

Durham E-Theses

*Adam, Satan, and the King of Tyre: The reception of
Ezekiel 28:11-19 in Judaism and Christianity in late
antiquity*

Hector M. Patmore

How to cite:

Patmore, Hector M. (2008) Adam, Satan, and the King of Tyre: The reception of Ezekiel 28:11-19 in Judaism and Christianity in late antiquity. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/2381/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Adam, Satan, and the King of Tyre:
The Reception of Ezekiel 28:11-19 in Judaism and
Christianity in Late Antiquity

Hector M Patmore

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author or the university to which it was submitted. No quotation from it, or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author or university, and any information derived from it should be acknowledged.



- 6 JUN 2008

Abstract

The lament over the King of Tyre in Ezekiel 28:11-19 has presented scholars with a great many difficulties. This thesis is a fresh attempt to make sense of this extremely complex text through a detailed reassessment of the text's early transmission history and by analysing its reception among Jewish and Christian communities in Late Antiquity, a topic which has not previously been examined in full.

The thesis re-examines the relationship between the Hebrew and Greek witnesses to Ezekiel in light of the manuscript data from Masada and Qumran. I conclude that the historical precedence of neither Hebrew nor Greek can be established and propose that two distinct recensions must have been in circulation concurrently. I then critically examine the Masoretic accentuation and vocalization of the Hebrew text as an interpretative layer and explore the possibilities for alternative meanings presented by a consonantal text. I then trace the evolution of the text in the Greek versions, asking how the Greek versions function as both translation and interpretation.

The thesis then examines more explicitly interpretative material, beginning with the Targum and moving into the classical rabbinic literature. The final chapter examines the contrasting interpretations of the early Church Fathers, particularly Origen and Jerome who interact polemically with Jewish traditions.

In these different sources the central figure of the lament is variously understood to be a 'god' (consonantal Hebrew), the Israelite High Priest (Greek versions), a political exemplar (Targum), a mythical cherub (pointed Masoretic Hebrew), Adam or Hiram (Rabbis), and Satan (Church Fathers).

Throughout I seek to ask not only *how* each community understood the text, but also *why* they understood it in that particular way. I seek to bring to light the methods of reading used, the results these produced, and the motivations underlying both of these.

I conclude by making some preliminary suggestions as to how the historical study of reception history might inform contemporary discussions of hermeneutics.

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
THE RECEPTION OF A PROBLEMATIC TEXT	
AIM & SCOPE	1
RECEPTION HISTORY	4
CONTEMPORARY CRITICAL RESPONSES	8
ESTABLISHING THE TEXT	9
WHO IS THIS FIGURE?	20
1. ESTABLISHING THE TEXT	31
THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT FINDS FROM MASADA AND QUMRAN	
INTRODUCTION	31
THE TEXTS OF EZEKIEL AT QUMRAN AND MASADA	32
THE HISTORICAL PRECEDENCE OF THE GREEK TEXT	39
QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE MASADA FINDS	42
CONCLUDING COMMENTS	44
2. 'YOU WERE אלהים'	46
THE MASORETTIC HEBREW TEXT	
INTRODUCTION	46
(28:12) אתה חותם תכנית מלא חכמה וכליל יפי	49
(28:13) בעדן גן אלהים היית	52
(28:13) כל אבן יקרה מסכתך ...	53
(28:13) וזהב מלאכת תפיך ונקביך בך ביום הבראך כוננו	56
(28:13-14) כוננו את כרוב ממשח הסוכך	62
(28:14) ממשח הסוכך	67
(28:16) אבדך כרוב הסכך	69
(28:14) ונתתך בהר קדש אלהים היית	70
DIVISION OF POINTED TEXT	74
PROPOSED DIVISIONS	76
CONCLUSIONS	78
3. THE FALL OF THE HIGH PRIEST	80
THE GREEK VERSIONS	
INTRODUCTION	80
ANALYSIS OF THE TEXT	84
CONCLUDING REMARKS	114

