

THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL

Editors

Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein

Shemaryahu Talmon

Associate Editor

Galen Marquis

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY BIBLE PROJECT

Research Associates

Moshe Bar-Asher, Benjamin Kedar, Yeshayahu Maori, Israel Yeivin

Section Heads

Shraga Assif, Noam Mizrahi, Shlomo Naeh, David Weissert, Rafael Zer

Research Assistants

Gabriela Cerra, Yonatan Sagiv, Uri Gabbay,
Nehemia Gordon, Renana Greenwald, Yifat Monnickendam, Lavi Shay

SUPPORTED BY

The Ministry of Education and Culture of the State of Israel;
The Israel Science Foundation; The Hebrew University of Jerusalem;
Yad Avi Ha-Yishuv; The Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture;
The Mizra Foundation, Japan; The Lucius N. Littauer Foundation;
The S. H. and Helen R. Scheuer Family Foundation;
The Perry Foundation for Biblical Research; The Charles Rosenbloom Foundation;
The Paula and David Ben-Gurion Fund for Jewish Studies
Established by the Federmann Family; Congregation Emanu-El, New York;
The Estate of the late Dr. Hymie Gordon; Martin and Lois Zelman

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY BIBLE

THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL

Editors

Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein
Shemaryahu Talmon

Associate Editor

Galen Marquis

JERUSALEM 2004

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY MAGNES PRESS

Distributed by The Hebrew University Magnes Press
P. O. Box 39099, Jerusalem 91390, Israel; Fax: 972-2-5633370
E-mail: magneshl@pob.huji.ac.il; www.magnespress.huji.ac.il

©
Copyright
The Hebrew University Bible Project

ISBN 965-493-186-9
PRINTED IN ISRAEL
TYPESETTING BY POSNER & SONS, LTD.

This volume is dedicated to Reverend Takeji Otsuki,
Founder and Spiritual Leader of Beit-Shalom, Japan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With the publication of the third volume of the Hebrew University Bible we wish to express our thanks to all those who assisted in its production and who supported the Bible Project over the years. Our gratitude is due to the second president of the State of Israel, the late Izhak Ben-Zvi, the successive presidents and rectors of the Hebrew University, the successive Deans of the Faculty of Humanities, the successive chairpersons of the Institute of Jewish Studies, together with the Secretaries of the Institute, the Research Coordinator of the Institute, the Institute's administrative assistants, as well as the administrative staff of the Faculty of Humanities. Our gratitude is due also to the members of the Advisory Council, Profs. S. Japhet, Y. Zakovitch, Y.-T. Assis, and G. Hasan-Rokem.

We express our thanks to the individuals and foundations listed opposite the title page for their continuous support of the Bible Project: Dr. J. Hochbaum, Vice-President of the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, Ms. P. Brumberg, Director of the Lucius N. Littauer Foundation, Mr. K. Tsujita, Chairman of the Mizra Foundation, and to Rabbi Dr. R. B. Sobel, Congregation Emanu-El.

The editors' task depends on the excellent preparatory work carried out over the years by the section heads and researchers in the diverse sections—Hebrew Text and Masora: R. Zer, R. Greenwald, N. Gordon and R. Merdler; Septuagint and Vulgate: D. Weissert, B. Kedar, G. Marquis, G. Cerra, S. Sznol; Targum and Peshitta: S. Assif, C. Meehan; Judean Desert Scrolls: N. Mizrahi, and at an early stage Y. Ben-Dov; Rabbinic literature: S. Naeh, Y. Sagiv, U. Gabbai, Y. Monnickendam, and at an early stage Y. Maori and M. Ben-Yashar; Geniza fragments: I. Yeivin; late Hebrew MSS: N. Mizrahi, Y. Sagiv, and U. Gabai; early Hebrew MSS: I. Yeivin, R. Zer, L. Shay, and R. Greenwald, with the assistance of Y. Sagiv, N. Mizrahi, R. Merdler, and G. Kedem. G. Marquis reviewed the literature on the text of Ezekiel and compiled the bibliographical references in the notes, assisted by S. Sznoll.

At our request, variant biblical quotations in the Babylonian Talmud were supplied by the Institute for the Complete Israeli Talmud of Yad HaRav Herzog (Rabbi Herzog World Academy) in Jerusalem, from the Institute's collation of variant readings in MSS, Geniza fragments and early editions. We express our thanks to the director, Rabbi Joshua Huttner and his team.

Thanks are due to the research team of the *Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language*, the ancient period, at the Academy of Hebrew Language, and to its President, Prof. M. Bar-Asher and Prof. A. Tal, editor of the *Historical Dictionary*, for permission to use the Academy's CD-ROM compilation of ancient sources.

We also express our appreciation to the following scholars who assisted us in collating materials from various rabbinic compositions: L. Elias, T. Kadari, M. Kahana, M. Kister, the estate of the late T. Lifshitz, P. Mandel, and E. Treitl.

A. Roitman, Curator, and the staff of the Shrine of the Book at the Israel Museum, generously granted access to the original manuscript of the Aleppo Codex. Thanks are due to

Aknowledgements

B. Richler, Director of the Hebrew University's Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts, his assistant, Y. Okun, and I. Weiser of the Israel National Library's photography and reproduction services for their help and cooperation in providing copies of manuscripts for collation in the present volume. Special thanks go to O. Lipschitz and S. Friedman of Simor Ltd. for providing a printout of bibliographical references from their extensive database.

The present volume was produced on the basis of data-base and formatting programs developed by G. Marquis, including the cross-platform porting of the material, with the final typesetting being handled with consummate skill and care by R. Posner of Posner & Sons Ltd. Special thanks are due to the Magnes Press, its Director, D. Benovicci and his staff, for their continuous support and assistance in all stages of the volume's production.

The Hebrew University edition of Ezekiel follows the layout of the preceding volumes of Isaiah edited M. H. Goshen-Gottstein (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995), and Jeremiah, edited by C. Rabin, S. Talmon and E. Tov (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997). Preparatory work on the edition of the book of Ezekiel was done by the late M. H. Goshen-Gottstein and his team up to chapter 31. Their findings were thoroughly revised and completed by S. Talmon and G. Marquis, together with D. Weissert and S. Assif and the present team. While essentially in line with the Introduction of the previous volumes, the Introduction to the book of Ezekiel has been extensively updated. As a result of ongoing discussions of the methodology of the edition, advances in research and changes in perception, definitions of phenomena were revised where necessary, and some textual issues pertaining to aspects of the evidence recorded in the apparatuses have been added.

April 2004

THE EDITORS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vii
<i>Introduction</i>	
I. The History of the Text of Ezekiel as Reflected in the Apparatuses	xi
II. The Basic Text and the Masora	xv
III. Apparatus I: The Versions	xvii
IV. Apparatus II: The Judean Desert Scrolls and Biblical Quotations in Rabbinic Literature	xxviii
V. Apparatus III: Medieval Bible Manuscripts	xxxvi
VI. Apparatus IV: Orthography, Vowels, and Accents	xl
Bibliographical Abbreviations	xliv
Abbreviations	xlviii
<i>Appendix</i>	
Open and Closed Sections	xlix
The Book of Ezekiel	x

INTRODUCTION

I. THE HISTORY OF THE TEXT OF EZEKIEL AS REFLECTED IN THE APPARATUSES

1. The readings collated in the apparatuses of the edition were culled from a variety of sources which, taken together, reflect the transmission history of the biblical text. The method adopted constitutes a compromise between a meticulous system of subdivision that provides a separate apparatus for each source or group of sources, and an omnibus apparatus of variants in the ancient versions, biblical scrolls from the Judean Desert, medieval Hebrew manuscripts, and quotations from the Bible in rabbinic literature, all of these covering a period of almost two millennia. The division of the material collected into the essential minimum of four apparatuses enables the reader to comprehend the entire documentation.
2. The apparatuses direct attention to the documentation of the text at our disposal, and enable readers to draw their own conclusions concerning the variants recorded. The particular character of the biblical text and its various witnesses in Hebrew and in translations, militates against the presentation of the data in a relatively simple apparatus, as is customary in editions of classical works. No other text is witnessed to by such varied types of sources, each of which requires specific procedures for the presentation of their testimony in a critical apparatus. This edition attempts to overcome the special problems facing the scholar who seeks to view synoptically the diverse witnesses bearing upon the study of the transmission of the biblical text.
3. The material is presented in such a way that the reader can access the facts with ease. Scholars who do not accept the assumptions on which the arrangement of the material is based can view the existing apparatuses as a collection of raw materials. However, various types and groups of variants are presented in a manner that reflects the editors' conception of the history of the biblical text. The construction of apparatuses and the formulation of a theory are necessarily interdependent. The system of apparatuses reflects the conclusion, based on preceding studies, that the reconstruction of an *Urtext* is not the supreme goal of a critical edition of the Hebrew Bible.¹
4. The system of apparatuses centers on the Hebrew text. The theoretical foundation of the division into apparatuses can only be outlined here in the briefest possible way:²

1 For a discussion of the concept of *Urtext* cf. Talmon, "Textual Criticism," 144–142, 162–163; Tov, *TCHB*, 165–166, 170–172. A list of bibliographical abbreviations is given at the end of the Introduction. Bibliographical references in the Introduction refer mainly to studies of members of the HUBP team, whose outlook is closest to that of this edition.

2 For a more in-depth survey, cf. Talmon, "Textual Criticism," 142–148; Tov, *TCHB*, 187–197.

Introduction

The first period of the oral tradition of the biblical texts ends before manuscript documentation begins.³ Therefore, any statement pertaining to this period is conjectural. The student of the text can venture only cautious speculations concerning this initial stage, based on its reflection in the manuscript transmission of the second period.

5. The apparatuses contain evidence stemming from the beginning of the second stage, the period of manuscript documentation that can be traced to the second or third century BCE, on the basis of the biblical manuscripts discovered in the Judean Desert.

6. The separation of sources into two main groups serves as the basic criterion for recording the material in the first two apparatuses: on the one hand, readings preserved in the ancient translations; on the other hand, variants collated from Hebrew witnesses. Study of the versions has shown that retroverted readings cannot have a claim to certainty, unless attested in a Hebrew source, for example, in a scroll from Qumran or Masada. Therefore, any retroverted reading does not have the same value as a Hebrew reading.

7. 'Material' variants in the different versions, first and foremost the Septuagint, outnumber those surviving in ancient Hebrew sources, and take pride of place in textual criticism. At the present state of the art, priority must be given to Apparatus I, the apparatus of the ancient versions, printed directly below the Hebrew text.

8. Details of the procedures followed in Apparatus I are given below in chapter 3. Linguistic analysis and the study of the translation techniques of the ancient versions, especially of the Septuagint, prove that the existence of Hebrew readings which differed from the masoretic text is not a matter of speculation and that many textual deviations seemingly due to a translator can be traced to a Hebrew *Vorlage*. In this regard, the text of each book of the Bible must be evaluated on its own merits. The transmission history of the text of the Pentateuch is not identical with that of the book of Samuel, nor is the text-history of the book of Jeremiah identical with that of the book of Isaiah, etc.⁴ The system adopted of weighing the possible existence of a 'real' variant reflected in an ancient version against a linguistic-exegetic interpretation of a difference between the MT and that translation, is intended to draw attention to the problems involved.⁵ Regarding the book of Ezekiel, the relative literalness of the Septuagint translation, which differs from the rather 'free' translation of the book of Isaiah, shows the translator to have been reasonably faithful to his Hebrew source. Therefore, due attention is given to the possibility that Greek renditions deviating from the MT may reflect a variant Hebrew source. Awareness of the translator's literalness affected the evaluation of the evidence of the versions and the inclusion of this evidence in the apparatus.⁶

3 Cf. S. Talmon, "Oral Tradition and Written Transmission, or the Heard and the Seen Word in Judaism of the Second Temple Period," *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition* (ed. H. Wansbrough; JSNTSup 64; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) 121–128.

4 Cf. Tov, *TCHB*, 196.

5 For a detailed discussion of 'real' and 'pseudo' variants reflected in LXX cf. Tov, *TCU*, chap. 5.

6 For the importance of the evaluation of translation technique and the specific evaluation of the degree of literalness in LXX-Ezekiel cf. 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; idem, "Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique as Exemplified in the LXX of Ezekiel," *VI Congress of the*

I. The History of the Text of Ezekiel as Reflected in the Apparatuses

9. These considerations account for the basic difference between the structure of Apparatus I and that of the other apparatuses. Whereas Apparatus I pertains to the earliest stage in the written transmission of the biblical text and evidences a degree of textual pluriformity, the other apparatuses (with the exception of readings from Qumran and Masada fragments in Apparatus II) reflect a later stage. Efforts were made to include in Apparatus I every suggestion worthy of consideration. Suggested explanations for the data recorded are presented in the notes.

10. Another aspect of the examination of the textual data *in toto* affects the division of the material into several apparatuses. Were knowledge of the facts more firmly founded, it might have been possible to present the evidence in an even stricter historical manner, for example, by subdividing the data into an apparatus of witnesses from the period before the destruction of the Second Temple, and one of the early post-destruction witnesses. From that time on, the history of the biblical text differs fundamentally from its history of transmission in previous periods. The destruction of the Temple and the following period, that is, the last third of the first and the first third of the second century CE, is the main dividing line in the history of the textual transmission of the Bible as far as it can be recovered.⁷

11. After this stage the '(proto-) masoretic' text tradition gained complete dominance, to all intent and purpose, although it did not yet achieve uniformity. Without entering into a discussion of the complex problem of the evolution of the versional traditions, a subdivision of each apparatus along the said dividing line in the transmission history of the biblical text would create more problems than it would solve. For theoretical and practical considerations it is preferable to assemble retroverted readings from the versions in the first apparatus, and to record in the second apparatus the Hebrew materials collated from Bible manuscripts that are not of the 'masoretic' period (see below, chapter 5).

12. As mentioned above, the transmission history of the text of the Hebrew Bible is particularly complex, as evinced by the variety of different types of sources in various languages. Therefore, the questions of method confronting editors of biblical books are rather different from those confronting an editor engaged in the collating of textual data from manuscripts in one language. The indiscriminate recording of every apparent textual divergence in a translation or in a biblical quotation in a Midrash manuscript would needlessly clutter a critical apparatus. Such variant readings must be carefully weighed and evaluated before deciding which to enter in the apparatus.

