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Problem

The dilemma of the Syriac version is its mysterious provenance and the direct relationship it may have to the other versions (particularly \( \text{\text{G}} \) and \( \text{\text{CJ}} \)). Thus some scholars have automatically discarded or ignored the Peshitta version as a useful tool (as a textual witness) for the study of the Hebrew text. The knowledge of textual problems, in this case the relationship of \( \text{\text{S}} \) to the ancient versions, is of extreme importance in the analysis and study of the Hebrew Bible. The awareness of \( \text{\text{G}} \), \( \text{\text{CJ}} \), and \( \text{\text{MR}} \) employed in the textual composition of \( \text{\text{S}} \) will help in exegetic, 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 (\(\mathfrak{G}\), and \(\mathfrak{C}\iota\)) and to \(\Pi\). The study covers the first twelve chapters of Ezekiel, but only those readings in the \(S\) that indicate a probable relationship to an external source are taken into consideration.

Conclusion

\(S\) (Ezek 1-12) was based on a Hebrew text similar to that of \(\Pi\), and any relationship to another ancient version can be explained as a mere coincidence or by the use of a common translation technique. In this case \(S\) is useful as a tool in textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, for it is a valuable witness to a Hebrew consonantal text very similar to \(\Pi\).
“Humble yourselves, therefore, under God’s mighty hand, that he may lift you up in due time.”

(1 Peter 5:6, NIV)
TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS ................................................. xiv

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ................................................................................... xix

INTRODUCTION ............................................................................................ 1

  Statement of the Problem ............................................................................. 1
  Delimitation ................................................................................................. 4
  Justification ................................................................................................. 7
  Methodology ............................................................................................... 7
    First Phase ................................................................................................ 8
    Second Phase .......................................................................................... 8
  Review of Literature .................................................................................. 9

Chapter

I. GENERAL GUIDELINES ............................................................................ 17

  Criteria for Evaluating the Relationship
    Among the Versions .............................................................................. 18
    Lund’s Criteria ..................................................................................... 19
    Invalid Criteria .................................................................................... 19
    Valid Criterion .................................................................................... 21
    Taylor’s Criterion .............................................................................. 21
    Criteria Derived from the Present Study ........................................... 22

  The Text of Ezekiel ................................................................................ 24
    The Masoretic Text ............................................................................. 25
    The Syriac Text .................................................................................. 25
    Syriac Manuscripts ............................................................................. 26
    The Greek Text .................................................................................... 29
    Greek Manuscripts .............................................................................. 31
    Manuscript Groups .............................................................................. 34
    The Targumic Text .............................................................................. 36
    Targumic Manuscripts .......................................................................... 36
  Conclusion ................................................................................................. 37

II. EZEKIEL 1 ............................................................................................... 38

  Collation ................................................................................................. 39
  Data Analysis ........................................................................................... 44
    Ezek 1:2 ............................................................................................ 44
    Analysis of the Variants ....................................................................... 45
    Ezek 1:3 ............................................................................................. 45
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 1:4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 1:6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 1:12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 1:14</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 1:17</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 1:18</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 1:19</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 1:20</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 1:22</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 1:23</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 1:24</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 1:27</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. EZEKIEL 2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collation</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 2:1</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 2:2</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 2:3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 2:5</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 2:6</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 2</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. EZEKIEL 3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collation</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 3:4</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 3:6</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 6:10</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 6:11</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 6:12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 6:13</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 6:14</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 6</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. EZEKIEL 7</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collation</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:2</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:3</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:5</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:6/7</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:8</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:9</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:10</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:11</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:12</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:13</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:14</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:15</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:16</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:17</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:18</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:19</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:20</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:21</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:22</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:23</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:24</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. EZEKIEL 8 ............................................................. 185

Collation ................................................................. 185
Data Analysis ............................................................ 186
Ezek 8:1 ................................................................. 186
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 187
Ezek 8:2 ................................................................. 188
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 188
Ezek 8:3 ................................................................. 189
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 190
Ezek 8:4 ................................................................. 192
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 192
Ezek 8:5 ................................................................. 193
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 193
Ezek 8:6 ................................................................. 194
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 195
Ezek 8:8 ................................................................. 195
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 196
Ezek 8:12 ............................................................... 196
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 197
Ezek 8:13 ............................................................... 198
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 198
Ezek 8:14 ............................................................... 198
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 199
Ezek 8:16 ............................................................... 199
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 200
Ezek 8:17 ............................................................... 201
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 201
Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 8 .......... 202

X. EZEKIEL 9 ............................................................. 204

Collation ................................................................. 204
Data Analysis ............................................................ 205
Ezek 9:1 ................................................................. 205
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 206
Ezek 9:2 ................................................................. 207
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 207
Ezek 9:3 ................................................................. 209
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 209
Ezek 9:4 ................................................................. 210
Analysis of the Variants .............................................. 211
Ezek 9:5 ................................................................. 211
Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 8 .......... 202

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 10:21</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 10:22</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 10</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. EZEKIEL 11</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collation</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:1</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:2</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:3</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:5</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:6</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:7</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:11</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:12</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:13</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:14</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:15</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:16</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:17</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:19</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:20</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:11</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:22</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:23</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:24</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 11:25</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 11</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel 12</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collation</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:1</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:2</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:3</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:4</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:6</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:7</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:10</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:11</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:12</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:13</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:14</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:15</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:18</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:19</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:20</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:22</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:23</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:24</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:25</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:27</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:28</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 12:29</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Variants</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 12 | 322

---

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
CONCLUSION ................................................................. 323

General Characteristics of S ........................................... 323
Textual Features of S ...................................................... 323
Textual Affinities of S in Relationship to the
Versions and to III ....................................................... 325

Methodological Criteria for Evaluating the
Relationship of S to the Other Versions ......................... 326
Conclusion ................................................................. 326

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ........................................... 328
# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Codex Alexandrinus (Manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABD</td>
<td>Anchor Bible Dictionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJSL</td>
<td>American Journal of Semitic Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a'</td>
<td>Aquila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App.</td>
<td>Apparatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Codex Vaticanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH</td>
<td>Biblical Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS</td>
<td>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZAW</td>
<td>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZ</td>
<td>Biblische Zeitschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod.</td>
<td>Codex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constr.</td>
<td>Construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons.</td>
<td>Consecutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep.</td>
<td>Deponent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS&lt;sup&gt;ms&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Reading in the Margin of a Specific MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Later Correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Masoretic Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Masoretic Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni.</td>
<td>Niphal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om</td>
<td>Omission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1°, 2°, 3°</td>
<td>Instances of a Specific Word in a Verse, or the First, Second, and Third Persons of a Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Hexaplaric Recension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oí γ'</td>
<td>οἱ τρεῖς (ἐρμηνευταί) or οἱ λαποί (ἐρμηνευταί), Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion all together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o εβρ'</td>
<td>The Hebrew Text of Origen's Hexapla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptc.</td>
<td>Participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf.</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep.</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr.</td>
<td>Prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prob.</td>
<td>Probably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pron.</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Qal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Codex Marchalianus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SL Source Language
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tr. Transposition
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INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

Statement of the Problem

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

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

2Tov, 151.

3Ibid.
dispute. Some scholars argue that $S$ has some distinctive exegetical features of the Jewish-Aramaic Targumim ($C$), especially in the Torah. Consequently $S$ would be of Jewish origin. Examples of possible targumic influence are seen in the following passages: In Gen 2:8 $\text{IR}$ and $\text{G}$ read "from the east" (גֵּפְנוֹת מַשְׂיָר), while $\text{C}^0$ and $S$ have "from the beginning." The phrase "from the beginning" is in accordance with Rabbinic tradition, in which the garden was created before the creation of the world. Targums $C^I$ and $C^N$ have a similar exegetical feature. Another example is Gen 8:4, where $\text{IR}$ and $\text{G}$ read "mountains of Ararat" (גְּרוֹנֵי אֲרָרָת), whereas $\text{C}^0$ and $S$ read "mountains of Kardu" (גְּרוֹנֵי קָרְדּוּ). 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

---


4 Ibid.

5 Ibid., 155.

Based on this premise, some believe that $S$ originated with the early Christians in the second century A.D. at the time of the conversion to Christianity of King Abgar IX of Edessa.\(^1\) Still others conclude that "no decisive arguments for either Christian or Jewish authorship have been advanced."\(^2\)

Furthermore, some scholars suggest that $\mathcal{G}$ could have had some influence on $S$. An example of that is Gen 2:2 where $\mathcal{MT}$ and $\mathcal{C_0}$ read "by/on the seventh day," while $\mathcal{G}$, $S$, 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 $\mathcal{T}_1$; 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 $S$ most related?

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


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

**Delimitation**

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

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

---


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

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

¹ W. Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel 1-24,
Ermeneia, a Critical and Historical Commentary of the Bible (Philadelphia: Fortress Press,
1979), 1.

² M. J. Mulder, Ezekiel, in The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta
Version, part III, 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1985); Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, ed. K. Elliger and
I took the Masoretic text as it is in the manuscript B19A of the Leningrad codex as the text against which all of the versions were compared. Even though the B19A manuscript is from a later date in regard to the versions under study, I believe that for the purpose of this investigation the text 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 $\mathfrak{G}, \mathfrak{C}',$ and proto-$\mathfrak{M}$ 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\(^1\) in the $S$ which indicate a probable relationship to an external source are taken into consideration.\(^2\)

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 $\mathfrak{M}$.

\(^2\)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 $M$ are seen as possibly related to external sources, those outside the $M$ and $S$ corpus of MSS.

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

4. Then those readings of $S$ that are deviations from $M$, 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 $G$ or $C$.\(^1\)

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.

\(^1\)The 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

¹For more bibliographic information see Leo Haefeli, Die Peschitta des Alten
Testamentes, mit Rücksicht auf ihre Textkritische Bearbeitung und Herausgabe,
Altestamentliche Abhandlungen, ed. A. Schulz, vol. 11 (Münster: Aschendorffschen

²Joseph Perles, Meletemata peschitioniana: Dissertation inauguralis (Breslau:
Typis Grassii, Barthii et Socii, 1859), quoted in Isenberg, 69-70.

³Comill, 137-156: W. E. Barnes, An Apparatus Criticus to Chronicles in the
Peshitta Version with a Discussion of the Value of the Codex Ambrosianus (Cambridge:
N.p., 1897); M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, “Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the Peshitta,”
One should remember, however, that Cornill did not have a critical edition of the Peshitta version.

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

---

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


5 P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959), 269-272; see also Wemberg-Møller, 255. A linguistic approach to support a Jewish-Palestinian origin for the
Wemberg-Møller presented the limitations of defining precisely the relationship between S and C. He briefly discussed the theory propounded by A. Baumstark and adopted by P. Kahle that S Pentateuch, “in the words of Baumstark, ‘is the result of the oldest Palestinian Targum shaped into an East-Aramaic spoken form.’”

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

M. D. Koster preferred to use the terms "midrashic" or "rabbinic" rather than "targumic" for the particularities of S. He analyzed Harold Gordon's method of dealing Syriac was presented by K. Beyer, "Der reicharamäische Einschlag in der ältestensyrischen Literatur," ZDMG 116 (1966): 252.

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

2Emerton, 204-211.

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

4Emerton, 205.

with $S$ in the Book of Exodus and found it deficient.\(^1\) 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.\(^2\)

Some scholars have suggested that $S$ was influenced by $\mathfrak{G}$ at some point in the history of transmission. In 1900, W. E. Barnes studied the influence of the $\mathfrak{G}$ on $S$. After briefly analyzing the OT, he concluded that "the influence of the LXX is for the most part sporadic, affecting the translation of a word here and there."\(^3\) Eleven years later Johannes Hänel published a study of nonmasoretic agreements between $\mathfrak{G}$ and $S$ in Genesis.\(^4\) For Hänel any agreements between $\mathfrak{G}$ and $S$ "would have to be considered late revisions and no conclusion could be drawn from them concerning P's Hebrew Vorlage."\(^5\)

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


\(^2\)Koster, 106.


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

Four dissertations have been written on $S$'s relationship to $\mathfrak{G}$ and/or $\mathfrak{C}$. In 1973 Abraham George Kallarakkal compared the Peshitta of Daniel with $\mathfrak{III}$, $\mathfrak{G}$, and Theodotion.\textsuperscript{3} Kallarakkal argued for Jewish authorship for $S$ and affirmed that it influenced the Greek Ur-Theodotion. However, he based his study on a Peshitta edition that is now outdated.\textsuperscript{4} In his 1988 doctoral dissertation, J. A. Lund studied the influence of $\mathfrak{G}$ on $S$ in Genesis and the Psalms. Lund based his conclusions on 118 variant readings of $S$ which deviate from $\mathfrak{III}$. 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 $\text{MT}$ and $S$, the extra-massoretic agreement between $S$ and $G$ must be considered coincidental.\textsuperscript{5}

What appear to be shared variants between $S$ [the $P$] and $G$ [the $\text{LXX}$] 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] = $\text{MT}$ before it.\textsuperscript{6}

\textsuperscript{1}Joshua Bloch, "The Influence of the Greek Bible on the Peshitta," \textit{JSL} 36 (1920): 166.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid.


\textsuperscript{5}Lund, 117.

\textsuperscript{6}Ibid., 46. See also P. B. Dirksen, "Peshitta Institute Communication XXII: The
Lund concludes that the most important criterion for measuring the direct \( \mathcal{S} \) influence on \( \mathcal{S} \) 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 \( \mathcal{S} \) from the Hebrew and Aramaic \( \mathfrak{M} \). Then he collated all the variations in \( \mathfrak{O} \) and Theodotion, against \( \mathfrak{M} \), to find out what patterns emerged. Taylor explained the variations of \( \mathcal{S} \) 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

¹Lund, 418.
²R. A. Taylor, 309.
Peshitta to Job had some W. Aramaic influence. Although this is an excellent work on translation techniques, Szpek does not present any clear criterion for evaluating variant readings found in $S$.

J. Cook compared $S$ with $\Theta$ and $\mathcal{C}$ (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 $\Pi$, $\mathcal{C}^j$, 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 $M$, and concluded that $S$ is a literal translation of $M$, 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 $\Omega$. 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.

---


2Ibid., 180.
CHAPTER I

GENERAL GUIDELINES

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

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

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

One of the many problems faced in modern textual criticism is that almost all rules concerning evaluation of variant readings were formulated having in mind the search for the original text of Mt. 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 the direct relationship to the Syriac version. The result of his investigation showed that there is only one valid criterion that can certainly indicate any direct relation between the versions. 

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 the versions agrees with the Greek. 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 the Greek 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 the versions. Even in cases where the Syriac had a good Syriac equivalent available, there is no reason to assume a direct influence of the Greek. 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 Ṣ.

"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 Ṣ Contra MT.** Doublets found in the text of S, where half agrees with Ṣ against M, do not provide evidence of later interpolations from Ṣ. 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 יָבֵן, 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 Ṣ. "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.”¹

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.”² Moreover, where the Greek idiom violates the Syriac language, the
influence of $S$ can be regarded a feasible possibility. The dilemma is that no examples of
such violation or contradiction can be found so far in $S$. (Although $S$ avoids Hebraisms,
they are not completely absent from the Syriac version, e.g., Ezek 3:18.)

Taylor’s Criterion

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

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

Ibid., 418.

Ibid.
additions or omissions\(^1\) (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 \(\text{IR}\). Otherwise it would reflect its relationship to any other version that the scribes used as a guideline (e.g., Ezek 1:4; 4:12; 4:16; 5:7; 7:22, etc.).

2. **Homonyms and Cognate Words.** These linguistic elements can assist us in the process of recognizing relationships among the versions. The use of homonyms may indicate if a version, in this case \(\text{S}\), is or is not related to a determined version, in this case \(\text{S}\). 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 \(\text{S}\) and \(\text{IR}\) regarding the addition or omission of *waw* conjunctive, it can be applied in a broader sense, e.g., avoidance of ambiguity and redundancies. Taylor, 317.
translating. Exceptions to this would be in cases of Hebraisms found in ₓ (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 ₙ was based on ₓ, 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 ₋ or ₓ, of a version with the aim of translating the supposed original text would require a guideline. In another words, if ₙ was based on either ₋ or ₓ, it should have had a manuscript of ₐ recension to be able to achieve the degree of closeness which we find in the Peshitta version to ₐ (e.g., Ezek 5:1; 2:2; 2:3; 3:4, etc.).

5. **Servi Agreement with ₐ While ₋ or ₓ 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 G
that are not present in S (e.g., Ezek 2:3; 4:9, 14; 5:4, 14, 15; 6:10; 7:5, 7:13, etc.).

6. Unique Readings in S. Unique readings are variant readings peculiar to a
single version, in this case the Peshitta version. Although it may be an addition, omission,
or substitution to the text (the remaining portion of the verse is similar to 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 nomina sacra throughout the first
twelve chapters of Ezekiel shows that the Peshitta corpus of MSS is consistent in its
translation. Even though some MSS of G^A almost always contain the reading of IR
regarding the nomina sacra, it would be almost impossible for a Syriac scribe to have
copied it from one of them, for if we accept that, the Syriac scribe should have had a critical
dition 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 9a1
fam. I list here only those MSS that were collated for the first twelve chapters of Ezekiel.

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

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

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

7h2. London, British Library, Add. MS 12. 136, fols. 1b-100b. Estrangela. This
MS has only the text of Ezekiel.

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

written in the Estrangela.

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

See bibliography for full bibliographic entry.

W. Wright, Catalogue of Syriac Manuscript in the British Museum, vol. 1
9a1 plus 17a8 supported by one or more of the MSS 17a6.7.9. 9a1 is housed in Florence, the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Or. MS 58, fols. 130b-139b. Written in the Serta script. 17a6, Paris, Bibl. Nati., Syr. MS 8, fols. 51a-70b. 17a7, from Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, MS 194, fols. 332a-352b. 17a8 from Rome, Vatican Library, Vat. Sir. MS 7, fols. 390a-411b. 17a9 from Rome, Vatican Library, Vat. Sir. MS 8, fols. 291b-309a.

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


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

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


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

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


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

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

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

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


The Greek Text

For the Greek text of Ezekiel I have relied upon the edition prepared by Joseph
Ziegler.1 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 \( \Theta \) represents the original text according to the Göttingen edition and the MSS of the first apparatus of the same edition, and the symbol \( \Theta^A \) indicates a reading supported by the witness listed in the first apparatus only. Hexaplaric readings are mentioned according to their respective witnessesees, e.g., \( \alpha' \), \( \alpha' \), \( \theta' \) 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 ερεις-13 σοσκίου;10:17-11:25 ελαλήσα προς, and several other portions not applicable to this study.

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


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

449 Milan, Ambrosian Library, Ε 3 inf., X-XI centuries.


613. Patmos, Ιωάννου του Θεολόγου, 209, XIII century.

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


770. Athos, Δευτέρα 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 (ἐρμηνευταὶ) or οἱ λ' = οἱ λοιποὶ (ἐρμηνευταὶ). 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.

The Targumic Text

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

Targumic Manuscripts

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

2. Haphtaroth.
   
   5. MS Or. 1470 of the British Museum.

3. Biblical Manuscripts with Tiberian or no vocalization.
   
   
   f. Codex Reuchlinianus of the Badische Landesbibliothek, Karlsruhe, Germany.

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. 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. XI 1.11 from bottom: insert after v. 10: הַחֲשָׁבָה for הַחֲשָׁבָה in vii 20.
- p. XII bottom line: xiv 17
  - read: xiv 17 (also found in 12a1).
- p. XXVI 1.8 from bottom: נֵיבָה
  - read: 20 נֵיבָה.
- p. XXVIII 1.18/19 from top: לָא
  - read: לָא לָא לָא.
- p. XXX (913) insert as error: xxxvii 14 לּוּ for לּוּ לּוּ לּוּ.
- p. XXXI 1.7 from top: יִתְרֵד
  - read: 10 יִתְרֵד.
- p. XXXI 1.15 from top: preceding xii 28
  - read: preceding xxii 28.
- p. XXXIV 1.17 from top, col. 1/2: xxxvi 1 מָכַר
  - read: xxxvi 1 מָכַר.
- p. XXXIV 1.18 from top, col. 1/2: xxxvii 1 מָכַר
  - read: xxxvii 1 מָכַר.
- p. 7 [Ez IV 7]: הַחֲשָׁבָה
  - read: הַחֲשָׁבָה.
- p. 10 [20 appar. ad 3 מַכַּר]: add מַכַּר מַכַּר מַכַּר
  - read: add מַכַּר מַכַּר מַכַּר מַכַּר.

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

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

1:1
כֶּסֶלֶתָם שִׂמֵה [tr.]
כֶּסֶלֶתָם בְּעַבְרֵי בָּבְרֶשֶׁת וַחֲרֵז [tr.]
הָנְגִיא + Peal Perf. יָמָּה “I was.”

1:2
וַיָּדָא [om.]
כֹּלְכָּל יְרוּש [tr.]
דֶּמֶסֶלֶת [הָנְגִיא] + ויָכְל “of his captivity.”
דֶּמֶסֶלֶת + ויָכְל “of Judah.”

1:3
וְלֶא נָב [מלָעַי] “upon me.”
Noun נָב [Aphel Ptc. יָמָּה “and shining.”

1:4
Noun נָב [Aphel Ptc. יָמָּה “and shining.”
Sing. pl. צְנָעָה “of calves.”
Adj. צְנָעָה [Aphel Ptc. Attributive יָמָּה “shining.”

1:5
“like.”

1:6
“of Judah.”

1:7
“stretching.”
1:8
Qere [יְדִי] מַסְכַּנְתָּא "and the hand."
Qere [יְדִי] מַסְכַּנְתָּא "from."
יְדִי מַסְכַּנְתָּא "on their sides."

1:9
(Idiom. Exp. מַסְכַּנְתָּא אל אֲחֹתָה נְכַפְּדוּ "on their sides."
(Idiom. Exp. מַסְכַּנְתָּא אל אֲחֹתָה נְכַפְּדוּ "to each other."
(Idiom. Exp. מַסְכַּנְתָּא אל אֲחֹתָה נְכַפְּדוּ "opposite to each other."
Fin [לֵאלָה תְּאֹב] tr.

1:10
(Idiom. Exp. מַסְכַּנְתָּא אל אֲחֹתָה נְכַפְּדוּ "on their right sides."
1°, 2°, 3° מַסְכַּנְתָּא לְאַחֲרֵבָהמָו "on their sides."
1°, 2°, 3° מַסְכַּנְתָּא לְאַחֲרֵבָהמָו "opposite to each other."
Ni. Imperf. m. pl. [לָא שָׁבַר] Ethpe. Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. מַסְכַּנְתָּא לְאַחֲרֵבָהמָו "they were not turning."
Inf. Cstr. בִּכְלָה[ om.

1:13
(Idiom. Exp. מַסְכַּנְתָּא אל אַחֲרֵבָהמָו "like."
sing. מַסְכַּנְתָּא הלַשׁ "lamp, torch."
om. copula. לְאַחֲרֵבָהמָו "and fire was shining."
tr. לְאַחֲרֵבָהמָו "from it."
1:14
Inf. Abs. [רָץִי] Peal Ptc. f. pl. מַעְלוֹת פֶּסַחְפַּס "were running."
Inf. Abs. [לִשְׁבַּע] neg. + Ethpe. Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. מַעְלוֹת פֶּסַחְפַּס מַעְלַמְלַמ "but they were not returning."

1:15
Sing. [רָץִי] pl. מַעְלוֹת פֶּסַח "wheels."
Sing. [לִשְׁבַּע] om.
Sing. הַזֶּה לַארבָּתה tr.

1:16
Subsit. [רָץִי] עַכָּל "appearance."
Subsit. מַעְלַמ כַּל "like."

1:17
Q. Imperf. [לִשְׁבַּע] Peal Ptc. f. pl. + enclit. מַעְלוֹת פֶּסַח מַעְלַמ עַכָּל "they were going."
Q. Imperf. [לִשְׁבַּע] Ethpe. Ptc. f. pl. +enclit. מַעְלוֹת פֶּסַח מַעְלַמ עַכָּל "they were turning."
Inf. Cstr. [לִשְׁבַּע] om. מַעְלוֹת פֶּסַח מַעְלַמ עַכָּל "and when they were rising."

1:18
"and their rims were high."
Verbal root confusion, Peal Ptc. f. pl. מֻסָּר פֶּסַח מַעְלַמ "and they were seeing."
Adv. [לִשְׁבַּע] Ethpe. Ptc. f. pl. מֻסָּר פֶּסַח מַעְלַמ "as they were going round about."

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

“and to the place where.”

And when they were standing.”

“they were rising.”

“was.”

“And when they were standing.”

“they were standing.”

“they were rising up.”

“was.”

“stretched, extended, firmament.”

“like the figure of the appearance.”

“of a mighty crystal.”
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1:23

“He shall stretch out... under it.”

Adj. Pl. Ptc. m. + enclit.

“stretched.”

[Idiom] Idiom “toward each other.”

Sci. Pl. “from above and from below.”

2° Pl. “toward each other.”

1:24

“of God.”


“when they were going.”

4° pr. “like.”

5° om.

Explanatory “in the midst of an army.”


“who were standing.”

Piel Imperf. 3° c. pl. Aphel Ptc. f. pl. + enclit.

“They were resting.”

1:25

“habitation.”

Pl. “their heads.”


“and when they were standing.”

Pi. Imperf. 3. f. pl. Aphel Ptc. f.

“they were resting.”

1:26

“habituation.”

1°, and 3° pr. “like.”

2° pr. “and upon.”

1:27

“like the appearance of God.”

“Enclosed in it”...

2° om.

“from within round about him.”

2° om.
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Data Analysis

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

Ezek 1:2

(Trans. of S) “On the fifth day of the month in the fifth year of the captivity of Jehoiachim,
Analysis of the Variants

In this verse the S reads like the IR with the addition of the last word ms'm, “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 6 read like IR, with the sole exception of MS 534 that reads ms'm sūlā 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

(IR) p x n  iron -ra p  bKptrr bs mrr - m  rrn rrn

(S) r£a.'ti<=j .riitnn ,» cl= j la  A.r < * .

(< E J) mrm an btnton r t o  k td  t o  ~n bsprn' ay

Ezekiel 1:3

Hd hdh dbr hdh al jwkaal bn hv hvk b'ir.

Cswd sm n tr cbr hv hvk uliy sm rd hvh

S 678934 Hm1234 5 67894 556789

Tqhd 67 67 67 67 67 67 67 67

Hd hvk nhrk m kdr y n jwkaal bn hv hvk mhrw drfrw hv hvk

Awsh s'hw b'mrtn s'hw c'sd sm c'sd sm c'sd sm rhd hvk
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(S*) καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου πρὸς Ιεζεκιὴλ υἱὸν Βουζὶ τὸν Ἱερέα ἐν γῇ
Χαλδαίων ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Χαβρῷ καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ ἐμὲ χείρι 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**

IIT reads "the word of the Lord certainly came,"1 while S, C5,c,f,v, ST read: "(ST
= and) the word of the Lord came." Exceptions are the targumic MSS b, g, o, 1, z, which
have the same reading as IIT, 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 C5,c,f,v, S, and ST may have been based on a Hebrew MS
that started with יִתְנָה (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 Cb,c,o,1h,2b 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 $1Q\text{Isa}\text{a}$, and culminates in MH. Therefore the $S$, $\mathcal{G}T$, and $C^{5,c,f,v}$ may have opted to omit the Inf. Abs. to update its reading for their readers, possibly to avoid an archaism or any misunderstanding of the text besides dittography. In this case the $S$ version seems to be on its own.

The next variant reading is the preposition "upon" plus the third person singular suffixed pronoun "upon him" (יָרָית). In $\mathfrak{M}$ the pronoun goes back to its antecedent "Ezekiel." Almost all MSS of $S$, $C^{5,c,f,v}$, and $\mathcal{G}T$ 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 $C^I$ and $\mathcal{G}T$ on $S$. On the other hand, $S$ has the word $\text{אָזְהָ}$(there) which is present in all the targumic MSS, but absent in some Septuagint MSS ($\text{εκεῖ}$ is present in MSS A-410, V-449, $[\text{X O}]$ εκεῖ $O [Q mg] - 62$). $S$ may have been affected by both $C^I$ and $\mathcal{G}T$, but more securely by $C^I$ 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.


2 Even though $S$ avoids Hebraisms, it has a reading that may be considered as a Hebraism in this verse; that is, the introductory χαὶ. $\mathcal{G}T$ has καὶ εἰς ἐνότο, which is a clear Hebraism.
Ezek 1:4

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 כנין החשמלם, “gleaming bronze, gleaming amber,” or he avoided it because of its inherent ambiguity. כנין החשמל is found otherwise only in vs. 27 and 8:2; therefore it could well have been a difficult word for its readers. These Hebrew words were translated by $\text{םשנה שָׁם שָׁם}$, “like a figure,” in the Peshitta version.

Even the $C'$ does not translate it, but keeps the exact Hebrew expression כנין החשמלם.
The δΤ translated it by δρασίς (except α’ οφθαλμός, α’ and Cod. 86 εἴδος, α’ ομοιωμα) ἡλέκτρου, “appearance of amber,” and adds a whole nominal clause at the end of the verse καὶ φέγγος ἐν αὐτῷ, “and brightness in the midst of it.”¹ Thus we cannot argue for any relation between S and δΤ. Although S has the word “figure,” which is similar to the one used in δΤ, it does not have the final additional nominal clause or the word “amber” that the latter contains.

Ezek 1:6

Analysis of the Variants

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

¹Zimmerli, 82-83. According to Zimmerli the Hebrew זְמִיר is most probably an additional comment necessary to clarify the text. This “gloss,” as he calls it, entered δΤ with a further addition, καὶ φέγγος ἐν αὐτῷ. As one can see, only δΤ has this reading, consequently it is hard to accept that the Masoretic reading is a gloss. The evidence indicates that זְמִיר is the original reading supported by Τ', S, and the only gloss is the extra-Masoretic reading found in δΤ.
second מָרָא, “every” or “each,” and לָהוּ, “of/to them,” while ג ט holds both (דְּמֶּ יָהוֹב). Even though ג holds a partial Masoretic reading except מָרָא, 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

(Ezekiel 1:12, Targum)

(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 מָרָא, “each,” while ג and \(\)^{T} read מָרָא, “each of both, both” (מָרָא every, each” O-147, L:\(^{\prime}\), 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 נין, "creature" (sometimes used for "each" like כל in Hebrew), respectively.

The relationship of ש to ג is represented by the omission of the last Hebrew Inf. Cstr. "as they went." However, MSS of גא, e.g., (X O, Qtxt) O-62 L-311, 410, 86, and also על over contain ἐν τῷ πορευόμενοι αὐτὰ, which is a typical Septuagintal translation of the Hebrew Inf. Cstr. that can be called a Hebraism (ἐν τῷ + Inf.). Another point is that ש has the word נפש, "spirit," as in מ and גט, but absent in ג.

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

Ezek 1:14

וַהֲדֵיתָם רִגְלֵיהֶם לֶחֱצוּת בְּרוּדָם הָגוֹן

ןַעֲשָׂה בְּמַעֲלָתוֹ לְמָשְׁבֵּר רְבִימָן אֲשֶׁר סָפְרֵהוּ בְּמַעֲלָתוֹ נֵלָא

וּרְבִימָן בְּכַלַּאֲתָהוּ לְמָשְׁבֵּר עָבָדְתָם וְאָסְפֵּרָהוּ בְּמַעֲלָתוֹ נֵלָא

םָפְרָה בְּכַלַּאֲתָהוּ לְמָשְׁבֵּר עָבָדְתָם וְאָסְפֵּרָהוּ בְּמַעֲלָתוֹ נֵלָא

זָמַן מֶלֶצָא שֶׁלַחְיוֹן הַמְּקַפְּקָם יִצְנָא מַעֲלָה וְלַעֲבָדָהּ בְּמַעֲלָתוֹ נֵלָא

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

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

(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. ἀλα, “and not,” to the participial form ἀνεκαμπτόν, “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. ἀλα 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 ל, and on the other hand the complete omission of this verse by ג* (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 מ that seems to have been added later on to their Greek text. Therefore the Vorlage of rel. could well be the same as of ג* (MSS B, 106) but a later hand included a literal rendering similar to that of מ. Support for this assumption, even though one may argue the opposite on the same
basis, is that the Hebrew word פּוּשׁ, "lightning," was transliterated as βεζεκ.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 ἀπορροιας η οστρακης, "flowing of lightning," for βεζεκ; σ′ has ακτινος οστρακης, "beam of lightning"; and θ′ reads οστρακης (+ κ βεζεκ).

This indicates that S is based on a different Hebrew recension than the one used by the majority of the witnesses of Ω, and the neg. Μ may be an authentic reading.

**Ezek 1:17**

(Ω) Φαρπον μετακατακατε τον αποπτομοντα

(σ) Η τεσσαρα αποστολαν εις το ιερον επορευομενον, ουκ επεστρεφον εν τω πορευομεναι αυτα.

(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 Ω and we must read with Ω (ibant) instead of the erroneous Ταραμεν, and with Σ (βρεκα) Ω Σ έβρεκ in Ταραμεν instead of the mysterious τοκοκοκ. Jerome is of the opinion that Ω has deliberately suppressed the verse, which speaks of a return (ες) 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 מ. This is one of the few cases of a textual expansion in מ. It holds a very large addition that seems to have entered its text in an early stage of transmission: מ.לאבנא רפמא מנסו לב סומא לב סומא בלבו. "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 מ 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).

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

Ezek 1:18

(6*) οὐδ' οἱ νῦντοι αὐτῶν, καὶ ὑψὸς ἦν αὐτῶς· καὶ εἶδον αὐτὰ, καὶ οἱ νῦντοι
αὐτῶν πλήρεις ὀφθαλμὸν κυκλάθεν τοῖς τέσσαραν.

(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 παρείρη, “and fear.” In a consonantal text it could well
be read as the verb παρείρη, “to see.” Thus a confusion of the verbal root may have taken
place causing the Syriac translator to render it as, “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 3.

Even though there is an addition to the targumic reading, the Hebrew word παρείρη is
rendered by the Aramaic παρείρη, “and fear,” as in 3. 6* is related to 5, for the former
reads καὶ εἶδον αὐτὰ, “and they were seeing” (except in some MSS of 6 Α, e.g., καὶ
φοβερὸν ἡσαν 88, L-ZV; καὶ φοβερὰ ἦν 62; καὶ φοβερα ἡσαν 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 τὸ πεζεύσαν, “round about to the four of them,” that was translated
in 5 as, “when the four of them were turning round about,” and
in ΟΤ κυκλόθεν τοῖς τέσσαρεσ, "round about [them] the four," indicating a non-relationship between them.

Ezek 1:19

(III) cnsix̂n ixor jnxn baa nvnrr xairm nbsx msixr? id "?

(Σ) rto o & C L lu \r< ^\r< \, \r< & alL u ,o<n ^

(€J) K 't o j 1'Din'D x'oo dti*? i n t o  xn'-.o xcim o' prtopb K 't o :  pbm xm ii t o

(Trans. of Σ) “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. Σ, as usual, tries to smooth the text and avoid ambiguity. For instance, the prep. phrase with them, was used twice, the first instance for 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.