4. "PRIDE GOETH BEFORE DESTRUCTION" 119

THE TARGUM TO EZEKIEL

TARGUM IN THE CONTINUUM OF INTERPRETATION	119
THE NATURE OF TARGUM	120
DATE OF THE TARGUM TO EZEKIEL	122
SITZ IM LEBEN OF THE TARGUM TO EZEKIEL	125
ANALYSIS OF TARGUM TO EZEKIEL 28:12-19	126
CONCLUDING REMARKS	151

5. THE WISDOM OF ADAM AND THE ARROGANCE OF HIRAM 156

EZEKIEL 28 IN RABBINIC LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION	156
EZEKIEL 28 IN RABBINIC LITERATURE	168
HIRAM: DIVINE CLAIMS AND DESTRUCTION	169
ADAM	179
ADAM'S VICARIOUS PUNISHMENT	180
THE WISDOM AND SPLENDOR OF ADAM	182
CONCLUDING REMARKS	190

6. THE FALL OF SATAN AND OTHER DEMONS 193

EZEKIEL 28 IN THE CHURCH FATHERS

INTRODUCTION	193
EZEKIEL 28 IN THE CHURCH FATHERS	201
TERTULLIAN, CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, AND AUGUSTINE: THE FALL OF SATAN	202
HIPPOLYTUS: THE COMING ANTICHRIST	209
ORIGEN: HOSTILE POWERS	213
JEROME: ECLECTIC REFLECTIONS ON THE TEXT	219
ENGAGING RABBINIC TRADITIONS	224
CONCLUSION	228

CONCLUSION 232

RESULTS	232
IMPLICATIONS	236
BROADENING THE DISCUSSION	237

ABBREVIATIONS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

INTRODUCTION

The Reception of a Problematic Text

Aim & Scope

The aim of this thesis is to examine the transmission and subsequent reception in Judaism and Christianity, in Late Antiquity, of the lament against the king of Tyre found in Ezekiel 28:11-19.

I am interested in this particular text first and foremost because it appears, at first glance, to contain an alternative or parallel account to the narrative of Adam's punishment found in Genesis 2-3, a text that has come to assume a central role in the theologies of Jews and Christians alike. But I am also interested in this text because it is a problematic text: for the past two and half millennia Ezekiel 28:11-19 has been successfully confounding every attempt by its readers to pin its meaning down in anything approaching a final form. The text remains defiant, and the present thesis makes no pretence that it has finally conquered it.

Rather the present thesis hopes to bring a new clarity to the situation, not by producing a novel reading in an established mode, that is, a new explanation of the text to add to the already manifold understandings, but by examining the early transmission and reception of the text in the hope that this might help us to better understand the text itself, its interpretative potential, and the process by which we read and respond to it.

First and foremost my interest is a purely historical one: we are interested to know how early readers transmitted, read, and understood the text. This will be useful not only for understanding better what the text itself is trying to say (as will become apparent), but also for broadening our understanding of how

biblical texts were handled in Late Antiquity among certain communities of readers. At a secondary and more abstract level I want to use this study of the early reception of the text as an opportunity to reflect more broadly on the questions of hermeneutics. What can an historical study of the reception of a text contribute to a discussion of what might be a good way of reading texts today? This secondary interest sits very much in the background throughout, but I wish to draw attention to it at the outset because it has, to some extent, directed my choice of texts and priorities when examining them, and will provide a point for reflection in my Conclusion.

In exploring the early reception of this problematic text it quickly becomes apparent that a careful examination of the transmission of the text itself is also necessary. Of course, in a study of the history of interpretation of a text, one needs to know what form of the text was actually received, but in the case of Ezekiel 28:11-19 it is apparent that due weight needed to be given to the transmission of the text as both *containing* interpretation and being itself a *process* of interpretation. The dividing line between the text's transmission and its interpretation in the case of Ezekiel 28:11-19 is found to be so utterly blurred as to be largely indistinguishable. In other words there is no clear way of seeing where the 'text' ends and the 'interpretation' begins.