13. Apparatus III contains readings resulting from processes of scribal transmission (such as harmonization, inversion, conflation, etc.) and linguistic variants. In contrast, apparatuses I and II also contain variants of other types, such as readings deriving from possibly divergent textual traditions and synonymous readings. This basic difference puts the Bible manuscripts from the ninth century CE onward in a category of their own.⁸

International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (ed. C. Cox; *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 23; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) 405–424. For the importance of the evaluation of translation technique in the text-critical use of the Septuagint in general cf. Tov, *TCU*, 17–29.

⁷ Cf. Talmon, "Textual Criticism," 147–148.

⁸ See M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts: Their History and Their Place in the HUBP Edition," *Biblica* 48 (1967) 243–290. Cf. also Tov, *TCHB*, 37–39.

Introduction

14. Only a few of the hundreds of manuscripts collated since the days of Kennicott preserve genuine variants. The text of the masoretic family became dominant in Judaism even before the destruction of the Second Temple. Nevertheless, other text traditions existed alongside it, which sometimes preserved genuine alternative readings. Biblical quotations in rabbinic literature show that some variant readings persisted into a later period, in spite of the tendency to produce a practically final leveling of the text, among other reasons for liturgical recitation.⁹ Hebrew Bible manuscripts of the masoretic period could have been disregarded altogether in a critical edition were it not for a few manuscripts that appear to preserve such variant traditions. In the wake of pilot studies, only five manuscripts (Kennicott numbers 30, 89, 93, 96, 150), which possibly preserve what may be termed ‘genuine’ alternative readings, were collated and recorded in the third apparatus.

15. In light of the present state of our knowledge, the tenth-century Aleppo Codex, ascribed to the famous masorete Aaron Ben-Asher, was chosen to serve as the basic text of our edition. Maimonides also attributed authority to this manuscript. Accordingly, the Masora of our edition is based on this codex. Apparatus IV, the apparatus of orthography and accents, is necessarily dependent upon and reflects this decision.

16. Details concerning Apparatus IV are discussed in chapter 6. Most cross-references to this apparatus relate to Apparatus III and only in a few cases to other apparatuses (cf. §18 below). These cross-references thus reflect a rather direct connection to the tradition of Hebrew medieval manuscript transmission.

17. Though there is a historical, diachronic dimension to the individual apparatuses, taken together, synchronically, they reflect the history of the biblical text over a period of almost 2000 years, from the most ancient fragments found in the Judean Desert and the ancient versions, primarily the Septuagint, to the *Biblia Rabbinica* of Jacob Ben-Ḥayyim which became the prototype of subsequent Bible editions.

18. Readings in the apparatuses that seem to present identical or similar evidence are connected by cross-references indicated by subscript Roman numerals (for example, II III IV). By themselves, however, these cross-references do not indicate genetic interdependence, just as the reading of an ancient version does not automatically acquire greater validity by a parallel in a masoretic manuscript. If all sources offer the same testimony, the value of the evidence may be greater, but must still be carefully weighed.

19. A few words about general technical arrangements: Considerable effort has been devoted to prevent similarities between abbreviations and symbols in the various apparatuses that may cause confusion. A detailed explanation of all these is given for each apparatus. In most cases there is a clear connection between the symbol and its meaning, which in the main is specific to each apparatus. Sources quoted are detailed in the introduction to each apparatus.

20. The structure of the apparatuses is intended to enable the reader to become readily aware of each word for which a variant may exist. Considerable effort has been devoted to the task of evaluating the material in the available collections of readings, especially in connection with Apparatus I. The material recorded in the apparatus is the result of exten-

9 Cf. S. Talmon, “Oral Tradition and Written Transmission,” (above, n. 3).

II. The Basic Text and the Masora

sive investigations. The full description of the process of digesting the evidence and a comprehensive philological and textual commentary remain a *desideratum*.¹⁰

21. The character of the editorial notes is discussed below, §§54, 55. Scholarly literature is mentioned only when pertaining to a detailed treatment of an issue. Bibliographical references are thus limited to studies specifically devoted to in-depth descriptions of text-critical issues and phenomena, translation technique, suggested retroversions and the like, that shed light on the nature of a given variant.

22. The method of presenting the basic text of this edition (⌘), its accompanying *Masora*, and the apparatuses is set out in detail in the following chapters of the Introduction, dealing mainly with technical aspects.

23. It has long been assumed that the text of the book of Ezekiel is rather poorly preserved and is marred by a plethora of corruptions.¹¹ While it is not the purpose of this edition to present such an overall evaluation of the book of Ezekiel's presumed 'state of preservation', the evidence presented, together with the comments in the notes, is intended to provide a precise and thorough picture of the character of individual readings. A particular problem exists in the case of the text of chapters 40–48. Here the oftentimes obscure specification of architectural details has, at times, made it practically impossible to sort out the differences between the sources.¹²

II. THE BASIC TEXT AND THE MASORA

24. This edition presents as faithfully as possible the text of the Aleppo Codex (⌘), printed together with its *masora magna* and *masora parva*.

25. The Aleppo Codex is the most important witness to the masoretic tradition of the biblical text, and it has become the dominant text in Jewish tradition. In comparison with all other extant witnesses, it is the most faithful representation of the Ben-Asher tradition. Thus no other manuscript has a better claim to serve as the basis for an edition of the Hebrew Bible according to the Tiberian *textus receptus* (see above, §15).¹³

10 Cf., for the present, S. Talmon and E. Tov, "A Commentary on the Text of Jeremiah: 1. The LXX of Jeremiah 1:1–7," *Textus* 9 (1981) 1–15, for an example of how such a commentary would be carried out.

11 Cf. the convenient summary of this issue by Lust, BETL.

12 Cf. G. A. Cooke, "Some Considerations on the Text and Teaching of Ezekiel 40–48," *ZAW* 42 (1924) 105–115.

13 For a discussion of the authenticity of the Aleppo Codex and its attribution to Aaron Ben-Asher, cf. M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Authenticity of the Aleppo Codex," *Textus* 1 (1960) 17–58; J. S. Penkower, "Maimonides and the Aleppo Codex," *Textus* 9 (1981) 39–128. A. Dotan, "Was the Aleppo Codex Actually Vocalized by Aharon ben Asher?" *Tarbiz* 34 (1965) 136–155 (Hebrew), among others, disputed this attribution, but nevertheless agrees that it is the best witness of the Ben-Asher tradition. Cf. also D. S. Loewinger, "The Aleppo Codex and the Ben Asher Tradition," *Textus* 1 (1960) 59–111. For an account of the discovery of the Aleppo Codex and its history cf. I. Ben-Zvi, "The Codex of Ben Asher," *Textus* 1 (1960) 1–16. The Codex is kept today at the Shrine of the Book in Jerusalem.

Introduction

26. The edition deviates from the format of \aleph in the following details:
- a) The text is not arranged in three columns as in the manuscript, but is printed in one column.
 - b) In accordance with a custom practiced in some printed editions, an open section is indicated by [פ] and a closed one by [ס], enclosed in brackets to indicate that they are not present in the manuscript.
 - c) *Rafe*-strokes were not applied systematically in \aleph . These strokes over letters are omitted in our edition in order not to complicate the printing.¹⁴
 - d) The scribe of \aleph often did not indicate the double stop (:), and marked the end of a verse simply by a *silluq*. Since the absence of punctuation marks may be confusing for the modern reader, a single raised point (·) indicates the added punctuation mark, corresponding to a *silluq* in the manuscript.
 - e) The individual catch-phrase references in the *masora magna* have been separated by spaces.
 - f) It seems that no importance can be ascribed to the relatively rare (in \aleph) positioning of the *ga'ya* sign to the right or left of the vowel.¹⁵ To avoid difficulties in typesetting, in the present edition the *ga'ya* is always printed to the left of the vowel.
 - g) Among the tens of thousands of graphic elements in \aleph , including signs for vowels and accents, there are occasionally obvious mistakes made by the scribe or by the masorete. Such errors, involving only signs for accents, *dagesh*-points, masoretic circlelets and the like, at times are corrected in the text with the correction recorded in the apparatus (cf., e.g., 3:18 מִיֶּדֶךָ, 16:3 וּמִלִּדְתֶיךָ), and sometimes are only pointed out in the notes (cf. *masora parva* 1:3 הִיָּה).¹⁶
27. The text of \aleph is reproduced as it appears to the eye. Only erasures and corrections of textual importance are noted, such as the deletion or addition of a letter, corrections of vowels or accents etc.¹⁷ The edition of Ezekiel differs from those of Isaiah and Jeremiah in the typographical representation of *sin* and *shin degushah* by the placement of the *dagesh* on the left and right sides of the letter, respectively, as indicated in the manuscript.¹⁸
28. The vertical marginal notation of the *masora parva* in \aleph well suits the writing of the text in narrow columns. Attempts to adopt this arrangement in the layout of the edition were not successful. Therefore, the *masora parva* is printed horizontally, corresponding to the masoretic circlelets in the text. Where numerous masoretic annotations pertain to one line of text, the *masora parva* is arranged in two lines (for example, 7:7). The *masora magna* is set out at the top of the page with a circlelet dividing between each notations, in accordance with the system employed in \aleph . In a few cases, a masoretic note is marked in the manuscript
- 14 *Rafe* strokes are given, in Apparatus IV, when a manuscript preserves a variant concerning *dagesh* together with a *rafe* stroke; see, e.g., 1:25 (בְּעֵמֶד).
- 15 For the question of the *ga'ya* see the exhaustive discussion by I. Yeivin, *The Aleppo Codex of the Bible: A Study of its Vocalization and Accentuation* (HUBP Monograph Series, vol. 3; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1968), esp. chaps. 2 and 4 (Hebrew); for the matter of positioning cf. p. 90.
- 16 There are over 30 such scribal errors in \aleph in Ezekiel, out of some 150,000 graphic elements. At 16:33 in the vocable לְכַל, the *methigah* is apparently *not* a scribal error, and is thus printed as in the manuscript.
- 17 A complete list of erasures will be given in an appendix to the edition of the Minor Prophets
- 18 Cf. Yeivin, *Aleppo Codex*, 49.

III. Apparatus I: The Versions

without an accompanying circlet, or else a circlet without a note. In the first instance, the word to which the note apparently refers is mentioned in the notes (see, for example 41:20 (ההיכל)); in the second instance, the absence of any masoretic annotation is marked (see, for example 40:21 (ואלמו)). Indecipherable or partly or entirely missing masoretic notations in the Codex (for example, at frayed corners) are reconstructed, when possible, enclosed in angular brackets (see, for example 40:21).

III. APPARATUS I: THE VERSIONS

29. Retroverted readings from the ancient versions in Apparatus I present the most difficult problems of method. For the collating of variants, the MT (ב) serves as the basis, and divergences in the various sources are noted as deviation from this text. The internal development of variants in each version is not traced, unless this is important for the history of the Hebrew text.

30. The Hebrew text available to the translators was unvocalized, though it is quite possible that the translators were aware of an oral tradition, preceding the development of the system for indicating vocalization in the written text.¹⁹ Therefore, from a historical and philological aspect, it may be unjustified to list variants reflecting differences in vocalization between the MT and a translation made several hundred years earlier on the basis of the unvocalized, consonantal text. While such a decision might be justified on purely text-critical/historical grounds, it is much more difficult to justify the exclusion of an entire class of variants solely in order to reflect this theoretical effort at historical accuracy. This edition thus records all differences between the MT and the versions.²⁰

31. A certain type of variants may reflect synonymous readings and/or renditions, as in variations in lexemes such as (בית / בני / ישראל), (עיר / שער, בני / בית / ישראל), etc. Such terms were presumably considered interchangeable, not only in Hebrew, but also at the level of translation. However, since the possibility of an actual variant reading is always present, these variants are recorded.²¹ Certain classes of grammatical functions can also be considered interchangeable, such as differences between active and passive forms like (ימות / ימות) (cf. 18:13). Here also, interchanges between synonymous readings can occur also in the translation language. Such variants are usually marked with the verbal symbol 'diath' (see below, §53).

32. This edition of the book of Ezekiel records differences in the versions concerning the indication of sub-titles in the text, indicated by angular brackets (<...>). Such differences are mostly found in the chapters dealing with the Prophecies Against the Nations (for example 25:1, 15; 26:1), although they are also found elsewhere, for example, in the Visions of the Dry Bones (37:1) and of the War of Gog and Magog (38:1). In particular, the Peshitta presents several variants in sub-titles, but these are also found in the Septuagint tradition.

19 Cf. Tov, *TCHB*, 39–43.

20 As an illustrative example of the problematics of this issue, cf. the apparatus of 22:4.

21 For a full discussion of this textual phenomenon, with copious examples, cf. Talmon, "Synonymous Readings."

Introduction

Such sub-titles are found in a number of fragments from Qumran, both biblical and non-biblical.²² It was decided, therefore, that such variations are of text-critical significance and worthy of recording in a critical edition.

33. Apparatus I includes variants collated from the *primary* versions, translated directly from the Hebrew.²³ The sources are indicated by the following symbols:

Masoretic Text	ⲧ
Septuagint	Ⲭ
Vulgate	Ⲯ
Targum Jonathan	Ⲛ
Peshitta	Ⲯ

34. Main classes of variants between a version and ⲧ:

(a) Recurrent deviations from ⲧ mostly due to grammatical differences and syntactic structure, simplification of expression, contextual adjustment, and the like. However, the possibility that such deviations reflect a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differed from the MT must be taken into account. They are therefore marked by verbal symbols such as ‘pers’, ‘num’, ‘verb’, indicating the type of phenomenological variation, as explained below in §53. The quantity of such differences exceeds by far that of all other reconstructed variants. Variants that can be characterized as phenomenological, either at the level of translation technique or scribal transmission, are generally considered of less importance than more ‘material’ variants, which are less likely to derive from these processes.

