpha\lambda\nu\tau\a$, "as one going into exile." This seems more a freedom in translation rather than the reflection of their Vorlagen.

Ezek 12:6

\begin{quote}
(\IR) noan -\pa K 'sm rmbm Ken f\]n b\' nn'rub
bKisn n'ab -\pnn: nsic o  pK n nK  rutin K b ',
(5)  p < T  r^-gjia .rO
\j'7i
s n  Xicuaa A 

(\S) 'onn -SK ptsn Kbipi bicon Karo bi? 
]. A * A . - ) .

(\C') 'onn -SK ptsn Kbipi bicon Karo bi?

(\S^T) \enwpon a\twn \\umon analimphi\sion kai kekrum\melineios \ektele\uion, to
prosomei\on ou\ suvkalip\seis kai ou m\h i\h\s t\in \h in dioti \t \\r \de\w\ka se to
\sik\w Israel.

(Trans. of \S) "And lift up the baggage on your shoulder and go out in the darkness, and

\footnote{An interesting and unique reading is found in MS 62. It reads, εις \of\al\mu\on \a\t\w\n kai su \u ne \av\r\p\w\u for \us \ekporeu\\eta\tau\a \a\chi\mu\a\l\u\tau\a, "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 Ṯ. Nevertheless, S has a different word order and some
pluses and minuses not found in Ṯ. 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. ל_pitchin tified 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 חזה,
“shoulder” (מַחַזֶה, “your shoulder”), indicating whom the text was referring to. In
addition, the cognate word כִּיסֶא, “baggage,” was placed after שָׁמַר, “you shall lift up,”
with the aim of specifying what was to be lifted up. Ṯ renders an interpretative or corrupt
translation for the Hebrew ואת חזה, “upon shoulder you will carry”; the subject of the
verb שָׁמַר became the object of it in the Fut. Pass. כִּיסֶא שָׁמַר מתָּכָּר, “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 Ṯ 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 κεκρυμένος, "and in secret." 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

אנסמ כל כשרא צורי כל הكاتא לכלו海尔 ימס בער (III)

חדרהו ל בור ביד בטלוש וקתא על חף משארו עלנייה

Ezek 12:7

ממסדה מסדה גירה להכרח Exercises: סמסדה סמסדה

Ezek 12:7

ובברת כל כמא אpożyczדית פי אפירקה כמי נלמאו חמש וכמסה (C)

Ezek 12:7

א 자체רת ל בור בקבלא נפקות על חסה נשמה עלנייה

Ezek 12:7

καὶ ἐποίησα οὖτως κατὰ πάντα, δόσα ἐνετελατό μοι, καὶ σκεῦη ἡζήνεγκα ὡς σκεῦη αἰχμαλωσίας ἤμερας καὶ ἐσπέρας διώρυξα ἐμαυτῷ τὸν τοίχον καὶ κεκρυμένος ἠζήλδον, ἐπὶ ὀμοὶ ἀνελθοῦσην ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν.
(Trans. of $) "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

$ is related to $* (MSS B; all the remaining MSS have it as in M, τη χειρὶ) by
omitting ἔτη, "by hand." Notice, for instance, that some MSS of £ (1, z) translated it by
τὴν, "as though or when."

It would be more a conjecture to take the Hebrew ἔτη as a defective portion of the
word ἔτη, "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 $, $* and £) to avoid any ambiguity and to harmonize it (vs.
7) with the preceding verse (vs. 5), where the same expression occurs without ἔτη, 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 $ and $*, for translation technique (harmonization, contextual exegesis) can adequately
account for differences such as this.

The verb Pual 1° s. ἔτη, "I was commanded," was translated by the Peal 3° plus
the suffixed pronoun ἔτη, "he had commanded me," as it occurs in $*. This may
indicate that $'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 $—because there are several
indications of that in the text. For instance, \( \text{תונ} \) omitted "my baggage," and added \( \text{אנה} \), "all," after \( \text{ניא} \), "I did so according to." These pluses and minuses are not present in \( \text{S} \).