ΟΤ is a more literal translation than Σ. The Hebrew Inf. Cstrs. were rendered into
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an un-Greek grammatical structure, ἐν τῷ + Inf. (πορεύεσθαι and ἐξαίρεται).\(^1\) Instead of ἐξαίρεται, “by their side,” ᾿Σ employs ἐξαιρέονται αὐτῶν, “neighboring them.” The remaining portion of the verse agrees precisely with ᾿Ι. The only clear deviation of ᾿Σ is the additional phrase λέγει σαμαθία, “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

(᾿Ι) ἐπὶ αὐτὸν ὕψωσεν τὸν ὄρος τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἔπεσεν κατὰ τὸν ὄρος (᾿Σ)

(᾿Ε, ᾿Ι, ᾿Τ) ἐκεῖνος ὁ πνεῦμα τοῦ πορεύεσθαι ἐπορεύοντο τὰ ζῷα καὶ οἱ τροχοί καὶ ἐξήγαγον τὸ σῶμα αὐτῶν, διότι πνεῦμα ᾿ζωῆς ἦν ἐν τοῖς τροχοῖς.

(Trans. of ᾿Σ) “And to the place where the spirit went they went, and the wheels were lifted up with them, because the living spirit was in the wheels.”

\(^1\) Maximilian Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, adapted by Joseph Smith in Scripta Pontifivii Instituti Bibliici, 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 רוח is rendered by ידוע, “will, wish,” probably because of its ambiguous source. The second instance, however, maintains the Masoretic reading indicating that רוח is applied to the creatures.

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

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

Ezek 1:22

(מ) רוחה על רוחה ויקע עניין ויקע עניין על ראשה מלמנהל

(ס) מכתס עהל כֶּל בָּשָׁבָש שֶׁנִּכְבָּש שֶׁנִּכְבָּש שֶׁנִּכְבָּש שֶׁנִּכְבָּש שֶׁנִּכְבָּש שֶׁנִּכְבָּש שֶׁנִּכְבָּש (ד')

(אי) רוחה על ירח ברחי רקרך עניין על עניין על רוחה מלמנהל
(S) καὶ ὄμοιωμα ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτοῖς τῶν ὄψιν ὤσει στερέωμα ὡς δραίος κρυστάλλου ἐκτεταμένον ἐπὶ τῶν πτερύγων αὐτῶν ἐπάνωθεν.

(Trans. of S) “And stretched upon the heads of the creatures was like a figure of likeness of a mighty crystal.”

Analysis of the Variants

S contains the word χρυστάλλου, “chrystallus,” which is a Greek loanword and also present in all MSS of A and also in S*. The verse, however, is completely different in S. It does not contain the additional word πτερύγων, “wings,” and gives a different rendering for πῦρ, “firmament” (םַלְאָם?), while T has both of them. Interestingly enough is the omission of the Hebrew word קָדָר, “awesome,” in both S and S*, while MSS of A contain it (בְּלֵם O-147, 46-449e, 86, 410, 62, or בְּלֵם L-46 [449*]-ZV, also O-1, and O read בְּלֵם Codd. 86 and X O). This may indicate that S reflects a Hebrew Vorlage similar to the one used by Cod. B.

S could have employed the Syriac equivalent for the Hebrew word πῦρ, “firmament,” which is סָפַט, but it uses a verbal noun סָפַט (pass. Ptc. of סָפח to stretch out, elongate, prolong). T and T have πῦρ and T the Greek correspondent στερέωμα.

The coincidence of one word (chrystallus), which is a Greek word, does not indicate an influence coming from 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 יִשְׂרָאֵל by an explanation.
“like the figure of the appearance,” whereas the Greek version reads ὡς ἄρασιν, “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 ראשיהם מעליהם, “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

(III) התחצוה הנקורים כנפיהם ירהו אש הוא על אשחה לאישה (S)

(E) וַהֲהַתְמִיםָתָם מָּכְסָתָם לַחֲבָה מָכְסָתָם לַחֲבָה אֶת נְצֵרָה (C)

(C*) וַאֲהַתְמִיםָתָם מָכְסָתָם לַחֲבָה מָכְסָתָם לַחֲבָה אֶת נְצֵרָה

(6*) καὶ ὑποκάτὼς τοῦ στεφεώματος οἱ πτερύγιοι αὐτῶν ἐκτεταμέναι,

(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 אֵלָיו זֶרַע הָאֱלֹהִים, “to each other,” is rendered according to the nature of the language of each version. The similarity between $S$ and $C'$ regarding the idiomatic expression is due to their language relationship and not to a direct dependency between versions, אֵלָיו זֶרַע הָאֱלֹהִים, which means literally “one opposite to the other.”

$S$ contains a unique reading by adding מִיַּחֲלָה מִיַּלָשֵׁה, “from above and from below,” instead of מִיַּחֲלָה. BHS suggests a dittographic error for the repetition of the Hebrew מִיַּחֲלָה, “and to each two covering them.” $S$ and $C'$ contain this reading as in $M$ against BHS suggestion. $G$ omitted it with the exception of group $O-Q$, which contains it in an asterisk, в καὶ δύο καλυπτουσαὶ αὐτοὺς τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν.

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 $M$ with some editorial work.

Ezek 1:24

אָמַסְמָה אֵל כָּל נַפְסָה כֶּכַל מֵסָר רְבֵּיתָ קָכִיל פֶּרֶי

בַּלְכַּחַת כָּל חַמָּל כָּל נַפְסָה בְּנֵגְדָה עֵרִיפֵה נְפָסִים

אָמַסְמָה מֵאֵל כָּל נַפְסָה כֶּכַל מֵסָר רְבֵּיתָ קָכִיל פֶּרֶי

רְאָמָלָה מֵאֵל כָּל נַפְסָה כֶּכַל מֵסָר רְבֵּיתָ קָכִיל פֶּרֶי
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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 T employs the un-Greek structure ἐν τῷ plus Inf. for the Hebrew Inf. Constr. The omission of ὡς φωνὴν ὑδάτων in T (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., A reads (Q) ὡς φωνὴν (ἡ 62mg-147, 710) ἑκοῦν (θεοῦ οὐάδαι [οὐάδαι λαχάνου 36, 534; οὐάδας 106] 62mg, L' [221x, 538x1, 449x1]-ZV, 534, 106) ἐν τῷ πορευομένῳ αὐτὰ φωνήν (ἡν 62 L'·36 765-V-449-ZV; ὡς φ. 86' ; ὡς φωνῆν 763) τοῦ (>763) λογοῦ ὡς φωνήν (ἡν 62 L'·36 46; -νης 198) παρεμβολής (-λων 407) rel. In addition, θ' has an asterisk, ὡς φωνὴν οἰκον (α' and σ' οἰκον; οἱ λογίοι read θεοῦ οὐάδαι and Cod. 86) ἐν τῷ πορευομένῳ αὐτὰ φωνὴ τοῦ λογοῦ ὡς φωνὴ παρεμβολής Qεβ. S reads ὡς φωνὴν ὑδάτων, "like the voice of God." The Syriac reading seems to be more a clarification

---

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

C' avoids anthropomorphism by translating "כָּכֵל שֵׁד, "like the voice of Shaddai," as "כָּכֵל מִן כָּכֵל שֵׁד, "like the voice from before Shaddai." Also there is a textual expansion in C' probably related to the Merkabah, where angelic chants praise God in the heights of heavens:

"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

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

Analysis of the Variants

Based on this verse $S$ would not have a targumic dependency or relationship, for it does not avoid anthropomorphism as the latter does. $\mathcal{T}'$ transliterates the Hebrew expression הָשָׁמַל, 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: מָשָׁלְךָ, “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 (ירמיהו חוֹשֶׁם), 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 ירמיהו (1:22, 27).

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

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

4. It avoids the paraphrasing and additions of \( \Theta \) (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: \( \text{אֲדֹנָי} \text{לְאָתָם} \) in 13, and \( \text{מְדַעָּה} \text{כִּפְרַקְתָּה} \) in 22).

6. \( \Sigma \) does not have any direct relation to \( \varepsilon \) because the former does not avoid
anthropomorphism and lacks all the textual expansions of \( \varepsilon \). (1:22, 27).
CHAPTER III

EZEKIEL 2

Collation

Based on the collation one may see that Ezek 2 contains the fewest difficulties regarding its relationship to 1.

2:1 Q. Perf. w. waw as Imper. 2° m. s. יאמר יאמר

“rise up.”

2:2

ויהיי

“with me.”

2:3

ויהיי

“against me.”

Q. Perf. 3 c. p. + prep. “rebelled against me” מפקח בק טושפ

“and they have done wrong against me.”

ומצ

om.

2:4

“their heart.”

ומצ

om.

2:5

“say.”

2:6

“do not tremble.”

MSS 7a1, 12d1→.

“and they will tremble.”

ומצ

tr.

"you [are] // there is//are"

2° לִבִּי

tr.

2° "not to."

"for [they will] deny.”

66
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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 M with the sole exception of the word "אָמַר, "to stand." S
uses the synonym "nao, "to rise up," which can be just a synonym. This is the verb used in \( \text{C} \) and is the correspondent verb for the Hebrew \( \text{מָעַק} \). The usage of the verb \( \text{מָעַק} \) can be explained by the lexical characteristics of a language in particular. This verb is peculiar to Early Biblical Hebrew (EBH), while the verb \( \text{מָעַק} \) is employed more in the context of Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH).\(^1\) Therefore the Syriac and Targumic versions reflect a more ancient lexical development and not a relationship between \( S \) and \( \text{C} \).

\( \text{S} \) has an entirely new introductory portion that makes any relationship to \( S \) impossible: "And he brought me up on the spirit into a wilderness, etc." Then the remainder of the verse is similar to \( \text{C} \). It is clear that the Syriac scribe employs a linguistic feature (the verb \( \text{מָעַק} \)) that is related to the Aramaic language and he is not dependent on any of the versions. The coincidence of both—\( S \) and \( \text{C} \)—regarding the use of the verb \( \text{מָעַק} \) is not strong evidence for a relationship, for it can be due to their related language.

Ezek 2:2

\[ \text{Ezek} 2:2 \]

\[ \text{Syriac: } \text{S} \]

\[ \text{Targum: } \text{C} \]

---

toûs pòdas mou, kai ἔκουν αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος πρὸς με.

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

Analysis of the Variants

This verse is related to C concerning the usage of the verb μεταναστεύομαι, “to rise up,” instead of περίτελλομαι, “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 ἀνέλαβέν με καὶ ἔχειπέν με). MS 407 omitted this addition, probably by homoiooteleuton.

Ezek 2:3

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

Analysis of the Variants

5 has its text closer to 11 than to any of the ancient version under study. It avoids the Targumic Memra (סピーָּר) and further accommodation of the text and the variations of 1 (אִּתָּרמ “house” for בְּנֵי “sons”) and its omissions (1 > 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 תֹּבֵּע "bone, substance (?)” which is a difficult idiomatic usage of this word (“this very day”). The verb מַשֵּׁת, “they rebelled,” is explained rather than translated by the verb מָלַל from חָצֵל, “do wrong, injustice.” Therefore, 5 seems to have been based on a Hebrew text similar to 11 for this passage; 5, however, smooths the text, making it easier to read.

Ezek 2:5

וְהוֹמָה אָם תֹּשְׁתָה לָא יִזְדַּרְכָּל כֵָּּל מִי תֹּהַדְדוּ כ לְבֵּי לְבֵי הַחֵתֵב (11)

וְהוֹמָה אָם תֹּשְׁתָה לָא יִזְדַּרְכָּל כֵָּּל מִי תֹּהַדְדוּ כ לְבֵּי לְבֵי הַחֵתֵב (5)

(ט') 'Eän ἢρὰ ἀκούσωσιν ἢ πτωτικώσι, διότι οἶκος παραπικράιων ἐστί, καὶ γνωσοῦνται ὅτι προφήτης εἰ σὺ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.

(Trans. of 5) “Perhaps they may listen and tremble, for they are a rebellious house, and they may know that you are a prophet among them.”
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Analysis of the Variants

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

₪T 'Εν αρα (whether) . . . ū (or) . . .
₪J, and ₩ מ (Whether/if) . . . ₩ (whether/if) . . .
S ἢ (perhaps) . . . (and) . . .

Furthermore apparently related to ₫T is the clause καὶ γνώσονται ὅτι προφήτης ἐστὶ σὺ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, "and they will know that a prophet you are among them" (the Syriac version renders מַהֲמָה, "and they may know that a prophet you are among them"), while ₩ has מֵהָמַה, "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 (מ) in the process of copying הָמַה, "you," for it can be easily confused with מַהֲמָה, "there was/is," as in MSS 7a1, 12d2. Therefore some S MSS support the ₩ reading while others contain this confusion between the personal pronoun and מַהֲמָה, "there are, is." This shows that S is without any relationship to ₫T.

1Zimmerli, 90: "nom was lacking in the Hebrew Vorlage of ₫." 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 כתרים, “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" ( образом חוסל לה). י reads "even if they rebel and argue against you." The אא has 들ות פארוסתיוזו נא אפודריוונ תן קוקלו, "for they will entice and rise against you" (א' reads يتمיון יאר ונא אפודריוונ תן פראוסו סל, "for bold and anxious they will be against you," and א' has סל דוסקולו נא פראוסו סל, "hard and disobedient with you" Cod. 86. This indicates that א was based on a Hebrew text similar to אא.

More evidence for a careful translation based on a Hebrew Vorlage is the chiastic structure found in אא א' [라도 [טבריתא] [תא] [דאה] א [דאה] [טבריתא] א, "do not fear them, and by their words do not be dismayed." All the versions recognized it including א. However, in the second part of the same verse, א presents a chiastic structure that is not found in the Hebrew sentence. The latter has [라도 [טבריתא] א' [דאה] [טבריתא] א, 'their words do not fear and before them do not be dismayed." אא and י agree with the Masoretic reading, while א, instead, has [라도 [טבריתא] א' [דאה] [טבריתא] א, "do not fear their words and at their faces do not be


2 According to Zimmerli the Hebrew phrase כת קוקלו is unsatisfactory. He stated that "the קוקלו points to an occurrence of the root סבל in the Hebrew original. Scribal considerations permit us to conjecture in סבל a scribal error for סבלים." 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 $S$ are not found in $S$ (2: 1, 2).

2. $S$ uses synonyms, e.g., for מַעֲמַר it employs the Syriac verb for מַעֲמַר. $S$ is related to $S^I$ 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 $S^I$ as its Vorlage.

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

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

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

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

EZELIKE 3

Collation

3:1
Imperf. אֶלְבָּנָה [Aphel Ptc. + pron.] יִרְאוֹנַת “you are finding.”

3:3
Hi. Imperf. 2° m. Juss. הָאֶלֶף [om.]

3:4
“A to the captivity to . . .”

3:5
Q. Pass. Ptc. וַיֵּשָּׁב [Peal Perf. 1° s. + suf.] “it is.”

3:6
Q. Imperf. 2° m. s. יִפְרָד [Peal Ptc. + pron.] יִרְאוֹנַת “you are not going to understand.”

3:7
Q. Imperf. 3° m. pl. יִשְׁמַע [Peal Ptc. m. pl. + enclit.] “they are going to listen.”

3:8
Q. pr. עִם “for.”
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Q. Inf. Cstr. Peal Ptc. m. pl. "listening."

Idiom "between their eyes" for "forehead."

"their heart."

3:8

Q. Perf. om. 

Adj. Subst. Aphel Perf. 1° c. s. "I cause to be strong."

Idiom "between your eyes" for "forehead."

Adj. Aphel Perf. 1° c. s. "I will cause to be strong."

Idiom "between their eyes" for "forehead."

3:9

"I have made."

Idiom "between your eyes."

"from before them."

3:10

Piel Imperf. Peal Ptc. + pron. "which I am speaking."

tr.

3:11

Perf. w. waw cons. Imper. sense "and speak."

"with them."

"perhaps they will listen and tremble."

3:12

+ Peal Ptc. m. s. "which was saying."

Peal Pass. Ptc. + copula "blessed is."

3:13

Idiom "each other."

"with them."

3:14

Ambiguity om. 

tr.
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3:15
Spell. פְּלַקְתַּה הִשִּׁיר [וּלְצַר אָבִיב]
Q. Ptc. m. p. רְשֵׁבָה [רְשֵׁבָה]
Peal Ptc. m. s. מְשַׁכֶּה
“that is located/situated.”
Ambiguity קָצְר הָא הַבָּשָׁם [קָצְר הָא הַבָּשָׁם] om.
הָּה הַבָּשָׁם “as I was speechless.”
3:16
Q. Perf. 2° m. s. מָשָׁה [מָשָׁה]
Peal Imperf. + Peal Ptc. דְּמַי "for you are listening.”
Sing. יַרְדֵּר] Pl. וְהָיָה [וְהָיָה]
מַעָּקז "words.”
3:17
Q. Inf. Cstr. בֵּלֵי רֹעֵה [בֵּלֵי רֹעֵה]
Temp. part. + Peal Ptc. יַּמָּשֵׁה "when I say.”
Inf. Cstr. + Imperf. יָהֵשֵׁה [יָהֵשֵׁה] Hebraism,
Inf. > 1 + Peal Imperf. מָשָׁה מָשָׁה יַּמָּשֵׁה “you will surely die.”
3:19
With the sense of “if” "ָּכָי [ָּכָי] “if.”
Q. Inf. שָׁלֵּה [שָׁלֵּה]
"to the sinner.”
3:21
Q. Inf. Abs. + Imperf. מָשָׁה מָשָׁה יַּמָּשֵׁה "he will live.”
Q. Inf. Cstr. בֵּלֵי רֹעֵה [בֵּלֵי רֹעֵה] Substi. יָהֵשֵׁה "the righteous.”
Inf. Cstr. + Imperf. יָהֵשֵׁה [יָהֵשֵׁה] Hebraism,
Inf. > 1 + Peal Imperf. מָשָׁה מָשָׁה יַּמָּשֵׁה “you will surely die.”
“and there was standing the glory.”


“of the God of Israel.”

Q. Perf. 3° c. pl. הָעַל + Pron.

“and when I am going to speak.”


“I am going to open.”

Q. Perf. 3° c. pl. הָעַל + Peal Ptc. m. pl. הָעַל + tr.

“they are going to put.”

Q. Perf. 3° c. pl. הָעַל + Peal Ptc. m. pl.

“and [they] are going to bind.”

Data Analysis

Selected portions of Ezek 3 are analyzed below. Those verses which have readings similar to III without any major deviation were not considered for this investigation.

Exceptions to this are those readings in S that, though similar to III, are not supported by the version(s). In other words, those extra-Masoretic readings of C¹ and G which are against S and III were also taken into consideration.

Ezek 3:4
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(79) καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς με τὴν ἀνθρώπον, βάδιζε ἐξελθὲ πρὸς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ λαλήσον τοὺς λόγους μου πρὸς αὐτούς.

(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 הָאָסָרְךָ, “children of Israel,” as in CJ, while MSS z and f are similar to II having בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל, “house of Israel.” G agrees with II (οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ). S, however, has a unique reading by adding the prepositional phrase לֵךְ אֵל הַשְּׁאָר, “to the captivity,” probably a collective noun to indicate the captives of Israel. This may not be a reflection of its Vorlage, but only an explanatory addition to its text, making it clearer where the prophet should go.

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

Ezek 3:6

לָא אָלַם עֹמְדָה מְפִיקָם שֶפֶךְ וְכֹבֵּדְךָ לְעֹלֶם אַשֶּׁר לָא תֶמֶם (II)

רֹבָיוֹם אֵשׁ לָא אַלְיוֹדָה שֵׁלַחְתֶךָ הָמֶה שְׁכָנָה אֲלֵךְ

בֹּשְׁהֵנָה לָא לָא חַטָּאתָךְ מְשִׁחתָהּ אַלֶּה מְעָטָה (S)
Analysis of the Variants

S seems to be an elaborated version of a Hebrew text similar to Ι. The particle < indicates a continuation from the preceding verse. Consequently S omits the redundancy of Ι: , “of foreign speech and difficult language,” in vs. 5 and again in vs. 6. Both ס and צ agree with Ι, 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 כ in instead of the imperfect.1

Ezek 3:8

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 <len>that</len>, which is a partial literal translation. For instance, the Hebrew adjective מְנַחֶם, “strong,” was conveyed by the verb מְנַחֶם, “I caused to be strong,” for the first instance, and in the second instance by the verb מְנַחֶם, “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.

<len>that</len>, 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 מְנַחֶם in the sentence מְנַחֶ�ם וְתַוְּסִפָּהוּ וַעֲנָיוֹ וַעֲמָנוֹ וַעֲנָיוֹ, “I gave/made your face strong,” as in מ. On the other hand, the second part of the verse has a different literary style, a Greek style, e.g., καταθυμώ, “I will make strong,” instead of the simple Hebrew adjective מְנַחֶם, “strong.” In this regard <len>that</len> agrees with the Masoretic text.

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

Ezek 3:9


Analysis of the Variants

Even though \( \mathcal{S} \) agrees with the \( \mathcal{M} \) reading, the Syriac scribe evades the use of the verb \( \text{ךס} \) with the sense of "to make" by employing another verb that conveys a more
specific sense, in this case the verb חָפָז, “to make.” It has a minus, namely, מֵאָשׁ רָחְצוּ, “I have made (given) your forehead.” Some MSS of 6 contain this Hebrew portion, e.g., 410 (δεδώκα το προσωπόν σου), 0', L'-ZV (δεδώκα το μετωπόν σου), and θ' (δεδώκα το μετωπόν σου Q161) contain a reading similar to that of 6. The introduction of 6 is different; it reads καί έσται διὰ παντὸς κραταιοτέρον πέτρας, “and it will be continually stronger than a rock,” which is a unique reading among the versions.

Although 6 has all the 6 reading, it contains an expansion to the text that 5 ignores completely: do not break in pieces before them,” and instead of תַנְבּא Targum reads תַנְבּא, “people.” Therefore 5 seems to be based on a Hebrew text similar to 6.

Ezek 3:11

(6) καὶ βαδίζει εἴσελθε εἰς τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν πρὸς τοὺς νίόν τοῦ λαοῦ σου καὶ λαλήσεις πρὸς αὐτούς καὶ ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτούς Τάδε λέγει κύριος, εὰν ἄρα ἀκούσωσιν, εὰν ἄρα ἐνδοθήν.
(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 ἔκλογες clauses, ἵππος ἀνήχετο, "perhaps they will hear and tremble,” probably to harmonize with 2:7 in which the same type of clause appears. Ᾱ* reads ὄντα ἀκούεις, ὄντα ἐνθύσης, “whether they will hear, or whether they will give up.” Ᾱ has MS 147' that reads πτωπηθώσουν ("be terrified") for ἐνθύσης, which is a reading similar to the Syriac one. α’, σ’ read παναιτροταί, “they will cease,” while θ’ and Cod. 86 have κοπασώσω, “they will cease.” θ’ is completely alien to both versions. It reads: ἡ γῆ ἐντελῶς ἡμῖν ἀπειληθη μῆλησα, “whether they would heed the instruction or whether they would cease from sinning.”

S has a consistent way of translating the name of God. It uses the words ἀνήχετο, "Lord of Authority/Lordship," for ἀνήχετο, whereas θ’ has ἀνήχετο, which is a reading similar to the Syriac one. Although Ᾱ* has only κύριος, “Lord,” MSS L’ - 449 Zv of Ᾱ have ἀπαίτητο prior to κύριος, and MS 62 has ὃ θεός. Taking into consideration the entire set of variant readings of this verse, the only possibility for S is a relationship to a Hebrew text very similar to that of Μ.

---

1L. J. McGregor, The Greek Text of Ezekiel, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 18 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 57-96. He devoted two chapters (3 and 4) to the discussion of the nomina sacra in the Greek text of Ezekiel. On p. 227 of his book, he presented a table with the readings of the Greek text and its witnesses at the 434 passages where BHS records ἄνηχετο. There are many variations among the Greek witnesses of ᾳ concerning the translation of the nomina sacra, whereas S is more consistent in its rendering.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Although several MSS of $\mathcal{G}^a$ contain a reading similar to $\Pi$ concerning the nomen *sacrum*, all of them have the same alternative $\Delta$ clause found in $\Pi$ 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 $\Pi$, but probably slightly different from each other.

Ezek 3:12

(\Pi) there was a holy spirit, full of speech, coming forth from the Lord.

(S) καὶ ἀνέλαβεν μὲν πνεῦμα, καὶ ἦκουσα κατόπισθέν μου φωνὴν σεισμοῦ μεγάλου Ἐυλογημένη ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ.

(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’.”

Analysis of the Variants

$S$ adds the Peal Ptc. נברך, “saying,” in the beginning of the direct speech to smooth the flow of the sentence. $\mathcal{G}^*$ does not have it. However, some MSS of $\mathcal{G}^a$ have a participle λεγοντων, “saying”; $A'$, 147, 535-46, $C'$-8631-710-239'-403, and MSS 86mg, 410 have the participle λεγοντος, “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 רָעָה, “bitter,” as א does in their texts. א’ has πικρός and א’ has πεπικράμμενος, both words having their roots from the word “bitter.” Several other MSS of א (rel.) contain the word μετερός, “anxious.” The omission of רָעָה, “bitter,” in S and א 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, א’ has a reading similar to א.

The idiomatic expression בָּאָמָה רָעָה, “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 הָעָמָה, “heat, rage,” is a case of polysemy in the Hebrew language. And, as it is in this verse, the expression בָּאָמָה רָעָה can be considered the only
instance in the Hebrew Bible. The Syriac language possesses a form cognate to the
Hebrew רָעָם that is סָרָּה. Perhaps to avoid the strong sense implied in the Syriac word
סָרָּה, “to burn with anger, be enraged, angry,” translates another word (סָרָּה “in the
eagerness”) instead of its cognate one. LXX reads εἰς ὀρμῶν τῆς πνευματός μου, “in
the impulse of my spirit,” while ןכ פא Redskinsי, “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 וְהָבָא מִן רָעָם יִעְלֵי הַקְּרֵם, “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

וְהָבָא מִן רָעָם יִצְבַּא וְהָבָא מִן הַקְּרֵם

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.

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

Analysis of the Variants

One of the key words in this verse is תֵל אֲבִיב, “Tel Aviv,” which is rendered by $S$ and $T$ as תֵל אָבִיב, “Telakiv” (probably a scribal error at some stage) and תֵל אֲבִיב respectively, whereas $\Theta$ substituted תֵל אֲבִיב by μετέωρος καὶ περιῆλθον, “and I went anxious round about” (α’, θ’, and Cod. 86 contain θελ αββ). This indicates that $\Theta$ was based on a different Hebrew recension from the one employed by $S$ and $T$, or the translator of $\Theta$ 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 רַאָם 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 אדוה suggests a Qere reading for רַאָם, that is, ובא, the Syriac scribe may have jumped from

¹“This $\Theta$ did not recognize the place name תֵל אֲבִיב and renders it at random . . . μετέωρος καὶ περιῆλθον appears to presuppose in אדוה a derivation from הָלָל ‘to be high’ and to have read in the form בֵּא or בֵּא. . . .” Zimmerli, 94.
Making this common translation error, rendered the relative nominal clause by "who were there," and by "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

(S)  "And after seven days the word of the Lord was upon me saying."

Analysis of the Variants

 avoids Hebraisms, thus it omitted the introductory that is translated by an un-Greek expression Kai ἐγένετο in . Even the second instance of is translated by as Kai ἐγένετο in rel. (O), and in α', σ', θ'.

A normal characteristic of is the avoidance of any anthropomorphic feature applied to God. Thus the last portion of this verse was translated as "and the word of the prophecy from before the Lord was with me." is completely alien to this tradition.
Ezek 3:18

(III) sen - prim 1 ? mn ai x4 lmrri xbi man mo sen1 'naxn

(5) mta' mra
dot
\[\text{Trans. of S} \] "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 $\text{CT}$ by omitting the word בָּשׁוּר, “wicked,” in the phrase רָשׁוֹן, “his wicked ways,” it is not strong evidence in favor of a direct relationship between S and $\text{CT}$, 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. רָשׁוֹת, “he will surely die,” conveyed into S and $\text{CT}$ as a non-Syriac
and an un-Greek form, which is usually called a Hebraism (ἀναρτωθήσῃ and ἡμεῖς ἄναρτωθήσῃ respectively). This also can be explained by a Hebrew influence in both versions. Notice that this is one of the few instances of a Hebraism in S.

On the other hand ᾿S has ἀποστρέφειν, “to turn” (ἐπιστρέφειν 239’), against the Syriac reading ἐστη, “that he might take heed,” and the Masoretic reading לֹא יִזְכֹּר, “to warn” (C’ אֶזְכֹּר), and the word רֹנֶם, “wicked one,” is rendered by סעמה, “sinner,” in the Syriac version (see also vs. 19 for this same reading), and by ἡμέρα, “lawless,” in ᾿S. If both S and ᾿S were somehow related, the verb ἀποστρέφειν, “to turn,” which is found in ᾿S, would be expected to be found in S instead of the verb ἐστη, “that he might take heed,” which is closer to the Masoretic reading לֹא יִזְכֹּר, “to warn.”

Ezek 3:21

A bare infinitive, namely without ∆, is frequently used in the manner of the Hebrew infinitive absolute to color the verbal notion in a variety of ways. Whatever its historical origin, the usage is by no means confined to the Syriac Old Testament where one might justifiably suspect Hebrew influence.” Muraoka, Syriac Grammar, § 96; Regarding quotations from the Septuagint in the NT Zerwick states that “we find also participles used to render the Hebrew absolute infinitive used to emphasise a finite verb.” In the present case the word θανάτῳ is a noun in the dative case. Zerwick, § 369.
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 הָרִצּוּמַן present in the Hebrew text, and the substitution of the pronoun הָרִצּוּמַן, “and he,” by the actual noun הָרִצּוּמַן, which makes more sense than the awkward reading of הָרִצּוּמַן. 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 © while ©* probably contains an editorial work omitting ἐκεῖ, “there,” from the first sentence, whereas MSS ( asia) O-Q-
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62 of the contain it. MS 12a1 of Ṣ has אָזֶה, “again,” probably to harmonize with the preceding statement (3:14) which is similar to it.

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

Ezek 3:23

This verse reflects a careful rendition by supplying a specific reference to God, in

Analysis of the Variants

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

Ezek 3:27

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

The use of the *nominasacra* "Adonai Yahweh," indicates that $S$ had a *Vorlage* close to $M$. $G^*$ employs κύριος, "Lord," for the whole expression $יְהֹוָה יְהֹוָה$ (pr. $אֲדֹנָי יְהֹוָה$ $O^{[Qts]} L$-311, Cod. 86, rel. has + κύριος), while the Peshitta of Ezekiel always uses אֲדֹנָי יְהֹוָה, "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 אֲדוֹנַי יְהֹוָה, "incline your soul," אֲדֹנַי יְהֹוָה, "instruction," and אֲדוֹנַי יְהֹוָה, "from sinning," and instead of בְּהֵב, "house," it reads בְּלֵב, "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

אִשָּׁה + עֲשֵׂה + “However.”

4:2

Q. Perf. רָצַן] Peal Imper. חָפַשְׁט “make.”

Q. Perf. w. waw consec. ובתִּת] Peal Imper.

“and build.”

Q. Perf. w. waw consec. וְשָׁכַש] Aphel Imper. חָסַשׁ “and cast up.”

Q. Perf. w. waw consec. וַרְתָנֵךְ] Aphel Imper. חָסַשׁ “and set.”

Q. Imper. וְרָצַק] Peal Imper. חָסַשׁ “and make.”

4:3

Q. Perf. רָצַז] Peal Imper. חָסַשׁ “and make it.”

[וֹר] om. supplies the prep. ל.

Hi. Perf. w. waw consec. פָּלִילו] Peal Imper. מִלְחַמְס “and set.”

וָצָא] Pr. תִּשַּׂא “this.”

4:4

Q. Perf. w. waw consec. וְשָׁמַת] Peal Imper.

“and place.”


“you are going to lie.”

4:5

Sing. וְיָמִים] Pl. מִשְׁפָּט “days.”

4:6

ומָת] om.

2° וָאֵם לֵשָׁה] om.

4:8

Q. Perf. וַרְצַה] Aphel Perf. חָסַשׁ “I have laid.”
Pi. Inf. Cstr. + pron. 2° m. s. מְכַלֵּא | Peal Imper. 3° m. pl. מְכַלֵּי • "they will be completed."

4:9

Pual Ptc. f. s. מִכָּלֵא | Verb + noun "it was not defiled."

4:10

ינן | om.

מִכָּלֵי "by beast."

4:15

Imper. ראה | "behold."

מִכָּל "dung."

4:11

one of the sixth part of a hin.

4:12

רְדוֹא | om.

מִכָּל "of sons of man."

4:16

"Staff of bread" מִכָּל "staff of food."

4:14

רְדוֹא | om.

מִכָּל "one another."

Particle+ Q. Imperf. (Subjunctive)

"and they will be lacking."
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

(מ) חוהحا חלמה גולמה, חודה חלמה פלאמה, חסד חלמה חלמה
(ס) חסד חלמה חלמה חלמה, חסד חלמה חלמה חלמה
(ד') חזרי חלמה בצר הובים חלמה זכרון חלמה חלמה חלמה

Analysis of the Variants

S* and S omitted the fifth חלמה, “against her.” S however has a synonymous prepositional phrase און instead of חלמה, while S* does not have anything. Some MSS of S* contain it; see MSS 881'-311. It may be only an editorial work rather than an actual reading in their Vorlagen.
Each version employed a different approach to render the verbs of this verse. \( \mathcal{S}^* \) and \( \mathcal{C'} \) 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 \( S \) has them in the Imperative mood, understanding the Hebrew idiom.

\( \mathcal{R} \) employs the verb חות, “you place, give, put,” in this verse. \( S \) translates the first instance by ἐρατεῖτε, “and make,” and the second by ἐκτεῖτε, “and set.” \( \mathcal{G}^T \) renders both instances with a more literal translation δώσετε, “you will give,” which sounds more like a Hebraism than a Greek usage of this verb. \( \mathcal{C'} \) reads ἠθερείη, “and lay siege” and ἡθορείη, “and pitch,” respectively.

There is a very interesting deviation in \( \mathcal{C'} \) חות יבש עֲלֵיהּ עֲפֹרָיוֹן וּשְׁאוֹר סַחוּר, “and appoint guards round about it,” that seems to be related to MS 538 of \( \mathcal{G}^A \). The latter one reads ταξιέω εἰς αὐτήν φυλάσσοντας καὶ ταξιέω εἰς αὐτήν, “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

והתח חלך מהבת בורלו נתזה חואת קר בורלו בינך וביKr נביר (\( \mathcal{Y} \))

הכיתנה את פין אַלָה חיזה בַּעַו וּרְתֵה עִלוּ הָאִם הָיָה לָבֵית יָשָרָא

גָּזְבַת עִלָּה לַעֲלָה בַּעַו, מַכְבַּא עַמְּלָה חַשְׁקֵה לַחֶשְׁקֵה (\( \mathcal{S} \))

מֵימָע וְשָׂם חָּלָה מֶסֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶמֶמֶם מֶסֶמֶm

אָאֵה כָּלָה מִשְׁרַת בּוֹרֵתַת צִוָּה כְּתוּל בּוֹרֵתַת בִּנְךָ כְּתוּל (\( \mathcal{S'} \))

נְחֲקָם יִתְנַח בִּאָף חַלָה בּוֹרֵתַת לְהָבֵית אֶחָא לְהָבֵית יָשָרָא
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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 $\mathfrak{C}^\prime$ agree with $\mathfrak{M}$ concerning the phrase בי ישראל, "house of Israel," while $\mathfrak{G}^\tau$ has יונים ישראל, "sons of Israel," harmonizing with 3:1. Furthermore, to avoid redundancy, $S$ omitted the second ב, "between." $\mathfrak{G}^\tau$, however, contains both instances of the preposition ב.