35. Variations in the use of *waw* in the versions are fully recorded in Apparatus I only for Ⲭ and are presented in two ways:²⁴ If the editors consider it more likely that translation technique caused a variation (taking into account the syntax of the various languages), this is indicated by the phenomenon marker ①; otherwise the omission is marked by a minus symbol. Variants in the use of *waw* for fragments from the Judean Desert are fully recorded in Apparatus II and for selected masoretic manuscripts in Apparatuses III-IV.²⁵

36. (b) Differences between ⲧ and a version which may reflect ‘material’ variants, such as pluses or minuses in the text,²⁶ or variances in wording other than the types of variation

22 For example, Isa 15:1, 17:1, 19:1 (מִשָּׂא דְּמִשְׁק, מִשָּׂא מוֹאֵב) et al.; CD X 14 (עַל הַשְּׁבֵת) et al.

23 Putative secondary influences of one version on another are usually disregarded, since in most cases, it is practically impossible to differentiate between influence and similar, yet independent, renderings.

24 If the evidence of Ⲭ_{var} is particularly strong, and makes sense syntactically, variations in the use of *waw* are recorded; cf. 11:10.

25 The editors doubt the importance of variant readings involving copulative or any other syntactic *waw*, even when attested in a Hebrew source, because the use of *waw* in Biblical Hebrew, as of analogous morphemes in a translational language, does not enable definite evaluation of differences. Similar considerations also pertain to the use of the word *kol* (see below, §53). A variant concerning *waw* was recorded for a version other than Ⲭ only when the syntactic/textual environment seemed to justify this (cf., e.g., 25:7, 9). Cf. Tov, *TCU*, 154–158.

26 The LXX of Ezekiel has a significant number of minus readings (some 553 in the present apparatus), amounting, according to one estimate, to some 625 words = some 35 verses if taken altogether (cf. G. Marquis, *The Translation Technique Reflected in LXX-Ezekiel* [unpublished MA thesis, Dept. of

III. Apparatus I: The Versions

mentioned in the previous section, are recorded in the apparatus with qualifying remarks, if any, in the notes (see below).²⁷ Two important points must be born in mind: (1) retroversion of a translation variant is always conjectural; (2) the presumed existence of a variant in a version does not imply that it is preferable over the MT.²⁸

37. (c) Differences between t and a version that can be attributed to the exegetical nature of a translation. Although this may be the most likely explanation, the editors do not refrain from recording variants that may reflect a reading for which a suitable retroversion into Hebrew cannot easily be suggested.

38. Notations in apparatuses I–IV are non-verbal (cf. below §53), and pertain only to data that reflect or may reflect variants. They are distinguished from the explanatory notes (cf. below, §55), which contain all verbalized reflections and suggestions, intended to present pertinent facts, at times to discount the possibility that a retroversion reflects an actual variant reading, or present considerations which may account for the variation.

39. Symbols such as > (minus), or differences of a grammatical nature, especially those marked ‘pers’, ‘num’, ‘pron’, etc., are self-explanatory. Occasionally, however, such differences are dealt with in an explanatory note (for example, 8:14, n. 2; 21:24, n. 1).

40. Retroversions suggested in the explanatory notes are recorded in order of probability. Unequivocal retroversions are recorded without any comments. ‘Perhaps’ (p) suggests a possible variant or editorial explanation, with a degree of doubt; ‘hardly’ indicates that there is practically no basis for the proposed variant; ‘not’ negates proposed variants.²⁹ The notes also characterize variants as items in the ‘index of phenomena’, namely, types of recurring textual variants, indicated by mostly self-explanatory abbreviations such as ‘exeg’, ‘struct’, ‘etym’, etc.³⁰ Syntactic or other difficulties in the Hebrew text which may have posed difficulties for translators are marked in the notes by the word “note problem t ” (cf., for example, 3:6; 6:11; 39:11). Notes are given in apparatuses II–IV or the Masora notations only when necessary.

41. Readings from the versions are quoted according to the sequence of the MT, as are readings from sources in the other apparatuses. A lemma is separated from the previous one by the marker ¶ , except at the beginning of a verse, and separated from the translational reading by a square bracket, for example, [הָאֵרֶךְ] . Verse numbers are indicated in bold Arabic numerals.³¹ References pertaining to two or more verses or to a string of words precede references to a single verse or to a smaller stretch of words; strings of words continuing

Bible, The Hebrew University, 1982] 188; E. Tov, *TCHB*, 333–334. A useful tool for the evaluation of minus readings in LXX is F. Polak and G. Marquis, *A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint* (CATSS Basic Tools 4; Stellenbosch: Print24.com, 2002).

27 Different types of textual phenomena that may underlie an apparent textual variance are often not specified, such as similarity of sound and form (including letters in the ancient Hebrew script), ligatures, *scriptio continua*, enclitic *mem* etc.

28 For a detailed discussion of the issue of retroversion cf. Tov, *TCU*, 57–89.

29 At times more than one counter-proposal may be adduced (e.g., 16:54, n. 1; 20:40, n. 4); cf. also below §52.

30 See the table of abbreviations below, §55.

31 Abbreviations of titles of biblical books follow SBL conventions. Differences in the numbering of verses between this edition and others are negligible.

Introduction

beyond the end of a verse have the verse number in parentheses in the lemma (for example, 1:25). A notation pertaining to an entire verse, mainly of the ‘pers’ type, is given without a lemma. Quotations from the beginning of a verse in a version and without a corresponding Hebrew text, are indicated by: init] (for example, Apparatus III 4:5; 21:19); and additions at the end of a verse not found in the MT are indicated by: fin] (for example, Apparatus I 24:14; 33:17). Compound verse numbers, for example 7–9, indicate variants concerning stretches of text beyond one verse that start at the beginning of a verse; otherwise, such stretches are indicated by the verse number in parentheses at the end of the Hebrew lemma (for example 13:17).

42. Quotations are vocalized only to highlight a divergence in vocalization. The vocalization is usually not complete, but indicates the divergent vocalization. *Ketib* (k) and *qere* (q) readings are noted only when retroversion yields a difference pertaining to the k/q reading itself. In such cases both forms are quoted as the lemma, separated by an oblique stroke (for example, 3:15). Marginal readings in the Aleppo Codex designated by *yetiv* (יתיר) are considered equivalent to *qere* readings, and are marked in the lemma with *y* (for example, 9:5).

43. Recurring words in a verse are identified by a small superscript Arabic numeral, for example, אֲרָא. If the same consonantal form occurs more than once in a verse, they are differentiated by vocalization. Generally, not more than two words are quoted as a lemma. However, in cases of particular phrases or idiomatic expressions, context was provided in parentheses (for example, 2:8). In a lemma of three or more words, the first and final vocables are spelled out, separated by an en-dash (–). In a quotation of non-consecutive words, the break is indicated by an ellipsis (...), with the variant concerning only the words in the lemma (for example, 1:27). These conventions are used for all apparatuses.

44. Variant readings are recorded after the symbol of the respective version. If the reading is documented by only some witnesses of a version, the symbol of the source is enclosed in parenthesis, for example (T). The part of the text reflecting variants in the transmission of G may also be enclosed in parentheses (for example, 10:2). Aramaic quotations are printed in ‘Miriam’ typeface (למימר), and Latin ones in *italics*.

45. Readings from different versions referring to the same lemma are quoted in the pertinent scripts in a fixed order: G V T S, and if testifying to (approximately) the same reading, are separated by semicolons.³² If, in the editors’ opinion, they testify to different readings, they are separated by a vertical stroke |.³³

46. When two versions testify to the same reading, often only one (mainly G) is quoted in full, and the other is referred to by an equal sign (=). Almost identical testimony is indi-

32 The order reflects the traditional history of the translations in general terms, but not their literary crystallizations. A symbol for one of ‘the Three’ (see below) before the symbol G_{var} indicates the possible influence of one on the other (e.g. at 27:24 כמכללים; 28:14 ממשח). At times one (or more) of ‘the Three’ is noted after G (e.g. at 21:35 השב; 22:4 ותבוא). Readings from Jerome’s commentary (Hier) are occasionally adduced in the notes (e.g. 22:16, n. 2). α’θ’σ’ are quoted in the apparatus in Syriac if the evidence is from the Syrohexapla (e.g., 22:17), and in Latin if it stems from Jerome (e.g., 22:16). Suggested retroversions are given in the notes.

33 Similarly, in the other apparatuses the vertical stroke is used to distinguish between variants of a slightly different character.

III. Apparatus I: The Versions

cated by the symbol \approx . Except for cases of minuses ($>$) and transpositions (\sim), at least one version is quoted in full. When referring to translational deviations not requiring explicit quotation (as, for example, in the case of ‘pers’), version symbols are printed without a space between them (for example GG).

47. Translations of versional readings are sometimes given in the notes to indicate a specific understanding of the text. Such translations are placed between single quotation marks (see, for example, 3:7, n. 1; 19:7, nn. 1, 2, 3, 5). Recurring transliterations of Hebrew words into Greek are noted only in the first instance, and are not recorded for every subsequent occurrence; cf., for example, 38:2–3.

48. Versional readings are adduced from the following sources:

- G The Septuagint, if Ziegler’s apparatus does not record variants for a given lemma. Greek quotations closely follow Ziegler’s edition.³⁴ Reservations regarding Ziegler’s text are indicated in the notes.³⁵
- G^- Signifies the text of Ziegler’s edition, and in most cases may be taken as representing the ‘Old Greek’. G^- always signifies the presence of variants in Ziegler’s apparatus.³⁶
- G_{var} Variants in Ziegler’s apparatus.³⁷
- α' Aquila
- θ' Theodotion
- σ' Symmachus
- γ' ‘The Three’³⁸
- V The Vulgate, according to the Benedictine *editio maior*.³⁹

34 J. Ziegler, ed., *Ezechiel* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum. vol. 16, pars 1: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952; 2nd edition 1977). The symbol G does not imply a *consensus codicum*. Divergence of a single minuscule manuscript or two from Ziegler’s printed text was not considered significant enough to warrant the limiting siglum G^- . The Syrohexapla is quoted according to A. M. Ceriani, *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolithographice editus curante et adnotante... Antonio Maria Ceriani* (Monumenta sacra et profana, vol. 7; Milan: Impensis Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, 1874).

35 For example, 21:20, n. 7. Cf. the notation “main evid”, e.g., 38:21, n. 1; 39:27, n. 1.

36 Any reading marked with an obelus in the manuscript tradition, even if unattested elsewhere, is automatically considered G^- .

37 In the edition of Ezekiel, variant readings were recorded only for the majuscules (seldom Q or V) or early papyri (967, 988, etc.). An alternative translation to that apparently reflected in the Old Greek (Ziegler’s text), is indicated in the notes: ‘ G_{var} add alternative trans = b ’ (e.g., 10:11, n. 2). At times, specific manuscripts of G are indicated in the notes in parentheses, especially papyrus 967 (cf. 36:23–38, n. 1; 40:6, n. 2).

38 The fragmentary character of these versions makes any argument *ex silentio* impossible.

39 *Liber Hiezechielis* (Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem 15; Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1978). The *Vetus Latina* is recorded as part of the Septuagint tradition. Jerome is quoted according to the edition of S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera, pars I, Opera Exegetica 4, Commentariorum in Hiezechielem (ed. S. Reiter; Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 75; Turnholt: Brepolis, 1964).

Introduction

- ⲧ The Aramaic Targum, according to Sperber's edition.⁴⁰
⊖ The Peshiṭta, according to the Leiden edition.⁴¹

When deemed necessary, variants in all these versions, including Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, are indicated as $\mathfrak{V}_{\text{var}}$, et al.⁴²

49. The appendix to the second edition of Ziegler's *Ezekiel* listing readings from 967 and other papyri was consulted in order to update the collation of the Greek evidence.⁴³

50. The book of Ezekiel contains some sections in which the various textual witnesses, including more or less parallel passages, may have influenced each other. It often cannot be decided whether a harmonizing reading in a witness emerged at the translational level or stems from a Hebrew *Vorlage*. In such cases the data are presented with references to the parallel verse. The reference to the parallel text is indicated at the beginning of the section, and its agreement with the parallel is denoted by a small subscript 'p' (for example, 33:7). In chapters 1 and 10 'p' refers to the parallel chapter.⁴⁴ Moreover, substantial evidence supports the influence of parallel passages in Leviticus, in particular chap. 26, and to a lesser extent in Deuteronomy, on the textual witnesses to Ezekiel. Such affinities are often marked in the notes, for example, 25:13, n. 2, 34: 26, n. 2.

51. Slight variations in verse numbering are indicated in the notes. At the beginning of each unit, usually at the beginning of a chapter, a note in bold characters specifies the place of that unit in ⊖ (for example 7:3, 6). Different versification in LXX in verse references is given in parentheses, after that of the MT: 1 Kgs 6:38(1d).

52. In the notes, "cf" refers to biblical verses and textual phenomena,⁴⁵ and the more technical "vid" to other apparatuses, including those of other volumes, and pertinent bibliography. "E.g." precedes an illustrative biblical reference or options for different vocalizations in retroversions from the translations. "Et al" refers to similar biblical passages (as does "et sim"). If a symbol of a version precedes a verse reference, it holds only for that reference (for example, 14:14, n. 2); if following a list of references, it holds for all those preceding it (for example, 17:19, n. 1). The same applies to a reference to an apparatus ("app") in the notes, for example, 1:3, n. 3.

53. Notations in the apparatus are non-verbal (cf. above, §38). Full quotes are given in the

40 A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic: The Latter Prophets* (Vol. 3; Leiden: Brill, 1962).

41 *The Old Testament in Syriac: According to the Peshiṭta Version* (3/3; ed. M. J. Mulder; Leiden: Brill, 1985).

42 $\mathfrak{V}_{\text{var}}$ (often reflecting hexaplaric readings) and ⊖_{var} readings are rare and given only when considered significant (cf., for example, 29:9; 5:12). Similarly, α'_{var} , etc., indicate that different sources of Aquila, etc., give conflicting evidence. A question mark after a siglum for the Three indicates doubtful or conflicting attributions.

43 The question of the importance of 967 as a witness to the Old Greek and its possible reflection of a variant Hebrew tradition cannot be treated here.

44 Cf. D. J. Halperin, "The Exegetical Character of Ezek 10:9–17," *VT* 26 (1976) 129–141.

45 References to other biblical verses or to similar phenomena (cf., e.g., 24:9) are not intended to be evaluative. In accordance with the general function of the notes, such references are meant to provide a somewhat fuller picture of the (possible) textual circumstances that affected a given reading, beyond the reading itself.