The verb \( \text{דנ} \), "I lifted up," was understood in the passive voice (Niphal) by \( \text{תונ} \), which translated it by the Aor. Pass. 1\(^{\circ}\) s. "אנה צמרא \( \text{י} \), "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 \( \text{S} \) added a suffixed pronoun to the noun \( \text{כף} \), "shoulder" (\( \text{כף} \) "and upon my shoulder"), indicating that the prophet was lifting something and not that he was being lifted up by somebody else.

The word \( \text{גמשא} \), "in the darkness," also plays a key role in this verse as in the preceding one. \( \text{S} \) renders an equivalent to the Hebrew word (\( \text{גמשא} \), "and in the darkness"), while \( \text{תונ} \) gives an interpretation to that Hebrew word, namely \( \text{אף} \), "and secret," as in the preceding verse. This rules out the possibility of relationship between the versions regarding this verse. Only Cod. 86 (\( \text{סנס} \)) and 87 (\( \text{סנס} \)) have a reading similar to that of \( \text{תונ} \).

The word order of \( \text{S} \) is different from that of \( \text{תונ} \), whereas \( \text{תונ} \) has the same order as the latter. This, however, does not commend \( \text{תונ} \) as having a better reading, for \( \text{S} \) is closer to \( \text{תונ} \) regarding vocabulary. It only indicates that the \( \text{תונ} \) version struggles to render a literal translation, and \( \text{S} \) strives to render a translation that presents the exact sense in the style of the Syriac language.
Ezek 12:10

(Trans, of S) "Say to them, 'Thus says the Lord of Authority, the prince will carry this baggage in Jerusalem and all the house of Israel with him'."

Analysis of the Variants

One of the key words of this verse is the polysemic Hebrew noun קָשָׁב, 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 אָמַר, "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 קָשָׁב as "burden, baggage." Notice that α' has a reading very close to that of S, namely ἐφέσασεν τοῦ ἀρχικαί τοῦτο, "the carrier of this burden/baggage." Since קָשָׁב, "prince," has a similar root to קָשָׁב, "to carry, lift up," α' may have misunderstood it. Thus, instead of prince, he wrote "carrier" and then "burden" (for קָשָׁב, "oracle"). T, however, takes קָשָׁב, "oracle," as an
apposition to καταφές, “prince,” or as part of the list of prospective prisoners going into exile. 

Θ 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 Θ, composed by the prince (Ὁ ἀρχων), the ruler of Jerusalem (ὁ ἀφηγοῦμένος ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ), and the house of Israel (καὶ παντὶ ὁ λόγος Ἰσραήλ). This implies that these nouns go back to their common antecedent, ἐπὶ τῶν ἀντίκρουσιν, “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 Θ; 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 Θ is specific, while in Θ it is arranged as an introduction to the coming message of vs. 11.

Θ also avoids the confusing ἐπί 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 ἐπί? Is it the house of Israel or the leaders, as in Θ? So Θ substituted the entire clause and rendered for it a translation based on contextual exegesis, καὶ ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρχουντος τοῦ προφήτη, “and all of the house of Israel with him,” thus eliminating any ambiguity.

Θ gives a very good interpretative translation concerning ἀρχων ἐπὶ τῶν ἀντίκρουσιν, “the prince this oracle/baggage.” It reads similarly to that of Θ (adds ἐπί, “concerning, about,” before ἐπί, thus with the reading “this prophetic commission concerns the prince . . .”), namely, περὶ τοῦ ἀρχωντος τοῦ δοκιμίου τουτοῦ, “this burden concerns the chief leader . . .” Θ, Cod. 86, 88 agree with the reading of Θ.
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Ezek 12:11

And say to them, ‘I am a sign to you; as I have done so will it be done to you, and into captivity you will go’.

Analysis of the Variants

This verse is strong evidence for a nonrelationship among the versions. The syntactic arrangement of ℳ is difficult and even awkward. First the prophet would say, “I am your sign,” then כ י поддержива then, “thus will be done to them,” and then כ י поддержива “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, S adds כ י поддержива, “to them,” after כ י поддержива “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. ℳ reads as it is in ℳ, word-for-word for the entire verse. ℳ uses pronouns similar to the Masoretic text, with the exception of the first one, which is omitted in ℳ (MSS B, O-62”, L-36, 46-311) and
substituted in $\mathcal{G}^*$ by \((πού ἐν μέσῳ) αὐτῆς, “(performing in) her (midst).”