Ezek 4:4

אֲשֹׁהַ מִכֶּבָּת עֹלָה וָדָּרְבָּן יָשָׁמָל שֶׁמֶת אָהֲנָה בִּית יִשְֹרֵאֵל (ר)

עֹלָה מְסֻכָּב הוֹמוֹת שֶׁמֶת הַמְּסֻכָּב עָלָיוֹת שֶׁמֶת אֲהַלָּב (5)

סָגִּית הָדַעֲכָה מַדֶּלָה פָּסְכָה מַדֶּלָה. מַגָּלֶד דַּלֶּלָה. מַגָּלֶד דַּלֶּלָה (5)

חֲלָשֶׁה. חֲלָשֶׁה לָגָדֶל דַּגָּדֶל חֲלָשֶׁה. חֲלָשֶׁה דַּמָּלֶד (ר)

אָשֶׁר מִכֶּבָּת עֹלָה וָדָּרְבָּן יָשָׁמָל הוֹמוֹת (ר)

עֹלָה וָדָּרְבָּן יָשָׁמָל מַדֶּלָה פָּסְכָּה מַדֶּלָה. מַגָּלֶד דַּלֶּלָה. מַגָּלֶד דַּלֶּלָה (ר)

אֲשֹׁהַ מִכֶּבָּת עֹלָה וָדָּרְבָּן יָשָׁמָל שֶׁמֶת אָהֲנָה בִּית יִשְֹרֵאֵל (ר)

כֹּמֶת אֲשֹׁהַ מִכֶּבָּת עֹלָה וָדָּרְבָּן יָשָׁמָל שֶׁמֶת אָהֲנָה בִּית יִשְֹרֵאֵל (ר) 

καὶ δὲ σεαυτῷ τήγανον σιδηροῦν καὶ θησεὶς αὐτῷ τοίχων σιδηροῦν ἀνὰ μέσον σοῦ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐτοιμάσεις τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ ἔσται ἐν συγκλεισμῷ, καὶ συγκλεισμὸς αὐτήν· σημεῖον ἔστιν τούτῳ τοῖς νῦσιν Ἰσραήλ.
tor oukou Israel et' autou kata arithmoun twn hmerwn penthkonata kai ekaton, de koimptia et' autou, kai lympsi tas adikias autwn.

(Trans. of S) “Then lie upon your left side, and lay the iniquity of the house of Israel upon that side; according to the number of days that you will lie upon it, you will bear their iniquity.”

Analysis of Variants

S agree with Ἱ by omitting the addition of ἸΤ (πεντήκοντα καὶ ἐκατόν).

Manuscript group C’ omitted it as in Ἱ, Ἱτ, and S. MS group O has an obelus marking this reading, indicating that this reading was not in its original text; and MSS O (Qmig)-147, 538, 534-239'-710 read ἐνενήκοντα καὶ τριακοσίας. For S to have had a Vorlage related to ἸΤ, S should have had a recension similar to manuscript group C’, which is the catena group. Therefore the chance is minimal for a relation between S and ἹΤ.

Ezek 4:5

(ⓘ) άριστα λέει ησα απο την τορμ σεα ημερη τις προσεβεν των φυσισ ειναν νεεητες υιν νεους υν νηιηαλ

(⚓) και εγώ δεδωκα σοι τας δυο αδικιας αυτων εις αριθμον ημερων ενενηκοντα
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καὶ ἐκατὸν ἡμέρας. καὶ λήμψῃ τὰς ἁδικίας τοῦ οἴκου Ἰσραήλ.

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

Analysis of the Variants

Regarding numerical figures S agrees with Μ (σαλεσ μοίχας τούτον), whereas ΘΤ has its own reading (ἐνενήκοντα καὶ ἐκατὸν "a hundred and ninety") against Μ, Ε', and S (τριακοσίας, "three hundred and ninety"). Manuscript group C', MSS 403' and 410 hold the reading τριακοσίας for ἐκατὸν. Also α' η' and θ' contain the reading τριακοσίας 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 ΘΤ as a whole.

Ezek 4:6

καὶ ἐκατὸν ἡμέρας. καὶ λήμψῃ τὰς ἁδικίας τοῦ οἴκου Ἰσραήλ.

(Μ) "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."

(Ε') "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."

(ΘΤ) καὶ συντελέσεις ταύτα πάντα καὶ κοιμήθη τῇ πλευρῇ σου τῇ δεξιᾷ καὶ λήμψῃ τὰς ἁδικίας τοῦ οἴκου Ιουδα εἰς ἡμέρας. ἡμέρας εἰς
(Trans. of S) "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 וְשָׁנַה, “second,” and the repetition of the Hebrew phrase וְשָׁנַה, “a day for a year.” Some MSS of א , e.g., (א O) O-62, 147 דֵּעֶתֶרִיַּו, and L'-311 דֵּעֶתֶרִיַּו, contain a reading similar to that of מ. The omission of the repetition of וְשָׁנַה is a general reading in all the witnesses of א even in the Hexaplaric witnesses מ מ. E' agrees with מ in this regard (יָמִים לָשָׁנָה “a day for a year”).

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

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

Ezek 4:9

In the Hebrew text, אַחֲרֵיהֶם אָדוֹד מָשָׁהוּ אָדוֹד מָשָׁהוּ (מ) אַחֲרֵיהֶם אָדוֹד מָשָׁהוּ אָדוֹד מָשָׁהוּ
Analysis of the Variants

S and ℃ agree with M concerning the reading of the number שלש מאה ותשע עשרה (390 days). Although א reads ενενήκοντα καὶ ἐκατὸν (one hundred and ninety), some MSS of א (ενενήκοντα καὶ τριακοσίας C'-403') contain the same reading as M. Regarding numerical figures, S agrees with M closely throughout the first twelve chapters of the Peshitta book of Ezekiel.
Ezek 4:10

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

Analysis of the Variants

$S$ has a different reading from $G^T, T',$, and $M$, 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.
(C) "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 ἁπλοῦν “its portion,” while C, D, 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

(Israel) "And you will eat barley cakes baked upon excrement of man in their sight."

(E) "And you will eat barley cakes baked upon dung of the excrement of man in their sight."

Analysis of the Variants

The Syriac scribe seems not to have understood the prepositional phrase ἃπλοῦν, “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 ἁπλοῦν, “dung.” We can see that in vs. 15
the word "בכל" appears again translated by the same Syriac word حضى. Therefore to avoid any difficult expression that was unnecessary for the understanding of the text, it was simplified for the sake of clarity.

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

Ezek 4:13

(מ) יאמר יהוה לכלע ישלל את להזם פמם בצון אחר איריווסקש

(ס) והוחל פמם בצון אחר איריווסקש

(ג') ואמר כי יכלע בני ישראל ירימל פמם בצון אחר איריווסקש

(ת') קא ופיירב תדיא ליגל קוריוס ד מהס תועפ פגונתא או הויו אירואפי אקחארה ב רהיסי קהנשין.

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

Analysis of the Variants

S and CJ are literal translations of a Hebrew text similar to מ, while ג* contains some additions and some omissions to the text, e.g., the additions קא ופיירב תדיא and ד מהס תועפ ב אירואפי אקחארה ב רהיסי קהנשין. (Cod. 86 and עי read קא ופיירב קוריוס פגונתא אירואפי אקחארה ב רהיסי קהנשין, "and the Lord told me," instead of the addition found in ג*), and the omissions of רהיסי קהנשין, "their bread,"
and "where I will drive them" (.genre). *A contains some MSS that have a reading for the first omission that reads τον ἀφτον αὐτῶν (αὐτῶν Q, L")

ακαθάρτον (τα 88) O (τον ἀφτον αὐτῶν under a *)-62', L", and some MSS with a reading for the second omission [τὸν] + οὖ διασκορπίσω (-πισ 88-62', L"-46-311) αὐτους εκεῖ O', L", C"-233-86'-239'-403', while ώ' and Cod. 86 have an obelus, which might be a damaged asterisk with the final reading οὖ διασκορπίσω αὐτους εκεῖ.

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

Ezek 4:14

(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*. 

C reads סנכנק מ"ק "God Lord of Authority," whereas ג shows קא יתא מטבאמט (א' reads א א א, ג' has ג), ק"תק תכ י"א יאף, "then I said 'not so, Lord God of Israel,'" which is a reading not found in any other version. Probably ג harmonizes with the preceding verse that has the same reading (ד ידיסי תכ יאף see vs. 13). The additional words of ג and the unique rendering of the *nomen sacrum* show that ג did not have any relation to ג and to C concerning this verse. It may be a gloss in the Syriac and Septuagintal texts rather than an actual reading of a Hebrew recession. The targumic reading is the traditional manner in which the *nomina sacra* are consistently translated.

Ezek 4:16

(ם) יאמיר את, הב אמת העני שבר משחה להמה בירושלם יאכלת,

(ס) אמר לי בר אדום חמא תבר עד מיכאל בירושלם ייכלון.

(ג) קא יתא יאכלה פא, " אני" יכלה חיכלה שמע.

(ס') קא אימן פרוס מי ליאבוספיא, ידוע ימע סענרבגיל סידגימא אפורט זנ יירושלם, קא פאגורת אפורט זנ שדואו קא זנ דאניא קא זנ דראפ תאמ קא זנ דאנהים פאוור.
(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, CJ, and T give slightly different translations for מְנַעְיָא, "staff of bread." CJ reads מְנַעְיָא, "food supply," S מֶכֶחֹחֹחָה, "cane of food," and T מְנַעְיָא סְעַרְיָא יָדְגָו, "firmness of bread." MS 46* is a exception to that; it reads מְנַעְיָא יָדְגָו, "destruction of bread." The Hexaplaric witnesses have Cod. 86, and α' reading ροδόν Άφτον, "rod, staff of bread," which is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of Μ, while σ' and θ' read στερεωμα Άφτον, "firmness of bread," a reading similar to T.

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 CJ and T (4:2).
2. S, in several passages, is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of Μ (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 Μ, which were kept in CJ and T (4:3, 6).
4. $S$ ignores the additions of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ (4: 4, 5, 13, 14, etc.).

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

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

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

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

EZEKIEL 5

Collation

5:1

“like, as”

Q. Perf. w. consec. waw Peal Imper.

“take for you.”


“and divide them.”

Fin] + “into three parts of them.”

5:2

“and one of the third part of them.”

Imperf. [ tr.

Imper. Imper. “set fire.”


5:4

“it will slay.”

Prep. 3° m. s. [ Prep. + 3° m. pl.

5:5

“of them.”

“all the cities round about her.”
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5:6
Hi. Imperf. [Peal Perf. 3° f. s. סלחנה]
“she has exchanged.”
“in my statutes you did not walk.”

5:7
Q. Inf. Ctr. 2° m. pl. suf. [Ethpe.]
Perf. 2° m. pl. (lamentation) 7a1
“you have regarded.”

5:8
3° m. רואנ “all of them.”

5:9
כומר [tr.]

5:10
“their sons.”

5:11
“he says.”

5:12
Hi. Imperf. 1° c. s. [Ethpe.]
“one part of you.”
“and another.”
“it will slay [by the sword].”

5:13
3° m. 1° c. s. “and I will fulfill.”
3° m. pl. בכם 2° pl. m. 7a1 “on you.”

5:14
“my anger.”
“before.”
Data Analysis

The scribe of 5 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

אַחֶה בּוֹ אֵדֵם חַּכּוֹל הַרְבּ הָזֹהי וְהַרְבּ הָזֹהי הַלָּבֵיָה קָהל (IR)

ותְּחַבְּרָה עַל רַאֲשֵׁם יְהִי וְקָהל הַלָּבֵיָה קָהל מָסִיָּה וְהָלֹךְ (S)

אָנה דָּנֵ<context data analysis here> (S)
κτήσῃ αὐτὴν σεαυτῷ καὶ ἐπάξεις αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν σου καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν πῶγνα 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.”

Analysis of the Variants

S smooths the text by adding the comparative particle ἄνεος, “like,” between “sword” and “barber’s razor.” In III these two phrases are in apposition without any particle between them. Furthermore, S adds the phrase λαλήματι ἡμέρας, “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

םלשה בואר בתויир בחרך תעיר כלְּמה ימי זמירה מעורר אָלָה (III)

ה ApiService את הדרב מיבשות וה ApiService חורה לזרח זמור אתרを与え

_masאכ_ם_ל_ל_ל_ל_ל

S reproduce with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
(S*) τὸ τέταρτον ἐν πυρὶ ἀνακάυσεις ἐν μέσῃ τῇ πόλει κατὰ τὴν πλήρωσιν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ συγκλεισμοῦ καὶ λήψῃ τὸ τέταρτον καὶ κατακαύσεις αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ τέταρτον κατακόψεις ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ κύκλω αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ τέταρτον διασκορπίσεις τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ μάχαιραν ἐκκενώσω ὀπίσω 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 the city.”

Θ reads τέταρτον, “fourth,” instead of τρίτον, “third,” with exception of some MSS of Θ, e.g., τρίτον 91 and Cods. 86, 87, and α’ σ’ θ’. Concerning numerical figures, the Peshitta of Ezek 1-12 is always in agreement with III. See 5:12 for another case of similarity in numerical figures between S and III.

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

A redundancy is omitted from the text; the second instance of the word “third,” in מ, was substituted by תזרע, “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 גֵּל 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
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κατακαύσεις αὐτοὺς ἐν πυρί· ἓ αὐτῆς ἐξελύεται πῦρ. Καὶ ἔρεις πάντι σῖκῳ 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

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

Ezek 5:5

(Μ) Τάδε λέγει κύριος Αὐτή ἡ Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν θεῶν τῆς ἐκβολῆς τῆς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ τὰς κύκλω ἀυτῆς χώρας.

(Θ) “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 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. C̱ and G agree with H̲I 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 G̲A, however, read κύριος] + αἰώναι 36° (+κύριος)-46, 130'; + αἰώναι κύριος 407, 410; pr. αἰώναι rel. = M̲. S has consistently rendered the nomina sacra by the same terms אולא, which correspond to the Hebrew terms.

Ezek 5:6

(ח) "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 ה. The use of the preposition ב in IR seems awkward; see nrn obrr K b -mpm iokc 'aatDon, "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 תנך, "my statutes," so it became מְסַכְּפֶּהוּ, "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 תנך (ב), "in my statutes." Therefore it might be a contextual harmonization of the text with the purpose of avoiding syntactical ambiguity.

CJ makes better use of the direct object mark found in the Masoretic reading. CJ reads אֶשָּׁשֶׁנָּה יִדְרֶה לְפָרָה בַּעֲדוֹ, "she altered my judgments to sin by them." Thus the targumic scribe changed the intransitive Hebrew verb מָרָה, "she has rebelled," for a transitive verb that requires a direct object. In this manner CJ avoids any syntactical blunder in its text.

Regarding GΤ, it has a reading on its own. It reworked the text presenting a different interpretation: καὶ ἐφεσ τὰ δικαίωματά μου τῇ ἀνομίᾳ ἐκ τῶν ἔθνων καὶ τὰ νόμιμα μου ἐκ τῶν χαράων τῶν κύκλω ἀυτῆς, "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 GΤ presents this verse as the purpose God had
for Jerusalem, “to declare His statutes” to the nations; on the other hand, S and CJ take it as a rebuke to Jerusalem.

Ezek 5:7

S agrees with IR regarding the translation of the *nomina sacra* (see 3:11), while 6* has its typical κύριος, “Lord.” The difficult Inf. Cstr. plus the third person plural suffix
“you are turbulent?” appears only once in  הָדָֽו . It was translated by the verb רָדָֽו , “to think, regard, count,” in the Ethpeel verb form. The cognate root of וַדָֽו , “to be turbulent,” in the target language is the noun דָֽו , “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 יָדָֽו , “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 יָדָֽו to a positive one, from “disregard” to “regard.” This shows that S did not have at its disposition any MSS of א or מ recensions. For if S had access to א or to any MS similar to the latter, the Hebrew verb יָדָֽו would probably be translated by S based on the Greek translation (ὅ ἄφοιμήν , “pretext, occasion, opportunity,” from the verb ἄφοιμεν , “to separate, excommunicate,” MSS 62, L-449-613 read μοφη). If a targumic tradition were behind its Vorlage, then S would agree with the reading of מ that translated יָדָֽו by יָדָֽו (particle ד plus Peal Perf. 2° masc. pl. of the verb יָדָֽו , “to sin, be guilty”). Therefore, for translating difficult words S did not recur to any other version, but depended on the context of the passage.

Furthermore, S lacks the ambiguous אֵֽל found at the end of the מ , while א and מ 613 ) and מ have it.

**Ezek 5:8**

לָכֵּן צָאָר אָדָם הָדַּֽו שְׁנֵי עָלִּים נַעֲלוּ קָמְנוּ קָמְנוּ בָּעֲזֵךְ מֶסְפֵּסָה לְלָטִיָּֽהּ (מ)

(ס)
(Trans. of S) “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.’”

Analysis of the Variants

On the one hand, S is related to ΘΤ for both lack the emphatic phrase ἀλλὰ μόνον μου, “also I/ I myself” (only MS 63 of ΘΑ, and α’, θ’ × καὶ γε ἐγὼ, Cod. 86 and ο’ × καὶ αὐτος ἐγὼ contain it). S, however, agrees with Μ concerning the translation of the nomina sacra as we have seen before (some MSS of ΘΑ contain κύριος ἀδώνις, 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 ΘΤ 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

(III) "לכל זה אני צאא א-earth את לא יעש את מקדש פמא באכ (S) סקופיק בוכל תועבהב ומכ אני אטרת לא חות מני ומכ לא א Hampton סכילה כמוי, שד ירייה, עמה, חבל ילהמט (S) סכילה ליהמטב. שד ירייה, עמה, חבל ילהמט, שד ירייה, עמה, חבל ילהמט"
Analysis of the Variants

Although C, G, and S are similar to M, one word seems to be difficult for them to translate. It is the verb אָנָּד, "I will diminish, withdraw," in the Imperf. from the root אָנָד. The Syriac and Aramaic languages have a homonymous verb. It is the verb אָדָּד and אָדָּד, "to shave, cut the hair" respectively, and its root is used in vs. 5:1 for the noun אָדָּד, "barber’s razor." The semantic range of these cognate verbs אָדָּד and אָדָּד—does not fit the context of the sentence. Therefore, there was a need for another verb, which was supplied by אָדָּד in C, and אָדָּד in S, "to cut, break off" and "drive you out/ reject you," respectively. One may suggest that this is one of the few cases where S seems to be related to G. The latter has the verb אָפָּד, "I will reject," from אָפָּד, similar in meaning to the Syriac verb אָפָּד, "drive you out/ reject you" (א' פְּלַקְּלָאָא סֶה, "I will shatter you"). On the other hand, one word is not a proof for a direct relationship, for coincidence might be involved. S simply substituted a Syriac homonym for its Hebrew
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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 byrA oH ^ r<ri=>i, while in ©* (B, 927) by xuptos* (MSS in ©A rel. haveaSwvat).
Also the Hebrew prepositional phrase "p^p® ^ 2 , “with all your detestable things,” was
omitted in©* (B) but it is present in© A, e.g., (5K O, 86) ev Traca tolct irpoaoxQiagaai
(v) (-Qniiaaiv V) aou <ai ev iraai(v) (> cl) rel “with all your offenses,” and in o’ to ic
gtaagaai aou, “yourstain/defilement,” 8’ ev iraai to ic TrpoaoxQtagaaiv aou teat ev
naaiv Q«t. Therefore, if the Syriac version is related to ©, the Syriac scribe had access to
some of the MSS of ©A that had the entire nominasacra and the reading omitted by © *. S
is also alien to the addition Hern o n ’ Kb- -pirn 'jipn =pc2pK, “I will cut off the might of
your arms for my Memra,” found in <EJ.

Ezek 5:12
(HI) 'b*r oino n’obom -o re tbo’ oinot imm -2 1 2 -T.cbc

□mrm p’-K 2 1 m mm mi bob n’O’bom -pm2 ’2 o
(S )

, 0 3 0 m l r O A ls O ..ClXa^lJ r^O=o=i

r<Xu

ja a tu l w, ‘>.infl .rtf't.lr^ jja-V A-xX XAX.tct ^ f . i u _a\ «m r t i t i a

(<EJ ) pbtsprr K2 ~in2 Knbm -pi:2 p m e r kieooi pmo’ KmD2 -pnbn
p m r a mm ta o ra pbcpn - 102K m2 bob snbm *]nno
(©*)

to

TeTapTov aou ev OavaTu dvaXw0i)a€Tai-

auvTeXeaSfjaeTat ev peaat aouauTous-

Kal

to

icai

to

icai

to

TerapTov aou ev Xig<2

TeTapTov aou els' navTa avegov oKopmai

TeTapTov aou ev pogcfxua TreaouvTai icutcXw aou, icai gaxaipav
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κεκεφαλωσε ὀπίσω αὐτῶν.

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

Analysis of the Variants

The main point in this verse is the rendering of the ordinal number ῥαβδὸν, “the third,” which is most of the time omitted in S due to its redundant usage in the Hebrew text. TextNode reads τέταρτον, “the fourth,” for ῥαβδὸν (except Cod. 86mg that has μονον for the first instance and for the second μονον τριτον; α’, Qtext and θ’ read και το τεταρτον αυτου). 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 (וּרְכֵּב אִירֵךְ אָסַר אֲנָו, “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 בְּרָעָב, “and by famine,” which fits the sense of this verse even though it is not in the original.

(Text is also similar to MT, but it reads for the last part וּרְכֵּב אִירֵךְ אָסַר אֲנָו, “and those who slay by the sword I will incite after them.” Therefore regarding this verse S is an independent translation based on a Hebrew text similar to MT 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 ᾿Τ agree with the reading of ᾿ΙΡ word by word. ᾿Τ, 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 ᾿Τ has additions that are not present in the other versions, while S has a reading similar to that of ᾿ΙΡ.

Ezek 5:17

(Trans. of S)
(Trans. of S) “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 יִכְכּלְךָ, “and you will be bereaved.” It reads דִּבְרַנֶנְךָ, “and you will be deprived/destroyed/slain.” The Syriac language has a cognate word for the Hebrew verb יִכְכּלְךָ that is כְּכַלֶנָךָ. The Hebrew כְּכַלֶנָךָ corresponds to כ in some Semitic languages. This is a normal linguistic phenomenon. S, however, did not use its cognate verb but a completely different one. CT employs the corresponding cognate verb, while G has a different reading: כִּיְמַוְרִיהָ כָּלָ, “and I will take vengeance upon you.” This may indicate that this verb (כְּכַלֶנָךָ) was rather confusing for the scribes or for their community, so it was substituted by another expression easier to be understood by the respective scribe/community.

Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 5

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

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

5. $S$ agrees with $M$ concerning the translation of the *nomina sacra*, while $\mathfrak{G}^*$ has its typical $\kappaυριος$ (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).
### Collation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:3</td>
<td>Q. Perf. w. waw consec.</td>
<td>םאכתי &quot;and say.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imper.</td>
<td>ארי מכיה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:5</td>
<td>&quot;and I will cast.&quot;</td>
<td>סמה &quot;house&quot; (12al &quot;sons&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:6</td>
<td>Q. Imperf.</td>
<td>ההמא &quot;they will be ruined&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peal Imperf.</td>
<td>יככ &quot;they will be desolated.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:8</td>
<td>Q. Imperf.</td>
<td>ימסע &quot;they will be guilty&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peal Imperf.</td>
<td>מ&quot;כ &quot;and they will be waste.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:9</td>
<td>Q. Act. Ptc.</td>
<td>מضاءו סמל &quot;and they shall remember me, those of you who have escaped.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Data Analysis

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

Ezek 6:2

(ם) בן עולם פייה אל ה' ישראל/jpeg300.jpg
(ס) כותב. כן קยา ויקרא לבליה תכרעט יושבי יטסה, חלמיי.
(ע') בר א偉 קבל נבואת על מאריס ישראל ואובידי מיליתון
(ט') עלי ויחרית, שריישון תודיפת קון עפי' תון בור ישראל קא.
Analysis of the Variants

$S$ is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of $\text{HI}$. Although $\text{C'}$ is very similar to $\text{HI}$, it omits the idiomatic expression שֶׁפֶר פְּנֵיהּ, "set your face," which is present in $S$ and $\text{GT}$. This is a classical example of Hebraism in $\text{GT}$ (στήρισον τῷ πρόσωπόν σου).

$\text{C'}$ reads כָּכֶל,* the prophecy.

Ezek 6:3

(Trans. of $S$) "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 Μ; the only exception is with the form of the first verb of the verse. Μ has וָאָמָר, “and (you will) say,” Qal Perf. 2° pers. sing., which with its waw consecutive is equal to the imperative, while S reads מֹאמֵר, “say,” Peal Imper. 2° m. s. צ‘ and ГТ have the verb in the future tense: “and you shall say,” וְהָנָה, respectively. The Syriac version is a literal translation of the idiom of its Hebrew Vorlage. צ‘ has also a unique reading regarding the Hebrew sentence אַרְּאֵה, “I am bringing against you a sword” (S and ГТ read similarly to Μ regarding this sentence); צ‘ reads דַּאֶת מָתִיר עִלְיָן וְכֹלְךָ בְּוָוֶר תִּקְלֵם, “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, אדוני יהוה, “Adonai Yahweh,” Α* keeps its usual way by omitting יִהְוָה, and translating only יהוה by κυρίον. There are, however, some MSS in Α* that contain the Masoretic reading, e.g., 36, 763, and rel.

Ezek 6:4

נַפְשָׁה מְבָהֵת עָקָר הַמַּעֲנֵה וּמַעֲנֵה הַחֹלֶלְתָּה הַכָּלְיָכָה לְפָנִי נָא לָכְלִי (מ‘)

מִפְּדֵה מְבָהֵת, מִפְּדֵה מְבָהֵת, מִפְּדֵה מְבָהֵת, מִפְּדֵה מְבָהֵת (ס‘)

נִרְגֵּדָן אֵלֶּה דְּבָרָן דְּבָרָן דְּבָרָן דְּבָרָן (צ‘)

(א‘) כַּאֹיִם מְבָהֵת עָקָר הַמַּעֲנֵה וּמַעֲנֵה הַחֹלֶלְתָּה הַכָּלְיָכָה לְפָנִי נָא לָכְלִי (מ‘)
Analysis of the Variants

S has its reading identical to M, while at first glance ᾦ* seems to have omitted the Hebrew verb בָּשַׁבַּר, “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 (בָּשַׁבַּר) in the Greek text. In other words, ᾦ* substitutes the introductory verb ἐνσυντρίβονται, “and they will be broken into pieces,” or it seems that ᾦ* dislocates backwards the second Hebrew verb (בָּשַׁבַּר) and omits the first one. Notice, however, that some MSS of ᾦ contain the Masoretic reading, e.g., μανιασθήσεται (-συντρίβεται 46, 106) τα θυσ. ύμων καὶ συντρίβεται (-συντρίβεται 311; > 106; καὶ συντρίβεται 311, 106 “your altars will be destroyed and broken.” The Hexaplaric witnesses read, init. -2ο και] α’, θ’ καὶ αφανισθήσεται (π’ καὶ αφανισθήσεται 86) τα θυσιαστηρία ύμων καὶ συντρίβεται Q\*\*; α’, θ’ καὶ συντρίβεται 86; ο’ καὶ συνκλασθήσεται, “they will be shattered,” 86.

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

Another deviation of ᾦ* is the rendering of וה себא, “your pillars/incense altars,” by the phrase τὰ τεμένη ύμων, “your sacred things” (α’ ἑδονα “wooden image” 86). This may be due to an interpretative translation of the Hebrew counterpart and not due to an actual
reading in \( \text{\textcopyright}^* \)'s Vorlage. \( \text{\textcopyright}^* \) contains some explanatory additions, e.g., יַרְדֵּנָן, "your decaying idols," and יַרְדֵּנָן, "your heathen altars."

Ezek 6:5

(Israel) יְהוָה יִקְצַח עָמַד וְנָמַס לִפְנֵי צַדְקֵי הַבָּא, וְנָמַס לִפְנֵי נָפַלְתָּוֹן הַבָּא, קָרָא קָרָא, וְנָמַס לִפְנֵי נָפַלְתָּוֹן אֲנָשָׁיָה. (S) יְהוָה יִקְצַח עָמַד וְנָמַס לִפְנֵי צַדְקֵי הַבָּא, וְנָמַס לִפְנֵי נָפַלְתָּוֹן אֲנָשָׁיָה. (\( \text{\textcopyright}^* \)) מַשְׁלֶה הַמָּסָּיוֹן מֶלֶשׁ לְמַלְאָכָיו מְסָרוֹתָו מְסָרָא. (C\( ^{\prime} \)) יְהוָה יִקְצַח עָמַד וְנָמַס לִפְנֵי צַדְקֵי הַבָּא, וְנָמַס לִפְנֵי נָפַלְתָּוֹן אֲנָשָׁיָה. (Trans. of S) "And I will cast the dead bodies of the house of Israel before their idols; and I will scatter your bones round about your altars."

Analysis of the Variants

S has two deviations from \( \text{\textcopyright} \). The first one is לַחַדְשׁא, "house of Israel," for the Hebrew בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, "sons of Israel," whereas MS 12a1 has the Masoretic reading בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. \( \text{\textcopyright} \) reads like \( \text{\textcopyright} \) regarding this word, though it has some interpretative additions to this verse. The second deviation is the rendering of the first Hebrew verb נָמַס, "and I will set, put, lay," by כִּיָּפָד, "and I will cast." Even though the main sense of נָמַס 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 \( \text{\textcopyright}^A \) containing the Greek verb διώκω, "I will give," which sounds more like a Hebraism than a good Greek translation.

\( \text{\textcopyright}^* \) (B, 106) omits the entire first clause from לַחַדְשׁא לַחַדְשׁא. On the one hand MSS of \( \text{\textcopyright}^A \) contain it, e.g., καὶ διώκω τὰ πτωματα (pars. 233) τῶν (> 62m, C\( ^{\prime} \)-87,
86*-239', 26) ἵνα Ἰσραήλ κατὰ (καὶ το 407) προσωπον των εἰδωλῶν αυτῶν, rel. On the other hand they read ἵνα Ἰσραήλ in the same way as מ. Consequently ס has a unique reading concerning בנים עם "sons of Israel."

Ezek 6:6

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

Analysis of the Variants

S and גmostly agree with מ with the exception of אראזר, "and they will be made guilty." They substituted this verb, probably based on contextual exegesis, by אראזר and
Another possibility is that the Syriac scribe may have confused the radicals of the verbs סרם, "to ruin," and ססס, "to make guilty," as well as the verb from vs. 4, ססס, "to become desolate." Thus the Syriac scribe decided to translate all of them by the same Syriac verb ר"ב, "to become desolate." ס* also deviates from ס by omitting this verb ר"ב.

Further Septuagintal minuses are ἀποκαταστάσει, "and they will be destroyed," and νόμος, "and wipe out your works," and pluses are καὶ εὐαφθησεται ἡ ναὸς, "and your sacred things be abolished." Some MSS of ס* contain a reading corresponding to ἀποκαταστάσει, "and they will be destroyed," with slight variation, e.g., καταπαντοποιοῦν, "they will cease" (X, O, -σωσι 88), O-407, L-51-311, also a X in 6, Q*8, and 86.

The unique reading of ס* καὶ εὐαφθησεται ἡ ναὸς ὑπήρεν, "and your sacred things/areas will be abolished," is rendered by ξοανα, "wooden image," in ס’s version as in the preceding verse. The final omission (ἀναπάντευς μετακαταστάσει, "and your works will be wiped out") of ס* (MSS B, 233) is present in some MSS of ס* (e.g., X, O, 449) καὶ εὐαφθησεται τὰ έργα (ορία 106) νῦν ὑπόθεν and τα έργα (α’ ποιηματα 86) νῦν Q*8, "and your works will be wiped out." ס contains the Hebrew reading regarding the last portion מַשְׁמֹלָה מַטְמֵאָה, "and your works will be blotted out," as also occurs in some MSS of ס*.

Ezek 6:8

(138)
Analysis of the Variants

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

The Hebrew idiomatic expression, Inf. Cstr. + לְכַפָּר, was rendered as סכנין, "a part/some of you," in the Syriac version. Note the Hebraism in $G^* \text{έν τῷ γενέσθαι} \text{εξ} \text{ύμων, except in MS L'-311 that reads τοῦ γενύ, and in MS 62 (19) that has εν τῷ εἰναι.}$

Ezek 6:9

$M$ (306)

הִכְרַת אֲמִים אַחַר בֵּיתֵם שֶׁמא אֶפְרַיִם אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּרָה אַחַר לַבֶּן הָוָה אֱלֹהָם כָּר מָשִׁילוֹ.

זֶה עַטְיוֹ הָיָה אֱלֹהִים אַוָּר נַעַלְתּוֹم בֵּיתֵם לָעָלָם אַוָּר שֶׁפֶּה לָעָלָם שִׁבְיוֹתָם.

$S$ (306)
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 3 with some editorial rearrangement of the text, e.g., construct chains are avoided, and the redundant repetition of the Participle ἡμῶν, "adulterous," is substituted by the Peal Perf. 3° pl. verb מַעֲבַדְתֵּנִי, "they have gone astray," probably to avoid monotonous repetition. T has some interpretative substitution, e.g., מְלֵאכָה, "my worship," for רֶאֶץ, "me," probably indicating that the people were worshiping strange gods, idols, as is implied in the context.

T is very different from S, T, and 3. It has several substitutions which are supported by almost all its MSS. Concerning the sentence מִגֹּרֶה וּמִשְׁבָּרָיו, "when I have
broken for myself” (Ni. form with middle voice sense). ©T reads ḫmāmāḵa, “I have sworn”; the only exception is MS 62 that has ṣūnētuṣa, “I will shatter.” The Hebrew word behind ḫmāmāḵa is ḥēḇeṯ, “I have sworn,” which is also present in ©T. BHS suggests ṣērēḵ (Qal cf. α’, θ’ ṣūnētuṣa, and θ’ συγκαταστάσα, “I will bring down/destroy”) as an alternative reading for the Hebrew Ni. perf. 1 c. sing. ḥēḇeṯ “when I have broken for myself.” S reads ḥmālāḏ, “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 (τοῦ ἵνα Νίν.) in the active voice (τοῦ ἵνα Νίν.) 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.

©* translates both instances of the participle ʾāḇa, and it has general support of its MSS (see ©A in Göttingen edition), while S substitutes for the second instance of it as

---

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

2 Lund, 418.
mentioned above. In addition, \( \delta^* \) reads \( δαυδεματων \) αὐτῶν, “their practices,” for καὶ ἀποθεματίζουσιν, “their idols.” The only MS similar to \( \Pi \) is MS 62 that reads εἰδολῶν.

The Hebrew verb 'Ep3' from o p , “and they will abhor, be unwilling, be reluctant, be loathsome,” seems to have been difficult to be understood by all the versions. \( \delta^T \) has κόψονται, “they will mourn,” instead of this verb (only MS 62 1° reads καὶ προσοχήσουσι, “and they will be angry, provoked/offended”); \( S \) reads ἐσπαθίζομαι, “they will be contracted [as in pain, wrinkled]”; \( CJ \) reads ὑιένετοι, “they will feel remorse, regret.” This verse is clear evidence supporting a noninterrelatedness of \( S \) to any other version, but to a Hebrew Vorlage similar to \( \Pi \).