III. Apparatus I: The Versions

original language. A suggested retroversion or seemingly appropriate exegetical solution is given in the explanatory notes.

a) Graphic symbols:⁴⁶

+	plus, addition to the base text (R)
~	difference in word order, transposition of words or parts of a sentence ⁴⁷
II III IV	cross reference to a similar reading in another apparatus ⁴⁸
← →	retroverted reading, or a reading 'issuing from', or 'developing towards'
⌋	taken as a single syntactic unit in a version, or marked with a conjunctive accent in ḥ
∧	read with a division between the parts of a sentence in a version, or with a disjunctive accent in ḥ
√	derivation from a specific root or nominal form, frequently in connection with 'lexic' ⁴⁹
>	lacking in a version
...	words left out in quote (ellipsis; see §43)
=	equals, in relation between versions (see §46)
≈	equals almost/approximately, in relation between versions (see §46)
≡	equivalent with, appropriate rendition ⁵⁰
p	indicates a parallel passage, as specified in the notes (see §50)
← →	reading causes necessary further change (in notes)
*	hypothetical form; no evidence in Hebrew, Greek, etc. morphology (in notes)

Cf. also the sigla mentioned in §55.

b) Symbols indicating phenomena take the place of explicit quotations and as a rule require no comment:⁵¹

coniug	variant relating to the conjugation of the verb (<i>binyan</i>), for example <i>qal/pi'el</i> ; <i>qal/hiph'il</i> , etc.
dem	variation pertaining to a demonstrative pronoun, including plus or minus

46 Parentheses serve in the usual manner.

47 In case of transpositions the marker also appears at the appropriate place in the lemma. Cases of transposition in LXX of Ezekiel are discussed in G. Marquis, "Word Order," *Textus* (above, n. 6).

48 Cf. above, §18. Cross-references, even if a reading is only partially parallel, are from Apparatus I, to II, III, and/or IV, from Apparatus II to III and/or IV, and from Apparatus III to IV. There are no references in the reverse direction.

49 Homographic roots are separated by Roman numerals, according to the listing in BDB (cf., e.g., 26:10, n. 1, 16, n. 4).

50 Used in the notes. In most cases the equivalence is a 'real' one, that is, it is attested elsewhere. For others, the equivalence may be hypothetical.

51 This and the following lists present the most important items in the 'index of phenomena' (cf. above, §34), and include comments in the notes when necessary.

Introduction

det	variation in the use of a determinative particle (mainly in ܐ)
diath	variation in the use of active or passive forms, especially with an indefinite subject, which may also affect the status of subject and object ⁵²
diff	version is altogether different from ܐ in the given stretch of text ⁵³
div	added or different appellation for the divinity
num	interchange of singular and plural nouns or pronouns ⁵⁴
/num/	singular/plural interchange in a stretch of text, affecting also verbal forms
pers	difference involving <i>agens</i> of the verb — person, gender or number ⁵⁵ (see also /num/)
pers/pron	interchange of person and pronoun
prep	difference concerning a preposition ⁵⁶
prep/pron	difference relating to a Hebrew preposition with a pronominal suffix, for example, ܠܝ, expressed in Greek by a declined pronoun
pron	difference in pronoun, whether independent or suffixed (common in the interchange: pron/det, pron/nom); ⁵⁷ see also dem
ptcl	difference in particle (including problems of ܠ)
reformul	a version has a turn of expression which differs from ܐ ⁵⁸

52 Concerning this type of textual variation it is difficult to determine whether a witness indeed reflects a different understanding of the text, or whether the seeming difference is but an accurate reflection of the possible active/passive. Cases in which the difference seems to be synonymous have not been listed (cf above, §31). Cf. C. Rabin, “The Ancient Versions and the Indefinite Subject,” *Textus* 2 (1962) 60–76. ‘Diath’ also covers, e.g., cases of interchanges between a first person action on an object and an object acted upon with an indefinite subject, though this may appear to be a variation concerning ‘coniug’; cf., e.g., 32:14.

53 This notation comes instead of listing such stretches of text in the apparatus. The text is usually quoted in the notes, together with editorial comments. However, in chaps. 40–48, where ܐ presents a text differing significantly from ܐ, the text itself is not given in the notes. The technical nature of these chapters presents particular difficulties, and the Peshitta here often goes its own way. Therefore, it was deemed sufficient to indicate the difference without over-burdening the notes with Syriac quotations.

54 Such differences may extend over a stretch of text or a number of verses. The notation does not imply that a version shows the variation in each pertinent word. A special case is the Hebrew syntactic figure of *singulare tantum*, customarily rendered by the plural in the versions, or the complementary *plurale tantum*, rendered by the singular in the versions. Such cases are not considered as ‘num’. Other examples of a consistent employment in a version of a plural for a collective expression in ܐ are also not listed as ‘num’.

55 The substitution of a finite verb for a Hebrew infinitive is usually taken to derive from a necessity of translation. Therefore, it is recorded only in the likelihood of reflecting a possible Hebrew variant.

56 E.g., for the purpose of notation, ἐπί is taken as the rendition of ܠܥ, and πρὸς of ܠܐ.

57 In differences involving pronouns it is particularly difficult to distinguish between translational deviations and possible Hebrew variants, and to decide which deviations should be recorded in the apparatus. The phenomenological nature of the presence or absence of the pronoun is highlighted by variations recorded as ‘> pron’ (e.g. 16:4) or ‘+ pron’ (e.g. 3:3).

58 The full text is given in the notes. The ‘reformul’ notation should not be understood as related to

III. Apparatus I: The Versions

semel	difference involving an element occurring twice (or more) in \mathfrak{b} , but in a version(s) only once (or less than in Hebrew), and vice versa (once in a version as opposed to twice or more in the Hebrew)
verb	interchange relating to 'tense' and/or status of a verbal form (interchange of imperative/participle/infinitive, etc.)
①	element signifying omission/addition of copula ⁵⁹
②	element signifying omission/addition of 'all'

The abbreviations 'coniug', 'ptcl', 'connect', and 'verb' are usually given in the notes as qualifiers of quotations of readings, but occasionally appear as verbal symbols in the apparatus. The manner of recording reflects the editors' evaluation of the variant and the possible factors which may account for it.

c) Self-explanatory non-annotated quotes from the versions involving changes in structure, person, pronoun etc, are indicated by the sign °, except cases involving small elements such as the addition of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ or $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$ (cf. 18:22).

The standardized marking of phenomena by verbal sigla allows for the marking of differences between textual witnesses in respect to the particular type of variance and the translation technique or scribal practices involved. Further types of phenomena are referred to in the notes (cf. §55).

54. Editorial comments qualifying readings listed in the apparatus are given in the explanatory notes at the bottom of the page. Proposals of exegetical solutions are intended as counter-considerations to assumptions of textual variation. Evaluations of variants expressed in the notes in Hebrew and English—retroversions, parallels, and counter-arguments—are necessarily subjective.⁶⁰

55. The verbal symbols employed in Apparatus I and the notes indicating phenomena are mostly self-explanatory. They clarify the nature of a reading, qualify it, or indicate the editors' evaluation:⁶¹

current conceptions concerning supposedly 'reworked' or 'rewritten' texts, implying a single *Urtext* that was later modified. The possibility of a different *Vorlage* remains, even though its text may have been only slightly different from, or practically synonymous with \mathfrak{b} .

59 Cf. above, §35.

60 In the Hebrew notes, texts from the versions are given in translation.

61 The following list comprises a roster of abbreviations that do not denote sources. 'Om' or 'hapl' reflect different ways of judgment. Such notations should not be taken as implying a preference for any reading. Similarly, symbols such as 'condens' or 'parall' denote contrastive trends in the ancient translations. The edition aims basically at presenting the evidence. Therefore, it was not thought necessary to spell out all possible explanations of variations. For instance: the interchange $\mathfrak{w} / \mathfrak{v}$ is marked 'num', but since it could have resulted from the neutralization of the opposition $/o/ : /aw/$, it can also be considered 'phon'. The change $\mathfrak{m} / \mathfrak{n}$ is defined as 'pers', but it could also be marked 'graph', viz., as due to a ligature, etc. Common consonantal interchanges are not spelled out (for example, 24:23, n. 2). In the notes, stretches of text with no word division illustrate cases of *scriptio continua* or different word division (for example, 26:10, n. 3); repeated consonants in parentheses point to possible instances of dittography/haplography (for example, 27:22, n. 1).

Introduction

abbrev	variant assumed to have resulted from an abbreviation ⁶²
add	added; additional ⁶³
app	cross-reference to an entry in another apparatus
apt	contrary to appearance, the rendering is suitable
aram	exegesis based on Aramaic (usually with ‘etym’)
atten	attenuation in the choice of a word; use of a ‘weaker’, viz., less specific word
condens	a longer expression in ה reduced to an equivalent shorter translational phrase, especially in cases of repetition or parallelism
connect	a difference relating to the connection between clauses or sentences
ditt	dittography ⁶⁴
dupl	textual doublet ⁶⁵
ed(d)	printed edition(s)
etym	interpretation based on a particular etymology
evid	‘main evid’(ence), when the printed text of the edition is based on a minority reading
ex	variance due to direct influence or borrowing from another text ⁶⁶
exeg	exegetical change, sometimes specified as due to geography, theology, etc.; combined with ‘synt’ indicates different syntactic exegesis ⁶⁷
expans	expanded rendering (sometimes creating new parallel)
formula	variant concerning a fixed expression or phrase recurring in different forms ⁶⁸
gloss	explanatory gloss entered by editor, scribe or translator, which sometimes leads to ‘dupl’ ⁶⁹

62 Cf. G. R. Driver, “Abbreviations in the Massoretic Text,” *Textus* 1 (1960) 112–131; idem, “Once Again Abbreviations,” *Textus* 4 (1964) 76–94; M. Fishbane, “Abbreviations, Hebrew Texts,” *IDBSup*, 3–4. Cf. also Tov, *TCHB*, 256–257.

63 Including exegetical additions from a similar text or texts. An excessively long addition is indicated by ‘add’ in the apparatus, with the added text given in the notes (cf. e.g., 24:14).

64 Cf. ‘hapl’.

65 Also indicates double translations, e.g., 1:4, n. 2. Cf. S. Talmon, “Double Readings in the Massoretic Text,” *Textus* 1 (1960) 144–184; idem, “Conflate Readings (OT),” *IDBSup*, 170–173; idem, in Talmon-Cross, 321–400. Cf. also Tov, *TCHB*, 241–243.

66 In contrast with the general reference ‘cf’.

67 In Ezek 40–48, several apparent differences were qualified as ‘architectural exegesis’ (cf., e.g., 40:12, 13; 42:3).

68 Cf., e.g., 2:7, n. 1; 25:15, n. 2.

69 Cf. E. Tov, “Glosses, Interpolations, and Other types of Scribal Additions in the Text of the Hebrew Bible,” *Language, Theology, and the Bible: Essays in Honour of James Barr* (ed. S. E. Balentine and J. Barton; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994) 40–66 [= *Greek & Hebrew Bible*, 53–74].

III. Apparatus I: The Versions

hapl	haplography ⁷⁰
Hier	readings in Jerome's commentary
homoio	homoioteleuton/homoioarchton or omission caused by a scribal factor ⁷¹
homophony	the translator chose the translational equivalent to imitate the sound of the Hebrew ⁷²
idiom	idiomatic usage
init	beginning of verse
inner-⊖(⊖...)	inner-versional corruption/development
k/q	<i>ketib/qere</i>
k/y	<i>ketib/yetir</i>
lexic	problematic lexicographical identification of word in ⚭
ms(s)	(unspecified) manuscript(s)
nom/pron	interchange of noun/pronoun
nom/verb	interchange of nominal form of lexeme with verbal form
om	omission (also >)
p	perhaps
parall	difference deriving from the influence of a syntactic parallel in the immediate context, at the scribal or translational level
phon	indicates a phonetic problem in ⚭, for example, an interchange of final ן/ך, etc.
pict	translation reflecting a different understanding of ⚭, especially in figurative passages
pr	placed before; preceded by ⁷³
prec	compare similar problem in a preceding lemma or same verse
Rabb Heb	etymological derivation based on Rabbinic Hebrew
rep	repetition resulting in <i>figura etymologica</i> , etc.
retrov	retroverted from a version
seq	refers to similar or pertinent data in the continuation of the verse or immediate context, a subsequent lemma, or, when specified, apparatus
slot	replacement of 'redundant' or difficult word with new content
struct	different understanding of the sentence structure or different division of words between clauses

70 Cf. 'ditt'.

71 It is sometimes difficult to determine precisely what text is missing, for example, at 40:8.

72 Cf. E. Tov, "Loan Words, Homophony and Transliterations in the Septuagint," *Biblica* 60 (1979) 216–236; cf., for example, 23:42, n. 1; 47:3, n. 4.

73 Sometimes used together with the notation 'init'; cf. above, §41.

Introduction

synt/syntact	difference involving the syntactic parsing of a clause or sentence, especially ‘synt exeg’
theol	difference deriving from theological motives ⁷⁴
transp	syntactical transposition ⁷⁵
usus	linguistic or exegetical habit of the translator (cf. idiom)
v, vv	verse, verses
var	reading in apparatus of an edition, for example $\mathfrak{G}_{\text{var}}$, $\mathfrak{T}_{\text{var}}$
Vrs	a difference occurring in all or in most versions
vid	reference to apparatus at another entry (including references to the apparatuses of the editions of Isaiah or Jeremiah) or bibliography
voc	possible different word pattern, which may be conceived of in terms of changes in vocalization (in notes) ⁷⁶

IV. APPARATUS II: THE JUDEAN DESERT SCROLLS
AND BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS IN RABBINIC LITERATURE

The Judean Desert Scrolls

56. Textual variants were recorded from two types of sources: fragments of the book of Ezekiel (below, §58), and quotations from the book of Ezekiel in non-biblical compositions (below, §59). The literary character of the latter present special problems concerning the evaluation of possible textual variants they may contain. Accordingly, and also due to the state of preservation of the fragments, the recording of this material in Apparatus II should be supplemented by reference to their complete edition, together with commentary and notes.⁷⁷

57. *Biblical Scrolls*: Fragments of six MSS from Qumran and one from Masada represent seven copies of the book of Ezekiel. None of these display any particular “qumranic” features of orthography and language.⁷⁸ Therefore, all variants between these fragments and the Aleppo Codex, including erasures, corrections, and even evident scribal errors (cf., for example, 1:21; 36:25; 37:4) were recorded in the apparatus. All differences in spacing of

74 Cf., e.g., 21:8.

75 If a conjunctive *waw* or other particle or preposition is involved in transposed elements, it is assumed that it retains its position; see, e.g., 3:21; 6:11.