$\mathcal{G}^*$ has a unique reading that seems more contextual exegesis than a translation: ἐγὼ τέρατα ποιῶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς, “I am performing a wonder in her midst” (>B O-62', L'-36. 46-311 = III). The pronoun “her” may go back to the city of Jerusalem of the preceding verse. The nouns are transposed in $\mathcal{T}$, whereas in $S$ the second one is omitted to avoid superfluous repetition of the same idea.

Consequently, this verse shows that $S$ holds a reading with a higher level of literacy than $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}$. The Syriac scribe seems more preoccupied with communicating the message than with transferring a literal translation of its Hebrew Vorlage.

Ezek 12:12

(III) ἐν τῷ Ἰερουσαλήμ ἠγείρεται ἡ ἡμέρα λαλήσας ἐν καθεδρίᾳ γενίσκεται (trans. of $\mathcal{T}$) “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 וַיְהִי אֱלֹהִים הָדוֹרָה, “and the prince who is among them,” as it is in IR, S reads בְּבַלְתָּהו, “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 הָאִישׁ as it did in the preceding verse with the aim of avoiding any possible ambiguity in the mind of the reader. Thus S reads בְּבַלְתָּהו, “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 וְצִיתָהו, “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 בְּבַלְתָּהו, “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 לָא was rendered by בַּלָּת, “upon,” which might be the one used in its Hebrew
Vorlage (כַּלְכּל); this reading is supported by $\mathfrak{T}$ ($כַּלְכּל$) and by $\mathfrak{G}$ ($כַּלְכּל$).

Since one of the features of the Syriac translation (Ezek 1-12) is the simplification of the text by omitting redundancies, the omission of לְעִיָּהוּ, “by that eye,” by $\mathfrak{S}$ can be classified as one of those cases, rather than being an actual reading of its Vorlage. $\mathfrak{T}$ has it, but in a transposed position after an interpretative addition that indicates the cause of the prince’s doom, which is לְעִיָּהוּ דְּבָרָה, “because he sinned.” Several targumic MSS, $b$, $g$, $o$, $f$, $c$, omitted לְעִיָּהוּ from their text indicating the existence of a Hebrew recension without it in support of the Syriac reading. Therefore if $\mathfrak{T}$ 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 לְעִיָּהוּ.1

$\mathfrak{T}$ 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 שָׁלַח, “he will carry,” into the Fut. Pass. 3° s. אָפַּרְדָּעַת, “he will be borne,” upon somebody else’s shoulder, and the entire negative sentence לֹא יָרַאה לְעִיָּהוּ אַלְכָּא רַחֵם, “by that eye, he will not see the land,” was rendered in a passive manner, הָלְךֵשׁ מָהְוָא פָּרְדָּעַת פָּרְדָּעַת, “so that he will not be seen by any eye.” The last deviation is the translation of הַלָּשׁוֹן, “darkness,” by קֶפֶרְמֶנֶשׁוֹ, “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: ולֹא רַאֲשָׂה לְעִיָּהוּ אַלְכָּא רַחֵם, “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) 'ntam 'rrrrann asm  rbu 'nen nit 'nensi

אוה בבלله אארמ כסידי וואוה לא יראיה וס מיית

(S) 'ntam 'rrrrann asm  rbu 'nen nit 'nensi

אוה לבללה אארמ כסידי וואוה לא יראיה וס מיית

(Eng) 'ntam 'rrrrann asm  rbu 'nen nit 'nensi

אוה לבללה אארמ כסידי וואוה לא יראיה וס מיית

(Re) καὶ ἐκπεπτάσω τὸ δίκτυόν μου ἐπὶ αὐτῶν, καὶ συλλεμφθήσεται ἐν τῇ περιοχῇ μου, καὶ ἀξιων αὐτῶν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα εἰς γῆν Χαλδαίων, καὶ αὐτὴν οὐκ ὁφεῖται καὶ ἐκεῖ τελευτησει.

