

8.1 Textual History of Ezekiel (W. Tooman)

8.1.1 Relevant Witnesses and Text Editions

8.1.1.1 Hebrew Witnesses. All major Hebrew witnesses to Ezekiel date from the medieval period (& 8.2.2.5). From the Judean Desert, fragments of six scrolls have been recovered, including all or part of the following verses: Ezek 1:10–13, 16–17, 20–24 (4QEzek^b); 4:3–6 (11QEzek); 4:16–5:1 (1QEzek); 5:11–17; 7:9–12 (11QEzek); 10:5–15; 10:17–11:11 (4QEzek^a); 16:31–33 (3QEzek); 23:2–3 (4QEzek^c); 23:14–18, 44–47 (4QEzek^a); 35:11–15; 36:1–10, 13–14, 17–35; 37:1–16, 23, 28; 38:1–4, 7–8 (MasEzek); 41:3–5 (4QEzek^a). All of these texts can be aligned, more or less, with the (proto-)MT. It should be noted, though, that some are too small for meaningful identification (1QEzek, 3QEzek), and there is some question as to whether or not these represent manuscripts of the book or fragments of excerpted texts (Brooke, “Qumran and New Testament”). Based upon the fragments of 11QEzek that can be read, it appears to be a nearly complete scroll of the book. Unfortunately, it cannot be unrolled. Its textual character remains a mystery.¹

Editions of all the Qumran mss are available in the *DJD* series (Barthélemy and Milik, vol. 1; Baillet, Milik and de Vaux, vol. 3; Ulrich *et al.*, vol. 15; Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, vol. 23). For the Masada scroll, one should consult Talmon (“Fragments”) and Talmon and Yadin (*Masada VI*). See further & xxx.

8.1.1.2 Major Greek Witnesses. There are three complete uncial mss of Ezekiel (B, A, and Q), one nearly complete ms (P967), and four fragmentary mss (P988, P922, P927, and Z, a fragmentary uncial palimpsest). Of these, P967, P988, B, and Z are the most important for mapping Ezekiel’s textual history.²

P967 is dated to the late second or early third century CE and covers Ezek 11:25–48:35 (Kenyon, *Chester Beatty*; Johnson, *Scheide*³). It manifests several significant differences from the (proto-)MT text. (1) It is significantly shorter, having some 350 minuses throughout, which total 4–5% of the MT-edition (Marquis, “Word-Order”). (2) It has several large minuses, vis-à-vis MT, including 12:26–28, 32:24b–26, and 36:23c–38. (3) It has several unique plusses, not represented in B (e.g., 35:8, 38:20; 39:4). (4) It has a different order of chapters in 36–39 (36:1–23b, 38, 39, 37). P988, the Antinoopolis Papyri, though only preserving parts of chaps 33–34, appears to share a common ancestor with P967, indicated by readings unique to the two mss (Fernández Galiano, “Antinoopolitano”; Fraenkel, “Nachtrag”). For the whole of P967, one must consult four sources: Kenyon (*Chester Beatty*), Johnson, Gehman and Kase (*Scheide*), Fernández-Galiano, (“Nuevas Paginas”), and Jahn (*Kölner Teil*). P988 was published in 1950 by C. H. Roberts (*Antinoopolis*; see also Fernández-Galiano, “Antinoopolitano”).

Codex Vaticanus (1209 or B), dating from the mid-fourth century CE, is the oldest manuscript of the complete book of Ezekiel in any language. Though pre-hexaplaric, B is more closely aligned

¹ The fragment of Ezek 5:12–13 from 11QEzek shows similarities to the LXX, which is suggestive of its potential importance. See E. D. Herbert, “11QEzekiel (pls. II, IV),” *DJD* 23 (1998): 26.

² For brief descriptions of the other Greek codices, see Olley, *Ezekiel*, 8–12.

³ Different portions of the Scheide edition (*The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel* [PUSP 3; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1938]) were prepared by the three authors, A. C. Johnson, H. S. Gehman, and J. E. H. Kase. When necessary, I will cite the authors individually as follows: Johnson, *Scheide*; Gehman, *Scheide*; Kase, *Scheide*.

with (proto-)MT in *certain* respects than is P967. B represents most of the same small minuses vis-à-vis MT and is also lacking 36:23c–38. However, it does not lack 12:26–28 or 32:24b–26, and its chapter order in 36–39 agrees with the MT. B is available in a colour facsimile edition, published in 1999 (*Bibliorum sacrorum Graecorum Codex Vaticanus B*) that is superior to the sometimes-blurry 1907 edition (*Bibliorum SS. Graecorum Codex Vaticanus 1209 (Cod. B) denuo phototypice expressus*).

Codex Zuqninensis rescriptus, or codex Z, is a fragmentary palimpsest dated between the sixth and eighth centuries CE.⁴ It is the earliest example of the Lucianic text of Ezekiel, which is also represented in mss 22-36-48-51-96-231-763. A complete transcription of Z was published by Tisserant in 1911. In addition, Wevers conducted an exhaustive examination of Lucian-Ezekiel in 2003, clarifying its similarities and differences from MT, B, Theodotian, and Symmachus.

8.1.2 History of Modern Research

The birth and death of modern theories regarding Ezekiel's textual-history is a grand movement from one (nearly) universal position to another. Early modern critics viewed the MT as a corrupt exemplar of the book, which must be corrected in light of the more pristine form represented in B. Contemporary critics tend to view the proto-MT and OG as variant literary editions, a longer and a shorter edition, descended from a common ancestor.