76 This symbol is meant to absolve us from the need to specify various possibilities of ‘reading’ a word. We did not try to reconstruct the exact form of the variant vocalization, i.e. the variation assumed does not pertain to the consonantal skeleton of the word, but rather to a difference of variant vocalization/morphological patterns.

77 For a concise discussion of this material see G. J. Brooke, “Ezekiel in Some Qumran and New Testament Texts,” *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (STDJ 11; ed. J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992) 1.317–337.

78 E. Tov, “The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran and the Origin of These Scrolls,” *Textus* 13 (1986) 31–57; idem, “Further Evidence for the Existence of a Qumran Scribal School,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery* (ed. L.H. Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000) 199–216

IV Apparatus II: The Judean Desert Scrolls and Quotations in Rabbinic Literature

the text, most likely indicating sections, were indicated by the section symbol (§), without, however, differentiation between open and closed sections, which were listed in the appendix.⁷⁹ The material was collated on the basis of the final editions of each text. In the few instances in which our reading of the text differs from that of its editor, this has been indicated in a footnote (cf. 4:16; 5:15; 23:45). The following is a list of sources together with their paleographic details:

1QEzek

The script was defined “assez classique” by the editor, but not dated.

D. Barthélemy, “9. Ézéchiel,” *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1; ed. D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955) 68–69, pl. xii

3QEzek

Dated to the end of the first century BCE or the beginning of the first century CE (Herodian hand).

M. Baillet, “1. Ézéchiel,” *Les ‘petites grottes’ de Qumran* (DJD 3; ed. M. Baillet, J. T. Milik and R. de Vaux; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962) vol. 1: 94; vol. 2: pl. xviii⁸⁰

4QEzek^a

Dated to the middle of the first century BCE (Late Hasmonean or early Herodian hand).

J. E. Sanderson, “73. 4QEzek^a,” *Qumran Cave 4, X: The Prophets* (DJD 15; ed. E. Ulrich et al.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997) 209–214, pl. xxxviii

4QEzek^b

Dated to the first century CE (Herodian hand).

Idem, “74. 4QEzek^b,” *ibid.*, 215–218, pl. xxxix⁸¹

4QEzek^c

Dated to the first or middle of the first century BCE (Hasmonean hand).

Idem, “75. 4QEzek^c,” *ibid.*, 219–220, pl. xxxix

11QEzek

Dated to the end of the first century BCE or the beginning of the first century CE (Herodian hand).

D. Herbert, “11QEzekiel,” *Qumran Cave 11, II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31* (DJD 23; ed. F. García Martínez et al.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998) 15–28, pl. ii (liv)

MasEzek

Dated to the end of the first century BCE (early Herodian hand).

S. Talmon, “Mas 1043–2220; Mas 1d; Ezekiel 35:11–38:14 (MasEzek, photo 302367),” *Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports: Hebrew Fragments from Masada* (Masada 6; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999) 59–75, pl. 8

58. *Explicit quotations in non-biblical scrolls: The influence of the book of Ezekiel on*

79 A similar policy was adopted for the book of Isaiah, for which the detailed list of section markers was published by Y. Maori, “The Tradition of *Pisqa’ot* in Ancient Hebrew MSS: The Isaiah Texts and Commentaries from Qumran,” *Textus* 10 (1982) 1–8 (Hebrew). In the present volume no need was felt to distinguish between the different types of spacing and indentation, and the customary distinction between ‘open’ and ‘closed’ sections was employed. Cf. E. Tov, “The Background of the Sense Division in the Biblical Texts,” *Delimitation Criticism: A New Tool in Biblical Scholarship* (Pericope 1; ed. M. C. A. Korpel and J. M. Oesch; Assen: Van Gorcum, 200) 312–350.

80 No reading from this scroll was listed in the apparatus.

81 No reading from this scroll was listed in the apparatus.

Introduction

the non-biblical texts of the Qumran community was considerable, both in regard to specific passages (for example, Ezek 14:3 in CD XX 9; Ezek 16:49 in CD VI 21, XIV 14) and in a general way (for example, in “The New Jerusalem” and in “Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice”).⁸² In such cases, however, the quotations are not strictly verbatim but rather are paraphrastic. Thus only a few variants from these sources were recorded (cf., for example, 3:12). Only five quotations and partial quotations from the book of Ezekiel, explicitly indicated as such in the scrolls (9:4; 25:8; 37:23; 44:15; 45:11), and a sixth quotation in a scroll which contains several paraphrastic biblical quotations (45:11) are found in these scrolls. These quotations are found in four sources:

“The Damascus Document” (CD^a, CD^b)

E. Qimron, “The Text of CDC,” *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992) 9–49, pl. i–xx

Eschatological Midrash (4Q174, 4Q177)⁸³

A. Steudel, *Der Midrash zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 (‘Florilegium’) und 4Q177 (‘Catena’) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994) 23–29, 71–76, pl. A, C

“Sefer ha-Milhamah” (4Q285)⁸⁴

P. Alexander and G. Vermes, “285. 4QSefer ha-Milhamah,” *Qumran Cave 4, XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD 36; ed. P. Alexander et al.; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000) 228–246, pl. xii–xiii

“Ordinances” (4QOrd^a, 4QOrd^b)

L. H. Schiffman, “Ordinances and Rules (4Q159 = 4QOrd^a, 4Q513 = 4QOrd^b),” *Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (PTS 1; ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994) 145–175

The quotations have been adapted linguistically, stylistically, and according to content to the compositions in which they are adduced, and were thus recorded in the edition in their entirety. The reader is advised to be cautious in relating to these instances as textual witnesses, since it is doubtful whether all or some may reflect an ancient variant text of the book of Ezekiel, rather than changes introduced by the authors of the compositions (either deliberately or as a result of *lapsus calami*).

59. Five copies of a work attributed to the prophet Ezekiel were discovered at Qumran in which passages from the book of Ezekiel (mostly from chapters 1/10, 30, and 37) were integrated with additions and changes deriving from the author. This work is not a witness

82 Cf. D. Dimant, “The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel at Qumran,” *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity Presented to David Flusser* (ed. I. Gruenwald, S. Shaked, and G. G. Stroumsa; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992) 31–51

83 The first editor of these texts thought that these were two separate compositions: J. M. Allegro, “174. Florilegium”, “177. Catena (A)”, *Qumran Cave 4, I: 4Q158–4Q186* (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) 53–57, pl. xix–xx. In Steudel’s view these are two copies of the same composition. Since we are not concerned with deciding this issue, the sources were indicated by their 4Q numbers.

84 The quotation apparently included Ezek 39:3–4. It is preceded by the quotation formula **כִּאֲשֶׁר הִיאָה** **עַל הַר יִשְׂרָאֵל** (4Q285 4:3). However, only remnants of three words are preserved from v. 4: **יִשְׂרָאֵל** (4Q285 4:4), and since they do not differ from the Aleppo Codex there was nothing to record.

IV Apparatus II: The Judean Desert Scrolls and Quotations in Rabbinic Literature

to the text of the book of Ezekiel and thus cannot be considered a primary source for readings deviating from MT (but cf., for example, 1:10; 10:14). Some variants from three copies of this work (4QpsEzek^a = 4Q385, 4QpsEzek^b = 4Q386, 4QpsEzek^c = 4Q385b) have been recorded in Apparatus II and in the notes to Apparatus I, mostly when other ancient witnesses contain similar differences.⁸⁵

Biblical Quotations in Rabbinic Literature

60. Classical rabbinic literature makes extensive use of the Hebrew Bible. Next to the ancient versions this is the most important witness for the biblical text used by the Sages in the first centuries of the common era. Midrashic homilies on biblical passages provide a glimpse of the text current in the period preceding its transmission by the masoretes. The biblical quotations in midrash literature are not altogether identical to the MT. At times, they reflect a variant vocalization, and at times also a different consonantal text.⁸⁶ Rabbinic literature in all stages of its transmission presents many difficulties in the attempt to identify the biblical text used by the Sages: the manner of its production, compilation and editing, its oral tradition and written transmission, and in medieval manuscripts.

61. Rabbinic literature is preserved in medieval manuscripts written hundreds of years later than its creation and editing. The text of these works preserved in these manuscripts is not always sufficiently clear, including that of the biblical quotations they contain. The accuracy of the copyists of manuscripts of rabbinic literature is not at all similar to the customarily painstaking care of copyists of biblical manuscripts, again including biblical quotations. Scribal errors affected also quotations of biblical texts. Even in regard to quotations which are not corrupted, it is not always possible to distinguish between similar letters such as ו/ו, ז/ז, etc. The text of quotations was also corrupted due to scribal habits, such as recording oft-repeated passages in abbreviation. In regard to orthography, scribes employed a *plene* orthography in quotation of biblical verses as in talmudic material. Furthermore, it is not always possible to distinguish between an actual biblical quotation and a

85 Four copies of this composition were published by D. Dimant: "4QPseudo-Ezekiel^{a-d}," *Qumran Cave 4, XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4* (DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001) 7–88, pl. i–iii. A fifth copy was published by M. Smith, "391. 4QpapPseudo-Ezekiel^e," *Qumran Cave 4, XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD 19; ed. M. Broshi et al.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995) 153–193, pl. xvii–xxv.

86 The phenomenon was already noted by the early Sages: cf., for example, Tosaphot on *b. Shabbat* 55b, *מעבירים כתיב*, and the comments of R. Akiva Eiger in *Gilyon HaShas ad loc.* See D. Rosenthal, "The Sages Methodical Approach to Textual Variants within the Hebrew Bible," *Isac Leo Seeligmann Volume: Essays on the Bible and the Ancient World* (ed. A. Rofé and Y. Zakovich; Jerusalem: E. Rubinstein, 1983) 2:395–417 (Hebrew); Y. Maori, "The Text of the Hebrew Bible in Rabbinic Writings in the Light of the Qumran Evidence," *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 283–289. The main lists of variants in biblical quotations in the Talmud were compiled by S. Rozenfeld, *Mishpat Sopherim* (Vilna: Romm, 1882); V. Aptowitz, *Das Schriftwort in der rabbinischen Literatur* (2 vols.; Vienna 1906–1915; repr. New York: Ktav, 1970). See also M. Kahana, "The Biblical Text Reflected in Ms Vatican 32 of Sifre Numbers and Deuteronomy," *Talmudic Studies* 1 (ed. Y. Sussman and D. Rosenthal; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1990) 1–10; I. Knohl and S. Naeh, "Studies in the Priestly Torah: Lev. 7:19–21," *The Bible in the Light of Its Interpreters: Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume* (ed. S. Japhet; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994) 601–612 (Hebrew).

Introduction

paraphrastic quotation intended to provide a basis for a midrash or a certain interpretation. As is well known, at times parts of biblical verses are telescoped for the purpose of a midrashic homily, or are combined in order to give a full expression to a certain midrashic notion. On the other hand, evidence of variant readings was expunged from manuscripts of rabbinic literature because scribes tended to view variants as *lapsus calami* and to correct them to agree with the masoretic text.⁸⁷

62. Accordingly, a biblical quotation in a midrashic homily, whether identical to the MT or at variation with it, cannot be construed offhand as a witness to the text of the Hebrew Bible. Concrete textual deviation is evidenced when the homily and the interpretation testify to a variant, and not the lemma, that is, when revealed in what is termed a 'hermetical reading' (herm).⁸⁸ The testimony of variant biblical quotations is strengthened when it corresponds to similar readings in other, unrelated talmudic passages or reflects a reading in an ancient version or a masoretic notation. Midrashic homilies of the *al tiqre* or *ketib* type can also evidence a variant reading, particularly when a similar reading is found in additional witnesses.⁸⁹

63. The apparatus contains variant readings from tannaitic and amoraic sources, classical midrash works and the various *tanḥuma* midrashim. It became evident that significant variants are concentrated mainly in the tannaitic literature. Only a few readings are found in amoraic literature, relative to the scope of the compositions. In later midrashic works they are practically absent. Therefore, later sources were not checked, since the homilies they contain are usually secondary or revisions of earlier ones. Biblical quotations in the *hekhalot* literature, whose textual character cannot be ascertained, have not been included.

64. The text of biblical quotations was always checked against manuscripts and critical editions (except for additions in which the quotations were harmonized to the MT). In regard to some sources we had recourse to material assembled by scholars or research projects (as acknowledged below). For other sources, use was made of manuscript editions prepared for the Historical Dictionary of the Academy of the Hebrew Language, published on CD-ROM.⁹⁰

87 See, for example, the responsa of R. Hai Gaon concerning the text of 2 Chr 14:5 quoted in the Talmud in disagreement with MT: "But the verse [is not written] thus, like the errors that creep in in the course of study, not to mention students in villages, who were not expert in Bible" (B. M. Lewin, *Otzar ha-Gaonim: Thesaurus of the Gaonic Responsa and Commentaries Following the Order of the Talmudic Tractates, vol. 5: Tractate Megila, Taanith and Rosh-Hashana* [Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press, 1932] 7) (Hebrew).

88 E. g., 34:9, מקדשי – the interpretation of the verse is in the Babylonian Talmud (*b. Yoma* 71b; *Ta'anit* 17b et al.), suggests that their biblical text read the word לשרתני after מקדשי.

89 Cf. S. Talmon, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts," *Textus* 4 (1964) 95–132; M. Zipor, *Tradition and Transmission: Studies in Ancient Biblical Translation and Interpretation* (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 2001) 166–210 (Hebrew).

90 *Ma'agarim: Second Century B.C.E. – First Half of the Eleventh Century C.E.* (The Hebrew Language Historical Dictionary Project, Ancient Literature Section; Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 2001). A complete list of the manuscripts collated on the CD-ROM is given in the disk's documentation.

IV Apparatus II: The Judean Desert Scrolls and Quotations in Rabbinic Literature

65. Variant readings in biblical quotations were usually recorded without a detailed listing of manuscripts in which they are extant: a reading in a single manuscript is indicated by 'ms', and one appearing in several manuscripts by 'mss'. The absence of one of these sigla indicates that the reading is found in all manuscripts examined. The following list details the literature used and the editions in which biblical quotations were checked. References to editions recorded in the apparatus include page and line numbers in parentheses.