In approaching the transmission of the text as contiguous with its interpretation I hope to have separated a number of stands that have become otherwise conflated in more recent critical responses to the passage, and have sought to mark-out or redraw some boundaries previously obscured or in need of revision:

In Chapter 1 the relationship between the Hebrew and Greek witnesses to the text has been re-examined in light of the manuscript finds from the Judean Desert, with the conclusion that we are dealing with two recensions of the text rather than two impressions of a single text at two different stages in a

process of continuous evolution. From this I have demarcated what I believe we can (and cannot) hope to achieve as historians with these two versions of the text. The Hebrew and Greek versions, therefore, are considered separately and with particular attention to the 'story' that each version tells as they stand (Chapters 2 and 3 respectively).

In giving due weight to the interpretative nature of the transmission of the text, the Masoretic vocalization and accentuation also demanded attention. That the vocalization and accentuation is a later addition to the consonantal text is widely known, but rarely is its impact on the meaning of the text given due consideration. In any problematic text, where one inserts the punctuation and how one vocalises the words is liable to have an impact on the meaning of the passage as a whole. In Ezekiel 28:11-19 that impact has been enormous, something I explore in Chapter 2.

From an examination of the interpretative nature of those elements that might otherwise be relegated exclusively to the realm of text-criticism, we move to materials more traditionally found in a history of interpretation: Targum, the classical Rabbis, and finally the Church Fathers (Chapters 4, 5, and 6 respectively).

The Targum to Ezekiel plays a particularly important role in the present study. Of all the material covered the Targum is unique in its form: Targum carried the dual responsibilities of providing both translation and explanation, so that it is bound exegetically and structurally by the source text, yet is able to incorporate explanatory and interpretative material, the result being a continuous interpretative re-presentation of the text, which we will examine in Chapter 4.

The Rabbinic material (Chapter 5) and the Church Fathers (Chapter 6) use the text quite differently, employing smaller units of the text dislocated from their context. In contrast to the preceding material this provides a certain freedom

from the text and it is never quite apparent whether the text led to the conclusion, or *vice versa*. Nonetheless, the materials from the Rabbis and the Church Fathers represent the earliest *overt* interpretations of the text, and in this sense are worthy of our attention.

That our investigation is circumscribed chronologically by (roughly speaking) the closure of the Babylonian Talmud in Judaism and the immediately post-Nicean Fathers in Christianity is in part a practical decision – one has to draw a boundary somewhere. But first and foremost it reflects the significance of this period as formative for mainstream Judaism and Christianity. In this period traditions had yet to establish themselves as orthodoxy, there was much less consensus, fewer shared objectives, and fewer norms against which a proposition might be measured. All this allowed for a less constrained creativity in responding to the text, and this in turn makes the material especially useful for appreciating the interpretative potential of the text and for understanding how readers respond to the text.

The outcome of this period is a series of methods and readings distinct from each other and quite alien to our own modern sensibilities. By virtue of their being thoroughly alien to us the conceptual frameworks upon which they depend are thrust into sharper relief. This in turn brings our own operative conceptual framework into sharper relief too, drawing our background interest in hermeneutics more clearly into the foreground (an idea I reflect upon in the Conclusion).

Reception History

In choosing to explore the reception history of a text this thesis finds a place in a surprisingly recent, yet rapidly growing, field of interest within biblical studies. A number of high-profile projects – already published or currently in

preparation – focussing on how biblical texts have been received are worthy of note here in order to set the present work within the broader scholarly context.

Undoubtedly the volume that has exerted the most influence over the present author (and to which I owe a huge debt of gratitude) is the *Mikra* volume of the *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* series, edited by Martin Jan Mulder and originally published in 1988¹. The strength of this influence is perhaps best explained by the volume's subtitle, *Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, which indicates the comprehensive scope of the material covered, from the emergence of writing in Ancient Israel up until Rabbinic and Patristic exegesis. A similarly significant, though less detailed, contribution has been made more recently with the publication in 2003 of the first volume (*The Ancient Period*) of Erdmann's *A History of Biblical Interpretation*, edited by Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson².

Neither of these volumes are in themselves a study of the reception history of individual texts, but they are indispensable handbooks for anyone undertaking such a task, and reflect a need felt within the academy to bring together into a coherent and accessible whole the huge volume of disparate research on biblical interpretation in Late Antiquity, not only to provide a useful introduction to various sources, but also because the juxtaposition of approaches is felt to be informative too.