Ezek 6:10

(\( \Pi \)) υἱὲς ב়נ נָהֲל הָא לֹא תַּכְּנֵנָה לְעָשֵׂה לְהוֹם הָרְעָה הָזָה

(\( S \)) יָדֵעַ נָהֲל הָה הָא לֹא תַּכְּנֵנָה לְעָשֵׂה לְהוֹם הָרְעָה הָזָה

(\( CJ \)) יָדֵעַ נָהֲל הָה הָא לֹא תַּכְּנֵנָה לְעָשֵׂה לְהוֹם הָרְעָה הָזָה

(\( \delta^* \)) καὶ εἰπεν ἡμῖν καὶ εἰπεν ἡμῖν διότι ἐγώ κύριος λειλάνηκα.

(Trans. of \( S \)) “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

\( S \) agrees with the reading of \( \Pi \) with a single modification of a nonfinite form of the verb (תַּכְּנֵנָה “to make”) to a finite one (יָדֵעַ “I will do”). The only targumic addition is “my Memra,” which is a common targumic characteristic. Although \( \delta^* \) 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 $\text{G}^\theta$ that read like $\text{M}$, e.g., ouk eis δώρεαν του (τουτο 311) ποιησαι αυτοις απαντα (παντα 538) το κακα ταυτα (αυτων 410), and rel. The same reading is present in $\theta$' and Q\* marked by a x ouk eis δώρεαν του ποιησαι αυτοις απαντα το κακα ταυτα. In this case $\text{S}$ is an independent translation avoiding the targumic interpretation and the omission of $\text{G}^\ast$.

Ezek 6:11

(III) האמר אליהם חיזו את משכן וקטנה ברעך ואמר אל אלי
כלה חצנה יחיה את משכן וקטנה ברעך ואמר אל אלי

(G) קנה ברכתו וחיים ברעך ברעך ואמר אל אלי
ככל חצנה יחיה את משכן וקטנה ברעך ואמר אל אלי

(C1) תָּכָּד לֶגֶּה יַעֲגֹּר קְרָטָּהָּא תַּהֻּ יַחְּרַי כָּאֶל פּוּדְי קָאֵל פּוּדְי אֲמָר יַעֲגֹּר אֲמָר יַעֲגֹּר אֲמָר יַעֲגֹּר
ככל חצנה יחיה את משכן וקטנה ברעך ברעך ואמר אל אלי

(G\*) τάδε λέγει κύριος Κράτησον τῇ χειρί καὶ ψώφησον τῷ ποδί καὶ εἰπὼν Εὐγενεῖς Εὐγενεῖς ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς βδελύγμασιν οἶκου Ἰσραήλ ἐν ρομφαίᾳ καὶ ἐν θανάτῳ καὶ ἐν λιμῷ πεσοῦνται.

(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.”

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

$S$’s word order is in agreement with $\Pi$, while $\mathcal{G}^*$ has a transposition between הבך, “by famine,” and ודבר, “and by pestilence,” namely תואם, “pestilence,” and ילמי, “famine.” Some MSS of $\mathcal{G}^*$ contain the Masoretic word order, e.g., $O'$, $L'^{-}-Z^v$, 534-403'. $\mathcal{T}$ agrees mostly with $\Pi$ in its rendering of the text. The only deviation is the verb הבא, “they will fall,” which was translated by ירומת, “they will be removed.” $S$ translates both proper names מְשַׁל as usual, while $\mathcal{G}^*$ renders only קְרָטס. Some MSS of $\mathcal{G}^*$ read like $\Pi$ regarding nominasacra, e.g., $A$, $O'$, $L'^{-}-46-311$, $C$.

Ezek 6:12

(\Pi) הָרָהוּכָּנ בְּבֵית יְמֹת וְקִרְיָת בְּחֵרָה יִפְלָל וְהָנֵשָׁא תֹּנַהוּ בַּרְבֶּה יִמְתָּה כְּלִית חַטֵּחַ בָּם

($\mathcal{S}$) יָסִים נְחָתָה מֵמְסָלָה, מְסָלָהּ כָּמָל, כָּמָל

($\mathcal{G}^*$) מְסָלָהּ מֵמְסָלָהּ, מְסָלָהּ כָּמָל, כָּמָל

($\mathcal{T}$) הָרָהוּכָּנ בֵּית יְמֹת וְקִרְיָת בְּחֵרָה יִפְלָל וְהָנֵשָׁא תֹּנַהוּ בַּרְבֶּה יִמְתָּה כְּלִית חַטֵּחַ בָּם

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

S is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of IR with only a different word order (transposition) regarding the two words ברב ימות, "by pestilence they will die." C may have had a different recension or undergone some exegetical interpretation based on the context; for it reads, "he who enters the besieged fortification/fortified cities will perish by famine," following the ס" reading, קא" ק περιεχόμενος ἐν λιμῷ συντελευθερια, "and he who is in the siege will be consumed by famine." Some MSS of סA contain the Masoretic reading, e.g., A', O-62', 538-449, 239'-403' καὶ οἱ υπολειφθεὶς, "and the one who remains," and MSS L-311-V-46-ZV, 410 read καὶ οἱ περιλειφθεὶς, "and he who is left behind," and the Hexaplaric witnesses are σ' οἱ πολιορκουμένος, θ' has an asterisk marking its reading X καὶ οἱ υπολειφθεὶς Ψιστ. Cod. 86 and λ [καὶ ο] περι[ε]ιφθεις.

Ezek 6:13

וַיִּשְׁכִּיתָם כִּי יָהָה בּוֹזָה מַלְוָיָה בַּתְּכֵנָה נַלַיְיָה מְסִיבָה מֵבּוֹתֵיהֶם (III)

אֶל כָּל שֵׁהָה רָמָה בָּכִּל רֶשֶׁם הָרוֹדִים תַּחַת כָּל תְּעִנֵי וְחָדָשׁ כָּל עָלָה

עַבְּדֵה מַכְּפָה אֲשֶׁר נֹצַר מְשֹׁר נֶר וְיָהָה נַלַיְיָה

 페이지 93 הָאָמָה גָּאָה מְקַסְּכָה אֲשֶׁר מְסִיבָה מַלְוָיָה (5)

וַיִּשְׁכִּיתָם כִּי יָהָה בּוֹזָה מַלְוָיָה בַּתְּכֵנָה נַלַיְיָה מְסִיבָה מֵבּוֹתֵיהֶם

לָא אֶל שֵׁהָה רָמָה בָּכִּל רֶשֶׁם הָרוֹדִים תַּחַת כָּל תְּעִנֵי וְחָדָשׁ כָּל עָלָה

עַבְּדֵה מַכְּפָה אֲשֶׁר נֹצַר מְשֹׁר נֶר וְיָהָה נַלַיְיָה

הָאָמָה גָּאָה מְקַסְּכָה אֲשֶׁר מְסִיבָה מַלְוָיָה (3)

Ezek 6:13

יִשְׁכִיתָם כִּי יָהָה בּוֹזָה מַלְוָיָה בַּתְּכֵנָה נַלַיְיָה מְסִיבָה מֵבּוֹתֵיהֶם

Purposely transcribed as an example of the Hebrew text. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Then they will know that I am the Lord, when their corpses will be among their idols round about their altars on every high hill and at all the tops of the mountains and under every green tree and under every thick oak, in the place where they put incense for all their idols."

Analysis of the Variants

S is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of M. While G* (B) omitted some key phrases, e.g., בָּכֵל רָאשׁ הָרֹאשׁ, “on every top of the mountains,” and "and under every leafy oak," there are some MSS of G that contain these two minuses. A group of these MSS have the first part, e.g., (X O) καὶ εὖ (εἰς 311, 239, 403') πασας (+ τας V-449) κορφας των (> 26) ορεων rel, “and in every top of the mountains.” The second minus is present in (X O) καὶ υποκατω πασας (> С' 393, 26) δρυς δασ(ε)μας rel, “and under every bushy tree.”

Another interpretative translation that does not change the original sense is the rendering of מַנְנָה יְolicy, “pleasing aroma.” S translates it by רַחֲמָה, “incense,” C1 has קָרַבְנִי לְפָלֹת, “sacrifice for the worship of,” and G* ὀμήν εὐώδιας, “sweet savor.”
Ezek 6:14

And I will stretch out my hand against them, and I will make the land desolate and waste, more than the wilderness of Diblath, throughout all their 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.” 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. ס transliterated it as part of the word itself, דבלתא. ε' has “from the wilderness of Diblat,” or “more than the wilderness of Diblat.” ס reads similarly to ε'.

1See J. Hoftijzer, A Study in the Syntactic Use of the H-Locale in Classical Hebrew (Leiden: Brill, 1981); Jolion and Muraoka, § 93c-k.
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indicating delimitation or comparison. Scholars have recognized that the *hapax legomenon* Diblah probably involved the common scribal error, for ֹ, 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” (דבלת). 1

Concerning 11, it avoids anthropomorphism by substituting “my hand” by “my destructive power.” 11 completely ignores this interpretative translation.

Another deviation of 11 is that it has ἐπιγνωσοῦσαί, “you will know,” instead of the Hebrew “and they will know,” while 11 and 11 agree with 11 regarding this reading. Some MSS of 11, however (L'-311-ZY), read ἐπιγνωσοῦσαί as in 11. These nonshared readings of the versions indicate a dynamic process in their translations.

**Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 6**

1. 11 is most of the time a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of 11.

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

3. 11 has some unique readings, e.g., מִזִּין for הָלִין (6:5).

---

1 Ḥ 패 (דבלת) cannot = ‘from the wilderness of Diblahah,’ as the punctuation intends, because the second word is an accus. = ‘to Diblah,’ not a gen. ; 1. “מַעְשֶׁר רַכְבִּין.” 11 Δεβלאת (so Jer. 529.26.27, 4 Regn. 2333 cod.1) follows 11, 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. 11 ‘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.
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4. $S$ does not have the pluses and minuses of $G^T$.

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

6. $S$’s relationship to $C^l$ 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

[291x677]CHAPTER VIII

EZEKIEL 7

Collation

7:2

“as for.”

Q. Perf. 3° m. s. pr. Peal Imper.

m. s. "say."

M S 9al t. ix. r. “and I will send.”

7:3

“and I will pour out,”

MS 9al ?p. f. s. “and you will know.”

7:4

“that I am.”

7:5

“for, instead, because, on account of.”

7:6

Aphel Perf. מָכָּה מְכָה “to grieve, afflict, distress.”

7:7

חַג “dawn, day-break.”

7:8

ם מָכָּה מְכָה “I will pour.”
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7:9
pr. הָרְדַכָּר “but.”
om. (MSS 6h15, 7h2, 8a1c, 9d1.2, 10d1, 11d1.2, 12a1, 12d1-3) have it after
“my eyes.”).
Q. Perf. 1° c. s. הָרְדַכָּר Object pron. “I will repay you, reward you.”
2° f. s. הָרְדַכָּר “and you will know.”
Hi. Ptc. m. s. הָרְדַכָּר Ptc. m. s. + 2° f. s. sf. הָרְדַכָּר “who have smitten.”
7:10
Q. Perf. 1° c. s. הָרְדַכָּר Peal Perf. 1° c. s. + Object pron. “I will repay you, reward you.”
7:11
2° f. s. הָרְדַכָּר “and you will know.”
Hi. Ptc. m. s. מָכָה Ptc. m. s. + 2° f. s. sf. מָכָה “who have smitten.”
7:12
Hi. Perf. 3° m. s. מָכָה Adj. מָכָה “and near.”
Q. Perf. 1° c. s. מָכָה Peal Perf. 1° c. s. + Object pron. “I will repay you, reward you.”
7:13
Q. Imperf. מָכָה Peal Perf. מָכָה “in their lives.”
7:14
Hi. Inf. Abs. מָכָה Peal Perf. 3° pl. מָכָה “they got ready.”
7:15
Hi. Inf. Abs. מָכָה Peal Perf. 3° pl. מָכָה “their purchase, possession.”
M. מָכָה “in the house.”
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7:16
Q. Perf. 3° pl. [ Peyel ] Peal Imperf. 3° pl. מְצַמְצֵּי “and they will escape.”
those "... who escape from them."
who are omitted [ יִזְדָּה ]

7:19
Prep. + n. f. s. + Q. Imperf. לִפְדוּת היה [ tr. ]
Aphel Pass. Ptc. m. s. מָכָלֵנוּ “they will be despised.”

7:22
“... My treasure place” נַפְשִׁי [ tr. ]
“my watchtower.”

7:23
Q. Imper. 2° m. s. והם ] Peal Imperf. 3° m. pl. מַכָּלִים “and they will cross, invade.”

“with bricks, mud, mixture.”

“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 ©. Notice that the verse order of © is completely different from the versions all together. The differences start in vs. 3, which corresponds to vs. 6 of IR, and vs. 4 to vs. 7 of IR, 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 IR.

Ezek 7:2

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

Analysis of the Variants

S and 6* share the same extra-Masoretic variant regarding the addition of the Imper. 2° s. of ἐνεχθήμενον, "say," and εἶπον, "say," respectively, before μακαριστός, "thus says the Lord..."

On the other hand, several MSS of 6A do not have this plus in their texts, e.g., MSS O-Q, V-Zv. Regarding this addition 6 agrees with 6’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 רוח— is frequent with verbs of speaking,1 and it may be the case in this verse, so S has supplied the Imperative even though its Vorlage lacked it. The use of this feature (verbal hendiadys) in 6* could well be a Hebraism and not a normal Greek style. This may be the case of S following a literary feature of the Aramaic language rather than a Hebraism.

S translates the nominasacra as usual against the minus of it in 6*’s reading (אזריא). Notice that most of the MSS of the latter version contain the Masoretic reading זָרִיא.

---

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 הָעָלָה, “and I will send.” Instead S has תִּפְקֵד, “and I will cast, throw, pour.” It seems more an interpretative rendering, rather than an actual reading. On the other hand, MS 9al of S reads נָשָׁ֔א, “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 נְאֹר, “my anger,” but some MSS of 6A contain the phrase תָּאֵ
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Regarding the preposition כ (in "כ-דריך"), S* omits it, while MSS L'-311-ZV read קמנש שֶּׁקֶת תַּאַכֶּלֶךָ. Although MSS L'-311-ZV read close to the Masoretic reading, they have the same verse order of S*. Therefore if S had any relationship to S A, S would not be able to have the same verse order as in III. Although S* has its paraphrases, it agrees with the verse order of III.

Ezek 7:5

(S) נַחֲנָא דְּנַחֲנָא כַּפָּה סָלָלָא סָלָלָา (Trans. of S) "Thus says the Lord of Authority, 'Behold an evil for an evil is coming'."

Analysis of the Variants

S and C' agree mostly with the Masoretic reading. Their only deviation is the rendering of the numerical noun נַחֲנָא, "one." Instead they have כַּפָּה, "for, instead, because, on account of," and נַחֲנָא, "after," respectively. S* lacks the entire clause נַחֲנָא. Several MSS of S A, however, contain a reading similar to the Masoretic regarding נַחֲנָא, e.g., MSS 410, 534, L-311-V-46-ZV κακία μα κακία ἐδω ταρεστήν or ερχόμενος.

Regarding nominasacra S has its usual Syriac counterpart רְמֵזָא לֶאֲדוֹנָא, "Lord of Authority," while S* reads only κυρίος. Several MSS of S A read αδωναὶ, e.g., L-311-V-
46-ZY, etc., while others have twice κυρίως, e.g., O-O C’-87-130-233-86-403’. α’, σ’, and θ’ have ἀδιωταί prior to κυρίως, and also have the missing clause of Σ
(דומא).

Ezek 7:6/7

(6) καὶ εἶδεν ἡ γῆ τὴν ἑκατέραν ἡμέραν τῆς ἡμέρας
(7) οἷον τὸν ἐπώνυμον τὰ ἑπτάνεν ἡμέραν καὶ τοὺς ἔριδας τὸν ἐπώνυμον ταῖς ἑκατέραις ἡμέρας
(6) καὶ ἦλθεν ἡμέραν ὡς ἑκατέραν ἡμέραν τῆς ἡμέρας
(7) οἷον τὸν ἐπώνυμον τὰ ἑπτάνεν ἡμέραν καὶ τοὺς ἔριδας τὸν ἐπώνυμον ταῖς ἑκατέραις ἡμέρας
(6)

(6) καὶ ἦλθεν ἡμέραν ὡς ἑκατέραν ἡμέραν τῆς ἡμέρας
(7) οἷον τὸν ἐπώνυμον τὰ ἑπτάνεν ἡμέραν καὶ τοὺς ἔριδας τὸν ἐπώνυμον ταῖς ἑκατέραις ἡμέρας

Analysis of the Variants

These are very controversial verses regarding their composition. All three versions—Σ, Σ’, and Σ’—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 Σ’Τ. It seems that Σ’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 S3 suffered two scribal errors. First, two haplographic errors may have taken place by skipping one of the two very similar Hebrew words of סָנַנ and סָנַנ and one homoioteleuton type of error by jumping the eyes from the first פּ to the second פּ and continuing from there on.

S, however, contains vs. 6 with some minuses regarding מ. It omits the phrases פּ and פּ, and renders פּ, "awakened," by מִהְמָה, "wearying, annoying, distressing, afflicting." Regarding vs. 7, S has a substitution as in S3, but both differ in vocabulary. Both omit the last nominal sentence פּ פּ, "and not of joyful shouting mountains," and substituted פּ, "tumult," by מִיָּם, "of destruction, trouble," and פּ מִיָּם, "not with tumult, nor with pangs," respectively. S has an interpretative reading by reading מִיָּם פּ פּ, "the kingdom has been revealed," and מִיָּם לֹא נָצַר הַמָּן פּ, "there is no escaping to the mountain stronghold." It shows that if a scribe (whether of S, or S, or S) had at his hand another version to consult, some similarities between the versions would be observed in this verse.

The polysemic Hebrew word פּ פּ פּ פּ ("doom, fate, morning, diadem?"") is translated by S by its Syriac cognate word, which has a well-known meaning מִיָּם, "dawn, early morning, daybreak" (cf. 7:10).

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

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

Analysis of the Variants

GT renders a translation similar to that of MT, and C also is similar to the latter one despite its interpretative additions. Although S has a reading very close to that of MT, it contains a unique reading. This extra-Masoretic reading is the rendering of the Hebrew verb דָּרְשׁ, "and I will accomplish," by מָנַה, "and I will pour." מָנַה is the same verbal expression used before in the same verse for the Hebrew word דָּרְשׁ, "I will pour." Probably S harmonizes the text rather than being based on a different Vorlage from that of MT.
And my eye will not spare, neither will I have pity. But according to your ways I will repay you; and your abomination will be in your midst, and you will know that I am surely the Lord, who has smitten you.”

Analysis of the Variants

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

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

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

goto has €πειγνύση 2° s. “you will know,” and S reads 2° f. s. “and you will know.” The Syriac feminine suffixed pronoun (αυτής 2° f. s. “and you will know”) may go back to its antecedent the Land of Israel in 7:2, which is a feminine noun. On the contrary the Hebrew masculine suffixed pronoun (דרומ 2° m. pl. “and you will know”) may refer back to the inhabitants of the land. CI has several targumic additions which are completely absent in goto, S, and M.

Ezek 7:10

(3) "Behold the day has come. The dawn went out and the rod has blossomed and shame has budded."

Analysis of the Variants

The text of S indicates that its Vorlage had a text similar to that of M. S smooths
the flowing of the text by omitting the redundant repetition of the 2° נב, “behold,” while ﾂ has an entire additional sentence לוח תפרא ﷲ, “behold the end has come,” before the 1° נב. Some MSS of ﾂ, however, contain an additional reading prior to the aforementioned addition, לוח תפרא ﷲ; תג תג תג ﷲ; תג תג ﷲ; תג תג ﷲ; תג תג ﷲ; תג תג ﷲ; תג תג ﷲ. It shows the diversity existent among the witnesses of ﾂ.

(Type (B) omits the entire clause לוח תפרא, “behold it comes, has gone out, the diadem/doom/?/plait?,” whereas several MSS of ﾂ (rel.) contain it as אֵלֶחֶב נ נָוֹכֶת, “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 ﾂ and its different rendering by some MSS of ﾂ are clear evidence that all of them— ﾂ and ﾂ—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 תפרא is a case of polysemy. 8 translated it by its Syriac cognate word, which has only one sense, “dawn, early morning, daybreak” (see 7:6/7). ﾂ translated it by נָוֹכֶת, “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”).

9 renders the Hebrew תפרא, “behold the day of retribution,” which is an acceptable rendering, and substitutes the corresponding Hebrew word with מָלָכָה תפרא. (See Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, Greek-English Lexicon (Oxford: Clarendon Press, repr. 1992), s.v. נוֹכֶת.)
“the kingdom has been revealed,” which seems to be an interpretative translation. Consequently, $S$, on its own, has nothing to do with $\mathbb{G}$ and $\mathcal{C}$.

Analysis of the Variants

Vs. 11 is a good example of a noninterrelationship among the versions. For instance, $S$ is similar to $\mathbb{M}$ concerning the first part of the verse מזגמה, המ ז ise סמיה סלמה, "injustice has grown up upon a wicked staff," which is very close to Aquila’s version too. Whereas $\mathbb{G}$ reads קא סמיה סמיה סלמה, "and he will break the firmness of the lawless," $\mathcal{C}$ has איבמה איבמה איבמה איבמה איבמה איבמה, "injustice has grown into a faithless staff," and $\sigma'$ as well as Cod. 86 have ה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונاة פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונאה פלאונاة פלאונאה פלאונא, "avarice has grown up into a lawless inclination."
has an interpretative translation, "violent men have arisen to support the wicked ones." $S$ and $\alpha'$ have the closest reading to that of $\pi$.

The middle part of the verse presents a more difficult situation regarding its translation by the versions: "none of them, nor their abundance, or their wealth, neither among them." $S$, instead, reads, "none of them, and neither their disturbances nor their works." $S$ contains an interpretative translation for the last part of the Masoretic reading ("neither 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 $\pi$ into a more understandable word $\gamma$, "to rest." $\Theta T$ renders it by $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\sigma\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\theta\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon$ $\omicron$ $\omicron$ $\nu$, "neither with tumult, nor with haste," which is also an interpretative rendering. $\Upsilon$ also resorted to the same translation technique, rendering it into a highly interpretative translation.

---

1. (K) Kimhi's commentary reads $\lambda \mu \sigma \tau \iota \nu \rho \nu$ (כײַ) "to stir up the wicked ones." See Sperber edition on this verse.


3. Although some MSS of $\Theta A$ ($\Theta B$) have a rendering of this section, they are all with a different sense, e.g., $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\omicron$ $\kappa$ $\xi$ $\alpha\upsilon\omega\nu\nu$ $\iota\sigma\iota\tau\omicron\nu$ $\omicron$ $\upsilon$ $\delta$ $\omicron$ $\rho$ $\varsigma$ (ἐν αὐτοῖς), "none of them, nor will there be adornment among them," rel. $\sigma'$, and Cod. 86 $\omicron$ $\upsilon$ $\delta$ $\epsilon$ $\alpha\chi\omicron\omicron\tau\omicron\alpha\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon\omega\nu\nu$ $\omicron$ $\upsilon$ $\delta$ $\omicron$ $\tau$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\nu\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon\omega\nu$, "neither from their ravenous hunger, nor from their beauty," and $\Theta$ has a $\kappa$ $\kappa$ $\omicron$ $\kappa$ $\xi$ $\alpha\upsilon\omega\nu\nu$ $\iota\sigma\iota\tau\omicron\nu$ $\omicron$ $\upsilon$ $\delta$ $\omicron$ $\rho$ $\varsigma$ (ἐν αὐτοῖς), "none of them, nor will there be adornment among them," Q$\Omega$.
translation, "none of them, nor of their noisy crowds, nor of their children, nor of their children’s children." This shows a common translation technique among the versions that can be defined as an avoidance of ambiguity when met with a difficult text. Their differences indicate that the versions are not related to each other in this regard.

Ezek 7:12

(1) "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 with 3; deviations are the predicative attributive adjective (Near, close”), instead of the verb, "it draws near,” and the substitution of the noun multitude,” by 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. א" lacks the entire subordinate nominal clause דמיה. The following MSS of א, though with some minor variants from each other, read similarly to that of ב (X O and 8) Cod. 88, L'311-ZV, 147, 534, 538, 130 etc., oτι οφνη ἐντο παύν το πληθος ("multitudes") αυτής. א has expanded the Masoretic text by means of an exegetical complement; it reads "the time has arrived for the repayment of debts; the day of punishment for sins draws near; let not the buyer rejoice, nor the seller be sad, for there is anger from before me upon all their noisy crowds."¹

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

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

Ezek 7:13

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."
As the seller returns not to [his] sale, so also life in their life span. Because neither will vision return on all their possession, nor will a man in his iniquity retain his life.”

**Analysis of the Variants**

Despite its different word order, $S$ agrees mostly with $M$. $\Theta^T$ renders the first subordinate clause by ди́о́т ὁ κτῶμενος πρὸς τὸν πωλοῦντα οὐκέτι μὴ ἐπιστρέψῃ, καὶ ἀνθρώπος εἰν οφθαλμῷ ζωῆς αὐτοῦ οὐ κρατήσει.

(Trans. of $S$) “[As] the seller returns not to [his] sale, so also life in their life span. Because neither will vision return on all their possession, nor will a man in his iniquity retain his life.”

Concerning the second subordinate (circumstantial nominal) clause (τῷ τῶν ἐθνῶν “while...

---

"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 (ἵσταται, "for vision..."), Σ* omits them, while several MSS of Σ contain them with some variations among its witnesses, e.g., (Ξ Ω, 36) καὶ εἶπεν (σουκέτοι 46, 5-534; 106) ἐν (+ τῇ 147, 106) ζωὴ τοῦ ζην αὐτῶν (-τοῦ 147') ὀτί ὅμοιοι εἰς παντὸς τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῆς (+ καὶ 46 534-86θε) οὐκ ἀνακαμψεῖ (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 Σ as καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐν ὀφθαλμῷ (ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς Λ’-311-ZV, Σ’-403’) ζωῆς αὐτοῦ οὐ κρατήσει, “and a man will not grab with the eye his life,” against the Ρ and Σ readings. Σ 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 Σ has some relationship to several MSS of Σ regarding the first and second parts of this verse, those same MSS do not relate themselves to Σ concerning the last portion of the verse.

Ezek 7:14

(Ρ) τούτων τούτων ηδονή ἡ ἑνάθετη καὶ ἀρρήτη ἡ προσφορὰ 
(Σ) τούτων καὶ ἄρτων καὶ ἀρρήτων καὶ ἀρτοῦ καὶ προσφορᾶς τούτων.
(Σ’) σαλπίζοντες ἐν σαλπίγγι καὶ κρίνοντες τὰ πρόταστα.
(Trans. of Σ) “They blew the trumpet and got everything ready, but there is none that goes to the battle because my wrath is upon all of their possession.”
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Analysis of the Variants

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

Since the motif of the verse is "war," C 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 י, "for there is anger from before me," was used instead for י, "for my anger/wrath."

Some MSS of ג have their unique readings concerning the coordinative and subordinate disjunctive clauses י, "get ready all, but none goes to battle."

They read (ג (B) וְסֻפָּהוּת תֵּאָת, "and pass judgement on all together"), [fin.) + (י, 86, 449) וְסֻפָּהוּת תֵּאָת (ב טו 87; ברי 231, 613) יא ה ב א (דפ 36 כ' 86'-239') יא ה (ג 79*-130) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (ג 79*-130) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא ה (דפ 239) יא H. Also 7 has an asterisk with the Masoretic reading. Although ג omits that last part, י, "for my anger is upon all of her multitudes," several MSS of ג contain it; see above. The Greek omission in its original reading (ג B) may be due to a misunderstanding of the Hebrew expression י, "for my anger." Note that in the preceding verse a similar י clause appears but with a different noun; instead of י, י.
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“anger,” it has πρόθεσις, “vision.” Therefore the Septuagintal scribe may have tried to solve this problem by omitting it—the υπό clause—in both verses. S has a reading similar to that of \( \Pi \).

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

Ezek 7:15

(\( \Pi \)) תִּהְרֶבֶת בַּתְיָם וַתְּהָרֶב וְתֶהָר יָפֵי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ בִּשְׁתֵּי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ יִשָּׁב (\( \Pi \)) (S) תִּהְרֶבֶת בַּתְיָם וַתְּהָרֶב וְתֶהָר יָפֵי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ בִּשְׁתֵּי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ יִשָּׁב (C) תִּהְרֶבֶת בַּתְיָם וַתְּהָרֶב וְתֶהָר יָפֵי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ בִּשְׁתֵּי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ יִשָּׁב (S) תִּהְרֶבֶת בַּתְיָם וַתְּהָרֶב וְתֶהָר יָפֵי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ בִּשְׁתֵּי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ יִשָּׁב (\( \Pi \)) (S) תִּהְרֶבֶת בַּתְיָם וַתְּהָרֶב וְתֶהָר יָפֵי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ בִּשְׁתֵּי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ יִשָּׁב (C) תִּהְרֶבֶת בַּתְיָם וַתְּהָרֶב וְתֶהָר יָפֵי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ בִּשְׁתֵּי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ יִשָּׁב (S) תִּהְרֶבֶת בַּתְיָם וַתְּהָרֶב וְתֶהָר יָפֵי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ בִּשְׁתֵּי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ יִשָּׁב (C) תִּהְרֶבֶת בַּתְיָם וַתְּהָרֶב וְתֶהָר יָפֵי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ בִּשְׁתֵּי בָשָׂר בֵּית אֶרֶץ יִשָּׁב

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

The entire phrase כִּנְיָה דְמָהָה, "like a dove of the valley," is lacking in S* (B). Several MSS of S, however, contain it with some deviations from מ, e.g., O, th, and rel., as מְרֵמָה מַלְמָדְתָּא, "like doves meditating." S holds a unique reading by rendering it כִּנְיָה דְמָהָה, "like a dove of the valley"—as מְרֵמָה מַלְמָדְתָּא, "like doves in the crags." T, כִּנְיָה דְמָהָה, "like doves of the valleys") is closer to the Masoretic reading than S.

Ezek 7:19
(Θ*) τὸ ἀργυρίον αὐτῶν ῥυθῆται ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις, καὶ τὸ χρυσίον αὐτῶν ῥυθῆται: αἱ ψυχαὶ αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ ἐμπληθῶσιν, καὶ αἱ κοιλίαι αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ πληρωθῶσιν· διὸτι 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 ΘΔ contain it, e.g., (Ξ O, Ξ θ’, L-449) τὸ καὶ τὸ 62, L-311, 410) ἀργυρίον αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ χρυσίον αὐτῶν (>233, 410) οὐ δυνητέσται (δυνητέσται Α’-410, 130-233-239’; ὑπεροφθήσται prob. οὐ δυνητό) εξελευθαί (του εξελ. 62) αὐτοὺς εἰς ἡμέρα ὁργῆς κυρίου (κυρίου ὁργῆς prob. o. κυρίου 233) rel. S and ΘΤ 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 καὶ κατὰ, “this is the torment, the reward for their iniquity.” Notice that S has a unique reading by adding κατὰ, “reward, retribution,” as an apposition to κατὰ, “torment.” ΘΤ seems to be related to S, because both have the same reading for the

This relationship, however, cannot support a direct connection between $S$ and $\Theta T$ in terms of translation, for the Greek version translates the verb ἐγένετο by its usual ἐγένετο, which is a Hebraism, while $S$ ignores it. Furthermore, $S$ adds ἱλαρία, “reward,” a word alien to the Greek version. Therefore the similar rendering of בְּכַשֵּׁלָה, “stumbling block,” is not convincing evidence for a direct relationship between both versions. $\Theta ^ {J}$ reads as it is in $\Theta$ without any interpretative addition; the Aramaic word נבניא means “offence, stumbling-block.”

Ezek 7:20

(\textit{M}) נַעֲרֵי תְּרוּאָה, צָלָם חַמָּה שֶׁפַּיִּיו וְשָׁמֶרֶת, וְעַד כָּנָה לִי לֵוָה לְזֻרֶה

(\textit{S}) מֶלֶךְ מְאֹד מֵעָשָׂה מִצְיָה סִירָה הָאָוֶיהָ

(\textit{C J}) פָּרֹרֶה מִצְיָה עָבָר הָאָוֶיהָ בָּאָוֶיהָ

(\textit{E}) ēkλέκτα κόσμου εἰς ὑπερφανίαν ἔθεντο αὐτὰ καὶ έικόνας τῶν βδελυγμάτων αὐτῶν ἐποίησαν εἴς αὐτῶν ἑνεκεν τούτου δέδωκα αὐτὰ αὑτοῖς εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν.

(Trans. of \textit{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.”

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

Although $S$ agrees mostly with $\text{MT}$ as $\text{G}^*$ and $\text{C'}$ do, it has some unique readings by rendering the Hebrew נאסם, "they placed, put, or used," by נשא, "they have made," and by using the same Syriac verb to translate the Hebrew והם, "I have made it." It is probably an editorial work with the aim of avoiding a Hebraism as in the case of the verb נתן with the extended sense of "to give." $\text{G'}$ read נ/use, "they have placed," for והם, and נספכט, "I have given," for והם; both are exact renderings of the Hebrew counterpart. $\text{C'}$ has in both instances the verbal expression נספכט, "I will give/make it," probably with the same extended sense of its Hebrew counterpart.

Another unique reading of $S$ is the noun נאש, "unclean thing," translated by the Aphel Ptc. נרשפכט, "despised." The noun נאש has its correspondent Greek counterpart in $\text{G'T}$, which is ἀκαθαρσίαν, "uncleanness" (σ' συκχος "fastidious person, disgusting, loathsome"), and in $\text{C'}$ it is substituted by περσῆς, "contempt."1

$\text{G}^*$ omits נאשך, "their detestable things," but some MSS of $\text{G'A}$ hold it, e.g., (X O) και ($O-407$, cf.403') προσωποθροματα (-ματων L-V) αυων O-62', L'-46-311-Zv C'-403'. Although BHS suggests that the last part of this verse is probably a gloss, the witnesses all together, including $S$, support the Masoretic reading.

---

1 is not familiar with the targumic interpretation of this verse. Levey, 35, n. 12. Regarding the נאשך, "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 sefini (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 ḠT have similar readings to that of Μ. The only two problems are the rare Hebrew word צאצא, “my treasure place, hiding place,” translated by μήλη, “my watchtowers,” from κατα, “watchman, one who observes,” and by επισκοπή, “visitation,” of a divine power or “office of an overseer”; and the Hebrew noun סר, “robbers,” rendered by the Syriac equivalent noun סול, “robbers,” and in ḠT 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 ḠT underwent a more elaborate editorial work than S in this verse. The two instances of the Hebrew verb לִפְנוּ, “to profane,” are translated in S by the same Syriac verb Pael ἐλπ, “to defile,” while ḠT has μαυρω, “defile,” for the first instance and βεβηλω, “to profane,” for the second.

Ḡ has a completely different rendering for פה, “and I will turn my face
from them.” C renders it by אָסַלֶּהַךְ סֶכָּנְתָּךְ מִצְאָהּ, “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 גֵּטָה, “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 ג and S are similar to III, they are different from each other, showing an independence in matters of translation and transmission of their texts.

Ezek 7:23

(III) מֶשֶׁה הרֹאֶהְךָ נלַחֲמָה מִסְפַּר דֶּמֶשׁ וּדוֹנֵר מִלְאָה חַסֶּה
(S) עֶבֶר שֶׁשָּׁלֹקַ אֶל לַשְּׁמַעַת חַוָּיָה קֹדֶשׁ וּמוֹדָהָה שֵׁלֶבֶּה
(C) καὶ ποιήσουσι φυσίμον, διότι η γῆ πλήρης λαόν, καὶ η πόλις πλήρης 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 III regarding some of the key words of the text.