66. Sources:

Mishnah (m. + title of tractate)

Variants were checked in the main manuscripts: Budapest (Kaufmann A50), Parma (de Rossi 138), Cambridge 1883 (in the edition of Lowe). The sigla are K, P, L, respectively. References are according to the edition of H. Albeck, *Shishah Sidrei Mishnah* (6 vols.; Jerusalem/Tel-Aviv: Bialik Institute/Dvir, 1958) (Hebrew).

Tosephta (t. + title of tractate)

Variants and references according to the edition of S. Lieberman, *The Tosefta* (5 vols.; New York: JTS, 1955–1988), for the orders *Zeraim*, *Mo'ed*, and *Nashim*, as well as the tractate *Nezikim*.

Mekhilta of R. Shimon bar-Yohai (MekiltaRŠ)

Variants recorded on the basis of *Ma'agarim*; references according to the edition of J. N. Epstein and E. Z. Melamed, *Mekhilta d'Rabbi Sim'on b. Jochai* (Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1955).

Sifre BeMidbar (SifreNum)

Variant readings were recorded on the basis of transcribed manuscripts in the possession of M. Kahana; references according to the edition of H. S. Horovitz, *Siphre d'Be Rab* (Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1966).

Sifre Devarim (SifreDeut)

Variants collated from Vatican MS 32 (*Ma'agarim*); additional variants and references according to the edition of L. Finkelstein, *Siphre ad Deuteronomium* (Berlin: Jüdischer Kulturbund in Deutschland, 1939).

Jerusalem Talmud (y. + title of tractate)

Variants on the basis of *Ma'agarim*; references according to the Venice edition and the Historical Dictionary Project: *Talmud Yerushalmi – According to Ms. Or. 4720 (Scal. 3) of the Leiden University Library with Restorations and Corrections* (introduction Y. Sussmann; Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 2001).

Babylonian Talmud (b. + title of tractate)

Variant readings in biblical quotations were specially recorded at the request of the Bible Project by Yad Harav Herzog – Rabbi Herzog World Academy, Institute for the Complete Israeli Talmud, Jerusalem. References are according to the Vilna edition.

Abot de Rabbi Nathan (AbotRN)

Variant readings from all extant manuscripts were collected by M. Kister; references are according to the edition of S. Schechter, *Abot de Rabbi Nathan* (New York: Philipp Feldheim, 1967)

Seder Olam Rabbah (S.'OlamR)

Readings and references according to the edition of C. Milikowsky, *Seder Olam: A Rabbinic Chronography* (PhD diss.; Yale University, 1981).

Introduction

Genesis Rabbah (GenR)

Variants and references according to the edition of J. Theodor and C. Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabba* (2nd printing; Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1965); variants in genizah fragments according to the edition of M. Sokoloff, *The Genizah Fragments of Bereshit Rabba* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1982).

Exodus Rabbah (ExodR)

Variants on the basis of *Ma'agarim*; references to sections I–XIV according to the edition of A. Shinan, *Midrash Shemot Rabbah: Chapters I–XIV* (Jerusalem/Tel-Aviv: Dvir, 1984).

Leviticus Rabbah (LevR)

Variants and references according to the edition of M. Margulies, *Midrash Wayyikra Rabbah* (4 vols.; Jerusalem: Ministry of Education, 1953–1958).

Deuteronomy Rabbah, ed. Liebermann (DeutR Liebermann)

Variants on the basis of *Ma'agarim*; references according to the edition of S. Liebermann, *Midrash Debarim Rabbah* (Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1964).

Canticles Rabbah (CantR)

Variants collated from all extant manuscripts by T. Kadari; references according to the Vilna edition.

Ruth Rabbah (RuthR)

Variants and references according to the edition of M. B. Lerner, *The Book of Ruth in Aggadic Literature and Midrash Ruth Rabba* (PhD diss.; Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1971).

Lamentations Rabbah (LamR)

All manuscripts were collated from photographs supplied by P. D. Mandel; references according to the Vilna edition.

Lamentations Rabbah, ed. Buber (LamR Buber)

All manuscripts were collated from photographs supplied by P. D. Mandel; references according to the edition of S. Buber, *Midrasch Echa Rabbati* (Vilna: Romm, 1899).

Pesikta de Rav Kahana (PesiqtRK)

Variants and references according to the edition of B. Mandelbaum, *Pesikta de Rav Kahana* (2 vols.; New York: JTS, 1962).

Midrash Tanḥuma (Tanḥuma + title of *parashah*)

Variants on the basis of *Ma'agarim*; references according to the “Eshkol” edition.

Midrash Tanḥuma, ed. Buber (Tanḥuma Buber + *parashah*)

Variants on the basis of *Ma'agarim*; references according to the edition of S. Buber, *Midrasch Tanchuma: Ein agadischer Commentar zum Pentateuch* (2 vols.; Vilna: Witwe und Gebrueder Romm, 1885).

Pesikta Rabbati (PesiqtR)

Variants on the basis of *Ma'agarim*; references according to the edition of M. Friedmann, *Pesikta Rabbati* (Vienna: Private Publication, 1860).

Midrash Samuel (MidrašSam)

Variants on the basis of a synopsis in the papers of the late Tirzah Lifshitz; references according to the edition of S. Buber, *Midrasch Samuel: Agadische Abhandlung über das Buch Samuel* (Krakau: Joseph Fischer, 1893).

IV Apparatus II: The Judean Desert Scrolls and Quotations in Rabbinic Literature

Midrash Tehillim (MidrašPs)

Variants on the basis of *Ma'agarim*; references according to the edition of S. Buber, *Midrasch Tehillim* (Vilna: Romm, 1891).

Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer (PirqeRE)

Variants collated from all extant manuscripts by E. Treitl; references according to the edition of M. Higger, *Horeb* 8 (1944) 82–119; 9 (1946) 94–166; 10 (1948) 185–293.

67. Additional sources checked, for which no variants were recorded in the apparatus:

Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael

All manuscripts were examined on the basis of photographs provided by L. Elias.

Sifra

All manuscripts checked

Sifre Zuta to Deuteronomy

Checked on the basis of the edition of M. I. Kahana, *Sifre Zuta on Deuteronomy: Citations from a New Tannaitic Midrash* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2002).

Megillat Ta'anit

Checked on the basis of the edition of V. Noam, *Megillat Ta'anit and the Scholion: Their Nature, Period and Sources, Accompanied by a Critical Edition* (PhD diss.; The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997).

Minor Treatises

Checked on the basis of the edition of M. Higger, *Seven Minor Treatises* (New York: Bloch, 1930).

Sifre Zuta on Numbers

Checked on the basis of *Ma'agarim*.

Baraita de Melekheth HaMishkan

Checked on the basis of *Ma'agarim*.

Deuteronomy Rabbah

Checked on the basis of *Ma'agarim*.

Qohelet Rabbah

Checked on the basis of *Ma'agarim*.

Canticles Zuta

Checked on the basis of *Ma'agarim*.

Ruth Zuta

Checked on the basis of *Ma'agarim*.

Seder Eliahu Rabbah and Zuta

Checked on the basis of *Ma'agarim*.

68. The method of determining what should be listed in the apparatus derives from the nature of the material. Only variants well-attested in manuscripts of rabbinic literature were recorded, after carefully weighing the relative importance and character of the manuscripts and the number of unrelated witnesses. Yet these were listed in the apparatus only when they were in agreement with at least one of the following criteria: (a) the variant transpires from the midrashic homily ('herm' or 'al tiqre'); (b) the variant has support in Apparatus I; (c) the variant is attested in both apparatuses III and IV; (d) the variant is attested in various com-

Introduction

positions of rabbinic literature, in midrashic homilies not directly dependant on one another; (e) the variant is attested in a homily in which the text of the relevant verse is its specific issue; (f) a masora comment witnesses to the antiquity of the variant reading (such as יפה, or סבירין).

69. Variants deriving from scribal practices were not recorded in the apparatus, such as interchanges of similar consonants (כ/ב, ד/ר, etc.), interchanges of אל/על, additions or omissions of *waw*, plene vs. defective spelling, changes due to the influence of Rabbinic Hebrew (*mem* or *nun* at the ends of words, etc.), and the like. In rare instances readings were listed which are attested in a large number of witnesses, even though they do not match any of the above conditions.⁹¹ Variants which were not included in Apparatus II, but have a bearing on variants in other apparatuses were adduced in the notes.⁹²

70. Sigla and abbreviations employed in Apparatus II:

>	lacking
§	a space indicating a section
א(בג)	Hebrew letters enclosed in parentheses are attested only in some manuscripts
[אבג]	Hebrew reconstructed text on the basis of a parallel or the extent of the lacuna
[>]	text section reconstructed on the basis of the extent of the lacuna
א̇	a partially but clearly preserved letter
א̈	a faintly preserved letter
אבג	text erased by the scribe
herm	possible reading in rabbinic source derived (sometimes implicitly) from the midrashic exegesis
al tiqre	a reading reflected in an 'al tiqre' type midrash
ketib	a reading reflected in a 'ketib' type midrash
ms(s)	a reading found in ms(s) of a rabbinic source
super	a superlinear reading

V. APPARATUS III: MEDIEVAL BIBLE MANUSCRIPTS

Sources

71. The two types of Hebrew witnesses included in Apparatus III, Genizah fragments and complete medieval manuscripts, chronologically reflect the third stage in the transmission

91 For example, 34:31, ואתן; the predominant reading in rabbinic literature is ואתנה.

92 The approach taken in recording variants in biblical quotations in rabbinic literature in the present volume is stricter than that taken in the editions of Isaiah and Jeremiah. Efforts have been made not to overload the apparatus with readings that are of questionable textual value. This accounts for the apparent paucity of variants from rabbinic literature in comparison to the approach taken by the editors of the preceding two volumes.

V. Apparatus III: Medieval Bible Manuscripts

history of the text of the Hebrew Bible, that is, the period during which the ‘masoretic text’ became dominant (see above, §11), but did not entirely represent the *textus receptus*. The Genizah fragments are remnants of manuscripts dating from the end of the first millennium CE, before the crystallization of the Tiberian masoretic system. They reflect two earlier branches of the Masora: Palestinian and Babylonian. On the other hand, the complete European medieval manuscripts date from the 12–15th centuries, and reflect a later stage of transmission, after the activity of the Masoretes.

72. The first type of sources includes complete MSS which are collated in Kennicott’s edition, and are indicated here after him as MSS 30, 89, 93, 96, 150.⁹³ These five manuscripts were selected from the hundreds recorded by him because of the unparalleled quantity of variants they contain. If it can be claimed that some medieval manuscripts preserve ‘non-receptus’ readings,⁹⁴ these are the most likely candidates:⁹⁵

30 *Oxford, Bodleian 105 (Tanner 173)*.⁹⁶
Prophets and Hagiographa; France, 13th century.

89 *Cambridge University Library, Mm. 5.27*
Entire Bible; Spain, 14–15th centuries.⁹⁷

93 *Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 404/625*
Prophets; Ashkenazi script of the 12th century.⁹⁸

96 *Cambridge, St John’s College A2*
Prophets; France, 14th century.⁹⁹

93 B. Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum Variis Lectionibus* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1776–1780). Kennicott collated only the consonantal text and disregarded differences in vocalization.

94 Cf. Goshen-Gottstein, “Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts” (above, n. 8); cf. also M. Cohen, “Some Basic Features of the Consonantal Text in Medieval Manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible,” *Arie Toeg in Memoriam* (Studies in Bible and Exegesis 1; ed. U. Simon, M. Goshen-Gottstein; Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1980) 123–182; idem, “The ‘Masoretic Text’ and the Extent of its Influence on the Transmission of the Biblical Text in the Middle Ages,” *Studies in Bible and Exegesis Presented to Yehuda Elitzur* (Studies in Bible and Exegesis 2; ed. U. Simon; Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University, 1986) 229–256 (Hebrew).

95 Thanks are due to Dr. Edna Engel of the Hebrew Paleography Project, who supplied us with the descriptive details of the manuscripts (on the basis of microfilms).

96 Cf. A. Neubauer, *Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1886) 12, §72; M. Beit-Arié and R. E. May, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford, 1994) 10, §72.

97 Cf. S. C. Reif, *Hebrew Manuscripts at the Cambridge University Library: Description and Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) 54. The colophon dating the manuscript to the year 856 is an evident forgery.

98 Cf. M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Gonville and Caius College Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1908) 471, 404/625.

99 Cf. M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St John’s College Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913) 2, §2. The ms is irregular in its vocalization and accentuation, and a number of words and even entire verses are left unvocalized.

Introduction

150 *Berlin 1 (Or. Fol. 1–4)*

Entire Bible with Targum; Ashkenazi script of the late 14th or early 15th century, with sporadic corrections in the text and margins by a 15–16th century hand.¹⁰⁰

73. The second type of sources consists of manuscript fragments from the Genizah. A mere listing of Genizah variants, lumping together a wide range of linguistic traditions and transmissions of the text from different periods and locations, is difficult to justify philologically. Variants from Genizah fragments have been recorded only when they reflect traditions older than that of the Tiberian:¹⁰¹

a) Fragments with Palestinian vocalization, indicated in the apparatus as follows:¹⁰²

<i>G-P</i>	Genizah fragment with Palestinian vocalization
200, 204, etc.	Manuscript number as catalogued by Revell

b) Fragments with Babylonian vocalization:¹⁰³

<i>G-B</i>	Genizah fragment with Babylonian vocalization
<i>Eb</i> (or: <i>Kb</i>)	Prophets fragments whose vocalization is simple (or compound)
10, 22, etc.	Manuscript number as catalogued by Yeivin
<i>Msr</i> 1, 2, etc.	Masoretic lists published by Ofer ¹⁰⁴

74. The edition makes a first attempt to call readers' attention to secondary but contemporary witnesses, viz. variant readings reflected in medieval Jewish commentaries. These contain two types of variants: those appearing in quotations in lemmas or in the body of the commentary, and variants, either explicit or implied, in the commentary itself. Variants of the first type are quite frequent, but real value can be attributed only to readings of the second type. The apparatus thus records only variants that were almost certainly present in the biblical manuscript used by the commentator, and furthermore, only when the same variant is evidenced in one of the primary manuscript sources. References to readings in commentaries are given in the notes.¹⁰⁵ The commentators examined for this purpose are Rashi, Kimḥi, Kara, Eliezar of Beaugency, Isaiah di Trani, and Menaḥem ben Shimon of Posquières.¹⁰⁶ A small number of variant readings have been listed from Ibn Janah, *Sefer HaRiqmah*.¹⁰⁷

100 Cf. M. Steinschneider, *Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin* (vol. 2; Berlin: Buchdruckerei der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1878) 1, §1.