(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’.”
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Analysis of the Variants

The main deviation of this verse concerns the Prep. Phr. "in my net." This shows that there was not a direct relationship among them. \( 	ext{EJ} \) inverted the order of the two synonymous Hebrew words, "my net," and "in my net." \( 	ext{GT} \) uses the Greek word δίκτυόν, "net," for the first instance and an interpretative rendering for the second, ἐν τῇ περίοχῇ μου, "in my enclosure," probably to signify "snare" or "trap," as if God was placing an ambush to catch those rebellious people. For περίοχή, \( 	ext{a'} \) reads ἀμφισβητοῦω, "casting net," \( 	ext{o'} \), and Cods. 86, 88 have σαρκοθήκη, "dragging net." \( 	ext{S} \) on the one hand reads גנבות, "my net," for the first Hebrew word, which is the Syriac cognate form for the Aramaic and Hebrew counterpart (גנבות/מקה) in the same transposed order as it occurs in \( 	ext{EJ} \). On the other hand, \( 	ext{S} \) has a Prep. Phr. אֶּמֶּרֶנ, "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.

\( 	ext{EJ} \) has some pluses in its text due to an interpretative exegesis. After גנבות, \( 	ext{EJ} \) adds עָנָי הָיוּ לְבָבַל לַמַּעֲרֵת אֲרוֹרָה סַמָּרָה, "I will exile him to Babel to the country of the land of the Chaldeans." \( 	ext{S} \) completely ignores this translation. Consequently \( 	ext{S} \) has its own reading; it is not related to any version regarding this verse.

Ezek 12:14

וכל אשוד מביתו עוזה וכל אנפה עוזה לכל בוב אריך אסתרים (ייו)
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. 5 agrees with 6 closely, even though additions and substitutions are present in its text. 6 has the most difficult text among the versions, while 5 tries to smooth it by making it more understandable in a Syriac style. To avoid ambiguity and syntactic confusion, 5 adds a suffixed pronoun to the first כל, namely כלה שלמה, “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 6, thus making the flow of the text more dynamic.

Difficult linguistic elements were substituted, like the apposition כה כרביח ורדה, “who were around him, his help,” which was separated into two distinct elements in the list, כה כרביח ורדה, “who were going about him, and who were helping him.” The second כה כרביח might have been omitted for the sake of literary beauty to avoid redundancy. The difficult Hebrew verb Hi. Imperf. 1° c. s. p (from כה כרביח, “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. רָשַׁה, “I will send.” This
rendering may be explained by differences in idiomatic expression, rather than by an actual
reading in the ס’s Vorlage.

The key word in this verse is וָעַשָּׁה, “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. הָעַשָּׁה rendered it not by its Aramaic cognate word הָעַשָּׁה, “wing, poultry, arms,
shoulder,” but by a more meaningful term הָעַשָּׁה, “his camp, troop, army.” This
shows that the targumic scribe understood it as a military term. ס 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 קָבָא קְבָא, “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.

פֶּל uses nouns for the first two elements of the list as in הָעַשָּׁה and not participial forms
like ס. The Greek version has the same apposition as in the Masoretic text, τούς γύρω αὐτοῦ τούς 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, וָעַשָּׁה,
“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
that both the Syriac and the Septuagint scribes did not understand the rare usage of the Hebrew word "לָהַכְּךָ", probably due to their lack of knowledge of the Aramaic and Assyrian cognate words.

**Ezek 12:15**

(יוו') וַיָּתֹמֵךְ, אָתָּה בָּהַפְסִּים אֲשֶׁר בְּנֵי הָבוֹרֵי אֲשֶׁר בְּאֶרֶץ

(ס) מַגְּלְךָ עַל הָאָרֶץ הָעָלָם, הִצְבָּאָתָךְ צַנְיָתְךָ, אִם הָיִיתָ קָדָם בְּאֶרֶץ בָּבֶל.

(גי') וַיִּתְנַבֵּל עִמָּהּ כֵּלָם יָדֵךְ וְלֹא יִהְיֶה לוֹמֶר לְבָלָהָ הָאָשֶׁר הוֹדֵה בַּבַּרְנֶשֶׁת.

(ח') בִּכְלָם יַנִּיחַ כֶּפֶר עִמָּהּ, כֶּפֶר עִם לוֹמֶר אֶלָּא עִם אוֹתוֹ לִשְׁמָרָם.