1Levey, 34.
S reads מָצַּחְתִּים, “and they will cross, invade,” for the imperative נָשִּׁיע, “make” (גֹּתְרָה, “they will make”) and מָצַּחְתִּים, “in/with bricks, mud, mixture, dough,” for מַצְחֶרֶת, “the chain.” S may refer to the invasion of the walled cities. The latter word is rendered in G as φυμόν, “confused mass, mixture” (in MS 407 φυμαγμόν from φυμαγμα “wanton behavior,” γ’ and δ’ have εποιησαν καθηλωσυν “they have made a revetment”), probably referring to the intermarriage with foreign nations (לַאֹוּד).

The Hebrew expression מָטָרָה דִּימוֹן, “bloody judgment,” is substituted by λαὖν, “foreign people, nation,” in G. Some MSS of G contain a reading similar to that of M, λαSOEVER krυσεώς αἰματων O'); αἰματων 62; + αἰματων 403'; and a conflate reading krυσεώς αἷμα τῶν λαῶν in MS 534. S is similar to Μ regarding θρίψιν.

C' agrees with M by translating, “the chain,” with its Aramaic equivalent סְעֵל, “chain.” The phrase מָטָרָה דִּימוֹן, “bloody judgment,” however, is substituted by קープל תְּדִיב, “those who deserved to be killed.” This may be due to the exilic interpretation of the context. According to C’ many would die during the invasion and exile.

The Hebrew word עֹזֵב, “violence,” is substituted by קָטַּם, “iniquity,” in S, and διαφοράς, “lawlessness,” in G, while C' has ἁρκῶν, “robbers.” It seems likely that G, S, and C' were based on Vorlagen similar to M, without any direct relationship among themselves.

Ezek 7:24

(מ) הָבַשְׁתָּהְיָה רֵעֵל נוֹמָה וָרֵשֶם אֶפְט בְּהוֹדָה וֹשֶׁבֶת נֵנָאְיָה לְתוֹיָה מְכָרֶשַׁם

(ס) מָצַּחְתִּים, מְצַּחְתִּים מְצַּחְתִּים
Analysis of the Variants

$S$ has two unique readings: for the phrase נַעֲרֵי נְגוֹיָ֑ם, "evil peoples," it reads נַעֲרֵי נְגוֹיָ֑ם לְאָמָ֖ר "shepherds of peoples." Probably the deviation is due to the confusing similarity between the noun נַעֲרֵי, "evil, misery, distress," and the verb נַעֲרֵי, "to tend, pasture, shepherd," whose Ptc. m. pl. Constr. may be spelled as נַעֲרֵי רָצִּים or נַעֲרֵי רָצִּים, particularly in a Hebrew unvocalized text. This is a semantic case of homonymy, for the Syriac language has the verb כָּאֵֽבָּר עַל, "to keep, shepherd, feed," and its pl. Act. Ptc. כָּאֵֽבָּר עַל, "shepherds," with only one sense. The Syriac word for כָּאֵֽבָּר עַל, "evil, misery, distress," is completely different in spelling (כָּאֵֽבָּר עַל).

$\text{\(\Theta\)}$ (B) lacks the entire Hebrew clause נָשָּׁאָה נַעֲרֵי נְגוֹיָ֑ם אַתְךָ בְּהֵרַעָם. "I will bring evil people and they will take possession of their houses." Some MSS of $\text{\(\Theta\)}^A$, however, have the Masoretic reading ποιησοῦς εὑνων "evil people," e.g., (X O, X Θ, 449) καὶ αξίω (εξώ 147) ποιησοῦς εὐνων καὶ κληρονομοσουσιν (κατακλήρ. 62) τοὺς οἴκους (τὴν γῆν πρὸ τ. οἴκους 407) αὐτῶν rel.

The second unique reading of $S$ is the rendering of the passive verbal form נַעֲרֵי,
“and they will be profaned,” by לֶאֶמֶרְשָׁם, “and they will possess.” It seems a careful editorial work due to some theological reasons, for לֶאֶמֶרְשָׁם, “and they will possess,” is the same verbal form as the Hebrew אר, “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.”

אֹת employs the singular passive form מַעֲנַחַשְׁתָּא, “it will be profaned,” for the Nifal form מָעַךְ, “and they will be profaned.” The word מַקְדָּשִים, “their holy places, or sanctuaries,” is in the singular in S, while in the plural in אֹת and כ. 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 אֹת and כ 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.

אֹת has a unique reading for מַן נַעֲבַד נַעֲבַד, “and I will put an end to their pride,” by rendering it as καὶ ἀποστρέψω τὸ φοβέργα δῆς λοχύς αὐτῶν, “and I will turn back the boasting of their strength.” Only α’ καταπαύω τὴν ὑπερφερεῖαν, ὑπερφανείαν Θμς and ὑπερφανείαν α’, Cod. 86 have their readings similar to מ, “I will put to an end to the pride.” The rendering of אֹת seems more an interpretative translation of a Hebrew text, while α’, α’, and Cod. 86 are more literal translations.

Ezek 7:25

(מ) הקדשה בן בוכרים שלום ואן

(א) הקדשה בן בוכרים שלום ואן
Analysis of the Variants

The Hebrew word הָעַשֶּׁפֶּה, 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 עַשֶּׁפֶּה, "wrath," G תֵּאָסוֹמ, "propitiation," σ and θ have αθυμίας, "discouragement," and Cod. 86 reads σπανος, "distress, anguish." The clue for a better translation is found in CJ that translates it by its cognate form עַשְׁפִּיא, "destruction," and its MS 0 by עַשֶּׁפֶּה, "anger, indignation." Therefore, this is another clear evidence for a non-interrelationship among them all together.

Ezek 7:26

הוּא עַל הָה הָבָה תֹּמְעָה אַלּ סֶפָּה תֹּרָה בּכֶשֶׁה תֹּו מְבִיא תֹּו רַה הָאָבֶר מְכֹתֶת עָטְפָּה מְסִכָּהֵן (S)

םֶה לֹא מִן לָאָהֵן. מִסָּכָהֵן דָּלֵסָהֵן מְשָׁמָהֵן מְסָכָהֵן (S)

םֶה לֹא מִן לָאָהֵן. מִסָּכָהֵן דָּלֵסָהֵן מְשָׁמָהֵן מְסָכָהֵן (S)

וְזָרַכְתָּם בְּרָם יִתְיַבְּרֵרָהָם עַל בָּשְׂרֵרָה זוֹתָה (CJ)

רֵבֵּם אַלְפֶּב מִסָּר וּאֱמֶרָה תֹּמְעָה מְכֹתֶת מַלְלַי מְסָכָּה (S*)

ουαὶ ἐπὶ οὐαὶ ἦσται, καὶ ἄγγελια ἐπὶ ἄγγελιαν ἦσται, καὶ ἐπιτηρήσεται

1Holladay, 321.
(Trans. of S) “Calamity upon calamity will come, and rumor upon rumor will be. Then they will seek a vision from the prophets, but the law will perish from the priests and counsel from the elders.”

Analysis of the Variants

GTK, S, and C are based on Hebrew texts similar to M. None of them, however, are dependent on each other regarding this verse. S has Ethpeel רכז, “will be heard,” for the Hebrew רכז, “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 רכז, “to hear,” better fits the context of the verse where “rumors” were to be heard instead of the Hebrew רכז, “will be.” GTK has רכז, “there will be,” for both Hebrew verbs רכז, “it will be,” and רכז, “it will come.” C 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, נשים, “prophets,” נשים, “elders,” and נשים, “priests,” probably to make a syntactical agreement with נשים, “elders.” GTK agrees with M having the same number for these nouns, except MSS L’-46-311-Z, which are in agreement with S and M most of the time, but in this case they have נשים, “of the elder,” in the singular.

There is an interpretative addition in C: רבד preseason Messiah and the people of God, 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 *nominasacra* 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).

¹ Levey, 34.
² Ibid.
³ Ibid.
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 [בָּשָׂר/beshar] tr. pr. Peal Ptc. מסכתה “standing.”

8:2 [בָּשָׂר/beshar] Substit. מסכתה חלנה “image of trouble.”

8:3 [בָּשָׂר/beshar] om.

8:6 [בָּשָׂר/beshar] tr. הוהי om.

8:8 [בָּשָׂר/beshar] Substit. מַסְכִּית “standing.”

8:5 [בָּשָׂר/beshar] om.

8:12 [בָּשָׂר/beshar] חספה “secret, hiding place.”
Data Analysis

Ezek 8:1

וַיָּרָאה וַיָּרָאה בְּמֶשֶׁת בְּמֶשֶׁת לָחְדָּו לָחְדָּו אֵּֽיךְ מִבָּאִית אֹֽן

זֹכַר יְהוָה נִסְכָּב לְעֵין יִחְפָּלוּ בֵּן בֵּן יִזְדַּר

(מ) מִשְׂפָּתָו בְּמֶשֶׁת בְּמֶשֶׁת בְּמֶשֶׁת אֶלָּא מִבָּאִית אֵֽיךְ מִבָּאִית

(ס) מִשְׂפָּתָו בְּמֶשֶׁת בְּמֶשֶׁת בְּמֶשֶׁת אֶלָּא מִבָּאִית אֵֽיךְ מִבָּאִית

(ט) קָאֵֽלָא אֶנֶּה תַּעְבֹּר תַּעְבֹּר בְּמֶשֶׁת בְּמֶשֶׁת בְּמֶשֶׁת אֶלָּא מִבָּאִית אֵֽיךְ מִבָּאִית
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 $M$. $T$ substitutes ἐν ὑπὲρ, “on the sixth (month),” by ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ ἡμείς, “on the fifth month.” Further deviations (of $E^*$) are the omissions of the possessive pronoun of ἡμείς, “my house,” rendered by τῷ οἶκῳ, “the house,” and the omission of the demonstrative particle ἦν, “there.” $E^*$ contains the latter two readings omitted by $E^*$ in some of its MSS, e.g., τῷ οἶκῳ + μου Ο-62, L’-ZV; ἐπὶ ἐμὲ + εἰς after ἐπὶ ἐμὲ ( ※ Ο) O-62, L-311-46-ZV; pr. εἰς V. The nominasacra are translated as usual, κυρίου in $E^*$ (B 26, 403’, 544, o’) and + αἰωνία in $E^*$ MSS e.g., pr. κυρίου αἰωνία 36;+ pr. αἰωνία rel.

$E$ agrees with $M$ more closely than $E^*$, but it contains an additional reading ὁ προφήτης λέγει, “the prophet said,” and as a normal targumic characteristic anthropomorphism is avoided. Therefore ἀνέβη ἐπὶ Ἄδην καὶ ἐνεύρετο ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐνεύρετο ἅγιον, “and the hand of the Lord God,” is rendered by ἀνέβη ἐπὶ Ἄδην καὶ ἐνεύρετο ἅγιον, “the spirit of prophecy from before the Lord God.” Consequently $S$ agrees with $M$ more than with any other version regarding this verse.
Ezek 8:2

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

Analysis of the Variants

Ś 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 ὄλος, “fire.” Ś lacks the first two instances of ἄνθρωπος, “appearance,” and also the noun εὐδοκία, “brightness.” Notice, however, that some MSS of Ś contain the first instance of εὐδοκία as οἵου εὐδοκία (X O) O, 36 C'-403', and the second instance is found only in MS 62 by ὀράσεως. MSS L-311-V-ZV, which are usually closer to ицы and ゞ, do not have the three instances of ἄνθρωπος.

The Hebrew word רָעָה, “brightness,” though absent in Ś, is present in several
The Last Hebrew Comparative Nominal Phrase, "like gleaming bronze (?)" is rendered by כִּנֶּן הָאֹתָם, "like the appearance of God," in S, and כִּנֶּן הָאֹתָם הָֽלֶ֑כֶטַּ֣ר, "appearance of amber," in T (א', א', א' וּכְּנֶן הָאֹתָם הָֽלֶ֑כֶטַּ֣ר). In T כִּנֶּן הָאֹתָם הָֽלֶכֶטַּ֣ר, and it is transliterated by כִּנֶּן הָאֹתָם הָֽלֶ֑כֶטַּ֣ר, "like the appearance of hashmal." This is support for an independent translation and transmission of the text among the versions.

The two instances of "his loins," are avoided by T as an anthropomorphism. It renders נֶֽסֶנְּיוֹ, "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 (א', Cod. 86 לְפָּשָׁלֹס). S ignores the unique reading of T (א' לְפָּשָׁלֹס) and the targumic interpretation.

Ezek 8:3

יִשְׁלָלַ֖ה יְבִ֣ית יְדֵי יְהוָ֑ה בְּרֵֽעַ וְיָשַׁ֣ע יְהוָ֑ה רִֽחֲנָ֥יו וְיָש֣וּב לְפָ֜שָׁלֹס וְלַשְׁמַע אָזֵֽן

יִרְשָׁלָ֖ם בְּאֶלְּדָ֑ם אֲלֵֽי פָּשָׁלֹס הָֽרִֽגָּה הָֽרִֽגָּה הָֽרִֽגָּה הָֽרִֽגָּה הָֽרִֽגָּה הָֽרִֽגָּה הָֽרִֽגָּה הָֽרִֽגָּה הָֽרִֽגָּה הָֽרִֽגָּה הָֽרִֽגָּה הָֽרִֽגָּה הָֽרִֽגָּה

סָפַֽךְ תִּכְּלַ֖ה יָשַׁ֣ע יְהוָ֑ה וְיָש֣וּב לְפָ֜שָׁלֹס וְלַשְׁמַע אָזֵֽן לְפָ֝שָׁלֹס (S)

סָפַֽךְ תִּכְּלַ֖ה יָשַׁ֣ע יְהוָ֑ה וְיָש֣וּב לְפָ֜שָׁלֹס וְלַשְׁמַע אָזֵֽן לְפָ֝שָׁלֹס (T)

אָוַהַ֥ם לְפָ֝שָׁלֹס וְלַשְׁמַע אָזֵ֥ן לְפָ֝שָׁלֹס וְלַשְׁמַע אָזֵ֥ן (T)
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 paraagogic ב or he locale has its equivalent in the Syriac preposition ܐ, which conveys the same syntactical sense of the former (לְעָלֶה / לְעָלָה, “to the north,” ירושלם / יֵרֶשֶׁלֶם, “to Jerusalem”). Therefore it is not a deviation from א. Some portions, however, of this long verse seem to be confusing to the versions all together.

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

1Jotion and Muraoka, § 93.
The Hebrew phrase "by the hair of my head," is rendered similarly by $S$, but as $\text{κωπάς} \text{ μου}, "by my extremity," in $\text{G}^*$ implying the extremity of the prophet's head. $\text{G}^*$ has several MSS that are explicit by reading $\text{κωπάς} \text{ της κεφαλής}, "the extremity of the head," as in $\text{M}$ $S$, e.g., $\text{Qmg}, \text{L}'-311-\text{Zv}, 267, 544, 62$. Notice, however, that some of these MSS, though in this case related to $\text{M}$ and $S$, add to the text an extra-Masoretic reading not found elsewhere, $\text{ανθρωπός} \text{ after χειρος} (\text{L}'-311-\text{Zv})$. Therefore it is hard to conceive that $S$ is related to them at all.

The last Hebrew nominal clause נוה נaphael ג'ור "where was the seat of an image of jealousy which provokes jealousy," is very debatable, particularly the last two words. $\text{G}^*$ renders נוה נaphael γ'ουρ "of the purchaser." Probably $\text{G}^*$ understood that the Hi. Participle γ'ουρ came from the root $\text{κτωμένου}, "to get, acquire, buy," from whence the meaning γ'ουρ, "purchaser," instead of the similar Hebrew root $\text{κρ}, "to be jealous"$1 ($S$ has נוה נraphא "an image of trouble"). The Syriac language has the verb κτω "to buy, acquire," which has the same spelling of the Hebrew $\text{κρ}, "to be jealous." Thus the Syriac translator seems to avoid any ambiguity by substituting the last two Hebrew words by the interpretative Syriac term κτω, "of trouble." This may have been due to the confusion or misunderstanding of the Hebrew verbal root $\text{κρ}, as it occurred in $\text{G}^*$ rather than to an actual reading of $S$'s Vorlage.

---

1Emmanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, 2d. ed., Jerusalem Biblical Studies no. 3 (Jerusalem: Simor, 1997), 172: Regarding $\text{G}$, Tov stated that this type of translation can be classified as “etymological exegesis.” He defines it as that exegesis which is based “on the translator’s understanding of the structure of Hebrew words.”
has some MSS with a reading closer to the Masoretic one, e.g., στηλή + τὰς εἰκόνας τοῦ ζηλου (-λους O, ζηλου 147) O', L'-311-ZV, 407' or * εἰσόδου τοῦ ζηλους in 86, and * τὰς εἰκόνας τοῦ ζηλους in Qικιτ. Τ has a unique reading that substitutes the Hebrew ביכרתה ἀλλίως, “in visions of God,” by the interpretative rendering οὕτως, “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

(מ) התנה סכ בכר אולת ישראלא כאמרא אסי לראות בֶּבֶּקֶעַ

(ס) כָּשָׁר אֲשֶׁר יִאְשָׁר אֲשֶׁר יָדְוָה אֶצֶל בֶּבֶּקֶעַ

(כ) היא תמים כנף יומא יבמראלא חוהו דרויית בֶּבֶּקֶעַ

(ד) כָּלֵי שֶׁנְּנֻּס אֵקֶּי הֵן בֵּןֵךְ קִרְיוּ שֶׁדֶא יִשְׂרָאֵל קאָטֶה תֶּהֶנְּ בִרְפָּאָה, הָיֶּנֶּנֶּנֶּנֶּ שֶׁנְּנֻּס בֵּעָלָא.

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

(ה) read like IR without any deviation. (S) and (C), 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 "... of the eastern gate stood an image of trouble," and by (Ra.) as "toward the eastern gate," omitting the last part. This is not proof for a direct dependency between these two versions, for it can be explained as a common knowledge of the geographical situation of the temple in Old Testament times. The eastern gate was...
the entrance to the temple and was the place where the altar was located. \( \Theta A \) has several MSS that support the Masoretic reading, e.g., τὴν (τοῦ B) πρὸς ἀνατολάς Ρα.] τοῦ

θυσιαστηρίου η (>544) εἰκών του ζηλούς τουτου (του 239) εν τω εἰσπορευομαι

(+ σε A*-544) αὐτήν τιν βλέπονταν προς (κατ 233) ἁνατόλας (ομ. την βλ. προς

ανατ. 26', 86(x9) A^*--106', 46, cII-86'-239'; and + (X O) του θυσιαστηριου ου (> O-

ο-147', C'-403';+ ην V) η (ουκ prob. ου η 62) εἰκών του ζηλού ( -λους O) τουτου

eν τω εἰσπορευομαι αυτήν (+ την προς ἁνατόλας 538) Ο', L='46, C'-403'; Θ' and

α' also contain it as (X Θ) του θυσιαστηριου η εἰκών (α' εἰδωλον Cod. 86) του ζηλούς

tουτου εν τω εἰσπορευομαι αυτήν.

The Hebrew expression פכּכּיָה יָבְשָׁה, “image of jealousy,” is also found in vs. 3

where one can observe the same type of variations in the versions. Consequently 5 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) נָאֵר אֵלֶּה בְּרֵאשִׁית הָרָהָּ֥ה לָהֶ֖ם עַשֶּׂנִיָּֽהּ כִּ֣י יְיָרָ֖ל מְסַיָּ֑ם פָּֽהּ

לִחְדָּהָּֽהּ מַ֣כֶּשׂ דָּ֖שֶׁם עַשֶּׂנִיָּֽהּ הַרָּ֥הָּֽהּ כִּ֣י יְיָרָ֖ל מְסַיָּ֑ם פָּֽהּ

(5) מַ֣כֶּשׁ לְכָלָּֽהּ בַּ֣בִּית דֶּ֖שֶׁם פָּ֣ולָ֑ם יִשְׂדָּֽהּ מַ֣כֶּשׁ לְכָלָּֽהּ בַּ֣בִּית דֶּ֖שֶׁם פָּ֣ולָ֑ם

ָֽיִשְׂדָּֽהּ מַ֣כֶּשׁ לְכָלָּֽהּ בַּ֣בִּית דֶּ֖שֶׁם פָּ֣ולָ֑ם

(5') מַ֣כֶּשׁ לְכָלָּֽהּ בַּ֣בִּית דֶּ֖שֶׁם פָּ֣ולָ֑ם

הָֽיִשְׂדָּֽהּ מַ֣כֶּשׁ לְכָלָּֽהּ בַּ֣בִּית דֶּ֖שֶׁם פָּ֣ולָ֑ם

אֵלֶּה בְּרֵאשִׁית הָֽרָּֽהָּ֥ה לָ֖הֶם עַשֶּׂנִיָּֽהּ כִּֽי יְיָרָ֖ל מְסַיָּ֑ם פָּֽהּ

הָֽעֲבֹרָֽה בְּרֵאשִֽׁית יָשֵרָֽהּ עַבְדָּֽי כִּֽי לָאָֽהֶֽרֶךְּֽהּ אֶשְּׂנָֽיָֽהּ מַּֽלְעָֽהּ דָּֽשֶֽׁם
And he told me, ‘Son of man, see what they are doing; great abominations the house of Israel is doing. For they have gone far from my sanctuary, but you will turn again and you will see great abominations which they are doing’.”

Analysis of the Variants

S has a unique reading. It adds after the last adjective ἁπλῶς, “great,” the relative participle, “which they are doing.” This seems rather a careful editorial work than a different Vorlage from ตำบล. The only minus of 5 is ἔδω, “here.” Although 6 (B) lacks ἔδω, several MSS of 6 have it, e.g., (X O Q ο’ θ’). As ὁ οὐκοσ (+ του 147, 46) ἱσραηλ rel. The Hebrew ורדו, “you will return, or turn” (jussive?), is omitted too in almost all the witnesses of 6; only MSS 62 and 403' have it, ἐπιστρέφως. 7 renders its Hebrew text, which is similar to ตำบล, as it is without any deviation. S is an independent translation, and is carefully translated in comparison to the versions.

Ezek 8:8

(�) ἔδω, ἁπλῶς, ἐπιστρέφως ἱσραηλ rel. (S)

(7) ἔδω, ἁπλῶς, ἐπιστρέφως ἱσραηλ rel.
(ס*) קלא elpen prois me Yile anavrapou, oruov kai oruva, kai idov thura mia.
(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 תָּבֵּרָה, "and behold," by וַיָּצֵא, "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 וַיָּצֵא conveys a stronger sense and action in the narrative than the simple Hebrew תָּבֵּרָה.

ס* omits both instances of the prepositional phrase תָּבֵּרָה, "in the wall." ס has a MS with a completely different reading for the first instance of תָּבֵּרָה, e.g., αναβλεπον τοις εφθαλμοῖς σου προς βορραν καὶ, "you will turn your eye to the north"; and (α' + ξ δη εν τω τοιχω Q3) rel. reads as מ en τω τοιχω, "in the wall." For the second instance of תָּבֵּרָה some MSS read as follows: קלא idov thura μαζ + ל'-311-ZV en two τοιχω; pr. O-62, 538, C'-534-86'-403', 26', 410. ס* agrees with מ as it is.

Ezek 8:12
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And he told me, ‘See, son of man, what the elders of Israel are doing in the darkness. Each man is in his secret chamber and they are saying, “The Lord does not see us, because the Lord has forsaken the land’.”

Analysis of the Variants

All the versions had some difficulties in rendering the Hebrew word יַסַּכִּית, “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 יָכַּט, “secret, hiding,” place or thing.

Although ס תֵּכַּט reads תֵּכַּט, “in their secret chamber,” similar to ס, the Syriac scribe might have committed a mistake of the eyes, by transposing the Hebrew letters יַכִּית in the word יַסַּכִּית, as it occurs in the linguistic phenomenon called metathesis. Then one has the word יִכְּט, which is an Aramaic Pass. Ptc. of יָכָּת, “to hide, conceal,” and the Syriac language has the same Ptc. יָכָּת. ס תֵּכַּט has a unique reading: יָכָּת, “his sleeping quarters.”

S could well be related to ס תֵּכַּט, for the former has יָכַּט and the latter תֵּכַּט, but it also can be explained as part of a careful editorial work on the Syriac text rather than a dependency between them.
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(ס') וַיָּדַעְנֵנִּי וּמִיָּרְדַּכְתְּ יִתְּהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם בָּהֵן בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם

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

Analysis of the Variants

S has a unique reading by substituting מַר for מַנָּה, “and I saw.” ס ת also has a unique reading that seems to be a harmonization with vs. 3. It reads, תָּשָׁנְתָה прֶשׁ בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית h

Ezek 8:16

(מ') יָדַעְנֵנִי וּמִיָּרְדַּכְתְּ יִתְּהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם בָּהֵן יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית h

(ט') וַיָּדַעְנֵנִי מִיָּרְדַּכְתְּ יִתְּהַנְּתָה בֵּית הָאָדָם בָּהֵן יַהַנְּתָה בֵּית h
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(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 וַהֲלֵךְ, as also in verse 14, and a synonym for the 1st instance of כָּלָה, "to the east," מֵהֶם, "to the east."

$G$* has a loan word, or a transliteration for the Hebrew word צַלְעָל, "the porch," that is, αἱλαμ. Furthermore, it reads twenty men instead of twenty-five, and lacks the second כָּלָה, probably to avoid redundancy. $G^A$ has several MSS that read like $M$, e.g., εἰκοσι $B] + καὶ πεστὲ$ rel. The second כָּלָה is present in some MSS, e.g., (※ O) κατὰ ανατολας rel.

$J$ has an interpretative addition to the text, "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 $M$. 
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Ezek 8:17

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 theמשה, “to do,” in the participial form, is omitted and the perfectמש, “they did,” was rendered by its participle formחפץ, “which [they] were doing.” The wordviolence, “violence,” was substituted byנוש, “iniquity,” perhaps to fit it in the context of idolatry.

The last clause was a crux interpretum for the versionsוהי שלחים ואיה ממריה. לא
“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 אַלּ is the rendering of נָפַל Niphal of קְלָל, “to trifle, to consider in a slight manner,” by the adjective מִנְקָה/מְנָקָה, “small.” All the differences, however, make it—the similarity—look like a mere coincidence.

אַל translates the first instance of the verb חָסַל by תִּמְנָח and the second by תִּמְנָח as in הָיָה against אָל. כ, which is missing in א, is rendered by סֱדוֹת, and the entire sense, “and they return to provoke me to anger,” is lacking in א. In א, the last sentence appears as καὶ εὐπρέπειον (αὐτοπρο. 147) τοῦ (α) παροργονομεν με rel. Also the sentence οὗτος με παραστάσεως, “Lo! they sent forth a branch to their nostrils,” is translated as it is by א, e.g., (gen O) εκτελεσθε νοστι, “to stretch out” (επεκτ. 147; απόκτενουσι 46) το (συν το 62) κλῆμα, “branch” (κρῆμα, “dispute, judgment,” 410; + αὐτον 407) rel. MS 130 reads μυκτηριζοντος, “scorners,” for the last Hebrew nominal clause.

א personalize the word מִשְׂמָה, “violence,” into מִשְׂמָה, “violent men,” and renders the last nominal sentence by מִשְׂמָה מְחַלָּה לָאוֹבֵד, “behold they are bringing disgrace right in front of their faces.” Therefore, conclusively א is not related to any of the versions concerning its translation.

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

1. א 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 T translation (8:2, 3, 14, 17).
4. S is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to MT (8:4, 13).
5. Similarities between S and T* 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 MT 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. Peal Perf. "and he said."
Synonym "her avengers."
Substit. "her retribution."

9:2  Substit. Peal Perf. 1° s. "and I saw."
Substit. "her retribution."

9:3  om.
Q. Perf. 3° m. "who were standing."

9:4  "and evils."

9:5  "who were with him."
"to them."
Substit. "to my sight."

9:6  Q. Imperf. 2° m. pl. [Peal Impr. 2° pl.]
"kill."
"there is, exists."
"begin."

204
Data Analysis

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.

Ezek 9:1

(III)
Analysis of the Variants

Although S has its own reading, it is very close to that of Μ. S has two words which are derived from the same root, אָכַל, “to avenge,” for the Hebrew words מִפְּסִים, “visitation, punishment,” and לִכְנֹא, “his destruction,” while all the versions have their own rendering for each Hebrew word. For instance, Τ reads ἐκδίκησις, “judgment,” for מִפְּסִים, and ἐξολοθρεύσεως, “utter destruction,” for לִכְנֹא. Τ' and σ' have the same reading for מִפְּסִים; they read ἐνῶσα, “who are in charge of,” and εὐπροσκυνάντης, “overseer.” MS 46 changes the Infinitive Construct לָאָכַל to the simple past אָכַל, “he said,” as it shows in S. Probably the repetition of the same root אָכַל, “to avenge,” is an attempt to smooth the flow of the text, avoiding rare Hebrew words.

The Infinitive Construct לָאָכַל is rendered by the perfect Peal in S. This does not mean that S had a different Vorlage, but it is a normal feature of the Syriac version to adapt the text to the Syriac style.
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Ezek 9:2

(III) תוהז משמי אנטמי בטיין מדרך שער העילין

אסף משמי זומיא איה כלכلا מפציה ברי איה חוד בוהקים ילב,

בידים יかもしれませんが באמת אחדים יברט וחפיו את מבוך התמונה

(1) סמך עליה חמש חמש

(5) גבר ושתה ושתה ליראתה.

(6a)しま שמה נברןSEQ הפורח החיה עלאתה דריה

לפיותה נבר מנבריה ביקיה נבראה ובר יائيل ליבשל למשלי הפסק ספרא

בוחראת תעל וקומ בוסר מדברה דניחה

(6b) קלאו בנ נבר הגרות הורה עלאתה דריה

(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 6T, while the first part
contains a unique reading in harmonization with the preceding verse. $S$ substitutes סנה, “and behold,” by a more specific term סנה, “and I saw,” and for a better harmonization of the text, which is a normal translation technique, the Hebrew word מסר, “his slaughter,” is rendered by מסר, “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 יכין השני, “and an inkpot/inkhorn of the writer/writing.” On the one hand, it seems that the Vorlage of $S$ ($יכין השני אוניביסל, “and he bound his loins with a girdle of sapphire”) was related to $\Theta T$, because the latter reads קא ילען ספionario עני תנה סופור אונש, “and a girdle of sapphire was upon his loins.” $\alpha$ and $\theta$ and MS 86 read close to $M$ <או קאסן (-דוא ed.) <תווע γραμματευς “<and> he reed of a scribe”; $\epsilon$ $\phi$ reads קא קאליאס γραφευς επι תנה סופור אונש, “and the reed of a writer was upon his loins.” On the other hand, the Hebrew word מסר, “writing, writer,” could well be a misunderstanding of an unvocalized text containing the word מסר, “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.

$\Theta$ agrees with $M$, but the only interpretative phrase is הברה, ס, “with his instrument of scattering,” as is found in MS 62 of $\Theta A$ ( πελγ] + τον υκρυπνου αυτου, “his scattered ones”).
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Ezekiel 9:3

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 6T, than vs. 3 denies that assumption, because the same phrase, "and whose loins were bound with a girdle of sapphire," which is found in vs. 2 of both versions, is found here in vs. 3 in S, but it is partially absent in vs. 3 of 6T. It has, however, only ζώνη, "girdle," instead of όσφυος. This is strong evidence for an independence of translation between S and 6.

S has a unique reading in its translation by substituting the verb ἔθηκεν by the
grammatical structure "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 כְּרֵדָה, "threshold," was rendered by אַלְפָּר, "corner, angle," whereas סֶ הָה has אֵיתְרִיבֶּן, "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 צ ′ is similar to that of מ; the only addition is קְדֵשׁ קְדֵשׁ קְדִישָׁה, "holy of holiest," after וְי, 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

(Trans, of S) "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

岑 is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of מ. There is a minus in ל and a plus in ס, namely the omission of the Hebrew prepositional phrase 'in the midst of the city,' in ל, which is present in some MSS of א, e.g., O-62', L-46-Zv, and the addition of עדים, "evils," in ס. This shows that ס did not copy from any version but did its own editorial work, improving the sense of the verse.

The idiomatic expression ידנה, "between their eyes," which is also the same Aramaic expression (ב ידナイ), was used to render the Hebrew word עדים, "forehead." This is just a case of a cognate expression between related languages rather than a relationship between ס and岑.

Ezek 9:5

"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 אב, "and to those he said," is rendered by the Syriac אב, "and to those who were with him, he said to them," and the Hebrew idiom "in my ears," is translated by a Syriac idiom "in my sight/eyes." Probably "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 $\mathfrak{T}$, for the latter keeps the Hebrew Idiom (Hebraism) in the phrase אב, "do not spare with your eyes." Though $S$ has לא, "let not your eyes have pity" which seems to be an editorial work, substituting אב, "spare," by לא, "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, "in my sight/eyes," while $\mathfrak{T}$ reads אב, "in my hearing," which is a closer reading to that of $\mathfrak{I}$.  

Ezek 9:6

Ezekiel 9:6 (S)

Ezekiel 9:6 (\mathfrak{T})

Ezekiel 9:6 (IR)
(S*) προεβυτερόν καὶ νεανίσκον καὶ παρθένον καὶ γυναῖκας ἀποκτείνατε εἰς ξέδειψιν, ἐπὶ δὲ πάντας, ἐφ' οὔς ἔστιν τὸ σημεῖον, μὴ ἐγγύσητε· καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων μου ἁρξάσθε. καὶ ἥρξαντο ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, οἵ ἦσαν ἐπὶ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ.

(Trans. of S) “Kill utterly old men as well as young men, virgins, children, and women. But do not come near to any man who has the mark upon him. Begin with my sanctuary. And they began with the old men who were standing in front of the house.”

Analysis of the Variants

S has a reading similar to ST by the use of the Imperative instead of the Hebrew Imperfect ναράς, “you will kill,” and ναίμα, “you will begin.” ST renders them by imperatives, namely ἀποκτείνατε, “kill,” and ἁρξάσθε, “begin,” respectively as in S.

This, however, does not support a direct relation between them for the following reasons: S lacks ἀρκεῦν, “elders,” but A has it in (X O) τῶν πρεσβυτέρων rel. Notice, however, that ST reads εἰς/εἰςθεν, “within, in,” for ἐν, “before of, in front of.” Therefore if one takes S as being based on some MSS of ST regarding the Imperatives, then S corrected the usage of the preposition ἐν/ἐνθα, “before, in front of,” in agreement with a Hebrew text similar to Μ, otherwise, S should have a reading similar to that of ST εἰς/εἰςθεν, “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 (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 \ before each object of \ “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

(II) –vjn ism i s n  iss tr^ n rrnsnn nx –ixbm non nx ixna nrr^x –inxn
(S) o \,n  C L o c u a  ,ri=i>' iu p tfn .T  aL n a .«ien A  ■tejrtfa
(C) xmpn ipEji ipis pb'ap s n n
(©*) Kai eTop ov pr'ous Miávate tón oíkon kai plávate tás ódous nekrián ekporevómenoi kai kóptete.
(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 רצא, רצהו, רצא, “go, and they went and smote,” is rendered by מפהו מפהה, “go and kill,” two
imperatives, while ἔτερον reads καὶ κόπτετε, “and smite.” The Greek Ptc. ἐκπορεύεσθαι,
“while going out,” is related to the preceding sentence πλήσσετε τὰς ὁδοὺς, “fill the
ways,” and to the last imperative καὶ κόπτετε, “and smite.” Though the Syriac version
omits יָשְׁרָה, “and they went,” it has מָלַלְתָּה, “go, kill,” both imperatives conveying an
emphatic sense stronger than that of the Hebrew יָשְׁרָה, “and they went out.” The two
Imperatives carry their action toward the word ἡ πόλις, “city.” The Prepositional Phrase
παρὰ, was omitted in 3, while 5 contains it in MSS (X - O) καὶ παραδέχετε τὴν
πόλις Ο (Qtr) 410; (X Qmg) καὶ εξελέγοντες εὐπτότον (εὐπτότον 22ο) τὴν πόλιν Qmg-
62, L’.