8.1.2.1. The Modern Period to 1938. The period before 1938, saw the production of many works on the textual-history of Ezekiel, including Merx (1883), Cornill (1886), Toy (1899), Jahn (1905), Rothstein (1st ed., 1913; 4th ed., 1922), and Cooke (1936).⁵ Most featured a rigorous attempt to deal with every text-critical issue, however minute, in a quest to recover an older, more original text. Underlying this effort, were the conclusions, based upon close comparison of the B with the MT, that: (a) the MT and LXX are both descended from a common parent text, and (b) the MT represents a late, corrupt text-form. George Adam Cooke expressed the views and aims of the age most eloquently: "In the Hebrew Bible perhaps no book, except 1 and 2 Samuel, has suffered more injury to its text than Ezekiel ... our problem is to recover a text which shall be free from alterations and corruptions, and so far nearer to the original" (xl).⁶ The central point in the period was the production of Cornill's critical edition of Ezekiel, in which he presented a reconstruction of Ezekiel's *Urtext*, buttressed by an exhaustive apparatus (1886; similarly, Jahn, *Ezechiel*).⁷

Because of the priority granted to the LXX, a number of studies were dedicated to its history and character. Central to this scholarship was a debate regarding the number of translators

⁴ To be precise, Ezekiel is represented by Z^V (Vat. Syr. 162) and Z^{VI} (Vat. Syr. 162 and Brit. Mus. Add. 14665). See Fraenkel "Nachtrag," 356–58.

⁵ A. Merx, "Der Werth der Septuaginta für die Textkritik des Alten Testaments an Ezechiel aufgezeigt," *JPrTh* 9 (1883): 65–77; C. H. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1886); C. H. Toy, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel: Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text with Notes* (SBOT; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1899); G. Jahn, *Das Buch Ezechiel auf Grund Septuaginta hergestellt, übersetzt und kritisch erklärt* (Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1905); J. W. Rothstein, *Ezechiel: Übersetzt und Erklärt* (4th ed.; KAT; Leipzig: Deichert, 1922); and G. A. Cooke, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1936).

⁶ Cooke refers to the LXX as a "weapon" to be used against MT (*Ezekiel*, xli).

⁷ These efforts were often paired with an assumption that most or all of the hypothetical *Urtext* stemmed from the hand of the prophet Ezekiel or his immediate circle. See, for example, the commentaries and studies by H. von Ewald, *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes erklärt* (Stuttgart: Aldolph Krabbe 1841); F. Hitzig, *Der Prophet Ezechiel erklärt* (KHAT 8; Leipzig: Weidmann, 1847); R. Smend, *Der Prophet Ezechiel* (2nd ed.; KHAT; Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1880); A. Bertholet, *Das Buch Heseckiel* (KHAT 12; Leipzig and Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1897); and V. Hertrich, *Ezechielprobleme* (BZAW 61; Gießen: Töpelmann, 1932).

involved in its production (& 8.3.5). In this period, little attention was given to articulating the precise relationship between the Greek witnesses and MT. Scholars were largely content to characterize the MT plusses as corruptions of the book.

8.1.2.2. From 1937 to 1986. The period from 1937 to 1986 was characterized by advances and disagreements in the study of LXX-Ezek and by new models for reconstructing Ezekiel's literary history. The two most important developments were the publication of P967 (begun in 1937; & 8.3.2) and the completion of the Göttingen edition of LXX-Ezek (*Ezechiel*; 2nd ed., 1977; & 8.3.2). Editions of two of the fragmentary Hebrew manuscripts of Ezekiel from Qumran were also released (1QEzek, 1955; 3QEzek; 1962). The importance of these developments for the text-history of Ezekiel only began to be appreciated later (& 8.1.2.3). In this same period, Walther Zimmerli (*Ezekiel* 1, 2) and Moshe Greenberg ("Ancient Versions," "Valid Criteria") articulated divergent models of Ezekiel's text history, models that would establish the trajectory of research and debate in subsequent decades.

The publication of P967 was complex because leaves of the manuscript are held in four locations. They were published independently over a thirty-five year period (1937–1972) in three different languages: Chester Beatty, Ezek 11:25–17:21 (Kenyon, *Chester Beatty*, 1937); John Schiede, Ezek 19:12–37:4, including 38–39 (Johnson, *et al.*, *Scheide*, 1938); Madrid, Ezek 28:19–29:12, 32:30–34:6, and 37:4–43:8 (Fernández-Galiano, "Nuevas Paginas," 1971); Köln, Ezek 11:25–21:14, 25:5–26:9; 43:9–48:35 (Jahn, *Papyrus 967*, 1972). Each edition evaluates the papyrus differently and the apparatuses and analyses vary widely in their detail.

The early publications of Kenyon and Johnson, Gehman, and Kase took a high view of P967. They advanced several important conclusions, reinforced by various independent studies:⁸

1. Kenyon, Gehman, and Payne, in particular, affirmed the close affinity of P967 to B, although there is enough variance to underscore P967's independence (Kenyon, *Chester Beatty*, x–xii; Gehman, "Other Greek Mss.,"; Payne, "Codex Vaticanus")
2. P967 and B represent different pre-hexaplaric traditions, though P967 is closer to the OG (Johnson *et al.*, *Scheide*, 79).
3. Johnson and Gehman identified a group of minuscules, 22-23-36-48-51-231, that shared a number of distinctive readings with P967 and constitute a "fairly consistent group" (Johnson *et al.*, *Scheide*, 21, 73–79).
4. Codex A (excluding the Hexaplaric additions) agrees, on many occasions, with P967 and must be considered a valuable witness even when it disagrees with B (Wevers, "Status Constructus," 216; Johnson *et al.*, *Scheide*, 42–47).⁹
3. Old Latin witnesses, especially *Wirceburgensis*, appear to be based on a text resembling P967 (Johnson *et al.*, *Scheide*, 42–47; see also Bogaert, "Vetus Latina"; Lust, "Oldest Greek Manuscript").
4. The Syro-Hexapa tends to agree with B against P967 (Johnson *et al.*, *Scheide*, 73–79).¹⁰