In the realm of the reception of individual texts or themes there have been two recent arrivals of significance: The first is the excellent series by Brill

¹ Since reissued: Martin Jan Mulder (ed.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 2004).

² Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson (eds.), *A History of Biblical Interpretation, Vol 1, The Ancient Period* (Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2003).

entitled *Themes in Biblical Narrative: Jewish and Christian Traditions*, under the editorial control of George H. van Kooten, Robert A. Kugler, and Loren T. Stuckenbruck³. The focus of the series has been on the reception of key biblical themes up until the modern day, although the emphasis has generally been weighted towards earlier periods. Among the volumes already realised are *The Creation of Heaven and Earth*, *The Creation of Man and Woman*, *Paradise Interpreted*, *The Fall of the Angels*, *Interpretations of the Flood*, *Sodom's Sin*, and *The Sacrifice of Isaac*.

Of equal significance has been the Blackwell Bible Commentary series under the editorship of John Sawyer, Christopher Rowland, Judith Kovacs, and David M. Gunn, the first volume of which appeared in 2003. Each volume deals with an individual biblical book 'through the centuries', although what material is covered in this broad remit is left by and large to the individual author's discretion, with the result that the series as a whole lacks consistency. We await Andrew Mein's volume, *Ezekiel Through the Centuries*, currently in preparation.

Anticipated as keenly is the new Bible project of the École Biblique of Jerusalem: *The Bible in its Traditions*. The motivation for this project is an attempt to reflect a "more realistic hermeneutic of the act of reading" by presenting "the most important readings of the text through history" alongside the biblical text itself, on the model of the Talmud or medieval commentaries on Aristotle or St. Thomas. Although the focus is inevitably skewed toward the Christian tradition, consideration of Jewish tradition is promised too.⁴

³ Brill, 'Themes in Biblical Narrative', www.brill.nl/brochures/ThemesinBiblicalNarrative.pdf (07 August 2007).

⁴ Jerome Murphy O'Connor, OP, 'The Bible in its Traditions: Excerpt NJ 2006 (English)' *Nouvelles de Jérusalem*, 82 (January 2007), http://ebaf.edu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=173&Itemid=52 (31 July 2007).

In Germany, Walter de Gruyter began work in 2006 on a massive multi-volume project, *The Encyclopaedia of the Bible and its Reception*, which they expect to complete between 2008 and 2017. The planned scope of the project is universal and exhaustive (and almost certainly over-ambitious), aiming to offer not only "a comprehensive and in-depth rendering of the current state of knowledge on the origins and development of the Bible" but at the same time documenting "the history of the Bible's reception in the Christian churches and the Jewish Diaspora; in literature, art, music, and film; in Islam, as well as in other religious traditions and current religious movements, Western and non-Western alike"⁵.

There are, of course, in addition a great many individual monographs on the history of biblical interpretation in individual communities, in particular traditions, or of particular texts. In gathering the results of these works together, these major projects indicate that a critical mass of interest has been reached within the field of the historical study of biblical interpretation, something that is indicated too by the growing number of undergraduate and taught postgraduate courses on the topic appearing on University syllabi within the UK.

The growing interest in reception history within biblical studies is concurrent with the emergence of reader-response criticism as a major force in literary theory, with the likes of Stanley Fish, Wolfgang Iser, and Hans-Robert Jauss, and in philosophical hermeneutics principally with Gadamer. Although this shift in the intellectual climate has doubtless had an effect on questions of biblical interpretation, it seems, to the present author at least, that the impact of the discoveries in the Judean desert in and around Qumran and Masada has been much more significant. These finds demanded such serious revision

⁵ Walter de Gruyter, 'The Encyclopaedia of the Bible and its Reception' http://www.degruyter.de/rs/5753_8634_DEU_h.htm (31 July 2007).

of so many facets of our discipline, and so dramatically undermined many of the presuppositions of classic text-critical approaches, that the location of authority within the text was destabilised and established reading strategies needed to be rethought. The radical reading strategies of the Qumran community also forced upon us a renewed consciousness of the determinative effect of the reader.