The Hebrew word הֵרָעָה, “courts,” probably related to the temple, is rendered by
ὁδοὺς, “ways,” in 4, whereas 5 has it as in 3, τὰς, “court” (Cod. 86, 91 and 81
γ’> read similarly to τὰς αὐλὰς, “courts”).

To accept 5 as being a translation based or directly related to 4 as a whole, one
would have to assume that the Syriac translator had at hand a critical edition of 4 to create
the actual reading of 5.

Ezek 9:8

יָדָה, הֵרָעָה נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא
אָזְרֶה הָעָה נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא
(5) נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא
נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא נָא
לָא חֲסֹרַה מֵהָעָה מֵהָעָה מֵהָעָה מֵהָעָה מֵהָעָה
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And when they had slain them, I was left and I fell upon my face and I cried with a loud voice and said, 'Ah, Lord of Authority, are you destroying all the remaining ones of Israel, and will you pour your wrath upon Jerusalem'?

Analysis of the Variants

S has a unique reading by rendering הוהי דברם, "while they were smiting them," by the Syriac מוהק מהדם, "and when they were slaying them." ™ and ™ agree with ™ in this respect. Another unique reading is the addition of זכר, "in a loud voice," after פס, "and I cried," which is absent in the other versions all together. ™ has אנברוגה and ™ גוזה, "I cried out," for פס, "and I cried." Regarding the nomina sacra, ™ (B) always lacks מני while ™ contains it in many of its MSS (rel.). ™ expands the text with the words קמכ מנהיג, "receive my petition"; this is a reading completely absent in the other versions. Although S shows a reworking of the text making it to sound more Syriac than Hebrew, it strives to keep as close as possible to its Hebrew Vorlage, as one can see in this verse.
Ezek 9:9

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 exceedingly great, is found in 𝐆'T "οφόδρον οφόδρον," but S has its customary
combination of two adjectives יִשָּׁע לְעֹאֵל to render the same Hebrew sense, thus avoiding a Hebraism. The two Hebrew words בָּרָאשׁי, “iniquity,” and כַּמָא, “injustice,” are rendered by the same Greek word αἰθακίας, “injustice,” in ST (S has its Syriac counterpart). Furthermore, this version adds ἀκαθαρσίας, “uncleanness,” after άθακίας, which is a unique reading. Another peculiar reading of ST is the substitution of ἄνθρωπος, “blood,” for λαῶν πολλῶν, “many nations,” implying foreign nations. Probably the translator had in mind the separation of the Israelite from other nations as mentioned in the book of Leviticus. Cod. 88 has the reading αἰματών, “blood,” instead of πολλῶν. Only ʼa and ʼl read αἰματών instead of λαῶν πολλῶν. CJ contains some targumic interpretation for this reading. It has כְּפִי, “those who deserve to be killed,” after ותָּאתוּרש אֲרָמָי, “and the land became full of.” This verse is strong evidence for an independent translation and transmission of S.

Ezek 9:10

וכָּא לא צִיד מִסְרָי לְאָה אַטְיוּת וַדִּכְמָךְ נַחֲלוּת (M)

סַלָּחָה לְנַהֲרִים מָלֵם כָּל אַרְגֵּגָה יַחְבָּר (S)

אַפָּךְ אַא לְאָה מְסָרִי לְאָה אַרְגַּע מְרַעְפָּה אָרְגַּע בְּרַמְעָה יָבִיעָה (CJ)

(ס) כָּא וּכְוּפָנָה אֵל וְרַבָּלִם מֹעַ, וּנְבֵל מִךְּלֶכְהָוֶם. וַאֲשֶׁר וֶדְוָוִים אָלָפָים אֵל כְּפָלָה אַלּוּ אֵלָדָה.

(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.’”
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Analysis of the Variants

S avoids some Hebraisms present in GT, καὶ οὖν φεῦσεται ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς μου, “and my eyes will not spare,” and the use of the verb δέδωκα as the Greek equivalent for ἐπιδέω, while S has λαμβάνω, “I will not have mercy upon them,” and ἀποδίδω, “I will recompense,” for ἐπιδέω. T avoids anthropomorphism by substituting for the Hebrew idiomatic usage of ישת, “my eye,” its targumic term מימר, “my Memra.”

Ezek 9:11

הנה הראית לך תphansኢחראךכבריהם בєיניהם מסיב דבר לאפרר כארים פרניר (III)

משה, לחיותך בחרך חזרך חזרך חזרך חזרך חזרך חזרך (S)

וזה נברא לכלשה ובقترحה זיתו מצות מצות לחרם לבנה כמא פקפונר (צ’)

(צ’) קא ויאו את י慮 ינות דון פדה קא יאשומיאס דחי ציאת דחי אדוען אדוען קא אתקריאת לקא פפייתא קאוחס אדהיאא ו międzוי מוי.

(Trans. of S) “And I saw the man clothed in linen, who answered and said, ‘I have done according to what you commanded me.’”

Analysis of the Variants

The relationship between S and GT can be easily explained by a common effort of conveying a better sense of their Hebrew Vorlagen. For example, S has ἀπεκρίνατο, “to answer,” while T* reads ἀπεκρίνατο, “he brought answer,” for the Hebrew idiomatic expression ינות דון, “bring back the word” (Hiph. Ptc. שיב). T* has a reading similar to that of III in some of its MSS, e.g., ἀπεκρίνατο + (X O O) λογον A’-403, O-
62. Both versions are just rendering the two acceptable possibilities of translating their Hebrew texts.

Quite strong evidence that leads us to posit a single translator for the entire chapter is the consistent way of rendering the Hebrew expression ראה, “behold,” by הביא, “and I saw,” as occurs in this verse. It might be also an avoidance of Hebraism on the part of the Syriac scribe, while ᵉᵀ has כא‏ו idou, “and behold,” which seems to be a clear Hebraism.

The relative clause רך נדנ תֹוכי, “who [had] the inkhorn on his loins,” is lacking in ˢ as in previous verses where the same phrase appears (9:2, 3). ᵉᵀ reads כא אָמָנוּ תֹוכי רך הביא אָנוּ, “and his loins were girt with a girdle” (א', and Cod. 86 read מֵלַאדוּשֵׂי תֹוכי וֹנֵאָמָטָא אֶת וַתִּשׁ אָנוּ, “who had a scribe’s inkhorn on his back,” and א' has מַתִּשׁ פַּנָּאָסֶא אֶת תַּתָּו הביא אָנוּ אָסָד, “who had the writing tablets in his loins”). Another difference is the rendering of the Hebrew word חֵרוֹת, “linen.” It is translated as חֵרוֹת, which is the Syriac word for linen, and חֵרְוָג, “long robe,” in ᵉᵀ. Only א', Cod. 86 (תא חֵרוֹת), and א' (תא חֵרוֹת) read in a way similar to that of ˢ and ᵉᵀ.

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 ᵉᵀ can most of the time be explained by a common translation technique, or by a relationship between the languages and not between versions.
(9:2, 3, 6).

4. $S$ prefers Syriac idiom (9:5).

5. $S$ does not contain the targumic interpretation (9:9).

6. $S$ does not avoid anthropomorphism as $C'$ does (9:10).

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

EZEKIEL 10

Collation

10:1
1° [וּאֵלָה] om.
pr. נְמוֹנָה נְמוֹנָה הָאֱלֹהִים "appearance."
om.
10:2
1° [וְיָסָר] Subst. Peal Perf. נַפְשָׁה נַפְשָׁה נַפְשָׁה "and he called."
2° נְמֶה כְּהֶבֶר כְּהֶבֶר כְּהֶבֶר "to him."
Pl. הַכְּהֶבֶר הַכְּהֶבֶר הַכְּהֶבֶר "cherubim."
10:3
Inf. Constr. כְּהֶבֶר כְּהֶבֶר כְּהֶבֶר כְּהֶבֶר Temp. particle + Peal Ptc. כְּהֶבֶר כְּהֶבֶר כְּהֶבֶר כְּהֶבֶר כְּהֶבֶר "when he was entering in."
tr.
Q. Perf. 3° m. s. מִלְתָּה מִלְתָּה מִלְתָּה מִלְתָּה Ethpe. Perf. 3° f. s. מִלְתָּה מִלְתָּה מִלְתָּה מִלְתָּה "it was filled."
tr.
10:4
1° [וְיָשָׁה] om.
pr. נְמוֹנָה נְמוֹנָה נְמוֹנָה "of God" (MS 1111 נְמוֹנָה נְמוֹנָה נְמוֹנָה)
1° נְמוֹנָה נְמוֹנָה נְמוֹנָה "of the Lord”).
10:5
Ni. Perf. בְּדוּ קָרָה בְּדוּ קָרָה בְּדוּ קָרָה Ethpe. Ptc. כָּרָה כָּרָה כָּרָה "was being heard.”
Pl. Inf. Constr. בְּדוּ קָרָה Temp. particle + Pael Ptc. כָּרָה כָּרָה כָּרָה כָּרָה כָּרָה "while speaking.”
10:6
1° [וְיָשָׁה] om.
Pi. Inf. Constr. בְּדוּ קָרָה Temp. particle + Peal Ptc. כָּרָה כָּרָה כָּרָה כָּרָה כָּרָה "and when he had commanded.”
222
Q. Inf. Constr. + Peal Ptc. (לברך) "saying."

Harmonization (ᴴ) "whirling wheels."

10:7 "of the man."

Ni. Perf. 3° m. s. ורדה Peal Perf 1 c. s. (וכות) "and I saw."

10:8 Dittography.

1° and 2° Qal Imperf. + Peal Ptc. + enclit. (פקידו) "[they] were going."

1° Ni. Imperf. יסנה Peal Ptc. + enclit. (בעתן) "they were not turning."

Q. Imperf. [וכות] Peal Ptc. + enclit. (ולך) "except to."

1° and 2° Qal Imperf. + Peal Ptc. + enclit. (ycopם) "where [they] were going."

Q. Inf. Constr. 2° 1° Ethp. Ptc. + enclit. (וכות) "and [they] were not turning."


10:10 [idiom] (והראיתם עדת אחד לאברעהם) "and one was their appearance (MS 1111 pl. 1°) "appearances") and their image."

Q. Inf. Constr. 2° לברך om.

10:11 Qal Inf. Constr. + 3° m. pl. suf. (לברך) + Temp. particle. + Peal Ptc. + enclit. (לברך) "and when [they] were going."

1° Ni. Perf. (וכות) Peal Ptc. + enclit. (בעתן) "[they] were going."

Q. Imperf. (וכות) Peal Ptc. + enclit. (כלך) "they were not turning."

Q. Imperf. (וכות) Peal Ptc. + enclit. (כלך) "except to."

Q. Inf. Constr. 2° 1° Ethp. Ptc. + enclit. (וכות) "and [they] were not turning."


10:12 [Substit.] (וקני) "whirling wheels."


1° Ni. Perf. (וכות) Peal Ptc. + enclit. (בעתן) "they were full of eyes."
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“when they went (Peal Ptc.) round about to their sides.”

10:13

 Pu. Perf. אֶחְתָּן (יִבְּשֵׁתָם) Perf. נְתָן “he called.”
 Substit. מִנֶּךָ “before me.”

10:14

“belonging to each one of them.”

1° om. צָהֵרַת “the next.”

10:16

Q. Inf. Constr. נִבְּשֵׁתָם [_temps] Temp. part. + Peal. Ptc. + enclit. מֵעֵדְוּפִים “and when they were going.”
 Q. Imperf. הָלְךֶהוּ [ולִבְּךָ] Peal. Ptc. + enclit. מָנוֹצִים “they were going.”
 Qal Imperf. הֶבְּשָה [לִבְּךָ] Temp. part. + Ettafal Ptc. + enclit. “they were mounting themselves

Q. Inf. Constr. נִבְּשֵׁתָם [_temps] Temp. part. + Peal. Ptc. + enclit. מֵעֵדְוּפִים “and when they were lifting up.”
 Ni. Imperf. תִּבְּרְאוּ Peal. Ptc. + enclit.
 Q. Imperf. הָלְךֶהוּ [ולִבְּךָ] Peal. Ptc. + enclit. מָנוֹצִים “they were turning.”

10:17

Prep. + Q. Inf. Constr. + Subj. pron. נִבְּשֵׁתָם [דִּבְּרָם] Temp. + Peal. Ptc. + enclit. מְסַמְּךָם “and while they were standing.”

Q. Imperf. הָלְךֶהוּ [לִבְּךָ] Peal. Ptc. + enclit. מָנוֹצִים מְסַמְּךָם “they were standing [too].”
 Q. Inf. Constr. נִבְּשֵׁתָם [דִּבְּרָם] Temp. part. + Ethpe. Ptc. + enclit. מָנוֹצִים מְסַמְּךָם “and when they were mounting up.”
 Qal Imperf. הָלְךֶהוּ [לִבְּךָ] Temp. part. + Ettafal Ptc. + enclit. “they were mounting themselves
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“and when the cherubim were lifting up their wings the wheels were lifting up with . . .”
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Prep. + Q. Inf. Constr. מִבְセルְתָהמִנָּה Temp. part. מִנָּה + Peal. Imperf. + enclit. מְפַסִּים . . . כֹּל “and they went out.” Q. Imperf. 3 m. s. רָבֲנֶם Peal Perf. 3 m. pl. מָפְסֵד “and they stood.”
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ף נָה] pr. מָפְסֵד “this.”

10:21

1° Idiom מַה נָה] pr. מַה מְפַסִּים “to each one of them.” 2° Idiom מַה נָה] pr. מַה מְפַסִּים “to each of them.”

10:22


Data Analysis

Ezek 10:1

אַוְהַרְתָּה וָהָנָה אֵל דְּרַקְנוּ עָפָר עַל רַאשׁ הַדּוּרְבּוֹת (5)
כָּכַלְכָלֵה גָּפָרְדָה דְּרַחְת גָּפָרְדָה נָרָא עַל יָדָה (5)
סְמָכָה מְרַחֲלָה לְדַלֵּלַה מִי דָּוְה מְסָפָר הָאָסָפָר מְסָפָר לְדַלֵּלַה (5)
Analysis of the Variants

One can argue for a relationship between $\mathcal{G}^*$ and $\mathcal{S}$ in terms of the common omission of the verb נאר, "it appeared," or for a relationship with $\mathcal{G}^\alpha$, for the latter contains a group of MSS that has the reading found in the Syriac version and $\mathfrak{M}$, but lacking in $\mathcal{G}^*$, ομοιόμενον. If $\mathcal{S}$ was based on a MS or recension similar to $\mathcal{G}^*$, how does it also have the reading of $\mathcal{G}^\alpha$? On the other hand, if $\mathcal{S}$ is related to $\mathcal{G}^\alpha$, then the question is which group of MSS $\mathcal{S}$ is it related to? for $\mathcal{S}$ has half of its reading similar to group O or L, whereas group O has the equivalence for the Syriac omission of נאר, "it appeared," that is, עף (O-62, and also α', β', 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. $\mathfrak{C}'$ agrees with $\mathfrak{M}$ without any deviation.
Ezek 10:2

(3) 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 ÇT regarding their agreement in both instances of the Hebrew word רָוֹצִים (רָוֹצִים, רָוֹצִים) (1° רָוֹצִים, 2° רָוֹצִים). S and ÇT translate both in the plural form. ÇT has both as they occur in 3, with the sole exception of MS c that has them in the plural (כְּרָבִים). 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 $< S T$.

Against a direct relationship between $S$ and $< S T$ is the presence of the second instance of the verb יִּשְׁמַר (יִשְׁמַר) in $S$, which is absent in $< S T$ (some MSS of $< S T$ contain it; O-62 καὶ εἰσερχομένος). Furthermore, the substitution of the introductory verb יְבַלָּה by יָשָׁר, "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 לִצְרָעָה, "before my eyes," was translated by its Syriac cognate idiom לִצְרָעָה, "before my sight/eyes"; on the other hand $< S T$ renders it by a preposition and the enclitic pronoun εἰς πρόσωπόν μου, "before me." This indicates that $S$ did not base its translation on $< S T$.

Ezek 10:3

(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., בָּאָה, "when he entered," by the Peal Ptc.
with the temporal mark אֵין רֶפֶן, "when entering," which is the consistent way Syriac renders the Hebrew Inf. Constr. structure. סֵפֶר renders it by the form אֵין רֶפֶן אֵין רֶפֶן אֵין רֶפֶן (Dep. Inf.), "while entering," probably a Hebraism. Notice that the word order is different between ס and סֵפֶר. The latter agrees with the order of נָס, 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 כָּסַוס, for instance the Q. Perf. כָּסַוס כָּסַוס, "it filled," was rendered by כָּסַוס כָּסַוס (Ethpe.), which can have the same time reference as the simple Perfect, but in the passive voice, "it was filled." 2 ה' adds כָּסַוס כָּסַוס, "dark misty, dense," after the word כָּסַוס, "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

(III) יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא

(5) יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא הָכִיתֶת יִירָמָא

1 Moule, 174: "אֵין רֶפֶן with Infin. in a temporal sense (as distinct from the sense consisting of) seems to be a Hebraism."

2 This can be classified as a shared variant/nonvariant according to Lund's criteria, p. 409. See Guidelines, p. 19.
(Trans. of $) "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

$ has a unique reading by rendering the first instance of the nomen sacrum as נְאָלָה, "God," and the second by נְאָמו, "Lord" (only MS 1111 has both instances as נְאָמו). $ translates both by קֵינַו, "Lord." A further reading peculiar to $ is the addition of נְאָמו, "inner," to qualify פָּאֲרָה, "and the court," as in the preceding verse ("inner court").

Another clear difference between $ and $ $ $ 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 $ 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 נְאָלו, "cherub," in the singular by $ indicates that the Syriac version has a closer relationship to the reading found in א than to that in $ $ concerning this verse, for the latter has a Hebrew transliteration χερουβιν in the plural (only MSS Q-88 read χερουβ as in א).
Ezek 10:5

(Trans. of S) “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 הַיָּדָה. The only significant deviations are the rendering of the Ni. Perf. וּכְאָמֵת by the common Syriac usage of the composite tense קֶשֶׁת Ethpe. Ptc. plus the enclitic form of the verb קֹרֶא, “to be,” namely קֹרֶא קְשֶׁם, “[it] was being heard,” whereas ꞌסָנָה has the Imperf. 3° s. קָשַׁמּוּ וְקָשַׁה, “it was heard,” and the rendering of the Pi. Inf. Constr. אֶת הַדָּבָר, “when he speaks,” by the Pael Ptc. קָשֵׁמ + א, “speaking,” preceded by the temporal particle קֵמ, “when.” Notice that ꞌסָנָה has a participle also, קְשַׁמּוּ וְקָשַׁה, “speaking,” without the temporal marker “when.” The crucial difference, however, is the rendering of the nomen sacrum God. S reads קָשַׁמ שְׂם, “God,” while ꞌסָנָה has transliterated it with an additional explanatory apposition of it, namely שְׂם שְׂם קָשַׁמ שְׂם. ꞌס also has יְמָש, but it avoids

---

1Nöldeke, § 263; Muraoka, § 70.
anthropomorphism by substituting the expression, “like the voice of Shaday,” by “like a sound/voice from before Shaday.” Therefore, $S$ is not related to any of the versions, but has its unique rendering of the text.

**Ezek 10:6**

(Trans, of $S$) “When he commanded the man, who was dressed in linen, he told him, ‘Take fire from between the wheels from among the cherubim,’ and he went and stood at the side of the wheels.”

**Analysis of the Variants**

Although $S$ has a peculiar reading, it agrees mostly with $M$. 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. 

and when he commanded." Ґ і has �� 팀 ὑ ἐ ντέλλεσθαι ἀ ω τό ν, “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 ᾲ ν, “and it happened,” is present in Ґ і (καὶ ἐ γένετο, Hebraism), but avoided in Ѕ.

Another indication of a high level of literary skills is the rendering of the two synonymous Hebrew words for “wheel,” יב and יב. Ѕ translates both using the same Syriac word ݲݿ “wheels,” since the text is about the same wheels. Probably this was done to avoid misunderstanding or ambiguity. Ґ і and  `$` also translate both instances by the same correspondent Greek or Aramaic word, ρξων and יב.

The usual Hebrew introduction of a Direct Speech, the Inf. Constr. מ ר, “saying,” is translated by a more direct expression in Ѕ, the Peal Perf. plus the Ind. Obj. מ ר, “he said to him,” while Ґ і and  `$` keep the Hebrew expression conveyed in their Participle and Infinitive respectively, מ ר and מ ר, “saying,” which can be considered a Hebraism in the case of Ґ і.

Ґ і contains an extra-Masoretic reading, which is not shared by any other ancient version. It is the addition of יב, “sacred,” after יב, long “robe,” that can be considered an explanatory gloss rather than an actual reading of its Vorlage. Furthermore,
reads a Ptc. of place1 ἐχομένος, “neighboring, close, near,” for the Hebrew יָגוֹז, “side.” The only exception to this reading is Cod. 86 which reads πλησίον, “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

(м) יָנוּכַּב יִדֶּנִית לְכַבְּרֹבִים אֵלֶּה אָמַר
בִּנְתֵּי הֶֽכַּבְּרוֹבִים רִשָּׁה וּרְזָהּ לָמָּן לְבָשּׂׂתָ דַּבְּרִים וּקְהַֽיִּים

(ס) סִֽמְכַּל מִֽפֳּכַס מַכְּפַסְתָּ לִמְכַסָּ טַמְלָא סְמַכְּתָהּ לִמְכַסָּ טַמְלָא סְמַכְּתָהּ לִמְכַסָּ טַמְלָא

(א) אַואָסְפִים הָרְבִים יִדְוֵה מֶבֶנֶים כְּרַבִּים לֶאַשָּׂא לְבָנִי

(ס') כְּרוּבִים תְּמוֹכִים וּדְמֵית לְחַפִּים לָלוֹשִׁים לְכַבְּרֹבִים מֵיסִים

(ס') קַיֶּהֶלְתֵּינֵנָא תִּהְנָא χειρά αὐτοῦ εἰς μέσον τοῦ πυρὸς τοῦ ὄντος ἐν μέσῳ τῶν χερουμίν καὶ ἔλαβεν καὶ ἔδωκεν εἰς τὰς χειράς τοῦ ἐνδεδυκτός τὴν στολὴν τὴν ἀγγείαν, καὶ ἔλαβεν καὶ ἔξελθεν.

(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 $\Theta$, $\theta$, and $\Gamma$. Notice that the Hebrew verbs $\text{שָׁנַה}, \text{“and he took,”}$ and $\text{נְפָר}, \text{“and he took,”}$ are rendered by
the same Greek verb $\varepsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\nu$ and the Aramaic verb $\text{מִשְׁכָּר}, \text{“and he took,”}$ whereas $S$ uses
synonymous verbs ($\text{סָנַה} \text{and} \text{סָנַה}, \text{“and he took”}$) for the instances as they occur in $\Gamma$.

The unique reading found in the Syriac version can be explained by its characteristic
feature of avoiding ambiguity; $S$ adds $\text{כָּרָב}, \text{“of the man,”}$ in the text, making sure that
the hands where the cherub placed the fire belonged to the man dressed in linen and not
another cherub.

$\Theta$ has several omissions which are ignored by $\delta$ (e.g., $\text{כְּרַב} \text{and} \text{כְּרַב}, \text{“long sacred robe.”}$ but none of them gives any indication for a Syriac relationship. $\Theta$ contains $\text{רְשֵׁם \şׅולשְׁנָךְ \רְשֵׁם \אָגִיל} \text{, “a long sacred robe.”}$ The last part ($\text{רְשֵׁם \אָגִיל}$) 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

ורָא לַכְּרַבִּים חֲבִיָּה יֶרֶדֶת מֵהָתֶם (III)
(5) 

Analysis of the Variants

In this case S is similar to icaid (except MS A). Both versions read סנמ and כק
eidon, “and I saw,” against the Masoretic reading ני. 3° m. s. א人死亡, “and it was shown, or
appeared.” This can be explained based on the unvowed Hebrew text, or based on the
preceeding chapter where סנמ, “and I saw,” was used instead of והנה, “and behold” (9:2,
11), and here (10:8) for the verb הוהי. 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. 41 agrees with the reading of מ.

Ezek 10:9

(9) זראקר נהדנה ארבעה אופנים על הכסנפה סף את חק אלגל הכסנפה
אחת אופנים את חק על הכסנפה סף את חק את חק
סנמ הטו האותים את חק האותים את חק האותים את חק האותים את חק
סנמ הטו האותים את חק האותים את חק האותים את חק האותים את חק
סנמ הטו האותים את חק האותים את חק האותים את חק האותים את חק

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
(CJ) s n ro noon in b:b; tvzrro “itson Kb bj nam» «m mm
ana p «
yvo
K ‘bib: trm in t a r o  noon ttt b:bn in
(C © )
icai
e t S o v  te a l
ISou
T p o x o i Tcaoapesr
e la T fj tc c ia a v  e x d n c va i
t u v
x ^ p o i^ iv ,

(Trans. of §) “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 & (B, 147, 311-46, 764-130-233) omitted the second instance of the
Hebrew nominal sentence, “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 &A contain it, e.g., (X O, Cod. 86) X τρο χως εἰς
ἐχόμενοι (ἐρχ. 91) χερουβ (τού χ. Α; του χερουβειμ του 62; -β(ειμ L-36-538, 87-
239-613, 26; twν χερουβιμ 410) έος (> A, 407) and rel, and because avoidance of

1Moshe Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20, AB, vol. 22 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 48
and 181: Greenberg supports the distributive force of this repetition; see also Jotom-
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 T because there are several key differences that do not allow for that conclusion. For instance, S omits וננה, whereas T has it, and the rendering of the two instances of the prep. ב, "beside," is by a long verbal sentence Pluperfect 3° pl. plus the Ptc. of ἐγέρσαι in its participial adverbial usage, namely εἰστήκεισαν ἐγέρσαι, "stood close," for the first instance, and for the second by the Ptc. used as an Adv. of place ἐγέρσαι, "close, near." S, on the contrary, uses its Syriac noun נכת "side," in a construct state, and T has בכסר, "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 יירה, which is transliterated by S, while T interpreted it as being ייווע offers (א' χρυσολυθρου; ο' ναρυνθου; εβ' and θ' παρασι), and T reads סב, "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

ברמחם אל אראנה רביןום ילך לא י√ יכ הב ט��

המקס אפר יเด็ก וראשה אחותי ילך לא יכ הב ט��

ססס זבוליים ססס, על זבוליים מניחים, של זבוליים פך, פך, פך. (S)
And while they were going, toward their four sides they were going, without turning, except to the place where the first of them was going; after him they went and they were not turning.

Analysis of the Variants

The main point to be noticed here is the "Syriacization" of the text of $\text{S}$, whereas $\text{GT}$ 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 $\text{κανά}$). $\text{GT}$, however, employs a non-Greek form for translating these Hebrew Inf. Constr., namely $\text{év tū plus Inf.}$, which is considered a Hebraism in Greek.

Notice the closeness of $\text{S}$ to $\text{M}$ by the use of the Syriac cognate word $\text{μέτοχος}$, "first (head) of them," for the Hebrew counterpart $\text{שאכום}, "the head," while $\text{T}$ has an

---

1 Muraoka, § 71.

2 Ibid.; Moule, 174.
Aramaic synonym, but not cognate word, כָּנָּה, “the first.” Q reads two nouns in apposition, הָאָרְכָּה וַחֲמָא, “the first one (the first, the one in the beginning)”; only Cod. Q has הַכֹּפֶלַח (א’ וְנֵעֶלַח כֹּפֶלַח; ב’ אֶרְכָּה אֲרָךְ; ג’ פָּרָט). Therefore one may conclude that the Syriac version was a very skillfully translated version based on a Hebrew text very similar to that of מ.

Ezek 10:12

(מ) לכל באסקים יהוה וירדיהו והוא创客 יאניين טוני סבכ לארבטמו אפרים

(ס) מחמלס חססלי סמטסלי מ الأنש])))

(ס) לכל באסקים יהוה וירדיהו והוא创客 יאניינ טלליין טוני סבכ לארבטמו הנללי

(ס) קא אוי נפלי אעתון קא אינורפש איבון קא אינורפש איבון קא אינורפש איבון

(ס) תרויויי פלירפי איבלים קקולון תוכי תסארובו תרויויי איבון.

(Trans. of 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

ס has a unique reading not found elsewhere in the ancient versions. The last portion of the verse, כָּנָּה לארבטמו אפרים, “round about to the four of them, their wheels,” which is an awkward phrase, is rendered by כָּנָּה לארבטמו אפרים, “as/when they were going around toward their sides.” It is not easy to explain this reformulation of the Syriac text, but one can suggest some possibilities. It could have been an attempt to improve the
sense of the verse in the target language, in this case Syriac, employing the verb "to
go round about," in a composite tense implying a continual, habitual action in the past, for
the Hebrew Adv. "round about," and by substituting the last two Hebrew words
that seem to be syntactically misplaced, by a clearer Syriac prepositional phrase "toward their sides." Another possibility is that the Syriac scribe harmonized it with vs.
11, which reads, "as they went toward their four sides."

* omits, "and their whole body," while * has it in (א O) και πασαί
αι σαρκες (πασα η σαρκ prob. π. s. III) αυτων O' III. Notice that α', ς', and θ', Cod.
87-91 contain it as in Μ, init) pr. * και (Cod. 91) πασαί αι σαρκες αυτων (-του
87-91) Qtxt 86 (without * ) 87-91 (both are without * ).

C' agrees with Μ, its only deviation being the repetition of "round about," for
emphasis, which is an Aramaic feature and not a deviation per se. Therefore the Syriac
version is on its own regarding the translation of this verse.

Ezek 10:13

(Μ) דאמשה דאמשה דאמשה דאמשה דאמשה דאמשה דאמשה דאמשה דאمش

(ס) דאמשה דאמשה דאمش

(צ') דאמשה דאמשה דאمش

(* כ) רכז וס R eproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Analysis of the Variants

S has a unique reading due to an editorial arrangement of the text. The Syriac scribe skillfully managed to smooth the Syriac translation by rendering the Pual קִרְא, "it was called," by the active Peal קִרְא, "he called" (rôT has a passive reading as in M), and by substituting the Hebrew idiom רָאתי אֵבֶן, "in my ears," by a Syriac prepositional phrase with a similar sense כָּאָר, "before me," indicating proximity, whereas S has אָדוֹן נִמְסָי, "in my hearing," which is closer to the Hebrew expression "in my ears," and can be a Hebraism.

CJ agrees with M, while rôT transliterates the Hebrew word דְּלֵלָה, "whirling [wheel]," as גֶּלְגֶּל, even to the point that M S 62 transliterates the Hebrew article את גֶּלְגֶּל. α' reads τρόχος, "wheel," α', Q, and Cods. 86, 87 have κυλισμάτα, "whirling," and Cod. 91 reads ερμηνεύεται τρόχος, "proclaiming/interpreting wheel."

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

Ezek 10:14

(M) "וַיֵּאָרְבָּה פִּינָה לָאָדוֹן פִּי הָאָדָם פִּי נֹעָר הָעַלִילָה פִּנָי אָדוֹן נִמְסָי מִנָּנֵי" (M)

(S) "וַיֵּאָרְבָּה פִּינָה לָאָדוֹן פִּי נֹעָר הָעַלִילָה פִּנָי אָדוֹן נִמְסָי מִנָּנֵי" (S)

(CJ) "וַיֵּאָרְבָּה פִּינָה לָאָדוֹן פִּי נֹעָר הָעַלִילָה פִּנָי אָדוֹן נִמְסָי מִנָּנֵי" (CJ)

This verse shows that though the reading of S is closely related that of M, the Syriac scribe strives to render his translation into good Syriac style, which is not the case of rôT into Greek.
(om. in $\Theta^*$ but present in $\Theta^A$) καὶ ἑσσερα προσώπα τῷ ενὶ τὸ προσώπον τοῦ ἐνὸς προσώπον τοῦ χερουβ καὶ τὸ προσώπον τοῦ δευτέρου προσώπον αὐθρωπόν καὶ τὸ τρίτον προσώπον λεοντός καὶ τὸ τετάρτον προσώπον αἰετοῦ.

(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 τῷ ενὶ, “belonging to each one,” into a clearer idiom in the Syriac language ᾲμασὰ ὑπὲρ τῶν, “belonging to every one of them,” thus making the Syriac syntax of the sentence smoother to its reader, avoiding ambiguity; whereas $\Theta^A$ contains what seems to be a Hebraism τῷ ενὶ, “of each” ($\Theta^*$ 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 ἀρτος, ἀρτος, ἀρτος, “second, third, and fourth,” respectively, by the same Syriac word ἀρτος, ἀρτος, “and the next,” which

¹Vs. 14 reads as follows in $\Theta^A$: καὶ ἑσσερα προσώπα τῷ ενὶ (+ καὶ 534) τὸ προσώπον τοῦ ἐνὸς (εἰχεν ἐκαστὸν τῶν ζωῶν τὸ προσώπον τὸ εν L’-46-311 et εἰχε τ. ζ. εκ. καὶ τὸ προσ. τὸ εν 46 πρὸ τῷ ενὶ τὸ πρ. τοῦ ε.) προσώπον (>544) τοῦ (τῶν 26, 410: >A, L’’-710) χερου (-βι 147; -β(ε)μ 62, 48c-II, 87c-II-613, 26, 410) καὶ το (>62’, V-46) προσώπον τοῦ δευτέρου (τὸ δευτέρου πρὸ τοῦ δευτ. L’’-311) προσώπον αὐθρωπόν καὶ τὸ τρίτον (τὸ προσώπον τοῦ τριτοῦ πρὸ τοῦ τριτοῦ A) προσώπον λεοντός καὶ τὸ τετάρτον προσώπον αἰετοῦ rel., see Apparatus of the Göttingen Edition. This verse also appears in Cod. Qtxt.
reflects more of an editorial work than its Vorlage. Σ reads τοῦ δευτέρου, τοῦ τρίτου, and τοῦ τέταρτου, similar to the Masoretic reading.

Ezek 10:16

(III) (S) (C)

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 אֶלָּת, “when,” and the Imperfect by the same grammatical structure without the temporal particle. As was mentioned before, the composite tense
(Ptc. + enclitic) is the normal Syriac feature to express a habitual action in the past. \( \text{God} \) renders the Inf. Constr. by a Hebraism, namely \( \text{ev} \, \tau \omega \, + \, \text{Inf.} \).  

\( S \) substitutes the Hebrew expressions פָּלַס, "beside them" (prep. of place), and פָלַס, "from beside them" (of source), by two simple Syriac expressions פָּלַס, "with them" (of accompaniment), and פָּלַס, "from them" (of source), respectively. \( \text{God}^* \) translates the first instance by the participle of place plus the pronoun פָּלַס, "near them," and the second instance is omitted in \( \text{God}^* \), but present in \( \text{God}^A \), e.g., \( \text{fin] + (X O) \) καὶ γε οὐτοὶ από τῶν (απ οὐτῶν or probably από τῶν 106; om. από τῶν 46) εξομένα (των 147). L. 449*, 764-233-613, 544) αὐτῶν (των 233) rel., and also in an asterisk in Cod. Q\( ^\text{ix} \) καὶ γε αὐτοὶ από τῶν εξομένα (α πλησίον) Cod. 86) αὐτῶν. \( \text{God}^! \) agrees with the reading of \( \text{M} \); its sole deviation is the substitution of the word יָם, "heavens."