⁸ See especially O. Procksch, *Studien zur Geschichte der Septuaginta-Die Propheten* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910); H.S. Gehman, "The Relations Between the Hebrew text of Ezekiel and that of the John H. Scheide Papyri," *JAOS* 58 (1938): 92–102; H.S. Gehman, "The Relations between the John H. Scheide Papyri and that of the Other Greek Mss. of Ezekiel," *IBL* 57 (1938): 281–87; J. Ziegler, "Die Bedeutung des Chester Beatty-Scheide Papyrus 967 für die Textüberlieferung der Ezechiel-Septuaginta," *ZAW* 61 (1945–48): 76–94; J. B. Payne, "The Relationship of the Chester Beatty Papyri of Ezekiel to Codex Vaticanus," *IBL* 68 (1949): 251–265; and Wevers, "Status Constructus."

⁹ As might be expected, where A agrees with P967 against B, Lucian not infrequently agrees with A and P967 (see also Wevers, "The L Text").

¹⁰ But note the cautions on this point in Johnson *et al.*, *Scheide*, 75–77.

In 1952, Ziegler published the first Göttingen edition of *Ezechiel*. In this edition, he took a distinctively different line than Kenyon, Johnson, Gehman, and Kase. Though Ziegler acknowledged the importance of P967 for the reconstruction of the OG, he was hesitant to grant it supremacy over B. Ziegler grouped P967, P988, B, Old Latin, and Coptic as related witnesses (the B-group).¹¹ He was most willing to read with P967 when it agreed with B, Latin, and Coptic, but tended to follow B, even when it stood against the rest of the group. Only B, in Ziegler's view, was free of hexaplaric influences. For Ziegler, then, P967 was merely "a valuable support of B" ("Chester Beatty-Scheide Papyrus 967," 77).

In his 1953 *Biblica* study, Ziegler reaffirmed his view, and clarified his understanding of the relationship of P967 to MT as follows: some verses in P967 show evidence of having been corrected toward MT, and thus the ms should not be given priority over B. (See, for example, the lengthy discussion of Ezek 27:16 in Johnson *et al.*, *Scheide*, 98–101). Thus, when P967 reads with other witnesses against MT it is strong evidence for OG, but when it reads with MT, its readings reflect secondary adjustments toward MT. Ziegler's position has not gone undisputed, but it continues to be adopted as the starting point for many scholars, especially in Germany.¹²

Ziegler did not have access to all the pages of P967 and P988 when he prepared his 1952 edition. In 1977, a revised edition was prepared by Detlef Fraenkel. Though Fraenkel seems to have a higher view of the importance of P967 than Ziegler, the 1977 edition reprinted Ziegler's text, apparatus, and introduction unchanged. Fraenkel merely added a supplement to the end of the volume (*Ezechiel*, 331–352). In it he listed additional evidence based on the Madrid and Köln portions of P967 and on new leaves of the Antinoopolis papyri (P988).

The texts released and the debates undertaken in this era have wide implications, not only for the recovery of OG-Ezek but also for the text-history of the Hebrew book. Despite this, it was outside of the field of Septuagint studies that sweeping models of Ezekiel's textual history were being proposed, models that did *not* take into account the implications of the evidence from the versions. With Walter Zimmerli's *Ezechiel*¹ and 2 (1969; ET 1979–83), a new era in the critical study of Ezekiel emerged. Zimmerli characterized the book of Ezekiel as the product of many layers of *Fortschreibungen*, "supplements." This characterized not only the redactional evolution of the book but also the expansions witnessed in the texts and versions. He offered an exhaustive description of the on-going growth of the book from its hypothetical origins to the MT. The notion of an *Urtext* corrupted by ill-fated scribal interventions was gone. Expansions, regardless of their time of origin, were viewed as thoughtful, deliberate, and literate. For Zimmerli, literary-criticism and textual-criticism were not divisible in any meaningful way. Zimmerli, however, did not utilize much of the new Septuagint scholarship. Though Zimmerli had access to early transcriptions of P967, including those released for publication after his commentary appeared, he relegated the papyrus to his discussion of "The Later History of the Book and its Text" (*Ezekiel*¹, 76–77). Because of this, and because the evidence from the Judean Desert discoveries was still emerging, he was not able to integrate the data from textual criticism with his-historical-critical innovations to produce a comprehensive model of Ezekiel's textual history.

In a pair of manifesto-style essays written in 1977 and 1986, Greenberg – singling out scholars like Zimmerli – called on the academy to abandon attempts to recover an "improved" text, either

¹¹ Ziegler did not have access to P988 for production of *Ezechiel*. He describes its relationship to the B-group in *Susanna, Daniel, Bet et Draco* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum XVI.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954), 77–78 (volume revised by O. Munnch in 1999).

¹² Note the criticisms of this point by P. Katz ("Zur Textgestaltung der Ezechiel-Septuaginta," *Bib* 35 [1954]: 29–39), as well as the extended discussion in Lilly, *Two Books*, 38–60.

by historical-critical or text-critical means.¹³ He contended that the OG and MT represent “two versions, each with its own quality and its own coherence” (“Ancient Versions,” 217). He further argued, based upon finds in the Judean desert, that the MT was as old as the *Vorlage* of OG and that “this means that in the third century B.C.E. ... several forms [of Ezekiel] were extant and considered authoritative” (“Ancient Versions,” 219). Like Zimmerli, Greenberg did not acknowledge or account for all of the available evidence. In Greenberg’s case, he particularly overlooked new arguments regarding the relationship of the OG to the (proto-)MT. Despite Zimmerli’s and Greenberg’s opposed points of view, together they laid the groundwork for a comprehensive model of the transmission history of the book.