101 To facilitate reading their parallel Tiberian signs have replaced Babylonian vocalization signs. The substitution relates only to morphological variants and does not reflect the phonological distinctions between the Tiberian and Babylonian systems of pronunciation.

102 E. J. Revell, *Biblical Texts with Palestinian Pointing and Their Accents* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).

103 Yeivin, *Babylonian*.

104 Ofer, *Babylonian*.

105 Other notes pertaining to apparatus III mostly concern linguistic or textual matters, in particular in regard to Genizah fragments with Babylonian vocalization, for which the reader is referred to the exhaustive grammatical discussion of I. Yeivin.

106 According to the edition of M. Cohen, *Ezekiel: Mikra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer'* (Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University, 2000).

107 M. Wilensky, *Sefer HaRiqmah* (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1964) (Hebrew).

V. Apparatus III: Medieval Bible Manuscripts

75. An examination of variants in medieval MSS reveals differences almost exclusively deriving from scribal practices, whether due to linguistic, analogical, or associative factors, or simply copyists' errors. By and large their textual value is practically nil.¹⁰⁸ However, the aforementioned sources are somewhat conspicuous among the hundreds of manuscripts collated since the beginning of the eighteenth century, since they also contain variants of a different nature, similar to those found in witnesses of earlier periods. This is especially true of the five complete manuscripts chosen for collation in the edition, which are characterized by a particular divergence from the *textus receptus* both quantitatively and qualitatively.¹⁰⁹ Nevertheless, their variants have no more than a corroborative significance.

Method of Recording

76. All sources were collated anew on the basis of photographs. The variants recorded in this apparatus concern differences in the consonantal text or in vocalization entailing significant variants in morphology (conjugation, determination, etc.). Variations in the use of *matres lectiones* or reflecting the Babylonian vocalization system (in Genizah fragments) were not recorded. Obviously, in some instances, the determination whether a reading differs from א either orthographically or grammatically is not unequivocal (cf., for example, 29:5 יארִיךְ). On the other hand, even obvious errors in these manuscripts are sometimes noted – indicated by an exclamation mark (!) – so as to present the reader with a fuller picture.¹¹⁰

77. This edition of Ezekiel also records differences in sections. It is doubtful whether any real text-critical significance can be attributed to a differentiation between 'open' (*petuhot*) and 'closed' (*setumot*) sections in these sources. Therefore, only differences concerning the presence or absence of a section were included in the apparatus itself, indicated by the section symbol (§). A full tabulation of differences including *petuhot* (פ) and *setumot* (ס), is given in the appendix to the Introduction.

78. Corrections in the MSS are recorded meticulously by the siglum 'pm', which refers to a reading before it was corrected, and by 'sm', which indicates a correction of the text (no attempt was made, however, to identify a third, or a fourth hand). The siglum 'sm' also refers to cases in which the correction is made by not vocalizing a letter (for example, 34:2 אֶלְיָהֻם); a lack of vocalization for entire word, however, is indicated by 'non voc'. Corrections by the scribe himself in the middle of a word were ignored. However, if the scribe stopped in the middle of a word without erasing the letters written, the curtailed word was recorded if it differs from the base text (indicated by ..). Rare cases of a variant readings entered in the margins of a manuscript (mostly in MS 150) and explicitly marked as נ"א (נוסח אחר, "another reading") or י"ג (יש גורסים, "some read"), are indicated by 'marg' (for example, 22:9 ואל).

79. As for *ketib/qeri* readings, the MSS tend to give only one in the text, usually the *qeri* reading.¹¹¹ Rare instances in which a manuscript has a *qeri* reading in the *masora parva*

108 For this reason the editions of Kennicott, de Rossi, and Ginsberg were not referred to.

109 Cf. Goshen-Gottstein, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts" (above, n. 8), 243–290.

110 Since it is at times impossible to distinguish between similar letters such as וי, דר, כב, we did not burden the apparatus with such readings. Because our collation is not based on the original manuscripts, such cases are often marked as dubious by a question mark (?).

111 Ms 96 consistently writes ירושלם according to the *qeri perpetuum* ירושלים. Such differences were not recorded in the apparatus.

Introduction

differing in any way from א, are fully recorded. In these cases the agreement with the *qeri* (q) or the *ketib* (k) is recorded, or if there is a *ketib* with a *keri* notation; nothing was recorded when the *ketib* and *qeri* were identical with א.¹¹² A reading in a manuscript identical with the *qeri* in form and meaning, but not orthographically, is indicated by ≈.¹¹³

80. Graphic and verbal symbols employed in Apparatus III:

>	lacking in a ms
~	difference in word order, transposition of words or parts of a sentence
§	section (indicated <i>before</i> the relevant verse)
..	word not completed by scribe
...	ellipsis
!	scribal error
[]	reconstructed text
(?)	dubious reading
(pm)	<i>prima manus</i>
(sm)	<i>secunda manus</i>
marg	marginal notation
Targ	the Aramaic Targum in a ms ¹¹⁴
non voc	unvocalized word(s)
pr	place before, preceded by

VI. APPARATUS IV: ORTHOGRAPHY, VOWELS, AND ACCENTS

Sources

81. Variants recorded in this apparatus usually do not affect the meaning and form of the text. However, the accuracy of the scribe concerning these minor details, seemingly of importance only in a liturgical context, may determine the value of a ‘Masora Codex’. This seems meaningful only with regard to a small group of selected manuscripts.

82. The choice of the Aleppo Codex (א) as the basic text of the edition prescribes the group of sources that may be usefully compared. In this apparatus the witnesses were selected according to type and period, specifically manuscripts close to the tradition of א

112 Chapter 40 gave rise to a special problem, because of the many plural nouns with 3 pers. sing. pronominal suffixes, which tend to be written in the mss in full spellings (e.g. אַן־לְנִי, אַן־לְמִנִי, etc.). As a rule, these were considered mere differences in orthography, and therefore were recorded only in the few instances in which א has a *ketib/keri* reading. ms 89 often added a *keri* reading י״ to the *ketib* י״ (and sometimes also ms 150 sm, marked with an asterisk): thus vv. 21 (וּתְאוּ, וְאֵילֹ, וְאֵלְמוּ*), 22 (וּתְאוּ, וְאֵילֹ, וְאֵלְמוּ), 24 (וְאֵילְמוּ*), 25 (וְאֵילְמוּ), 26 (וְאֵילֹ), 29 (וְאֵילֹ, וְאֵלְמוּ, וְאֵלְמוּ), 31 (וְאֵלְמוּ), 33 (וְאֵלְמוּ), 34 (וְאֵלְמוּ, וְאֵלְמוּ, וְאֵלְמוּ), 36 (וְאֵלְמוּ), 37 (וְאֵילֹ, וְאֵלְמוּ). These instances were not recorded in the apparatus.

113 This holds also good for י״ יתיר or י״ יתיר notations, which are simply another form of *qeri* readings.

114 Cf. e.g., app 18:11.

VI. Apparatus IV: Orthography, Vowels, and Accents

alongside non-Tiberian traditions and Tiberian *non-receptus* and later manuscripts that differ in certain details. This apparatus, therefore, reflects ancient witnesses of the Tiberian ‘Ben-Asher’ type on the one hand, and on the other hand, ancient representatives of other types, as well as developments of the Tiberian tradition as it finally took shape in Jacob Ben-Ḥayyim’s *Biblia Rabbinica*, which became the basis of later editions.¹¹⁵

83. The sources for this apparatus can be subsumed into four groups, according to their relative affinities to the Tiberian Ben-Asher tradition:

a) Manuscripts ל (Leningrad), 4ל, 10ל, 14ל, 20ל, 23ל, 28ל, 29ל, 30ל, 32ל, 35ל, 37ל, ק (Cairo),¹¹⁶ 1ק, and ו (Sassoon). These MSS represent the Tiberian tradition in general, and the Ben-Asher tradition in particular.

b) Manuscripts 18ל, 25ל and 1 (New York). These manuscripts show some influence of extra-Tiberian traditions. Variants in MS 25ל involving divergent vocalization, *metheg*, light *ga’aya* next to the cantillation sign, and the deviant doubling of *pashta*, as well as influences of compound Tiberian pointing, were not recorded.¹¹⁷

c) Manuscripts פ (Petersburg) and 7 (Reuchlinianus). Manuscripts פ and 7 are adduced because they are the most ancient known representatives of traditions close to the Tiberian *receptus*, although distinct from it. These manuscripts, examined by Ginsburg,¹¹⁸ were collated anew for our edition. Because of their different vocalization system only differences in orthography were recorded, including a few substantial variants in vocalization, reflecting differences in determination, different conjugation or morphological pattern, etc, but not differences in pronunciation. The Babylonian punctuation in פ (as well as that in the *masora magna* and *masora parva* appearing sporadically in other manuscripts) is transcribed into Tiberian punctuation, for the reader’s convenience.

d) Edition נ, the second *Biblia Rabbinica* – מקראות גדולות. The *Biblia Rabbinica* (נ) served as the basis for many later editions of the Bible. It thus constitutes the opposite pole of the early manuscripts, and represents what was regarded *de facto* as the ‘Tiberian *textus receptus*’. In the edition of Ezekiel variants in indicating *parashot* (*petuhot* and *setumot*) for *Biblia Rabbinica* are fully recorded.

Variants from ‘Differences between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali’ are recorded according to the edition of L. Lipschütz,¹¹⁹ as well as differences between the *ma’arba’ei/maedinha’ei*

115 The reading of MS א is recorded in the apparatus in two instances: when the manuscript itself contains a correction, and when a scribal error has been corrected (cf. 1:1 הגולה; 3:18 מידך).

116 It was recently proven conclusively that the scribe and the *naqdan* (vocalizer) of the Cairo Prophets codex cannot be identified as Moshe Ben-Asher, and cannot be dated to 895 but rather to the 11th century CE. Cf. M. Beit-Arié et al., *Codices Hebraicis litteris exarati quo tempore scripti fuerint exhibentes* (Monumenta palaeographica medii aevi. Series Hebraica; Paris/Jerusalem: Brepols, 1997) 25–29; D. Lyons, *The Cumulative Masora: Text, Form and Transmission* (Beer-Sheva: Ben-Gurion University Press, 1999) [4]–7 (Hebrew).

117 19ל, included in Apparatus IV of the edition of Jeremiah, is no longer included, due to its poor state of preservation and its considerable distance from manuscripts close to א.

118 Ginsburg lists these as 1 and 2.

119 “Mishael ben Uzziel’s Treatise on the Differences Between Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali,” *Textus* 2 (1962) א–ג [1–48] (Hebrew). Cf. his introduction, “Kitāb al-Khilaf, The Book of Ḥillufim,” *Textus* 4 (1964) 1–29.

Introduction

traditions, according to the lists at the end of ms 7.¹²⁰ Masoretic notations pertaining to variant readings such as *qeri* and *ktiv*, *yetir* (יתיר), *sebirin*, are also recorded.

84. The details of the sources:

- א Aleppo Codex, entire Bible (incompletely preserved),¹²¹ first half of tenth century
- ב Leningrad (St. Petersburg) Codex B 19a, entire Bible, dated 1009
- 47 Leningrad II Firk 124, Prophets (incomplete), dated 946
- 107 Leningrad II Firk 1283, Latter Prophets (incomplete), dated 1058
- 147 Leningrad II Firk 144 II c, Prophets (incomplete), dated 1122
- 187 Leningrad I Firk 59, Latter Prophets (incomplete),¹²² 11th century
- 207 Leningrad II Firk 9, Latter Prophets (incomplete), 10th century
- 237 Leningrad II Firk 116, Latter Prophets (incomplete), 11th century
- 287 Leningrad II Firk 30, Latter Prophets (incomplete), 11th century
- 297 Leningrad II Firk 57, Latter Prophets (incomplete), 12th century
- 307 Leningrad II Firk 61, Latter Prophets (incomplete), 10–11th century
- 327 Leningrad II Firk 76, Latter Prophets (incomplete), 11th century
- 357 Leningrad II Firk 122, Latter Prophets (incomplete), 10–11th century
- 377 Leningrad II Firk 1233, Latter Prophets (incomplete), 10th century
- א New York, ENA 346 = JTS 232, Latter Prophets (incomplete), 10th century
- ב Codex Petersburg Heb B 3, Latter Prophets (complete), dated 916¹²³
- א Cairo Codex, Gottheil 34, Prophets (complete), 11th century
- א Gottheil 22, Latter Prophets, 10th century¹²⁴
- א Codex Karlsruhe 3 ('Reuchlinianus'), Prophets (complete), dated 1105¹²⁵
- א Sassoon 1053, entire Bible, 10th century.
- א Second Rabbinic Bible, ed. Jacob Ben-Haim Ibn Adoniyah, Venice 1524–5

¹²⁰ These lists are in general agreement with those at the end of א; whenever they differ, it is indicated in the apparatus.

¹²¹ The book of Ezekiel has been preserved in its entirety; for details of what is missing from the Aleppo Codex, cf. I. Ben-Zvi, "The Codex of Ben Asher," *Textus* 1 (1960) 2–3. Facsimile edition: *The Aleppo Codex* (ed. M. H. Goshen-Gottstein; Jerusalem: HUBP, 1976).

¹²² The book of Ezekiel is preserved in its entirety.

¹²³ Edited by H. Strack, *Prophetarum Posteriorum Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus* (Petropoli: Typis Academiae Scientiarum Caesareae, 1876).

¹²⁴ Cf. R. Gottheil, "Some Hebrew Manuscripts in Cairo," *JQR* 17 (1904–05) 609–655; I. Yeivin, "A Biblical Manuscript Very Close to the Aleppo Codex from the Karaite Synagogue in Cairo (C1)," *Moshe Goshen-Gottstein: In Memoriam* (Studies in Bible and Exegesis 3; ed. M. Bar-Asher et al.; Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1993) 169–194 (Hebrew).