(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**

**ח** is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to ל. It has רָצוּאָ for the Hebrew particle יא introducing "I am ..." and both convey the same syntactical sense "that." The Hi. Inf. הבארץ with its suffixed subject and the temporal preposition was rendered by a non-Greek linguistic structure, בְּיָעֵד + Inf. + Subject pronoun (בְּיָעֵד תּוּרֶפֶתִּים, מָשָׁמֶה, "when I have scattered"), which is a clear Hebraism in the Greek text.

Even though ח 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 1° s. לְכֶנָּ, "I will exile," and the noun for
“lands or countries,” was substituted by מִדְרְשָׁה, “countries,” or probably “province” as Esth 1:1, 3 may imply.

On the one hand 5 has a degree of relationship to TJ in terms of translation technique, for both avoided the Hebrew infinitive construction. On the other hand, they are different, because TJ translated ב by דִּבֶּר, an Aramaic particle that can convey a temporal sense like its Hebrew counterpart, while in S the most common and versatile Syriac particle כ 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., מִגְּדַל, “for I will scatter,” while TJ has an interpretative substitution as mentioned above (Aphel 1° sing. יָלֵל, “I will exile”). Regarding the last Hebrew word, S supports the Masoretic reading, מַדְעַת, against the targumic reading, מַדְעַת, for I will exile. Based on all of these differences, one cannot assume any direct relationship among the versions.

Ezek 12:18

(5) נֵבָא לְעֵבָר מִקְלֶם בָּרַעְתֵּם בְּמִרְיָם מְבָרַע מֵעָשָׁה שֶׁהָשָׁה

(S)

(5) נֵבָא לְעֵבָר מִקְלֶם בָּרַעְתֵּם בְּמִרְיָם מְבָרַע מְבָרַע מִשְׁתַּחְתָּא שֶׁהַשָּׁה.

(CJ)

(5) בַּר אָדָם בַּרְאָל בָּרַעְתֵּם בָּרַעְתֵּ�ָא שֶׁהָשָׁה.

(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’.”

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Analysis of the Variants

The main linguistic structures to be observed in this verse are, “in quaking,” “in trembling,” and “and in fearfulness.” They were rendered respectively in ס by "in quaking," וה ansible "in quaking," and "and in fear of scarcity." צ reads "in despair," "in despair," and "and in desolation." ג translates them as "with sorrow," "with torment," and "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

(Ezekiel 12:19)

The main linguistic structures to be observed in this verse are, “in quaking,” “in trembling,” and “and in fearfulness.” They were rendered respectively in ס by "in quaking," וה ansible "in quaking," and "and in fear of scarcity." צ reads "in despair," "in despair," and "and in desolation." ג translates them as "with sorrow," "with torment," and "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
καὶ τὸ ἔδωρ αὐτῶν μετὰ ἀφανισμοῦ πίνονται, 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 δ' (B) reads as usual, omitting יְרֵאָה; all of the remaining MSS have יְרֵאָה as part of their reading (S). The preposition יָא is rendered by the Syriac ל against the targumic translation הָלַע and the Septuagint reading ἐνί. The last two versions seem to reflect a Vorlage that had a reading slightly different from M and S.

The order of the two prepositional phrases בְּנַבְעָה, "in fearfulness," and בְּנַבְעָה, "in dismay," in relation to the preceding verse, which contains a similar reading, plays an important role in the differentiation of the versions. Since M 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, בְּנַבְעָה, the Syriac scribe seems to translate them more freely than we normally would expect: בְּנַבְעָה, "in fear," and בְּנַבְעָה, "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. δ' introduces a completely different set of expressions. It employs μετά ἐνδείας, "with scarcity," for בְּנַבְעָה, and μετὰ ἀφανισμοῦ, "with
desolation.” Notice however that in the preceding verse the same Hebrew expression
 đáבגא was translated by a different Greek expression, namely µετὰ βαοάνου, “with
torment.”

The only relationship between S and ST is the rendering of the Q. Imperf. Subjunct.
3° s. f. λαμνὴ τὰ ἀσθῆ, “That [she] it may be stripped” (λαμνὴ + Imperf. = Subjunt.). Both
versions substituted it in their respective translations, namely χαίρω, “because of the
desolation,” and ὄπως ἀφαινηθῆ, “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. μαται, “on account of the violence,” is taken
into consideration. S has ἐν ἁθή, “on account of the iniquity,” while ST reads ἐν ἀσεβείᾳ, “in ungodliness” (only ο’ and Cod. 86 have a reading similar to Π, διὰ ἀδικίαν,
“because of the injustice”).