**Ezek 10:17**

(\( \text{M} \)) בּּוּדֵמְתָה תַּשָּׁמְתָה וְבוּדֵמְתָה יֵרְמֵמָה אֶזְכָּר לְךָ יְהוָה בָּהֵם

(\( S \)) עֶשְׂבֵּיתָמְתָה מֶשְׁבֵּיתָמְתָה מֶשְׂבֵּיָּמְתָּה בּּוּדֵמְתָּה וְבוּדֵמְתָּה יֵרְמֵמָה אֶזְכָּר לְךָ יְהוָה בָּהֵם

(\( \text{God}^* \)) εν τῷ ἐστάναι αὐτὰ εἰστήκεισαν καὶ εν τῷ μετευπίζεοντα αὐτὰ ἐμετευπίζοντο μετ' αὐτῶν, διότι πνεῦμα ζωῆς εν αὐτοῖς ἦν.

---

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 ܢܗܪܐ ܢܗܪܐ, “. . . cherubim their wings,” was added to ܐܠܐ ܐܠܐ, “when the cherubim lifted their wings up,” and the plural noun ܕܐܢܐ “wheels” (some MSS of א have this reading, e.g., 239 ܐܢ ܬܘ ܡܢܘܐ, ܢܢ ܐܢ ܬܘ ܡܢܘܐ 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 ܐܢܐ “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.

Τ agrees with Μ precisely, while Τ struggles to render a reading as close as possible to its Hebrew text, even containing several Hebraisms. For instance, Τ translates the Inf. Constr. by the grammatical construction εν τω + Inf. + pronoun, which is a Hebraism.

The only relationship between S and Τ is a reading found in Α 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

(Γ) εἰρέαν τὸν χορηγὸν ἡμῶν καὶ ἐνεργῆσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐνώπιον ἡμῶν εὐνυμανεῖν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκλέξειν αὐτὰ καὶ οἱ προθυρίνες εἰσέλθῃν αὐτῶν καὶ ἔστησαι ἐπὶ τὰ πρόθυρα τῆς πύλης οἰκου κυρίου τῆς ἀπέναντι, καὶ δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἦν ἐπὶ αὐτῶν ὑπεράνω.
(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 ס) regarding the number of the Hebrew verb רוחם, “and it stood.” S renders it by the plural form of the verb אسس, “and they stood,” probably referring to the cherubim as its antecedent, while מ and also כ refer back to the singular noun זכאריה, “and the glory.”

ס has a unique reading (except α' אנהווקס Cod. 86 θ' κατ' אנהווקס Cod. 86, and 91) that may be due to a misunderstanding of the Adj. הקדריך, “the eastern,” by the preposition ב, “before, in front,” rendered by the Greek τῆς ἀπέναντι, “the front, opposite.” Another possibility is that the scribe was familiar with the geography of Jerusalem and tried to give a better orientation to that gate. S agrees with מ in this regard.

ס has an equivalent substitution for the Hebrew idiom ליעיני, “before my eyes,” that is επιδειξιον μου, “before me.” Only Cod. 86 and α’ read similarly to מ κατ' оφαλμους (μου), “to my eyes.”

Ezek 10:21
Analysis of the Variants

S and CJ agree with the Masoretic reading. In this case S is a literal translation of its Hebrew Vorlage; the only difference can be explained by the use of a Syriac literary style. S renders both instances of תִּאְדוּחֵל, “each one [had],” by a Syriac equivalent expression that makes clearer the syntactical context of the verse אָדוּחֵל מִנֵּה, “each of them [had].” The expression אָדוּחֵל, “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 נְדוֹחֶל, “four.” S and CJ contain it in their text, while it is absent in ג, but present in some MSS of גא (X O-Syh) Q-Syh-62 תֹּטָאַּרֵא (α, θ, and Qtxt have an asterisk before the first instance of תֹּטָאַּרֵא X תֹּטָאַּרֵא). These readings are a strong evidence against BHS’s suggestion.

Notice also the unique reading of ג, כָּל הַקָּטְלָה תֹּטָעֲגַּוֶּי, “and eight wings,” for ארבע ענפים כָּנָפָם, “and four wings.” גא, however, has the Masoretic reading in MSS O, 538, Cc' (871xt, 911xt)-534-86-403'. Regarding numerical figures, the Peshitta of Ezek 1-12
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always agrees with מ.

Ezek 10:22

The Syriac scribe makes some adjustments that make the text more readable without losing its agreement with the Masoretic reading. For instance, S adds כ, “like,” before non, “they [were],” where one would expect the Hebrew preposition כ, “like”; and the awkward word כ, “and their sign,” is substituted by כ, “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 כ, “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 T omits it completely, it
adds ὑποκάτω τῆς δόξης θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ, “under the glory of God of Israel,” after ראיים, “I saw.” This might be a harmonization with vs. 19 that contains it. The word מראים, “their appearance,” is found in S, but omitted in ®*, though some MSS of ®A have it, e.g., L-311-V-46 read τὸ εἰδος αὐτῶν; (ς Θ) τὴν ὀρασίν αὐτῶν rel. (θ' + σ τὴν ὀρασίν αὐτῶν Q').

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 ®.

2. S avoids Hebraisms while ®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 ®T and S can be explained by common translation techniques (10:8, 9).

7. Regarding numerical figures S agrees with ® (10:21).
CHAPTER XII

EZEKIEL 11

Collation

11:1  
2° קְרֵסָא "eastern."  
[וְהָנַן] Subsit. קְרֵסָא “and I saw.”  
Collective נֶפֶשׂ] pl. נֶפֶשׁ “men.”  
[זָה] קְרֵסָא “standing” in 8a1.

11:2  
[זֶה] קְרֵסָא + [תַּא] קְרֵסָא "the Lord."  

11:3  
אֲלֵה וְעֻסָא “is it.”  
Q. Inf. Constr. בְּבֵדֵרְבָּו] Subsit. קְרֵסָא “in her midst.”  
Q. Inf. Constr. בְּבֵדֵרְבָּו] Peal Perf. 1 c. pl. קְרֵסָא “we have built/we are building.”

11:5  
[ז] קְרֵסָא, 8א1, 9ד1.2, 10ד1, 11ד1.2, 12א1, 12ד1-3 → קְרֵסָא “says the Lord of Authority.”

11:6  
[ז] קְרֵסָא + [תַּא] קְרֵסָא “your killed ones.”  
[ז] קְרֵסָא] Synonym קְרֵסָא “her market-places.”

11:7  
[ז] קְרֵסָא + [תַּא] קְרֵסָא “because of that.”

copula.

11:10

11:12

11:13 Ni. Inf. Constr. + suf. 1° c. s. [כְּבֵנָא] Temp. particle + Ethpe. Perf. 1° c. pl. וַיֵּאמֶר "and when I had prophesied."

11:14 tr. רָבָר יָהּ

11:15 Substit. יָשָׁרְלָה "they will be anihilated." אַלֹם קְשֶׂם "captivey."

11:16 + Causal particle וְלָא "for." 1° and 2° om.


11:18 1° om.


11:19 Substit. יָשָׁרְלָה "new."

11:20 Synonym בְּכַרְבָּכָם "in them."

11:21 Idiom לְמַעֵן + וְלָא "in the mind/conscience."

Suf. Pron. 3° pl. ָמָשׁה Substit. 6h15 וַיִּמָּשׁוּק "in them."

Suf. Pron. 2° pl. וַיֵּאמֶר "I will assemble you."
“your images and your abominations.” Chaldeans.”

11:22 "and it departed with them.”

om.

11:24 “to the land of the

Data Analysis

Ezek 11:1
(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 "eastern," after the first instance of "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 "behold," by "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 "standing," added to the text after "men" (collective), with the aim of making the text flow smoothly.

S' is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of P, whereas G has "about 25 men," indicating that the scribe was unsure of the number of men gathered in the house of the Lord, while P and S were precise in their figures.

Ezek 11:2

Ezekiel 11:2
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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 T inasmuch as both employ the same translation technique. Both, especially S, strive to avoid ambiguity. Notice that the subject of the verb רומז is in the 3° m. s., therefore its antecedent cannot be המר, "spirit" (vs. 1), for that is a feminine noun. Thus S and T added מִסְחָס, "the Lord," as the one speaking to the prophet. This is not evidence for a direct relationship between them, but an indication of a shared translation technique to avoid ambiguity.

Ezek 11:3

And saying, 'Is it not near to build houses in the midst of it [city]?' This is
the caldron and we are the flesh’.

Analysis of the Variants

All three versions make a syntactical arrangement of their text in relationship to that of MT. They try to avoid any misunderstanding of the ambiguous text. Thus the key Hebrew expression is the Inf. Constr. with the prepositional phrase functioning as an Adv. of time and the neg. particle, namely, “Is it not near to build houses?” It, as well as the relative Ptc. "who were saying,” does not have their common subject in this verse but in vs. 1, namely the “twenty-five men.” 5 recognizes it by rendering the Hebrew Inf. by the Syriac Peal Perf. 1° c. pl. "we are building.” In this case, “we” would be the twenty-five men gathered at the house of the Lord. The syntactic construction of the second part of the verse supports the Syriac interpretation, "she is the caldron and we are the flesh.” “She” is the city and “we” are the twenty-five men, probably the leaders of the city. The Syriac scribe strived to make a translation that would render not only its Hebrew text but also good Syriac style, avoiding ambiguity as much as possible.

renders the Inf. Constr. by the Perf. 3° pl. "they have built for themselves”; also the subject of the Greek verb is the twenty-five men. Although 3 has several epexegetical additions to the text, it renders the Inf. Constr. by its Aramaic cognate Inf. Constr. without any deviation.
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 "Lord of Authority" (7h2, 8a1, 9d1.2, 10d1, 11d1.2, 12a1, 12d1-3), for the two instances of מַשׁ found in M (7a1 has only מַשׁ). 6A contains a reading similar to that of S in several of its MSS, e.g., α琎-carious L'-311, C'-86'-393 (κυρίος α琎-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 תיתשת, "I know it," is rendered in the Syriac version by יִדֶשׁ, "I know them," indicating that the Syriac scribe corrected the syntactical disagreement of the Masoretic reading (number agreement between the Direct
Object of its antecedent, "things that come up in your mind"), which is rendered in ג by אגא "I understand" (MS 62 + ס), and that the Syriac scribe recognized the casus pendens of the pronoun א; אמ "sons of Israel.

Ezek gives an extended version of the Hebrew text substituting the Construct chain י ל, "spirit of the Lord," by י ל, "the spirit of prophecy from before the Lord," probably to avoid anthropomorphism, and by rendering י ל המעולים מהברא, "and the things that come up in your mind (spirit)," into a more explanatory translation י לאו, "what you are planning," and the last Hebrew nominal sentence by the Aramaic translation י ל עלי להב וקרפ נל, "and the things that come up in your mind (heart) are revealed before me."

Ezek 11:6

הבריה התליבס בעיר העמה חלויות וחלות (III)

טוחנה ו׳לתCog��בשכש שם. חאלת עכם של. (S)

אשיתן קסילקור בקדרה הודא תיליתון פקירה קפלן (C)

(א) אסילקנ יקונס פקירה ומיליתון פקירה קפלין (א) אסילקנ יקונס פקירה ומיליתון פקירה קפלין (א)

(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 בֵּית הבָּנָה, "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 סָפַר, "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 רָתִים, "killed by the sword." On the other hand, the Hebrew verb לֶחֶם may be taken as a case of homonymy between the Hebrew and Syriac languages. The corresponding homonymous Syriac verb is the Pael פָּאֵל, "to purify, wash away, etc."

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

Although כָּפַר is related to S by translating תָּבְרִים, "her outside," with the Aramaic noun וַתְּבוּרְנָה, "her marketplace, broad street, city quarter," as it occurs in S וַתְּבוּרְנָה, "her marketplaces, street," כָּפַר has the same noun for both instances of the Hebrew הבָּנָה, which
is the Aramaic generic term for any type of killing (כмя).

Ezek 11:7

לבך כל אשר עדין יהי הלחם אשר שמה בוהכה הנאם שהר והיה תמר ואמות ופרס הועצה מועצת

Ezekiel 11:7

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 ⁵ and ⁶ is overshadowed by their overwhelming differences. For instance, the Hi. Perf. 3° m. s. שלחה, “he brings [you] forth” (which may be a scribal error for שלחה, 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 מְהַכַּם אַל נָה, “I am bringing [you] out,” while ס ת translates it by the Fut. Act. Ind. 1° s. הִדְּגַּז, “I will lead [you] out.” Both versions try to make sense out of the Hi. 3° m. s. נָהַצָּה, for it is in a direct speech in which יָחָד יְהֹוָה is speaking.

Then who is the antecedent of the person of the Hi. verb form since it is in the third person? Probably the Syriac and Septuagintal scribes corrected the text based on vs. 9 (vs. 9 in מ has the first person for this same verb). Although ס has an exilic interpretative expansion of the text, it employs a verb in the first person also; it reads אֲנִי, “I will exile [you] out” (see vs. 9 for the same reading).

Also, notice the careful construction of the expression מַהַקָּם אַל נָה, “they are the flesh.” This is a good Syriac construction: “The enclitic forms (אִלָּא) 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

(מ) בה לא תהי כלב עלון ואמו ותהי בותכה עבכתי אל נבוק ישראל אעספ אדום

(ס) מָהֵת אַל פָּאֵשֶׁת לֵיהָ מַמָּשׁ מַאֲשָׁף אַל פָּאֵשׁ מַאֲשָׁף

(ס) מַאֲשָׁף מֶלֶת פַּתָּם אַל הָאָשׁ מַאֲשָׁף

(ס) בה לא תהי כלב עלון ואמו ותהי בותכה עבכתי (ס)

בכשלא כיtolower על תוהם אררטא דירשאלו אאפב מוכך

1Muraoka, Classical Syriac for Hebraists, § 68.

2Ibid., § 10; Nöldeke, § 64.
(S*) ἀυτῇ ὑμῖν οὐκ ἔσται εἰς λῆψια, καὶ ὑμεῖς οὐ μὴ γεννηθεὶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς ἐἰς κρέα· ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρίων τοῦ Ἰσραήλ κρύνῃ 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 \( \text{G}^{\text{A}} \) 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 \( \text{P} \). \( \text{C}^1 \) gives again a direct exilic interpretation of this verse by rendering כָּבָּשׁ אָדָם נֶפֶשׁ יְהוָה, “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

(\( \text{P} \)) Ῥωδενεῖ χίνα ἵππα βάπτῃ, ἄν ἄλληται μισσήμον (\( \text{G}^\text{A} \))

לֹא ἐν σέστη ἔμμαστα γῆν ἀνευσαμενοιν σφαίρας

כְּבָּשׁ אָדָם נֶפֶשׁ יְהוָה, מִסְמַר אֵיךְ מַסְמַרוּנָּה (\( \text{C}^1 \))

לֹא מַסְמַר נְפָשׁוֹת נָפָשִׁים מִסְמַרֹת מַסְמַרֹת

ותוֹדְעָת אַיא אָשִׁי דְּבָקָם לֹא אֱלֹהִים וָרָחִים (\( \text{P} \))

לֹא מִסְמַרֹת עֵמֶסֶת עֵמֶסֶת מִסְמַרֹת עֵמֶסֶת

(\( \text{G}^* \)) καὶ ἐπιγνώσθη ὁ ἐγώ κύριος.

\(^{1}\text{Levey, 41, n. 2.}\)
(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; $^\text{*}$ has only καὶ ἐπηγνώσεις διότι ἐγὼ κύριος, but $^\text{A}$ contains it in several MSS in its entirety, e.g., ( xi O, 86 ms, 449) οτι εν τοις δικαιωμασιν μου ουκ ἐπορευθητε και τα κριματα μου (>147) κατα (>88-147, 86ms, 410) τα κριματα των εθνων των περικυκλω υμων (+ ουκ 62 L'-311) εποιησατε O', L'-311, 86ms, 403', 410. Also an asterisk appears in θ' οτι εν τοις δικαιωμασιν μου ουκ ἐπορευθητε και τα κριματα μου ουκ ἐποιησατε και κατα τα κριματα των εθνων των περικυκλω υμων εποιησατε Q\text{xx}. $^\text{C'}$ agrees with the Masoretic reading for the entire verse with the sole exception of the word וּכְשָׁפַטְךָ, “and according to the judgments of,” which is rendered by וָכֹכֶסְךָ, “according to the practices of.”

$^\text{S}$ is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of $^\text{M}$, based on the Syriac rendering of the Hebrew והיה אלהי ולך, “that I am the Lord,” which is כִּי אֲנִי אֱלֹהִי, “that I am the Lord.” The consistent use of the pron. כִּי as a copula to translate this Hebrew formula (והיה אלהי ולך) 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.
Analysis of the Variants

The language of S is purely Syriac in syntax and grammar, while ṢT has some Hebraisms. For instance, the Ni. Inf. Constr. plus suf. pron. became, "while I was prophesying," was rendered by the Syriac Ethpe. Imperf. with an introductory circumstantial or temporal particle made, "and when I was prophesying," omitting the Hebrew 

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  does not contain the Hebrew word ב, having instead the genitive with a relative particle ב כנהו בanaía, “the one of Banaia” (cf. vs. 1).  introduces an expansion that is unique to its text כנהו, “receive my prayer.” Therefore each version had its own characteristics regarding this verse.

Ezek 11:14

( ) ש ה יז ר יז יא ר ( )
( ) מז ל ה יז ( )
( ) מז ל ( )
( ) מז ל ( )
( ) מז ל ( )
( ) מז ל ( )
( ) מז ל ( )
( ) מז ל ( )
( Trans. of ) “And the word of the Lord was upon me saying.”

Analysis of the Variants

avoids anthropomorphic representation of God by rendering מז ל by מז ל “the word of the prophecy from before the Lord.”  and  translate it literally.

Ezek 11:15

( ) מז ל ( )
( ) מז ל ( )
Analysis of the Variants

The S and ℶ versions have both instances of ἡρωτάς, “your brothers,” which is suggested to be a dittographic error in ℶ, thus deserving to be deleted according to BHS App. Though ℶ* omits it, ℶA contains it in some of its MSS. 1ο οὐν] + ἀδελφοὶ σου O-88-62; and 88 + καὶ ἀδελφαί σου.1 Also ὠ γ and Cod. 86 Q[ex have both instances introduced by an asterisk *. Therefore, the majority is in favor of ℶ 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.
The similarity in the rendering of רָחִיבְךָ, "your kindred," which is translated as רָחֵצִיךָ, "close relative," in קJ and also by א', ὀ', θ' αὐχυστευν, "close relative, heir at law," was rendered as ὁμοανακόρομα, "of your captivity," in ס and τῆς ἀληθείας σου "your captivity," in שT. 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 רָחִיבְךָ, "your kindred," has a similar spelling to רָחֵצִיךָ, "your captivity/exile," which is the spelling suggested by BHS.

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

The Hebrew word רָחַד, which can be an Imper. or a Perf. 3° c. pl., was rendered by the Syriac scribe as ἐθπά. Perf. 3° c. pl. ἀποστάσις, "they have been removed far away." The change from active to passive voice is more a choice of the translator than an actual
translation of S’s Vorlage. Regarding this type of variation Lund stated that “both text and translation technique adequately account for such differences, so much so that it is impossible to decide between them as to the raison d’être for most cases.” ¹ (See from passive to active voice change in the collation of verses 1:20, 21; 3:4; 10:11, 13, 16; 12:25, 28.).

C has a similar reading, but it adds an expansion to the text, "you have gone far from the worship of the Lord." assium, on the other hand, has Μακρὰν ἀπέχετε, “far have you gone,” a Pres. 2nd pl., which is a translation based on a contextual exegesis. Furthermore, the Nimaoni, “has been given,” was translated by the Ethpe. form in S and in the Perf. Act. in assium, 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 א，则 “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

לכל אחד קט amer אתר תזודה כי החרקدين בונם כי הפורחים (M)
באורות בן אלה למקדש עמי בארצית amer鬓 exemption

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 ג ת, except MS 26; ג ת also has it, except MSS b, g. The Hebrew syntactical construction of the two subordinating clauses (concessive clauses) and the syndetic clause with an adversative ווא, "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 ג ת. S presents two independent short clauses and the last of them is joined by the adversative ווא, "yet," "I will cast them . . . ," "I will scatter them . . . ," "yet I will be to them . . . " Thus the introductory Syriac expression רמא הריא, "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.
CJ 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 כנסנא, "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' assumption that the origin of the synagogues was during the Babylonian exile.  

The targumic translation is imbued with an exilic flavor; it seems that the targumic interpreters did not want to miss any opportunity to mention something related to the exile. For example, see the last portion of the verse ראייתויא, "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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>עֵמָא</td>
<td>שְׁנֵחַ</td>
<td>בְּרֵי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּרְנָה</td>
<td>יִשְׁרֵי</td>
<td>קְרַנָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּרְנָה</td>
<td>יִשְׁרֵי</td>
<td>קְרַנָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּרְנָה</td>
<td>יִשְׁרֵי</td>
<td>קְרַנָּה</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 \( \text{H} \), but neither is it a paraphrase full of additional interpretative ideas.

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

**Ezek 11:17**

\[
(\text{H}) \text{ Therefore, thus says the Lord of Authority, 'I will gather you from among the nations and I will bring you from the countries where you have been scattered, and I will give you the land of Israel'.}
\]

Analysis of the Variants

\( S \) has its usual rendering for the *nominasacra*, while \( \text{G}^* \) (MSS B, 538, 233) omits \( \text{N} \); \( \text{G} \), however, has it in all of the remaining witnesses of \( \text{G} \). \( S \) again, as in the preceding verse, omits the Imper. \( \text{לִקֵּן} \text{ אֶמֶר} \text{ הָאָרֶץ} \text{ מַדּוֹנָתָי} \text{ אֲחָסֵפ} \text{ מִנָּה} \text{ אֶפְסָּתָה} \) \( \text{N} \), probably to avoid redundancy. \( \text{C} \) and \( \text{G} \) 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>מ</th>
<th>ס</th>
<th>ט</th>
<th>י</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מְבֹרָך</td>
<td>סָרַכֵּר</td>
<td>קָאָה</td>
<td>אָבֶדֶנְעָי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִשְׂפָּר</td>
<td>צָרְכִּי</td>
<td>קָאָה</td>
<td>סְעָדָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַשְׁפָּר</td>
<td>מְשָׁפְּרָה</td>
<td>דַּאְרוֹבְּרָה</td>
<td>אוּ דְיוֹסְפָא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that ס and י have the same cognate verbs for the first two, but in an inverted position. י is related to מ, regarding the second verb, and to ס, 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 מ. Notice that י has the three direct objects, αὐτούς, “them,” in the 3° pl., while ס and י have them in the 2° m. pl. in agreement with מ. This may be more a choice of the translator than a reflection of the י’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 י.

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

Ezek 11:19

(Hebrew) "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 the Hebrew word דוד, “one,” make the difference among the versions. First, the Hebrew word דוד, “one,” is rendered by הבט, “new” (S), by המ, “faithful, reverent” (L), and by המ, “another” (T except MS 26 that reads המ, “strong,” and α, α’). 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 καρδίαν ἐκείνην, "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
αὐτός instead of αὐτή, άλλος instead of ἄλλης, a common scribal error). The Syriac scribe may
have harmonized the translation of ἕν αὐτός, "one heart," with ἔναν νεόν, "and a new spirit,"
probably to make more emphatic the complete transformation of the people, or he
understood the Adj. νεόν "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 וּלְ). 1

The second deviation is the translation of the suffixed pronoun of the prepositional
phrase בְּכִיָּבֶךָם, "within you, in your inside." S has בְּכִיָּבָם, "within them," T reads ἐν
αὐτοῖς, "within them," and only Cods. 86, 88 and α' have a reading similar to וּלְ, εἰς τὰ
ἐγκάτα νήσσων, "in your inmost part." Although C' agrees with the Masoretic text with
some additions2 (בְּבֵיתךָ, "in your inmost part"), some of its MSS support the usage of the
third-person plural, e.g., MSS b, g, o, c, בְּבֵיתךָ, "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 ḫdt' in all cases: this seems to be a
deliberate attempt to assimilate all these closely allied passages." Greenberg, 190.

2 C' expands the text by reformulating the Hebrew text in the following manner,
אֲנָהִי לְמָלַיְהוֹ דִּשְׁמַע רֹאְשַׁת הַחֶקֶק מַאָבָא,
"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 $^G\text{A}$ at the conclusion of the verse, which is foreign to $\text{M}$, $S$, $^G\text{*}$, and $^G\text{I}$, end] + λέγει κυρίος in MSS $\text{A'}$-410-147, 36-538-46, $^G\text{C'}$-86'-239'-393-403', 14, 29.

Ezek 11:21

(Trans. of S) καὶ εἰς τὴν καρδιὰν τῶν βδελυγμάτων αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομίαν αὐτῶν, ὥς ἦ
καρδία αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο, τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν εἰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν δέδωκα, λέγει κύριος.

(Trans. of S) "For in the mind their heart is going to their images and abominations. Their ways upon their heads I will repay," says the Lord of Authority."

Analysis of the Variants

The contrasting difference here is the rendering of the introductory prepositional phrase ἐν καρδίαις, "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 ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀλλὰ ἀπεργίαν, "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 ἐν τῷ καρδιῶς, "for in the mind/conscience." Probably the Syriac scribe uses "mind" instead of "heart," which is a normal equivalent for mind, to make the point that the idolatrous behavior of the people was a voluntary and conscious act.

C reads ἀπεργίαν, "after," supporting the BHS suggestion. S (MSS B, O-62', L) has a reading similar to M, καὶ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν, "and toward the heart," whereas A (rel.) reads κατὰ τὰς καρδίὰς, "according to the hearts." Regarding the nomina sacra S translates them consistently, and S (MSS B V) has, as usual, only its typical κύριος, while A has both αὐτῶν κύριος (rel.).

Ezek 11:22

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

S has a peculiar reading by lacking the last Hebrew prepositional expression

This may be an endeavor to avoid redundancy in the text. CJ has it as מַלְמַעֵש, which is the cognate for the Hebrew expression, and διά, ὑπεράνω αὐτῶν, “above them.”

Ezek 11:23

(Trans. of S) “And the Glory of the Lord went up from the midst of the city and stood on the mount, which is on the east side of the city.”

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

C' has a theological interpretation of the text. Instead of “mount” it has a very interesting, specific translation, וַיַּחַד עַל מָרַת מִזְרָיִם, “and rested upon the Olive Mountain.”

According to the tradition, the Shekinah would make a journey of ten stops; one of them was the Mount of Olives.1 All the other versions support the Masoretic text and ignore the targumic interpretation.

Ezek 11:24

(Trans. of S) “And the spirit lifted me up and brought me to the land of the Chaldeans to the exile, in the vision and with the Spirit of God; and the vision which I had seen departed from me.”

---

1Levey, 43, n. 11.
Analysis of the Variants

5 has a reading related to \( C^i \), but the rest of the verse indicates an independent translation for both. For instance, 5 adds \( \text{_flas} \), “to the land,” of the Chaldeans as found also in \( C^i \). 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 \( 51\) (נסיך).

The rendering of \( \text{לְתֵּלָה} \), “and it went up from me,” is unique to 5. \( C^i \) also has a unique reading by expanding the text: \( \text{וַיַּחַד לְתֵּלָה} \), “in the spirit of prophecy which rested upon me from before the Lord.” This reads against any relationship to the Syriac or Greek versions. 5* has a unique reading too, \( \text{καὶ ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὸ κήπος ὅρασιως} \), “and I rose up from the vision,” for the Hebrew \( \text{וַיֵּעַל מֵעַל} \), “and it went up from me.” Only Cods. 86, 88, and 5' have a reading close to 51, e.g., \( \text{καὶ ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὸ κήπος ὅρασιως} \).

Ezek 11:25

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{יָדָּבֵר} & \text{ אל} \text{הלל} \text{ אל דִּבְרֵי} \text{ יהוה} \text{ אַשְּרָה} \text{ הרָשִׁי} \text{ (נ)} \\
\text{הָאָמַל} & \text{ בְּעֵיתוֹ} \text{ הָמַלְכוּת} \text{ הָעִבְרִית} \text{ כָּלִים} \text{ מְשֵׁי} \text{ (נ)} \\
\text{אֲבָדְתֶּךְ} & \text{ ביתו} \text{ נַחֲלוּתא} \text{ כָּל} \text{ מַעְנֵה} \text{ זוּי} \text{ דָּרוֹת} \text{ (נ)} \\
\text{כֹּל} & \text{ קִאָלַתְּוָה} \text{ πρὸς} \text{ τὴν} \text{ αἰχμαλωσίαν} \text{ πάντας} \text{ τῶν} \text{ λόγων} \text{ τοῦ} \text{ κυρίου} \text{ ὥς} \text{ εἶδες} \text{ μοι}. \\
\end{align*}
\]
(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 nominasaacra (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
12:2
12:3
12:4
12:5
12:6

Hi. Perf. w. consc. waw ḫaph] Aphel Imper. הושלחו “and bring out.”
Q. Imperf. ניהו] Peal Imper. הושלח “go out.”
Q. Inf. Constr. om.
Q. Perf. 3° m. pl. Peal Ptc. m. pl. סָּפֶה “seeing.”
Q. Inf. Constr. om.
Q. Perf. 3° m. pl. Peal Ptc. m. pl. סָּפֶה “listening.”
Q. Inf. Constr. om.
Hi. Imperf. אָסָּה] Peal Imper. “and lift up the burden on your shoulder.”

Hi. Perf. w. consc. waw ḫaph] Aphel Imper. הושלחו “and bring out.”
Q. Imperf. ניהו] Peal Imper. הושלח “go out.”
Q. Inf. Constr. om.
Q. Perf. 3° m. pl. Peal Ptc. m. pl. סָּפֶה “seeing.”
Q. Inf. Constr. om.
Q. Perf. 3° m. pl. Peal Ptc. m. pl. סָּפֶה “listening.”
Q. Inf. Constr. om.
Hi. Imperf. אָסָּה] Peal Imper. “and lift up the burden on your shoulder.”

"there is.”
"there is.”
"like one in captivity.”

"and lift up the burden on your shoulder.”
and cover." 

12:7

Q. Imperf. 3° m. pl. [ Banco ] Peal Imperf. 2° m. pl. yale "you will go."

12:12

Prp. + 3° m. pl. suf. [ Banco ] rel. + prep. + 2° m. pl. suf. "who is among you."

Q. Perf. notf [ Peal Ptc. m. pi. ] nino "and he will break through."


12:13

[ Banco ] Simplif. "and all of them."

12:14

Noun + suf. [ Banco ] Peal Ptc. m. pl. + Prep. Phr. "who are surrounding him."

Noun + suf. [ Banco ] Peal Ptc. m. pl. + D. O. "who are helping him."

Noun + suf. [ Banco ] Peal Ptc. m. pl. + D. O.
“and strengthening him.”

“I will send.”

“for I will disperse.”

“quaking.”

“quaking.”

“to the land of Israel.”

“on account of the iniquity of.”

“and all of them.”

I am bringing to an end.”

“they are drawing nigh.”

“and it will be, take place.”

“sons of.”

“of deception.”

“I
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

Data Analysis

Chaps. 1-12 comprise one fourth of the total number of chapters in the book of Ezekiel (48 in total). This entire portion is homogeneous in style, vocabulary, and translation techniques. Thus it seems a good indication of a single translator for this entire portion.
(Trans. of S) "And the word of the Lord was upon me saying."

Analysis of the Variants

S and 6T have a reading similar to that of M, while C' tries to avoid any hint of anthropomorphism applied to God. In this case, C' 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."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
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 $<\text{אִיה} \text{ אֵל}$, "there is/ are," which is a common particle used to indicate an existential clause, location and also used as a linking verb in tripartite nominal clause. In $N$, the existential element is implicitly understood by the context. The Aramaic construction of $C^I$ is closer to that of $N$, for though the Aramaic language possesses a similar existential particle like the Syriac one ($\text{אִיה}$), $C^I$ does not make use of it in this particular instance.

$G^T$ is related to $S$, because the former employs the Pres. Act. 3 pl., $\varepsilon \chi o u v$, "they have," which conveys the similar sense of the Syriac existential particle $<\text{אִיה} \text{ אֵל}$. In spite of that relationship, $S$ has a unique reading that makes any attempt toward seeing a direct relationship between the Syriac version and $G^T$ an impossibility. The Syriac language uses for both instances of the Hebrew word $\text{ד} \text{ש} \text{ש}$ a cognate adjective $\text{עָשָׁן}$, "rebellious, contentious," while $G^*$ holds $\delta \Omega \kappa \theta \nu$, "unrighteous," for the first and $\pi \rho \alpha \pi \nu \kappa \rho \alpha \iota \nu \omega \nu$, "rebellious, embittered," for the second instance. Only MSS L-311-V-449mg are similar to $N$ having $\pi \rho \alpha \pi \nu \kappa \rho \alpha \iota \nu \tau \omicron \varsigma$ for the first occurrence as well. $C^I$ employs the word $\text{בָּרָא}$, which has the same semantic sense of the Hebrew $\text{ד} \text{ש} \text{ש}$. $C^I$ also has a unique reading; it

---

exchanges the Hebrew word בֵית, "house," for עָם, "people." Only MS 1 reads as in II, 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. S keeps both Infinitives as Articular Inf.1 τοῦ βλέπειν and τοῦ ἀκούειν.

In addition, S translates the Q. Perf. 3° m. pl. רָא and שָׁמָּה by the Peal Ptc. שָׁמָּה and רָא, 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 ST. Thus the Syriac deviations from II 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 ST 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 τοῦ, not so much in dependence upon a substantive as independently, with final or consecutive sense.”
Analysis of the Variants

Although S has some accommodations of its Hebrew Vorlage into Syriac style, it does not lose its closeness to מ. כ', however, substitutes the word רָבְרִי by רָבָרָה as in the preceding verse. Although the Aramaic language has a cognate counterpart to the Hebrew word רָבְרִי, "rebellious," כ' employs instead a noncognate but synonymous word, רָבְרִי, "rebellious." S renders רָבְרִי by its Syriac cognate רָבְרִי, which has the same semantic and etymological relationship to its Hebrew counterpart.

כ' omitted the imperative רָבְרִי, "go into exile." BHS App. suggests that a dittographic error took place in מ, thus רָבְרִי should be deleted. In reality, only MSS B, 967, 106 (כ') omitted it; all the remaining (כ') contain it רָבְרִי with some slight
differences. \(\mathcal{T}^1\) and \(S\) have this imperative (בָּאתוּ, and "go into exile," respectively), indicating that their Vorlagen were related in this point against \(\text{6}^*\).

\(\mathcal{T}^1\) has an interesting reading in two of its MSS, namely \(g\) and \(o\). They read יָדַ֖לְתָּם, "they may fear," instead of the Aramaic יְהַוָּן, "they may see." This is a good indication that the confusion goes back to the consonantal period of \(\mathcal{M}\). The translator may have confused the Hebrew Imperf. of the verb רָאָׁ֖א, "to see," with the Imperf. of the verb רָאָׁ֖א, "to fear."