8.1.2.3. From 1986 to the Early 21st Century.¹⁴ Major editions of the Ezekiel fragments from Qumran’s Cave 4 and the Masada scroll were published between 1996 and 1999. The importance of the Judean Desert finds for the text-history of Ezekiel does not lie in the Ezekiel fragments themselves. Their importance lies in the broader picture of Second Temple textual developments that they present. The scrolls made it apparent that, for certain books, multiple text-types were in circulation simultaneously and (potentially) in use within individual communities. This is most plainly the case for Joshua, Jeremiah, Proverbs, Esther and Daniel as well as portions of Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Judges, Samuel, Nehemiah, and Chronicles (*TCHB*³, 283–326; Ulrich¹⁵). This discovery, as it emerged, introduced new possibilities for explaining the relationship of LXX-Ezek to MT-Ezek.

Thus, the evidence from the Judean desert witnesses and the on-going analysis of the Greek witnesses (especially B and P967) provided, eventually, the necessary evidence for a more-or-less complete picture of Ezekiel’s transmission history to emerge. Two scholars have done the most to compile this evidence into a new portrait of Ezekiel’s literary history: Johann Lust and Emanuel Tov.¹⁶ In a seminal 1981 article, “Ezekiel 36–40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript,” Lust asserted, against Ziegler, that P967 is the best witness to the OG. In it, Lust compared the MT with P967, focusing particular attention on the large plus in 36:23c–38 (MT) and the alternate arrangement of chapters 38–39–37. He proposed that the two texts represent variant editions of the book. The older edition is represented by P967. The younger MT-edition reflects anti-apocalyptic, Pharisaic sentiments.¹⁷ Lust continued to advance and nuance this position in subsequent publications that extended his ideas to text-segments like Ezek 7 and 32:24b–26,¹⁸ though he gradually abandoned the Pharisaic hypothesis.¹⁹

In 1986, Tov also characterized LXX-Ezek as a variant edition of the book, earlier than MT. Tov focused attention on differences in arrangement in Ezekiel 7 and on the many small expansions to MT-Ezek. He concluded that “the MT and LXX texts of Ez. reflect two different redactional stages

¹³ In his 1977 essay, “The Use of Ancient Versions,” Greenberg singled out the following for criticism: Cornill, *Ezechiel*; Fohrer, *Ezechiel* (HAT 13; Tiibingen: Mohr, 1955); W. Eichrodt, *Der Prophet Hesekeiel* (3rd ed.; ATD 22; Göttingen 1968; ET 1970); Wevers, *Ezekiel* (1982); and Zimmerli, *Ezechiel* 1 and 2 (1969).

¹⁴ A summary of findings from the period can be found at the end of this section.

¹⁵ E. Ulrich. “The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time of Hillel and Jesus,” in *Congress Volume: Basel, 2001* (ed. A. Lemaire; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 85–108; idem., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

¹⁶ See, in the bibliography: Lust, 1986 (x3), 1987, 1996, 1999, 2000, 2003, 2006; Tov, 1986, 1987, 1994, 2006.

¹⁷ Lust did not characterize the *Tendenz* of P967, focusing instead on the unique features of the MT.

¹⁸ See, in the bibliography, Lust, 1981, 1986 (x3), 2003, 2006.

¹⁹ See Lust, “Stepbrothers,” and discussion in Crane, *Restoration*, 236–45.

of the book.” As such “*none* of the readings should be preferred *textually* to another one.”²⁰ Whereas Lust focused attention on the significance of P967 for Ezekiel’s textual history, Tov focused in subsequent publications on text pluriformity as a central component of Ezekiel’s textual history (see esp., 2006 and *TCHB*³: 299–301).²¹

The emerging view that OG and MT represent variant editions of the book has been extended by several recent monographs. Ashley Crane’s 2006 study of Ezek 36–39 examined differences in the “theology of restoration” presented in P967, B, and MT.²² Like Lust, Crane began with the assumption that P967 is the closest witness to OG. Crane then set out to nuance Lust’s views. He suggested that the MT edition of Ezekiel reflects a Second Temple political context. Through rearrangement and expansion, P967’s vision of peaceful national reunification (with 37:24–28 immediately preceding chaps 40–48) was recast as a “call to arms” in the face of foreign domination (*Restoration*, 251–54).

In 2010, Timothy Mackie concluded an exhaustive study of the pluses in MT and OG (identified with Ziegler’s critical text). He produced a descriptive typology of the types and purposes of the expansions. The basis of Mackie’s study was the recognition that the differences in quantity and arrangement between MT and LXX constitute different editions of the book.²³ Distinguishing it from other studies though, he highlighted similarities in the *production* of the two editions. He concluded that expansions to MT and LXX, though achieving different results, were conducted by the same scribal techniques and inspired by similar aims. Expansion and alteration was motivated, not just by historical concerns (as Lust and Crane emphasize) but also by purely interpretive and inner-biblical considerations.

By the time Ingrid Lilly completed her Emory dissertation in 2010, she could assume broad acceptance of the view that P967 and MT represent alternative editions.²⁴ Filling a significant gap in extant research, Lilly examined P967 as an independent document with its own ideological profile. Lilly isolated several tendencies that distinguish P967 from the MT, *Tendenzen* that emerge only when a comprehensive survey of variants between the two texts are examined. She highlighted unique perspectives in P967 on prophecy, the fate of the slain, Israel’s restoration, and the war with Gog. Lilly’s study is the most exhaustive yet attempted on the different editions of Ezekiel and clarified the relationship of P967 to MT, in particular.