However, the growing interest in reception history as a historical discipline has yet to be matched, in the discipline of biblical studies at least, with prolonged theoretical consideration of how this might impact on our own reading strategies. I hope to make some modest suggestions in my Conclusion as to the direction in which such a discussion might proceed.

Contemporary Critical Responses

Before we begin on our journey through the text and its reception, however, it is sensible to outline first what has been said about our text in the academic world in recent years. This will serve not only to set the present work within the context of the wider scholarly conversation, but it will also help to make clear how and why the present author hopes to go beyond what has already been said.

A number of questions and concerns reappear consistently among commentators. The first, and undoubtedly the most important for the present study, is the question of text. As will become apparent in later chapters the text of Ezekiel 28:12-19 is extremely difficult. Indeed, it is not even simply a question of how the text might best be translated or understood, since there is no agreement about which text one ought to be translating in the first place. Does the Hebrew reflect a more 'original' version than the Greek or *vice versa*?

This question is no idle curiosity: how one answers it will shape how one responds to almost every other question put to the text.

At the heart of all biblical interpretation is the desire to understand what message a text is trying to convey. So once the question of text is settled the second question we find being asked is, Who is the figure under discussion and how does he relate to the historical king of Tyre? Finally, a prerequisite of answering that question has been, for many scholars, the question, Is there a background myth, and if there is, how much is background myth and how much is the product of the author's imagination?

Establishing the Text

It is generally understood that the book of Ezekiel shows evidence of three stages of development. First came the actual prophecies of the priest, Ezekiel; later these were developed in order that they might speak to the later concerns of the exiles; and finally, at a later stage, these prophecies were edited into a composite whole. The date of Ezekiel's prophetic ministry is by and large accepted to be – as the book of Ezekiel describes (1:2; 29:17) – the twenty-two years from the fifth year of Jehoiachin's exile (i.e. 593 – 571 BCE)⁶, with the oracles against Tyre in the main dated around the time of siege of Jerusalem (c.586 BCE)⁷. There has been some debate concerning the principal

⁶ E.g. Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, The Anchor Bible 22 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 12, 15; Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24*, Hermeneia, trans. Ronald E. Clements (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 11; Walther Eichrodt, *Ezekiel: a Commentary*, trans. Cosslett Quin (London: SCM, 1970), 1; John William Wevers, *Ezekiel*, New Century Bible Commentary (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1969), 23

⁷ E.g. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, 8; Eichrodt, *Ezekiel: a Commentary*, 18; George Albert Cooke, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936), Intro. xviii, xxxvii

locale of the prophet's ministry, whether exercised entirely in Babylon⁸, as most now accept to be the case, or partly (or even exclusively⁹) in Palestine¹⁰, but this debate is of little relevance to our discussion.

Scholars do differ significantly as to the extent and importance of the editorial process. Allen might be the most conservative in his estimate of the date of the process, placing a single generation between the last of Ezekiel's prophecies proper and the adaptations that appear in the book, with the imminent return from exile stimulating the final redactional stage (during 550's), but the vast majority of scholars have accepted the conclusion that the whole process spanned a relatively short period of time and in all likelihood involved the input of Ezekiel himself.¹¹

Arriving at the final redacted form of the text of Ezekiel has, however, not been that simple. Critical response to the text of Ezekiel over the past century has been characterised by the view that there has been extensive reshaping of the text, based on the opinion that the 'Septuagint' represents a 'more original' version. The lineage of this approach among modern scholars can be traced back to Cooke in his *International Critical Commentary on Ezekiel* of

⁸ E.g. Cooke, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*, Intro xxiii-xxiv; Georg Fohrer, *Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 72 (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1952), 8-26, 240f; Leslie C. Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, Word Biblical Commentary 29 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1990), Intro. xx; Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, 15; Eichrodt, *Ezekiel: a Commentary*, 7-9; Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 24-25;

⁹ E.g. Volkmar Hertrich, *Ezechielp Probleme*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 61 (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1933); William H. Brownlee, *Ezekiel 1-19*, Word Biblical Commentary 28 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1986), Intro. xxiii-xxv.