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

Ezek 12:4

\(\mathcal{M}\):

\(\text{הָוְדָאָתָא} \text{כַּלָּר} \text{נִולָּה} \text{יֵיָּסָּל} \text{לְעַדְּשֵׁם} \text{אָחָה} \text{בֵּעִרָּב} \text{לְעַדְּשֵׁם} \text{כָּמָּרָּא} \text{נִולָּה} (31)

\(S\):

\(\text{לָמְכֵּנָּה} \text{מַכְּהָּה} \text{כָּמָּרָּא} \text{מַכְּהָּה} \text{כָּמָּרָּא} (S)

\(\mathcal{T}^1\):

\(\text{תָּפְקַמְּכָר} \text{מַכְּהָּה} \text{כָּמָּרָּא} \text{לְעַדְּשֵׁם} \text{אָחָה} \text{בֵּעִירָּב} \text{לְעַדְּשֵׁם} \text{כָּמָּרָּא} \text{נִולָּה} (31)

\(\text{6}^*\) and \(\text{6}^*\) have the reading that the speaker says "we saw a visions of the God" and "we saw the vision of the God" respectively.
"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 5 has a direct relationship to ©*. The only extra-Masoretic variant noted in the BHS App. is that both versions omitted the second instance of the Adv. Prep. Phr. יַלְמוּדָה, "before their eyes" (only ©* [MSS B, 967, 410] omits it; all the remaining, however, contain this Prep. Phr., see ©A). The analysis of the entire verse shows that any direct relationship is not tenable for this verse.

S renders both the Hi. Perf. וְהָעֲבַרְתָּם, "and you shall bring out," and the Q. Imperf. וַיָּלְכוּ, "you will go out," by the Imperatives Aphel וַיַּעֲבַרְנוּ, "and bring," and Peal וַיִּלְכְּנוּ, "go out," respectively. This indicates that the Syriac scribe felt that the imperatives would convey a more emphatic sense to the narrative of the text, or he understood that the syntactical implication of these two Hebrew forms conveys the imperative sense. ©T literally translates both Hebrew verbs in the future tense, thus conveying a lesser emphasis to the narrative.

The relationship between S and ©* can be explained by a common translation technique. Sometimes the ancient scribe felt the need to update the linguistic style of his translation by arranging his translation in such a manner that all redundancies, which are a normal feature of biblical Hebrew, were omitted without compromising the reliability of his translation. In this case, the omission of יַלְמוּדָה does not affect the meaning of the text. In
the preceding verse, Ṣ omits it too, while Ṣ.contains it.

The rendering of the comparative Hebrew construct chain, "like those of exile," is key evidence for a noninterrelationship among the versions. Ṣ has a distinctive construction against the Hebrew plural construct chain, namely "like the one in exile," while Ṣ reads, "like those who have gone into exile," and Ṣ has ὡς ἐκπορεύεται αἰχμαλωτός, "as one going into exile." This seems more a freedom in translation rather than the reflection of their Vorlagen.

Ezek 12:6

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

1 An interesting and unique reading is found in MS 62. It reads, εἰς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ σὺ νῦν αὐθάρατον for ὡς ἐκπορεύεται αἰχμαλωτός, "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 L. Nevertheless, S has a different word order and some pluses and minuses not found in L. 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. לְעַל וַיֶּלֶךְ 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 כִּרְסָא, "shoulder" (כִּרְסָא, "your shoulder"), indicating whom the text was referring to. In addition, the cognate word עָלַי, "baggage," was placed after כִּרְסָא, "you shall lift up," with the aim of specifying what was to be lifted up. ס ת renders an interpretative or corrupt translation for the Hebrew כאכִרְסָא, "upon shoulder you will carry"; the subject of the verb will became the object of it in the Fut. Pass. מֵעֶלֶךְ עָלַי אֲשֶׁר מִיִּנֵּה, "upon shoulders you shall be carried." This might be more an interpretative translation indicating the manner the people would be carried out to exile, rather than an actual reading of its Vorlage.

Another key difference between S and ס ת is the translation of the Hebrew Prep.
Phr. בֵּסְלֵהֶז, "in the darkness." The former renders it by its Syriac equivalent, while the latter gives an interpretation of it, namely καὶ κεκρυμμένος, "and in secret." C in all respects is a word-for-word literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to II.

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 II.

**Ezek 12:7**

(II) dijoi □nr ribi;

(S) r i j r i a <kn_St< ,» j.T X L a .T

(C) S O D 1D 1 D O V D  K m bj '303 H 'P'SS

(© * ) K a i e t r i o i r i o a

Ezek 12:7

אָמַּם כָּכָשָר צוּרָה כָּלָה, הוֹצָאתָה כָּלָה, נְכוֹלָה, יְתֵם, בּוֹשָׁב (II)

תֹּאֲרוּ, לֹא בּוֹקֵר בּוֹדֵה, בּוֹשָׁהּּּוּתָה, נְכוֹלָהּ, יְתֵם, בּוֹשָׁב (S)

מַגְדְּחַתָהּ, בְּשָׁזַחְתָהּ, מַגְדְּחַתָהּ, בְּשָׁזַחְתָהּ, מַגְדְּחַתָהּ, בְּשָׁזַחְתָהּ, מַגְדְּחַתָהּ, בְּשָׁזַחְתָהּ (C)

וְסָרֵבָהּ כָּכָשָר דָּאָפְקָדְהָּ עַיְּן, עַיְּן הַפַּרְיָמָה, כְּמִי נְלוֹחָה, כְּמִי נְלוֹחָה, כְּמִי נְלוֹחָה (© )

אֶסְדַּוְתָהּ לֹא בּוֹכָלָהּ בּוֹכָלָהּ בּוֹכָלָהּ בּוֹכָלָהּ בּוֹכָלָהּ בּוֹכָלָהּ בּוֹכָלָהּ בּוֹכָלָהּ (© )

(© ) K a i επιστάσα σοῦ | κατὰ πᾶντα, ὁσα ἐνετείλατό μοι, καὶ σκεύη ἐξῆνεγκα ὡς σκεύη ἀεὶμαλλοσίας ἡμέρας καὶ ἐσπέρας διώρυξα ἐμαυτῷ τὸν τοιχον καὶ κεκρυμμένος ἔξηλθον, ἐπὶ ὁμον ἀνεληφθῇ ένώπιον 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 $* (MS B; all the remaining MSS have it as in מ, ת"א ח"ש) by omitting ז"ב, "by hand." Notice, for instance, that some MSS of צ (1, 2) translated it by יד, "as though or when."

It would be more a conjecture to take the Hebrew ז"ב as a defective portion of the word ז"ב, "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 צ) to avoid any ambiguity and to harmonize it (vs. 7) with the preceding verse (vs. 5), where the same expression occurs without ז"ב, 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 $ s. ר"ת, "I was commanded," was translated by the Peal 3° plus the suffixed pronoun הנד, "he had commanded me," as it occurs in $ ת. 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, .Gr omitted כְּלַי, “my baggage,” and added כלשהי, “all,” after אמרתי, “I did so according to.” These pluses and minuses are not present in $S$.

The verb נָשָׁה, “I lifted up,” was understood in the passive voice (Niphal) by .Gr, which translated it by the Aor. Pass. 1º s. הָנָחָה, “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 $S$ added a suffixed pronoun to the noun מָנְחֵה, “shoulder” (מדל מחלף “and upon my shoulder”), indicating that the prophet was lifting something and not that he was being lifted up by somebody else.

The word בֵּית הָלָא, “in the darkness,” also plays a key role in this verse as in the preceding one. $S$ renders an equivalent to the Hebrew word (mychashel, “and in the darkness”), while .Gr gives an interpretation to that Hebrew word, namely καὶ κεκρυμμένος, “and in secret,” as in the preceding verse. This rules out the possibility of relationship between the versions regarding this verse. Only Cod. 86 (σκοτεί) and Θ’ (ἐν σκοτίᾳ) have a reading similar to that of _MR_.

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

Analysis of the Variants

One of the key words of this verse is the polysemic Hebrew noun קָרָא, 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 לְעָלָא, “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 קָרָא as “burden, baggage.” Notice that α’ has a reading very close to that of S, namely ἐπερρήνων τό αρμα τούτο, “the carrier of this burden/baggage.” Since קָרָא, “prince,” has a similar root to קָרָא, “to carry, lift up,” α’ may have misunderstood it. Thus, instead of prince, he wrote “carrier” and then “burden” (for קָרָא, “oracle”). Θ, however, takes קָרָא, “oracle,” as an
apposition to ἀρχων, “prince,” or as part of the list of prospective prisoners going into exile. 

The list of people to be carried into captivity is, according to ΘΤ, composed by the prince (Ὁ ἀρχων), the ruler of Jerusalem (ὁ ἀφηγούμενος ἐν Ἰερουσαλημ), and the house of Israel (καὶ παντὶ ὁ Ἰσραήλ). This implies that these nouns go back to their common antecedent, ἐπὶ πρὸς αὐτῶν, “say to them”; the prophet should tell to these leaders and to the house of Israel (probably referring to the king’s lineage) what is narrated in vs. 11. On the other hand, vs. 10 has a complete idea in S; it contains part of the actual message for the leaders: the prince would carry his baggage and the house of Israel would go with him into exile. The syntactical arrangement of vs. 10 in S is specific, while in ΘΤ it is arranged as an introduction to the coming message of vs. 11.

S also avoids the confusing ἀρχων 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 ἀρχων? Is it the house of Israel or the leaders, as in ΘΤ? So S substituted the entire clause and rendered for it a translation based on contextual exegesis, ἀρχων, “and all of the house of Israel with him,” thus eliminating any ambiguity.

Θ gives a very good interpretative translation concerning ἀρχων ὁ Ἰσραήλ ἄρχων, “the prince this oracle/baggage.” It reads similarly to that of Θ (adds ὁ, “concerning, about,” before ἀρχων, thus with the reading “this prophetic commission concerns the prince . . .”), namely, περὶ τοῦ ἀρχωντος το ἁμα τοῦτο, “this burden concerns the chief leader . . .” Θ, Cods. 86, 88 agree with the reading of ΘΤ.
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 \( \text{Hebrew} \) is difficult and even awkward. First the prophet would say, “I am your sign,” then “thus will be done to them,” and then “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, \( \text{Septuagint} \) adds “to them,” after “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. \( \text{C'} \) reads as it is in \( \text{Hebrew} \), word-for-word for the entire verse. \( \text{Septuagint} \) uses pronouns similar to the Masoretic text, with the exception of the first one, which is omitted in \( \text{Septuagint} \) (MSS B, O-62', L'-36, 46-311) and
substituted in \( \text{G}^* \) by \((\pi\omega ~ \epsilon\nu ~ \mu\epsilon\sigma\upsilon) ~ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma\), "(performing in) her (midst)."

\( \text{G}^* \) has a unique reading that seems more contextual exegesis than a translation: \( \epsilon\gamma\omega ~ \tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\tau\alpha \pi\omega ~ \epsilon\nu ~ \mu\epsilon\sigma\upsilon ~ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma\), "I am performing a wonder in her midst" (>B O-62', L'-36. 46-311 = \( \text{II} \)). The pronoun "her" may go back to the city of Jerusalem of the preceding verse. The nouns are transposed in \( \text{G}^* \), whereas in \( \text{S} \) the second one is omitted to avoid superfluous repetition of the same idea.

Consequently, this verse shows that \( \text{S} \) holds a reading with a higher level of literacy than \( \text{C}' \) and \( \text{G}^* \). The Syriac scribe seems more preoccupied with communicating the message than with transferring a literal translation of its Hebrew Vorlage.

Ezek 12:12

\((\text{II})\) ὁ ἄρχων ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν εἶπ' ὑμῖν ἄρθησεται καὶ κεκρυμμένος ἐξελεύσεται διὰ τοῦ τοίχου, καὶ διορύξει τοῦ ἐξελθεῖν αὐτῶν ἃ' αὐτοῦ· τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ συγκαλύψει, ὡπως μὴ ὁρᾷν ὁ φθαλμὸν, καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν γῆν οὐκ ὑψεῖται.

\((\text{Trans. of \( \text{S} \)})\) "And the prince who is among you will carry [it] upon his shoulder and he
will go out in the darkness and he will break through the wall and go out through it, and he will cover his face so that he will not see the ground’.”

Analysis of the Variants

All three versions are not literal translations, but somehow free renderings of their similar Hebrew *Vorlagen*. Reasons for this assumption are as follows: The deviations of S seem to be based more on the stylistic arrangement of the text, rather than on deviations of its *Vorlage* regarding the Masoretic standard. First let us start with the syntactical accommodations of the Hebrew language into the Syriac. The Syriac scribe tries to make the narrative of the text closer to the prophet’s audience. Thus instead of,’ נורא נוק ירוש, “and the prince who is among them,” as it is in I, S reads תגא חמש, “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 מ, as it did in the preceding verse with the aim of avoiding any possible ambiguity in the mind of the reader. Thus S reads מ, “his shoulder”; the leader of Jerusalem would carry his own baggage into exile. Another syntactical ambiguity of I is the 3° person pl. of the verb ירשה, “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 מ, “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 מ was rendered by י, “upon,” which might be the one used in its Hebrew.
Vorlage (תַּנִּן); this reading is supported by א' (תַּנִּן) and by ו (תַּנִּן).

Since one of the features of the Syriac translation (Ezek 1-12) is the simplification of the text by omitting redundancies, the omission of לָעָי, “by that eye,” by ס can be classified as one of those cases, rather than being an actual reading of its Vorlage. א' has it, but in a transposed position after an interpretative addition that indicates the cause of the prince’s doom, which is רָאשׁ דַּבָּר, “because he sinned.” Several targumic MSS, ב, ג, ה, ו omitted לָעָי from their text indicating the existence of a Hebrew recension without it in support of the Syriac reading. Therefore if א' 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 לָעָי. ¹

א' 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 כִּי, “he will carry,” into the Fut. Pass. 3° s. כִּי יַכְאָרֵי, “he will be borne,” upon somebody else’s shoulder, and the entire negative sentence לָעָי רָאשׁ לֻבָּן הַלֵּה יַגְּזָר, “by that eye, he will not see the land,” was rendered in a passive manner, כִּי יַכָּאֵרָי כִּי יִלַּכָּאֵרָי, “so that he will not be seen by any eye.” The last deviation is the translation of עֻלָּמָה, “darkness,” by קֶדֶם מִיִּרְבּוֹ, “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: כִּי יָדֹ֣בֶךְ תְּכֹרֵ֥ה טָעָה וְלֹא יֵתוּדֵי כִּי אֶרְבַּנֵּיהּ, “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

(Trans. of S) “And I will spread my net upon him and he will be caught in it and I will bring him to Babel to the land of the Chaldeans, yet he will not see it and he will die there.”
Analysis of the Variants

The main deviation of this verse concerns the Prep. Phr. "in my net." This shows that there was not a direct relationship among them. כ ו inverted the order of the two synonymous Hebrew words רֶשֶׁת, "my net," and בָּשַׁב, "in my net." כ ו uses the Greek word δίκτυον, "net," for the first instance and an interpretative rendering for the second, ἐν τῇ περιοχῇ μου, "in my enclosure," probably to signify "snare" or "trap," as if God was placing an ambush to catch those rebellious people. For περιοχῇ, α’ reads μισοβλαστρω, "casting net," ς’, and Cods. 86, 88 have σαρκαθή, "dragging net." כ on the one hand reads תּוֹתֶל, "my net," for the first Hebrew word רֶשֶׁת, which is the Syriac cognate form for the Aramaic and Hebrew counterpart (רֶשֶׁת/מַעְרָד) in the same transposed order as it occurs in כ ו. On the other hand, כ has a Prep. Phr. בֵּין, "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.

כ ו has some pluses in its text due to an interpretative exegesis. After רֶשֶׁת, כ ו adds האל, "I will exile him to Babel to the country of the land of the Chaldeans." כ ו completely ignores this translation. Consequently כ ו has its own reading; it is not related to any version regarding this verse.

Ezek 12:14

וכל אשֶר מַסְכִּיט עָרוֹד כֹּל אֲמִפי אָוָדָה לְכָל רוּחַ וְהוּבָא אָוָדָה אָוָדָה (מ"ע)
Analysis of the Variants

The Syriac version is an excellent literary work in a Syriac style, without betraying its Hebrew Vorlage. S agrees with R closely, even though additions and substitutions are present in its text. R has the most difficult text among the versions, while S tries to smooth it by making it more understandable in a Syriac style. To avoid ambiguity and syntactic confusion, S adds a suffixed pronoun to the first Hebrew word, namely, "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 R, thus making the flow of the text more dynamic.

Difficult linguistic elements were substituted, like the apposition, "who were around him, his help," which was separated into two distinct elements in the list, "who were going about him, and who were helping him."

The second Hebrew word might have been omitted for the sake of literary beauty to avoid redundancy. The difficult Hebrew verb Hi. Imperf. 1° c. s. p. "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. יָשֵׂא, “I will send.” This rendering may be explained by differences in idiomatic expression, rather than by an actual reading in the S’s Vorlage.

The key word in this verse is מְשָׁרָה, “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 ʿageppu.1 צי rendered it not by its Aramaic cognate word ʿנת, “wing, poultry, arms, shoulder,” but by a more meaningful term מִשְׂרָה, “his camp, troop, army.” This shows that the targumic scribe understood it as a military term. S may have had some difficulties in understanding it, due to the fact that the meaning “wing” would not fit the context. Thus it was rendered by a participial form that would supply a meaningful sense in the context of the verse מִשְׂרָה, “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.

 צי uses nouns for the first two elements of the list as in IT and not participial forms like S. The Greek version has the same apposition as in the Masoretic text, τοὺς κύκλῳ αὐτοῦ τοὺς βοηθοὺς, “those around him, his helpers.” Despite these similarities, the Greek version had the same problem in the rendering of the last element of the list,↾ sworn, “his troops, wings”; thus it was rendered by ἀντιλαμβανόμενος, “his helpers,” indicating

---
that both the Syriac and the Septuagint scribes did not understand the rare usage of the Hebrew word נָּאַ א, probably due to their lack of knowledge of the Aramaic and Assyrian cognate words.

Ezek 12:15

(III) רְדֵּשׁ כָּאָה יְהוָה בְּפַסְחָה אֲחָת בּוֹרֵם וְרָוִית אֲחָת בּאֲרֵצוֹתָה.

(S) רְדֵּשׁ אֲרֵי מַאֲן יִכְלֶּל חֵוֹרַת לְבָנִי יָמָה וְאֱבֹדֵר חֵוֹרַת בּמַרְדְּנָתָה.

(C) Καὶ γνώσονται διότι ἐγώ κύριος ἐν τῷ διασκορπίσαι με αὐτούς ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεῖσιν, καὶ διασπερῶ αὐτούς ἐν ταῖς χώραις.

(Trans. of S) “And they will know that I am the Lord, for I will disperse them among the peoples and scatter them among the countries.”

Analysis of the Variations

(IT) is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to III. It has διότι for the Hebrew particle כ introducing “I am . . .” and both convey the same syntactical sense “that.” The Hi. Inf. הבארץ with its suffixed subject and the temporal preposition was rendered by a non-Greek linguistic structure, ἐν τῷ + Inf. + Subject pronoun (ἐν τῷ διασκορπίσαι με, “when I have scattered”), which is a clear Hebraism in the Greek text.

Even though C has an almost literal translation, it introduces into its text an interpretative translation based on the exilic motif of the context of the verse. The sense of the Hebrew Inf. is conveyed through the Aphel 1st s. יָלֵא, “I will exile,” and the noun for
On the one hand $S$ has a degree of relationship to $T'$ in terms of translation technique, for both avoided the Hebrew infinitive construction. On the other hand, they are different, because $T'$ translated ב by רכ, an Aramaic particle that can convey a temporal sense like its Hebrew counterpart, while in $S$ the most common and versatile Syriac particle י 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. קָנָה, "for I will scatter," while $T'$ has an interpretative substitution as mentioned above (Aphel 1° sing. יָלַל, "I will exile"). Regarding the last Hebrew word, $S$ supports the Masoretic reading, מְרִית, against the targumic reading, מְרִית, that is, I will exile. Based on all of these differences, one cannot assume any direct relationship among the versions.

Ezek 12:18

(Trans. of $S$) "Son of man, your bread you will eat with quaking and your water you will drink with quaking and fear of scarcity."
Analysis of the Variants

The main linguistic structures to be observed in this verse are "in quaking," "in trembling," and "and in fearfulness." They were rendered respectively in S by "in quaking," "in quaking," and "and in fear of scarcity." C reads "trembling," "in despair," and "and in desolation." T 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

The main linguistic structures to be observed in this verse are "in quaking," "in trembling," and "and in fearfulness." They were rendered respectively in S by "in quaking," "in quaking," and "and in fear of scarcity." C reads "trembling," "in despair," and "and in desolation." T 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.
καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ αὐτῶν μετὰ ἄφανισμοῦ πίνουσιν, ὡς ἄφανισθῇ 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 G* (B) reads as usual, omitting ῥῆμα; all of the remaining MSS have ῥῆμα as part of their reading (G♀). The preposition ἐκ is rendered by the Syriac A against the targumic translation ἐπί and the Septuagint reading ἐν. 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 ἐν φόβῳ, “in fearfulness,” and ἐκ δολίας, “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, ἐκ δολίας, the Syriac scribe seems to translate them more freely than we normally would expect: ἐν φόβῳ, “in fear,” and ἐκ δολίας, “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. G♀ introduces a completely different set of expressions. It employs μετὰ ἐνδοχῆς, “with scarcity,” for ἐκ δολίας, and μετὰ ἄφανισμοῦ, “with
desolation.” Notice however that in the preceding verse the same Hebrew expression 
was translated by a different Greek expression, namely μετὰ βασάνου, “with
torment.”

The only relationship between S and ST is the rendering of the Q. Imperf. Subjunct.
3° s. f. ἔλαται τὰ ἄρα μὴ ἀναπευθύνετε, “That [she] it may be stripped” (λαμβάνεται + Imperf. = Subjunct.). Both
versions substituted it in their respective translations, namely μὴ ἔλαται τὰ ἄρα, “because of the
desolation,” and διὰ τῶν ἀφανισθέντων, “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. on account of the violence,” is taken
into consideration. S has ἐν ἀδεδείᾳ, “on account of the iniquity,” while ST reads ἐν
ἀδεδείᾳ, “in ungodliness” (only s' and Cod. 86 have a reading similar to ST, διὰ ἀδικίαν,
“because of the injustice”).

Ezek 12:20

(Trans. of 5) “And the cities which are inhabited will be laid waste and the land will
become a desolation and you [plural] will know that I am the Lord”.
Analysis of the Variants

Notice the word choice of 5; the Hebrew term סְפָם, which was translated by רָסִילָה, "terror," in the preceding verse, is now rendered by לְשֵׁנ, "desolation." It indicates that the Syriac translator knew very well the Hebrew language, for the Hebrew word סְפָם may convey both meanings ("desolation and terror") depending on the context of the passage where it is located. 7 departs from its rendering in vs. 19; 5 keeps the same word אַףַעְנֹּם, "desolation."

Ezek 12:22

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 אֵלֶה, “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 רַחֵם גַּרְבָּא אַמָּה, “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 מִיַּה, “vision,” was rendered into an interpretative substitution, נְעַבָּד, “prophecy,” probably to harmonize with some preceding interpretation, e.g., 12:21, מָאָר בַּלֵּד, “and the word of prophecy from before the Lord was with me.” The only significant deviation of CJ is the substitution of the verb יָרָכָה, “they will grow longer,” by the adjective μακράν, “long,” which is not evidence for a difference in the Vorlagen.

Ezek 12:23

(31) לָכֵן אָמַר אָדָם כֹּה אָמַר אֱרוֹן יְוהֵיהָ הָעָבֹה יַעֲשֵׂה הָיוּ הָיוּ אֲלֵה (M)

(32) יִמְסָל אֵלֶּה וּדְנָא בֵּשְׁרָאֵל כְּאָם דְּבָרָא אֱלֹהֵי מִדְחָא וּדְבָרָא מִדְחָא (S)

(33) חַיַּל מִשְׁמָע פָּנֵי יָבֹעֵר אֶלֶה חַיַּל מִשְׁמָע פָּנֵי יָבֹעֵר מִשְׁמָע פָּנֵי יָבֹעֵר (S)

(34) מִכְּלָל מִשְׁמָע פָּנֵי יָבֹעֵר מִכְּלָל מִשְׁמָע פָּנֵי יָבֹעֵר מִכְּלָל מִשְׁמָע פָּנֵי יָבֹעֵר (C)

(35) בְּכֵן אָמַר לָכֵן אָמַר יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲבָלִים יָאָשָׁה מִדְחָא הָיוּ הָיוּ הָיוּ הָיוּ (C)

(6*) διὰ τούτῳ εἰπὼν πρὸς αὐτοὺς Τάδε λέγει κύριος ἀποστρέφω τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην, καὶ οὕκειτο μὴ εἰπὼσιν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτι λαλήσεις πρὸς αὐτοὺς Ἑγγύκασιν αἰ χεράκι καὶ λόγος πάσης ὅρασεως.
(Trans. of S) "Therefore tell them, 'Thus says the Lord of Authority, I am bringing to an end this proverb and they will no longer proverbialize it in Israel,' but say to them, 'the days are drawing nigh and each vision will take place'."

Analysis of the Variants

Each one of the versions has its own unique reading on this verse, and it seems clear enough that any relationship among them is merely coincidental. S translates the nomina sacra consistently as in the preceding chapters. ©* (B, 534) lacks אֲדֹ נָ צֶ ה, which is its normal feature, even though the remaining MSS have it (א ת).

The Hi. Perf. 1 c. s. תָּ הָ שֹׁ בְּ צֶ ה, "I will put to an end," which seems to be a prophetic Perf., is conveyed through the participial (Pael Ptc. + pron.) construction יָ לְ כָ ה, "I am bringing to an end," which is good Syriac style. The verb רָ דָ ב י, is a typical case of homonymy; thus, the translator opted to use the verb רָ ד, "say," instead of the Syriac רָ ד, "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 רָ ד י and its verbal form would be identical. Thus, the construct noun רָ ד י, "word of," was omitted and replaced by the Imperf. רָ ד ל, "and it will be," and, in an extended sense, "and it will take place, come, etc.," to avoid any ambiguity in the text. ©, Cods. 86, 88, and some MSS of א ת 311 had the same problem in rendering this noun; they read רָ ד ל ( λογος in א*). The omission of רָ ד י in the Syriac version seems more an accommodation than a translation of an actual reading.

א ת stays closer to א ל by rendering a literal translation (except MSS א ת-311). The
Septuagint translator understood the Hebrew Prophetic Perf. Hi. 'ro, “I will put to an end,” implying future meaning by rendering it in the Fut. Act. 1° c. s. 'Αποστρέψω, “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 אֵלֶּה, "say to them," it has עָבְרֵה אֶלְיוֹת, (Ithpa. Imper.), “prophesy to them,” and for חזָה כְּחַזֵּק, "word of every vision," it reads חזָה כְּחַזֵּק, "the words of each prophecy." The use of the term “prophesy” seems very important to the targumic translator; it might be a tradition that permeates the entire section of Ezekiel under study (Ezek 3:14, 16, 22; 6:1, 2; 8:13; 11:14, 25; 12:1, 8, 17, 21, 23, 26). Most of these instances, however, are due to the avoidance of anthropomorphism.

S does not take into consideration any interpretative substitution of C', nor the literal translation of C, but has its own rendering. Consequently, it shows the non-relationship among them altogether concerning this verse.

Ezek 12:24

(Trans. of S) “And there will be no more any false vision or deceitful divination among the children of Israel.”

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The key element in this verse is "house of Israel." So reads בֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל, "the house of Israel," but MSS g, o, c have בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, "the sons of Israel," while S has בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל, "children of Israel." There are several possibilities for this variant reading. First, those MSS and versions that contain the extra-Masoretic reading may reflect a recension different from that of Ir; second it could have been a scribal error in Ir; 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 פיה, "vision," was translated by רָאָש, "prophecy," in Ir, and the words מַסְכִּים שֶׁל כִּלָּה וּבְחֶדֶשׁ, "and flattering divination," by καὶ μαντευόμενος τὰ πρὸς χάριν, "and graceful divination." Thus the similarities among the versions are an indication that they are related inasmuch as they were based on Hebrew texts that shared a variant common to all of them.
Ezek 12:25

Therefore I am the Lord, I have spoken, and I am going to speak the word, and I am going to perform it, and I will not delay, and in your days, O rebellious House, I am going to speak the word and I will perform it, says the Lord of Authority.

Analysis of the Variants

Although S has a translation in a very stylistic Syriac manner, it seems to have been based on a Hebrew text similar to that of L. On the contrary, even though having a literal translation, contains a reading that may indicate a difference in its Vorlage against that of L. The targumic text uses שמו, “people,” for בית, “house,” which might be a rendering conveying a broader sense than בית, “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 \( T \) and \( S \) by translating 
\[ \text{"He says, or said," the two are not related at all.} \]

\( S \) 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 
\[ \text{"and it [m.] will be performed and it [f.] will not delay," into} \]
\[ \text{"and I will perform it [m.] and I will not delay."} \]
This shows the preoccupation of the Syriac scribe for producing a readable version for his audience. He tries to make sense out of the difficult reading found in his Hebrew text, probably similar to \( M \), namely 
\[ \text{"I will speak what I will speak a word," by giving a clear rendering that is nothing more than an accommodation of the text as} \]
\[ \text{"I have spoken, and I am going to speak the word."} \]
This arrangement, which implies an effort to make the text readable, is also found in \( T \). It translated this difficult Hebrew sentence by 
\[ \text{"I will speak my word."} \]
This similarity cannot provide proof of a direct relationship between \( S \) and \( T \), since common translation technique may explain this similarity, and the word-choice is different in each version. The targumic reading agrees mostly with that of \( M \).

\( S \) keeps the \textit{nomina sacra} as in \( M \), while \( G^* \) (MSS B, 967) omitted \textit{אֶרֶץ}, as we have seen in all instances in which the \textit{nomina sacra} appear. The remaining (rel.) MSS of \( G^A \) contain \textit{אֶרֶץ} in their text. \( T \) is also consistent like \( S \) in its rendering of the \textit{nomina sacra}, always having \textit{אֶרֶץ} for its Hebrew counterpart.
Ezek 12:27

(3) "Son of man, behold, those of the house of Israel are saying, "This vision which he saw belongs to a distant future [is for many days], and about distant times he was prophesying"."

Analysis of the Variants

C is a literal translation of a Hebrew text similar to that of M. S and G, 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 קָרָא. The first Hebrew Ptc. (וַיָּרֵא קָרָא, "he is visioning") was kept as a Ptc. (רֵאָב, "which this one is seeing") and the second Ptc. (וַיָּרֵא קָרָא, "he is prophesying") was turned into its corresponding Syriac Ethpael Ptc. (רֵאָב, "[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 (רֵאָב, "[he] is prophesying") indicates that the act of prophesying was simultaneous.
with the Ptc. (אנו, “which this one is seeing”).

ΣΤ has a unique reading that seems more a harmonization with the preceding verse where the same expression οἶκος Ισραήλ appears with the Attributive Participle ὁ παραπτωματικόν, “rebellious,” thus it (Attributive Participle) was added in vs. 27. Another characteristic feature of ΣΤ is that it contains many Hebraisms against S, which seems to avoid them. For instance, in the Greek of the Septuagint a Participle plus a finite form of the same verb is used to convey the emphatic force of the Hebrew cognate dative (Inf. plus a finite form of the same verb). 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

לכל אמר אלהים כי אמר אני זה לא מסכת עד
ככל דברי אברר דבר ומשהiami זה אני

(3)

כ başına נון-Cola נון-Cola נון-Cola נון-Cola נון-Cola

(5)

בכל אמר לוהי אשר אמר אני אלהים לא יבוא עד
ככל פרנס ולאמלס פנסיא ובקים אפור כי אלהים

(6') dia touto elipon proo autous Tade legi kuriou Ouy mi mhnknwson owketi pantes oi logoi mou ody av lalhsa lalhsa kal poihos legi kuriou.

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. _EXTENDED_B has a similar reading but with a different word order from the corresponding Masoretic reading of vss. 28 and 25. The Syriac structure אָמַר אֲנָהִי אָנָהִי, "there will not be delay" (vs. 28), was used to render the Hebrew יָגוּר יָגוּר, "it will not delay," but in vs. 25 the same Hebrew expression was translated by אָמַר אֲנָהִי אֲנָהִי, "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. _EXTENDED_A translates this verse as it did verse 25 without any deviation.

* (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 אָמַר אָמַר, "I will speak I will speak" (except for MS 538, the remaining MSS have לאとして instead of the second repetition of אָמַר). The scribe of * (B) may have misread the Hebrew word הָאֹמֶר 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 * (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, *translated by omitting both instances of אָמַר against _EXTENDED_B, _EXTENDED_A, and _EXTENDED_C.
Characteristics of the Peshitta Version of Ezek 12

1. S does not avoid anthropomorphisms (12:1).

2. S has several unique readings (12:2, 3, 11).


4. The Syriac scribe strives to avoid ambiguity (12:6, 10).

5. The interpretative additions of C' and pluses and minuses of SetText 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 MT.

8. S tries to avoid Hebraisms while SetText 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 Μ).

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 Μ, 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 Μ 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 Μ (as is the case most of the time with 67), neither is it a paraphrase (as in several
places in $\mathcal{C}$, but it is a translation that strives to render its Hebrew text into good Syriac literary style. In other words, the Syriac scribe strives to convey the best rendering of his Hebrew text into an excellent piece of Syriac literature:

1. He avoids redundancies (e.g., Ezek 8:17; 12:3, 14), Hebraisms (e.g., Ezek 6:5, 14; 7:2; 10:3; 11:13), and syntactical ambiguities (e.g., Ezek 10:4, 7, 17).

2. He smoothes the text (e.g., Ezek 5:1, 6; 6:9; 10:2), adding some words to clarify the passage, never to modify it (e.g., Ezek 5:1, 2), but rarely omitting any portion of the text (e.g. Ezek 1:4, 27 om. נֵכָה הנֶפֶשׁ עַל גֹּלֶן ; 8:6 om. הָדַע ; 9:2, 3, 11 om. פִּקּוּלָה נָשָׁךְ).

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 H

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 Σ 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 Σ 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 Σ. 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 ξενόσαβυμίλησαν and 22 χρυσείαν/κρυστάλλου).

S does not agree with the expansions and interpretations of Σ, except in a few exceptions where similar words and expressions may be due to their akin languages, rather than to a direct relationship between both versions (e.g., Ezek 2:1, 2; 3:7, 8). Therefore Ezek 1-12 in Syriac has nothing to do with the targumic tradition.
Methodological Criteria for Evaluating the Relationship of $S$ to the Other Versions

The criteria for evaluating the relationship among the versions were defined in the General Guidelines (see chap. 1). Based on those criteria one may state that $S$ is an independent translation, even though similarity to another version, or to $\Pi$, may exist. These criteria support the main findings of this investigation that the Syriac version is a translation based on a Vorlage similar to $\Pi$. Notice, for instance, that no Grecism, which is a strong criterion to support a direct relationship between $S$ and $\mathcal{G}$, 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 $\Pi$ and any relationship to the versions can be explained as a mere coincidence or by the use of a common translation technique. In this case, $S$ (Ezek 1-12) is useful as a tool in textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, for it is a valuable witness of a Hebrew consonantal text very similar to $\Pi$.

Further study should be done to cover the remaining portion of the book of Ezekiel and the entire Old Testament (those books of the Peshitta version which were not yet

Lund, 416.
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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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