Similarly, in 2012 Christoph Rösel completed an exhaustive analysis of all divergent features of the MT and OG in Ezek 38–39 (*JHWHs Sieg*). (Like Mackie, Rösel equates Ziegler’s text with the OG.) His analysis extends to argumentative and ideological distinctives that are only apparent when the cumulative differences between the MT and LXX are compared. He too concluded that the two texts, though descended from a common Hebrew progenitor, represent different literary editions with different ideological trajectories (119–26). For example, the MT has linked the Gog Oracles more tightly with the book, as can be seen, for example in the addition of הָר, “mountain(s),” at 38:8, 21 – connecting to chaps 6 and 36 – and of עֵבֶר at 39:11, 14 – connecting to 33:28. (*JHWHs Sieg*, 85, 117; cf. Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, 184–85).

²⁰ Tov, “Recensional,” 101 (italics original); see also *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 307–11.

²¹ Tov has not addressed P967 specifically. He has continued to affirm that recensional rewriting is evident only in a “thin layer of literary (editorial) differences ... in 7:3–9” (*TCHB*³, 299).

²² Crane, *Restoration* = “The Restoration of Israel: Ezekiel 36–39 in Early Jewish Interpretation. A Textual-Comparative Study of the Oldest Hebrew and Greek Manuscripts” (PhD diss. Murdoch University, 2006).

²³ Mackie dis-prefers the use of the word “edition” for Ezekiel because the word that suggests a *systematic* redaction of the whole book (“Expanding,” 279–81).

²⁴ Lilly, *Two Books* = “Papyrus 967: A Variant Literary Edition of Ezekiel” (PhD Diss., Emory, 2010).

Thus, current consensus holds that MT and OG represent different literary editions of the book, one longer one shorter, with different ideological profiles. The consensus view, though, has not been achieved without opposition. Dan Block famously rejected the evidence of P967 as late and corrupt, a view he later surrendered.²⁵ Likewise Hector Patmore, appealing to the evidence from Qumran and Masada, has questioned arguments in favour of the priority of P967. Echoing the arguments of Greenberg from thirty years prior, Patmore has contended that priority cannot be granted to either edition of Ezekiel.²⁶

Though not all their findings are congruent, the full picture of Ezekiel's literary history was further clarified in this period by targeted studies of the Syriac text,²⁷ Ethiopic text,²⁸ Lucian,²⁹ and Old Latin and Vulgate.³⁰ Most important for the textual history of Ezekiel are the analyses of Lucian. Though post-Hexaplaric, *L* represents an important link in Ezekiel's evolutionary chain. Lucian is a revision of a Greek exemplar toward the MT that is heavily reliant on the Hexapla, and, hence, has many similarities to Theodotion. It also, on occasion, manifests readings from Symmachus, though this has sometimes been overstated. Though, most likely, the result of inner-Greek development, Lucian represents one of the most comprehensive attempts to adapt the OG to the MT text-form (albeit in Greek).³¹

The findings of this period of academic ferment are diverse and multifaceted. They can be summarized as follows:

1. All pre-masoretic Hebrew texts of Ezekiel can be aligned with the (proto)MT, pointing to the antiquity of the text-form. Though it should be cautioned that the Qumran fragments may well be from excerpted texts.³² MasEzek, the most extensive of the Hebrew sources (= Ezek 35:11–38:14), deviates only slightly from MT (Talmon, "Fragments," 33–37). Expansions reflected only

²⁵ D. I. Block, *Ezekiel 25–48* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 337–43. See also Lust, "Stepbrothers," 15–21; Crane, *Restoration*, 236–45.

²⁶ "The Shorter and Longer Texts of Ezekiel: The Implications of the Manuscript finds from Masada and Qumran," *JSOT* 32/2 (2007): 231–42. It also should be noted that many of the Hebrew texts from Qumran to which Patmore appeals (e.g., 4Q73–75) have been tentatively identified as excerpted texts and do not represent any particular "edition of the book" (Brooke, "Qumran and New Testament").

²⁷ W. Baars, "Peshitta Institute Communications IX: A Palimpsest of Ezekiel Reconstructed," *VT* 20 (1970): 527–536; J. A. Lund, "Converse Translation in *Peshitta Ezekiel*" (<http://www.reltech.org/TC/v06/Lund2001.html>; online revision of an essay read at Syriac Symposium III on June 19, 1999, at the University of Notre Dame); J. A. Lund, "Syntactic Features of the Syrohexapla of *Ezekiel*," *AS* 4 (2006): 67–81; M.J. Mulder, "Ezekiel 20:39 and the Peshitta version," *VT* 25 (1975): 233–236; M.J. Mulder, "Die neue Peshitta-Ausgabe von Ezechiel," in *Ezekiel and his Book* (ed. J. Lust; BETL 74; Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1986), 101–110; M.J. Mulder, "Some remarks on the Peshitta translation of the Book of Ezekiel," in *Peshitta*. (Leiden: E J Brill, 1988), 169–182; H. F. van Rooy, "Agreement between LXX and Peshitta versus MT in Ezekiel: Some Important Examples," in *Translating a Translation* (ed. H. Ausloos *et al*; BETL 213; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 213–227.

²⁸ M. Knibb, "Two Notes on the Ethiopic Text of Ezekiel," in *Semitic Studies in Honour of Edward Ullendorff* (ed. G. Kahn; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005), 236–244.

²⁹ N. Fernandez-Marcos, "On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel," in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (ed. F. García Martínez and M. Vervenna; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 151–161; E. Tisserant, "Notes sur la recension lucianique d'Ézéchiél," *RB* 8 (1911): 384–390; Wevers, "The *L* Text."