Ezek 12:20

(Π) ἡ πόλεις τῆς ἡτέρας ἡ ἀρχή τῆς ἀσθῆς διὰ τῆς ἁθής οὐδὲνος ἔσται. (Γ)

(Σ) ἡ πόλεις τῆς ἡτέρας ἡ ἀρχή τῆς ἀσθῆς διὰ τῆς ἁθής οὐδὲνος ἔσται. (Γ')

(Trans. of Σ) “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”.
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Notice the word choice of S; the Hebrew term נemoth, which was translated by אֶלֶּחָה, “terror,” in the preceding verse, is now rendered by אֵלֶּחָה, “desolation.” It indicates that the Syriac translator knew very well the Hebrew language, for the Hebrew word נemoth 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; G keeps the same word אֵלֶּחָה, “desolation.”

Ezek 12:22

(Trans, of S) “Son of man, what is this proverb that you [pl.] 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, "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: "what is this proverb that you [pl.] have which is figuratively being spoken?"

CJ did not have a problem translating this verse. The last Hebrew word, "vision," was rendered into an interpretative substitution, "prophecy," probably to harmonize with some preceding interpretation, e.g., 12:21, "and the word of prophecy from before the Lord was with me." The only significant deviation of CJ is the substitution of the verb, "they will grow longer," by the adjective μακράν, "long," which is not evidence for a difference in the Vorlagen.

Ezek 12:23

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 nominasacra consistently as in the preceding chapters. ©* (B, 534) lacks החרזא, which is its normal feature, even though the remaining MSS have it (ס ת).

The Hi. Perf. 1 c. s. ת"강.sex, “I will put to an end,” which seems to be a prophetic Perf., is conveyed through the participial (Pael Ptc. + pron.) construction ס"כש"כש, “I am bringing to an end,” which is good Syriac style. The verb להפר, “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 וירא and its verbal form would be identical. Thus the construct noun וירא, “word of,” was omitted and replaced by the Imperf. ס"כש, “and it will be,” and, in an extended sense, “and it will take place, come, etc.,” to avoid any ambiguity in the text. ©*, Codes. 86, 88, and some MSS of ©A L’-46-311 had the same problem in rendering this noun; they read ס"כש (λογος in ©*). The omission of וירא in the Syriac version seems more an accommodation than a translation of an actual reading.

© ת stays closer to II by rendering a literal translation (except MSS L’-46-311). The
Septuagint translator understood the Hebrew Prophetic Perf. Hi. וצבזת, "I will put to an end," implying future meaning by rendering it in the Fut. Act. 1° c. s. ἀποστρέψω, "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 ידבר אלהים, "say to them," it has י prophesy to them," and for ירבד כל חออกแบบ, "word of every vision," it reads דמחם כל ח璨ת, "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 ὧν, nor the literal translation of ὦν, but has its own rendering. Consequently, it shows the non-relationship among them altogether concerning this verse.

Ezek 12:24

כִּי לא יהי עד כל ח.gameObjectлекс חلحق בּוּךְ יִשְרָאֵל (M)

כִּי לא יהי עד כל ח(gameObjectлекс חلحق בּוּךְ יִשְרָאֵל (S)

אֵזֶף לא יהי העד כל נְבֵואָה סְבַר הָכִּסְמָמְךָ כֹּבר בּוּךְ יִשְרָאֵל (C)

εἰς τινὰ ὄνομα ἐκ οἷον Πάσα ὁ παντεύομενος τὰ πρὸς χάριν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν μισθῶν Ἰσραήλ (S)

(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 "house of Israel." כ ת has דֶּבֶּשׁ פָּלוֹת, "the sons of Israel," but Mss, o, c have פְּלוֹת כ, "children of Israel," while S has חֲסַם כ, "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 MT; second it could have been a scribal error in MT; 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 פִּיה, "vision," was translated by רְשָׁע, "prophecy," in CJ, and the words פִּיהוּ תָּלִים, "and flattering divination," by καὶ μαντεύωμενος 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.
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Ezek 12:25