¹²⁵ A. Sperber, *The Pre-Masoretic Bible* (Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1956).

Introduction

!	scribal error
(פ)	open section (<i>parasha petuḥah</i>)
(ס)	closed section (<i>parashah segurah</i>)
(<)	absence of a section (<i>parashah</i>)
ס	<i>seder</i>
מ"ן	<i>masora parva</i>
ג"ן	<i>masora magna</i>
א"ב	Ben-Asher
נ"ב	Ben-Naphtali
מ"ד	<i>medincha'ei</i>
מ"א	<i>ma'arba'ei</i>
(פירוק?)	a correction possibly made by Firkowitsch ¹³¹

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

- Allen, ZAW 102
L. C. Allen, "Annotation Clusters in Ezekiel," ZAW 102 (1990) 408–413
- Begg, ETL
C. Begg, "The Reading in Ezekiel 19,7a: A Proposal," ETL 65 (1989) 370–380
- Ben-Ḥayyim, *Leshonenu* 21
Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, "Masora and Tradition," *Leshonenu* 21 (1957) 283–292 [Hebrew]
- Bewer, *JBL* 72
J. A. Bewer, "Textual and Exegetical Notes on the Book of Ezekiel," *JBL* 72 (1953) 158–168
- Bogaert, BETL 74
P.-M. Bogaert, "Les deux rédactions conservées (LXX et TM) d'Ézéchiél 7," *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation* (ed. J. Lust; BETL 74; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986) 20–47
- Breuer, *Leshonenu* 58
M. Breuer, "Biblical Verses of Undecided Syntactical Adhesion," *Leshonenu* 58 (1994/5) 189–199 [Hebrew]
- Cooke, ZAW 42
G. A. Cooke, "Some Considerations on the Text and Teaching of Ezekiel 40–48," ZAW 42 (1924) 105–115
- Cornill
C. H. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1886)

¹³¹ For the notorious forgeries of Firkowitsch cf. E. Deinard, *Masa Crim* (Warsaw, 1878) 194–204 (Hebrew).

Bibliography and Bibliographical Abbreviations

- Driver, *Biblica* 36
G. R. Driver, "Notes on Notes," *Biblica* 36 (1955) 71–73
- Driver, *Textus* 1
idem, "Abbreviations in the Massoretic Text," *Textus* 1 (1960) 112–131
- Elat, *Shnaton* 10
M. Elat, "Tarshish in Isaiah 23 and in History," *Shnaton* 10 (1990) 17–30 [Hebrew]
- Field
F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta* (2 vols.; Oxford, 1875; reprinted Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964)
- Ginsburg
C. D. Ginsburg, *The Massorah: Compiled from Manuscripts* (4 vols.; London/Vienna: Carl Fromme, 1880–1905)
- G-K
E. Kautzsch, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (2 ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1910)
- Halperin, *VT* 26
D. Halperin, "The Exegetical Character of Ezek 10:9–17," *VT* 26 (1976) 129–141
- Ibn Janah, *Riqmah*
Abulwalid Merwan Ibn Ganah, *Sepher Hariqmah* (Jerusalem: Hebrew Language Academy, 1964)
- Ibn Janah, *Shorashim*
idem, *Sepher Haschoraschim* (Jehuda Ibn Tibbon, trans.; Berlin: H. Itzkowski, 1896)
- Joosten, *Textus* 14
Jan Joosten, "The Use of Some Particles in the Old Testament Peshitta," *Textus* 14 (1988) 175–183
- Joüon, *Biblica*
P. Joüon, "Notes philologiques sur le texte Hébreu d'Ézéchiél," *Biblica* 10 (1929) 304–312
- Katz, *Biblica*
P. Katz, "Zur Textgestaltung der Ezechiel-Septuaginta," *Biblica* 35 (1954) 29–39
- Kogut, Fs. Goldenberg
S. Kogut, "Discussions on Biblical Verses and Their Accentuations," *Massorot* 9–11 (G. Goldenberg Festschrift; ed. M. Bar-Asher; Jerusalem: The Institute of Jewish Studies, 1977) 153–163 [Hebrew]
- Kogut, *Leshonenu* 46
idem, "The Extra Pronominal Element in the Bible," *Leshonenu* 46 (1982) 9–26, 97–123 [Hebrew]
- LSJ
H. G. Liddell, R. Scott and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1940), used together with the *Supplement* (ed. E. A. Barger; Oxford 1968) and the *Revised Supplement* (ed. P. G. W. Glare; Oxford 1996)

Introduction

- Lust, BETL 74
J. Lust, "The Final Text and Textual Criticism: Ez 39,28," *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation* (ed. J. Lust; BETL 74; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986) 48–54
- Marquis, *Textus* 13
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
- Masson, *VT* 37
M. Masson, "Şepîrâ (Ezéchiel VII 10)," *VT* 37 (1987) 301–311
- Newsom, *JJS* 38
C. A. Newsom, "Merkabah Exegesis in the Qumran Sabbath Shirot," *JJS* 38 (1987) 11–30
- Ofer, *Babylonian*
Y. Ofer, *The Babylonian Masora of the Pentateuch: Its Principles and Methods* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew Language Academy, 2001) [Hebrew]
- Peters, *JBL* 12
J. P. Peters, "Critical Notes," *JBL* 12 (1893) 47–60
- Polak, *Textus* 17
F. H. Polak, "The Interpretation קָלָה/קָלָה in the LXX: Ambiguity and Intuitive Comprehension," *Textus* 17 (1994) 57–77
- Rabin, *Textus* 2
C. Rabin, "The Ancient Versions and the Indefinite Subject," *Textus* 2 (1962) 60–76
- Reider, *Prolegomena*
J. Reider, *Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew & Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila* (Philadelphia: Oxford University Press, 1916)
- Schleusner
J. F. Schleusner, *Novus Thesaurus Philologico-Criticus, sive Lexicon in LXX et Reliquos Interpretes Graecos ac Scriptores Apocryphos Veteris Testamenti* (5 Vols.; Leipzig: Heismann, 1821)
- Slotki, *AJSLL* 43
I. W. Slotki, "ועשה אח מאחד מאלה" – Ezek 18:10," *AJSLL* 43 (1927) 63–67
- Talmon, in Talmon–Cross
S. Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible: A New Outlook," *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (ed. F. M. Cross and S. Talmon; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975) 321–400
- Talmon, *Hebrew Studies* 25
idem, "'Yad Wašem': an Idiomatic Phrase in Biblical Literature and its Variations," *Hebrew Studies* 25 (1084) 8–17 = "ש' טלמון, 'יד ושם': גלגולי מטבע לשון בספרות המקרא," 8–17 = מחקרים במקרא: יוצאים לאור במלאת מאה שנה להולדתו של מ"ד קאסוטו (בעריכת ש"א ליונשטם; ירושלים: מאגנס, תשמ"ז) 148–137
- Talmon, *Masada* 6
idem, *Hebrew Fragments from Masada* (Masada 6; Jerusalem: IES, 1999)

Bibliography and Bibliographical Abbreviations

- Talmon, *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8
idem, "Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the Old Testament," *Studies in the Bible* (Scripta Hierosolymitana 8; ed. Ch. Rabin; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961, 335–383)
- Talmon, *Textual Criticism*
idem, "Textual Criticism: The Ancient Versions," *Text in Context* (ed. A. D. H. Mayes; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) 141–169
- Talmon, *Textus* 1
idem, "Double Readings in the Massoretic Text," *Textus* 1 (1960) 144–184
- Tov, *Biblica* 60
E. Tov, "Loan-Words, Homophony and Transliterations in the Septuagint," *Biblica* 60 (1979) 216–236 [= *Greek & Hebrew Bible*, 165–182]
- Tov, *Greek & Hebrew Bible*
idem, *The Greek & Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (SVT 62; Leiden: Brill, 1999)
- Tov, *JNSL* 13
idem, "Some Sequence Differences Between MT and LXX and their Ramifications for the Literary Criticism of the Bible," *JNSL* 13 (1987) 151–160 [= *Greek & Hebrew Bible*, 411–418]
- Tov, *TCHB*
idem, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis/Assen/Maastricht: Fortress Press/Van Gorcum, 1992)
- Tov, *TCU*
idem, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (revised and enlarged 2nd edition; Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997)
- Walters
P. Walters, *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendation* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1973)
- Weiss, *JBL* 82
R. Weiss, "On Ligatures in the Hebrew Bible (ם=נו)," *JBL* 82 (1963) 188–194 = ר' ויס, 'שילובי אותיות במקרא', מחקרי מקרא: בחינות נוסח ולשון (ירושלים: מאגנס, תשמ"א) 3–19
- Weissert, *Bible and Jewish History*
D. Weissert, "The Verb חדל in LXX-Ezekiel," *Bible and Jewish History* (J. Liver Festschrift; ed. B. Uffenheimer; Tel-Aviv: Students Organisation Press, 1972) 279–288 [Hebrew]
- Weissert, *Textus* 8
idem, "Alexandrian Analogical Word-Analysis and Septuagint Translation Techniques," *Textus* 8 (1973) 31–44
- Weissert, *Textus* 21
idem, "Qal versus Nif'al in Ezekiel 37:8," *Textus* 21 (2002) 129–138

Introduction

Wutz, *Transkriptionen*

F. Wutz, *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen II, P. Kahle Ed.), Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933

Yeivin, *Aleppo Codex*

I. Yeivin, *The Aleppo Codex of the Bible: A Study of Its Vocalization and Accentuation* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1968) [Hebrew]

Yeivin, *Babylonian*

idem, *The Hebrew Language Tradition as Reflected in the Babylonian Vocalization* (2 vols.; The Academy of the Hebrew Language: Jerusalem, 1985) [Hebrew]

Yeivin, *Ohel Hayyim*

idem, *Ohel Hayyim: A Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts of the Manfred and Anne Lehman Family, Vol II: Biblical Manuscripts* (New York: The Manfred and Anne Lehman Family Foundation, 1990)

Ziegler

J. Ziegler, ed., *Ezechiel* (Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum. vol. 16, pars 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952; 2nd edition 1977)

Zimmerli

W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel* (BKAT 13/1–2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969)

Zipor, ZAW 103

M. A. Zipor, "Ezechiel 16,7," ZAW 103 (1991) 99–100

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AJSLL</i>	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature</i>
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
BKAT	Biblische Kommentar: Altes Testament
CATSS	Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint/Scriptural Study
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
HUBP	Hebrew University Bible Project
<i>IDBSup</i>	<i>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume</i> (ed. K. Crim et al.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1976)
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNSL</i>	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>Leshonenu</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Hebrew Language and Cognate Subjects</i> (Hebrew)
PTS	Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project
<i>ScrHier</i>	<i>Scripta Hierosolymitana</i>
<i>Shnaton</i>	<i>Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies</i> (Hebrew)
STDJ	Studies on the Texts from the Desert of Judah
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

APPENDIX

Open and Closed Sections

In the present edition sections in the Hebrew manuscripts were recorded in the apparatuses according to the type of the sources. In Apparatuses II and III the siglum § indicates an interval functioning as a marker of a new sense unit, without differentiating between types of intervals (i.e. whether “open” or “closed” sections, in masoretic terms). Such intervals were recorded only in instances in which there was no correspondence between § and other manuscripts, that is when an interval was present in a manuscript but lacking in §, or when present in § but lacking in a given manuscript.

In Apparatus IV sections are treated differently, because the affiliation of a masoretic codex (e.g. to the Ben Asher tradition) depends – among other factors – on the (dis)agreement in reference to sections. Therefore in this apparatus sections were recorded with the indication “closed” (ס) or “open” (פ).

The following table presents an overview of the material. It includes all intervals, specifying “open” and “closed” types, in all extant sources: Judean Desert scrolls, recorded in Apparatus II; the complete manuscripts and Geniza fragments, recorded in Apparatus III; and the manuscripts recorded in Apparatus IV.* As a rule, a blank cell indicates a lacuna in the manuscript, and means that it could not be determined whether a “closed” or “open” section is involved. Lack of a section is marked by the symbol > (or <). If reconstructed on the basis of a count of spaces and characters, this is marked by square brackets [>].

Corrections in section markings are indicated by the sigla used in apparatus IV: a single apostrophe marks the original or *prima manus* reading; a double apostrophe marks the corrected or *secunda manus* reading. Thus e.g. "ט פ" means that the manuscript originally had a closed section, but later was corrected to an open section. Doubtful readings, which usually are due to the poor preservation of a manuscript, or cases in which the nature of the correction could not be defined, are marked by a question mark (?).

The symbols used in the table:

פ	פרשה פתוחה	open section (a blank interval, followed by a text at the beginning of a new line)
ס	פרשה סתומה	closed section (a blank interval in the middle of a line followed by a text)
^	פסקה באמצע פסוק	a section within a verse
'		<i>prima manus</i> (before a correction)
"		<i>secunda manus</i> (after a correction)
?		dubious reading

* The table of sections in mss recorded in apparatus IV is justified to the right, like the apparatus itself.

Appendix – Open and Closed Sections
Sections in Hebrew Manuscripts Recorded in Apparatuses II–III

Appendix – Open and Closed Sections
Sections in Hebrew Manuscripts Recorded in Apparatus IV

Appendix – Open and Closed Sections
Sections in Hebrew Manuscripts Recorded in Apparatuses II–III

Appendix – Open and Closed Sections
Sections in Hebrew Manuscripts Recorded in Apparatus IV

Appendix – Open and Closed Sections
Sections in Hebrew Manuscripts Recorded in Apparatuses II–III

— |

| —

Appendix – Open and Closed Sections
Sections in Hebrew Manuscripts Recorded in Apparatus IV

— |

| —

Appendix – Open and Closed Sections
Sections in Hebrew Manuscripts Recorded in Apparatuses II–III

Appendix – Open and Closed Sections
Sections in Hebrew Manuscripts Recorded in Apparatus IV

Appendix – Open and Closed Sections
Sections in Hebrew Manuscripts Recorded in Apparatuses II–III

Appendix – Open and Closed Sections
Sections in Hebrew Manuscripts Recorded in Apparatus IV

Appendix – Open and Closed Sections
Sections in Hebrew Manuscripts Recorded in Apparatuses II–III

Appendix – Open and Closed Sections
Sections in Hebrew Manuscripts Recorded in Apparatus IV