³⁰ P.-M. Bogaert, "Le témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l'étude de la tradition des Septante: Ezéchiel et Daniel dans le Papyrus 967," *Bib* 59 (1978): 384–95; Ranke, *Wirceburgensium*; H. F. van Rooy, "The Minor Versions and the Text of Ezekiel," in *Florilegium Lovaniense* (ed. H. Ausloos *et al*; BETL 224; Leiden: Peeters, 2008), 493–506.

³¹ Wevers concluded ("The *L* Text," 115), and Fernandez-Marcos agreed ("On Symmachus," 160–61), that there is "no compelling evidence" that Lucian knew or used any Hebrew source(s).

³² See Brooke, "Qumran and New Testament," and discussion in Talmon and Yadin, *Masada VI*, 69–73.

- in the MT tradition are already present in MasEzek, including the recurring difference in expressions of the divine name.³³ The same alignment with MT exists with respect to true variants.³⁴
2. P967, B, and MT are all descended from a common Hebrew progenitor or closely related progenitor texts (Lilly, *Two Books*, 128–29).
 - a. There is little evidence of textual error in P967 or B. Both are extremely accurate copies of Greek translations that are closely aligned with their Hebrew *Vorlagen* in quantity and consistency of representative elements (& 8.3.3; 8.3.4).³⁵
 - b. Disregarding variances in their arrangement and the numerous expansions in MT, the *Vorlagen* of P967 and B are substantively identical to the consonantal MT (Marquis, “Word Order,” “Consistency”).
 3. Numerous books and portions of books existed in alternative literary editions that circulated concurrently well beyond the Second Temple period. In as much as the Greek witnesses reflect an edition of Ezekiel that differs in arrangement, quantity, and *Tendenzen* from the MT, Ezekiel can be added to this group.
 4. The cumulative evidence suggests that B and P967 reflect different, pre-hexaplaric instantiations of a developing Hebrew text. Several lines of evidence lead to this conclusion:
 - a. Both P967 and B contain unique expansions and variants that point to their independent development. Among the expansions can be cited the following in P967: 35:8, 38:20; 39:4. In B, unique expansions are found, most densely, in chaps 40–43 (Mackie, “Expanding,” 349–51; Lilly, *Two Books*, 95–103; 128–29).³⁶
 - b. Both P967 and B are shorter than the MT, though P967 is slightly shorter than B. At Ezek 32:24b–26 (MT), for example, P967 represents a 39 word minus, whereas B represents a 24 word minus (Lust, “Major Divergences,” 87–89; Lilly, *Two Books*, 119–120).
 - c. The arrangement of chaps 37–39 in B, corresponds with MT. B and P967 both diverge from MT’s arrangement in chap 7. P967 is not extant for chap 7 (Bogaert, “deux redactions”; Tov, “Recensional”; Mackie, “Expanding”).
 - d. P967 includes three major minuses vis á vis MT – 12:26–28, 32:24b–26, and 36:23c–38 – none of which can be plausibly attributed to scribal error (Lust, “Oldest,” “Textual Witnesses,” “Major Divergences”; Lilly, *Two Books*).
 - e. There is little evidence to suggest that the differences between B and P967 reflect inner-Greek development (see arguments in Lilly, *Two Books*, 128–29).
 5. Lucian represents a correction toward the (proto)MT edition of the book. This is suggested, for example, by the fact that MT shares 45 asterisked readings with *L*. Even *A* only agrees with MT in 35 asterisked readings (see Wevers, “The *L* Text”; Lilly, *Two Books*).

These diverse findings have important effects for the proposals of Zimmerli and Greenberg. Both models were correct, in certain respects, and less-correct in others. The available manuscript

³³ The full list of plusses in MasEzek corresponding to MT appear in Talmon, “Fragments,” 37–38. Regarding the divine name, e.g., LXX: αὐτός :: MT, MasEzek: יהוה אֱדֹנֵי. On this complex issue, see the excellent summation by Olley (“Part 1,” 145–46) and the bibliography there.

³⁴ Talmon groups Ezek 35.12 in this class: MT כל :: LXX φωνῆς = קוֹל (“Fragments,” 38–39).

³⁵ Marquis, “Lexical Equivalents,” 1987; D.M. O’Hare, “Have You Seen, Son of Man?": A Study in the Translation and Vorlage of LXX Ezekiel 40–48 (SCS 57; Atlanta: Scholars, 2010), 33–71; Lilly, *Two Books*, 127–28. Note however, that there is an open question as to how many translators may have been responsible for OG-Ezek. See 8.3.5 as well as the recent summaries in O’Hare (1–31) and Olley (“Part 1,” 145–46).

³⁶ See 40:12, 13, 16, 19, 21, 23, 27, 39, 41, 43, 44, 47, 48; 41:3, 15, 16, 21, 22; 42:1, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 20; 43: 1, 14, 16, 20. See also Marquis (“Lexical Equivalents”) and Tov (“Recensional”).

evidence suggests that the latter stages of the book's growth and development are characterised by progressive expansion and rearrangement conducted in a manner akin to Zimmerli's model of progressive supplementation. With Greenberg, it must be acknowledged that these developments resulted in different texts with their own logic and literary coherence. It now appears that two editions of the book circulated simultaneously in antiquity: a shorter text, represented most distinctively by Pg67, and a longer text, represented by the MT. These editions differ not only in length but in order: order of verses in chap 7, and order of chapters in 37–39. Based on the translation character of LXX-Ezek (& 8.3.3), it can be positively affirmed that both editions appear to be descended from a common progenitor and reflect different stages in the literary evolution of the book.