(Trans. of $) "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 $ has a translation in a very stylistic Syriac manner, it seems to have been based on a Hebrew text similar to that of $$. $$, on the contrary, even though having a literal translation, contains a reading that may indicate a difference in its Vorlage against that of $$. The targumic text uses מַמֵּלָכָה, “people,” for עֲבָדֵי, “house,” which might be a rendering conveying a broader sense than עֲבָדֵי, “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 "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, "and it [m.] will be performed and it [f.] will not delay," into "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 IR, namely, "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 "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 TT. It translated this difficult Hebrew sentence by "I will speak my word." This similarity cannot provide proof of a direct relationship between S and TT, 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 IR.

S keeps the nomina sacra as in IR, while S* (MSS B, 967) omitted רְבָר הָדָרָה, as we have seen in all instances in which the nomina sacra appear. The remaining (rel.) MSS of SA contain רְבָר הָדָרָה in their text. CJ is also consistent like S in its rendering of the nomina sacra, always having יִנְשָׁה 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

Cargo is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of מ. S and ג, 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 כ. The first Hebrew Ptc. (רֵדֻּדָּו כ, "he is visioning") was kept as a Ptc. (רֵדֻּדָּו כ, "which this one is seeing") and the second Ptc. (רֵדֻּדָּו כ, "he is prophesying") was turned into its corresponding Syriac Ethpael Ptc. (רֵדֻּדָּו כ, "[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 (רֵדֻּדָּו כ, "[he] is prophesying") indicates that the act of prophesying was simultaneous.
with the Ptc. (גֶּשֶׁם, “which this one is seeing”).

$\Omega$ has a unique reading that seems more a harmonization with the preceding verse where the same expression ויקס Ἰσραήλ appears with the Attributive Participle ἀναπαύσαιον, “rebellious,” thus it (Attributive Participle) was added in vs. 27. Another characteristic feature of $\Omega$ is that it contains many Hebraisms against $\Sigma$, 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). Then λέγοντες λέγουσιν 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

(1) ילך אמר אלהים כל אמר אדרי היה לא 말씀 תuda
כל דברי אמר דברי דבר רועה ולא אדרי היה

(2) במלך לייא אמיה הנבואה לא הנבואה לא הנבואה לא הנבואה לא הנבואה

(3) כל אמר לולא בק אמר לא אלהים לא בק פה

(4) דיון תועו איכה פרו איכה תדאה λέγει κύριος Οὐ μὴ μηκόνωσιν οὐκετί πάντες οί λόγοι μου, οὐς ἐν λαλήσοι λαλήσω καὶ ποιήσω, λέγει κύριος.

---

(Trans. of S) "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 ख न ड न अ, "there will not be delay" (vs. 28), was used to render the Hebrew र , "it will not delay," but in vs. 25 the same Hebrew expression was translated by च न स , "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. CJ 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 लल्लट अल्लट, "I will speak I will speak" (except for MS 538, the remaining MSS have लोगोव instead of the second repetition of लल्लट). The scribe of S* (B) may have misread the Hebrew word अल्लट 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 र as against S, CJ, and IR.
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 ČJ and pluses and minuses of ŠT 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 ŠT.

8. S tries to avoid Hebraisms while ŠT 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 111).

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 111, 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 111 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 111 (as is the case most of the time with 687), neither is it a paraphrase (as in several
places in \( \text{T} \)), 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. \( \text{כַּפַּרְרָה} \) \( \text{כַּפַּרְרָה} \); 8:6 om. \( \text{כָּפָרָה} \); 9:2, 3, 11 om. \( \text{כָּפָרָה} \)).

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 ١

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 ٥ 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 ٥ 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 ٥. 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 εκκαιογιαμπαδων and 22 κρυσταλλου).

S does not agree with the expansions and interpretations of ١, 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 Μ, may exist. These criteria support the main findings of this investigation that the Syriac version is a translation based on a Vorlage similar to Μ. Notice, for instance, that no Grecism, which is a strong criterion to support a direct relationship between S and G, 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.”

Conclusion

Summing up, S is directly related to a Hebrew text similar to Μ 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 Μ.

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.
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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