8.1.1.4. Future Directions

Within text-critical scholarship, there are several new horizons and open opportunities for significant research. Perhaps most needed is a comprehensive critical edition of Pg67. Likewise, the relationship between B and Pg67 is still not entirely clear. Both appear to represent pre-Hexaplaric witnesses. Whether or not one or both are recensional – as Olley argues for B; (*Ezekiel*, 5) and Ziegler for Pg67 (*Ezechiel*) – still requires exhaustive exploration. Their differences in translation technique also require exploration. Further, there is a new urgency to compare the text-form of the many quotations and allusions to Ezekiel within Jewish Second Temple literature and early Christian sources with the extant texts and versions. Finally, there is a new appreciation of the ways that textual-criticism is essential for understanding the early reception of Ezekiel's book, a field that is only beginning to be explored.

Scholarship on Ezekiel, beyond the field of textual-criticism, continues to be divided into two broad types. The first embraces the MT exclusively, and largely rejects attempts to reconstruct its literary history (apart from correcting scribal errors or purging of the occasional MT expansion).³⁷ This position is often reinforced by the contemporary scholarly interest in the various texts and versions as literary artefacts in their own right. The second, following in the footsteps of Zimmerli, is focused on the redaction of the book and increasingly cites the text-critical evidence for corroboration of the model.³⁸ More recently, a third position has begun to emerge that attempts to construct a redaction critical model that *begins* with empirical evidence from the texts, versions, and rewritten scriptures, rather than citing textual evidence in support of an existing model (Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, "Covenant and Presence"; Rösel, *JHWHs Sieg*).

Bibliography

W. Baars, "Peshiṭṭa Institute Communications IX: A Palimpsest of Ezekiel Reconstructed," *VT* 20 (1970): 527–536.

³⁷ E.g., D. I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel 1–24; The Book of Ezekiel 25–48* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997–98); J. Becker, *Der priesterliche Prophet. Das Buch Ezechiel* (2 vols; SKK 11–12; Stuttgart: Kath. Bibelwerk, 1971); P. Joyce, *Ezekiel: A Commentary* (2d ed.; LHBOT 482; London and New York: T & T Clark, 2009). Motives for adopting this position differ widely. For example, some view the book as a whole is a late pseudepigraph (e.g., Becker). Others are sceptical of the potential of redaction criticism (e.g., Block, Greenberg, Joyce).

³⁸ For example, K.-F. Pohlmann, *Ezechiel. Der Stand der theologischen Diskussion* (Darmstadt: WBG, 2008); K.-F. Pohlmann, *Der Prophet Hesekiel/Ezechiel 1–19; Der Prophet Hesekiel/Ezechiel 20–48* (ATD 22.1–2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996–2001); A. Klein, *Schriftauslegung im Ezechielbuch: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Ez 34–39* (BZAW 391; Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008).

- Bibliorum sacrorum Graecorum Codex Vaticanus B* (Rome: Istituto poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1999).
- Bibliorum SS. Graecorum Codex Vaticanus 1209 (Cod. B) denuo phototypice expressus. I. Testamentum Vetus* (Mediolani: ulricum Hoepli, 1907).
- P.-M. Bogaert, "Les deux rédactions conservées (LXX et TM) d'Ézéchiél 7," in *Ezekiel and His Book* (ed. J. Lust; BETL 74; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986), 21–47.
- P.-M. Bogaert, "Le témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l'étude de la tradition des Septante: Ezéchiél et Daniel dans le Papyrus 967," *Bib* 59 (1978): 384–95.
- G. Brooke, "Ezekiel in Some Qumran and New Testament Texts," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (eds. J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 317–37.
- C.H. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1886).
- A.S. Crane, *Israel's Restoration, A Textual-Comparative Exploration of Ezekiel 36–39* (VTSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2008).
- M. Fernández-Galiano, "El papiro Antinoopolitano de Ezequiel a la luz de las páginas Matritenses de 967," *Emerita* 39 (1971): 51–61.
- M. Fernández-Galiano, "Nuevas Páginas del códice 967 del A.T. griego," *StPap* 10 (1971): 7–76.
- D. Fraenkel, "Nachtrag zur 1. Auflage von 1952," in *Ezekiel. Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum, Auctoritate Academiae Societatis Litterarum Göttingensis editum*, vol. 16/1 by J. Ziegler (2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977).
- H.S. Gehman, "The Relations Between the Hebrew text of Ezekiel and that of the John H. Scheide Papyri," *JAOS* 58 (1938): 92–102.
- H.S. Gehman, "The Relations between the John H. Scheide Papyri and that of the Other Greek Mss. of Ezekiel," *JBL* 57 (1938): 281–87.
- M. Greenberg, "The Use of Ancient Versions for Interpreting the Hebrew Text: A Sampling from Ezekiel ii 1–iii 11," in *Congress Volume: Göttingen, 1977* (ed. J. A. Emerton; VTSup 29; Leiden: Brill, 1978): 131–148.
- M. Greenberg, "What are Valid Criteria for Determining Inauthentic Matter in Ezekiel?" in *Ezekiel and His Book. Textual and Literary Criticism and their Relation* (ed. Johann Lust; BETL 74; Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 123–35.
- L. G. Jahn, *Der Griechische Text des Buche Ezechiel nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967* (PTA 15; Bonn: Peter Habelt, 1972).
- F. J. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther*. Fasc 7. 2 vols. London: Emery Walker, 1937.
- I. Lilly, *Two Books of Ezekiel: Papyrus 967 and the Masoretic Text as Variant Literary Editions* (VTSup 150; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012).
- J. Lust, "Ezekiel 36–40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript," *CBQ* 43 (1981): 517–533.
- J. Lust, "The Use of Textual Witnesses for the Establishment of the Text: The Shorter and Longer Texts of Ezekiel," in *Ezekiel and His Book* (ed. J. Lust; BETL 74; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986), 7–20.
- J. Lust, "Ezekiel Manuscripts at Qumran: Preliminary Edition of 4Q Ez a and b," in *Ezekiel and His Book* (ed. J. Lust; BETL 74; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996), 90–100.
- J. Lust, "Textual Criticism of the Old Testament and of the New Testament: Stepbrothers?" in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis. FS Joël Delobel* (ed. A. Denaux; BETL 161; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 15–31.
- J. Lust, "Major Divergences between LXX and MT in Ezekiel," in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible* (ed. A. Schenker. Atlanta: Scholars, 2003), 83–92.

- J. Lust, "The Ezekiel Text," in *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker Offered by the Editors of Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (eds. Y. A. P. Goldman et al.; VTSup 110; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006): 153–67.
- T.P. Mackie, "Expanding Ezekiel: The Hermeneutics of Scribal Addition in the Ancient Text Witnesses of the Book of Ezekiel" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2010).
- G. Marquis, "Word Order as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the LXX and the Evaluation of Word Order Variants as exemplified in LXX-Ezekiel," *Textus* 13 (1986): 59–84.
- G. Marquis, "Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique as Exemplified in the LXX of Ezekiel," in *VI Congress of the international Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem, 1986* (ed. C. Cox; SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: SBL, 1987), 405–424.
- A. Merx, "Der Werth der Septuaginta für die Textkritik des Alten Testaments, am Ezechiel aufgezeichnet," *JPrTh* 9 (1883): 65–77.
- D.M. O'Hare, "Have You Seen, Son of Man?": *A Study in the Translation and Vorlage of LXX Ezekiel 40-48* (SCS 57; Atlanta: Scholars, 2010).
- J.W. Olley, *Ezekiel. A Commentary Based on Iezekiel in Codex Vaticanus* (SCS; Leiden: Brill, 2009).
- J. W. Olley, "Trajectories of Ezekiel: Part 1," *CBR* 9/2 (2011): 137–170.
- J. W. Olley, "Trajectories of Ezekiel: Part 2," *CBR* 10/1 (2011): 53–80.
- J. B. Payne, "The Relationship pf the Chester Beatty Papyri of Ezekiel to Codex Vaticanus," *JBL* 68 (1949): 251–265.
- E. Ranke, *Par palimpsestorum Wirceburgensium antiquissimae Veteris Testamenti latinae fragmenta e codd. Rescriptus* (Vienna: Braumüller, 1871).
- C.H. Roberts, *The Antinoopolis Papyri. Edited with Translations and Notes* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1950).
- C. Rösel, *JHWHs Sieg über Gog aus Magog: Ez 38-39 im Masoretischen Text und in der Septuaginta* (WMANT 132; Göttingen: Neukirchener Verlag, 2012).
- J.W. Rothstein, *Das Buch Ezechiel* (4th ed; HSAT 1; Tübingen: Mohr, 1922).
- P. Schwagmeier, *Untersuchungen zur Textgeschichte und Entstehung des Ezechielbuches in masoretischer und griechischer Überlieferung* (Disertation; University of Zürich, 2004).
- S. Talmon, "Fragments of an Ezekiel Scroll from Masada (Ezek 35:11–38:14) 1043–2220, MAS 1D," *Orientalia Lovaniensia* 27 (1996): 29–49.
- S. Talmon and Y. Yadin, *Masada VI. Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports: Hebrew Fragments from Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999).
- TCHB*⁸ = E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012).
- W.A. Tooman, *Gog of Magog* (FAT II/52; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).
- W.A. Tooman, "Covenant and Presence in the Composition and Theology of Ezekiel," in *Divine Presence and Absence in Exilic and Post-Exilic Judaism* (eds. I.J. de Hulster and N. MacDonald; FAT II; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming).
- E. Tov, "Recensional Differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint of Ezekiel," *ETL* 62 (1986): 89–101. Revised ed. in E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 1999), 397–410.
- E. Tov, "Some Sequential Differences between the MT and LXX and their Ramifications," *JNSL* 13 (1987): 151–60. Revised ed. in E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 1999), 411–18.
- E. Tov, "Glosses, Interpolations, and Other Types of Scribal Additions in the Text of the Hebrew Bible," in *Language, Theology and the Bible: Essays in Honour of James Barr* (ed. S. E. Balentine and J. Barton; Clarendon: Oxford, 1994), 40–66. Revised ed. in E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 1999), 53–74.

- E. Tov, "Hebrew Scripture Editions: Philosophy and Praxis," in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection—Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (ed. F. García Martínez et al.; STDJ 61; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006), 281–312. Revised ed. in E. Tov, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 247–270.
- J.W. Wevers, "The Evidence of the Text of the John H. Scheide Papyri for the Translation of Status Constructus in Ezekiel," *JBL* (1951): 211–216.
- J.W. Wevers, "The *L* Text of Ezekiel," in *Studies in the Text Histories of Deuteronomy and Ezekiel* (eds. J. W. Wevers and D. Fraenkel; MSU 26; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 68–116.
- J. Ziegler, "Die Bedeutung des Chester Beatty-Scheide Papyrus 967 für die Textüberlieferung der Ezechiel-Septuaginta," *ZAW* 61 (1945–48): 76–94.
- J. Ziegler, "Zur Textgestaltung der Ezechiel-Septuaginta," *Bib* 34 (1953): 435–55.
- J. Ziegler, *Ezechiel. Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum, Auctoritate Academiae Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum*, vol. 16/1 with addendum by D. Fraenkel. (2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977).
- W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1–2* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979–83). German original: *Ezekiel 1–2* (BKAT 13/1–2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1969).

Keywords

Ezekiel
Greenberg
Lucian
Septuagint
(proto)MT
text history
P967
P988
Ziegler
Zimmerli

Glossary terms

Scheide Papyrus (P967)
Antinoopolis Papyrus (P988)
Codex Vaticanus (B)
Codex Zuqninensis (Z)
Lucian
B-group