¹⁰ E.g. Alfred Bertholet, *Hesekiel*, Handbuch zum Alten Testament 13 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1936), 12-17; P. Auvray, 'Le Problème Historique du Livre d'Ézéchiel', *Revue Biblique* 55 (1948), 519; Henry Wheeler Robinson, *Two Hebrew Prophets: Studies in Hosea and Ezekiel* (London: Lutterworth, 1948), 75-79; Herbert G. May, 'The Book of Ezekiel' in G.A. Buttrick, *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York, NY: Abingdon, 1956), 57-58; Peter R. Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration* (London: Xpress Reprints, 1994 [1968]), 106 n.20.

¹¹ Leslie C. Allen, *Ezekiel 1-19*, Word Biblical Commentary 28 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1994), Intro xxiv-xxxvi. Cf. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel: a Commentary*, 13.

1936¹², who built on the work of Cornill (1886) and made palatable the absolute commitment to the Greek of Jahn (1905)¹³.

Cooke accepted the view that the Versions – of which the Septuagint stands first in importance – “were translated from an earlier form of the Hebrew text”, and on this basis took as his object the recovery of “a text which shall be free from alterations and corruptions, and so far nearer to the original”. His view of the Masoretic version of the text was as a result rather dismal: “In the Hebrew Bible perhaps no book, except 1 and 2 Samuel, has suffered more injury to its text than Ezekiel”¹⁴

Most influential among more recent scholars is without doubt Walther Zimmerli, whose massive commentary on Ezekiel first appeared in German in two volumes, the first in 1955, the second in 1969 (translated in English in 1979 and 1983 respectively). Zimmerli’s view of the relationship between the Hebrew and the Versions is almost identical in every respect to Cooke’s. Like Cooke, Zimmerli took the view that “corruptions” had entered the text later on and that the Versions – with the Septuagint taking primacy – could be used to identify these corruptions, enabling the “recovery of a *better text*”¹⁵ (my italics).

But Zimmerli goes beyond Cooke in his “recovery” of the more original version. While Cooke aimed to achieve a more original *text*, Zimmerli believed he could go beyond the text and recover the “the oral, spoken word of the prophet”, those fixed units “first minted in oral delivery”¹⁶, which he believed could be separated from the editorial layers formed by Ezekiel

¹² Cooke, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*.

¹³ Carl Heinrich Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (Leipzig: Hinrich, 1886); Gustav Jahn, *Das Buch Ezechiel auf Grund der Septuaginta hergestellt* (Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1905).

¹⁴ Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, Intro. xl.

¹⁵ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 1, 75.

¹⁶ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 1, 68.

himself and his “school” in a process of “updating of tradition”¹⁷. He achieved this by taking the view that where “metrical speech” or “rhythmic sections” were present this could be reckoned the “unaltered deposit of spoken address” on the principle that “rhythm is for the ear, and not for the eye”¹⁸.

Despite the impression given in his introductory comments, Zimmerli did not limit himself in his quest to recover the “direct deposit of oral delivery” to those parts where rhythmic sections were already present in the text. On the contrary he made drastic revisions to the text (including to Ezekiel 28:11-19, which he considered “badly disturbed”) in order to restore the putative metre where it was lacking¹⁹.

While this novel contribution of Zimmerli is little more than pure speculation that can be rightly dismissed as “thoroughly unconvincing”²⁰, his basic predilection for the Versions – principally the Septuagint – is shared by Wevers (1969)²¹, Eichrodt (1970)²², Pohlmann (1996 / 2001)²³, and others²⁴.

¹⁷ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 1, 71.

¹⁸ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 1, 68.

¹⁹ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 1, 68; a comparable – and equally questionable – approach is taken by Fohrer. Fohrer believed the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint to stand nearer to the original text than MT, but considered that it also contained later changes and editions that needed to be expunged in order to get back to the “the original text of the prophetic word” // “dem ursprünglichen Text des prophetischen Wortes”; the result being a text of MT heavily revised on the basis of LXX, which was itself significantly revised by Fohrer wherever he detected later intrusions. Georg Fohrer, with a contribution from Kurt Galling, *Ezekiel*, Handbuch zum Alten Testament 13 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955), Einleitung VII.

²⁰ Ronald M. Hals, *Ezekiel*, The Forms of Old Testament Literature 19 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989), 199. Brownlee has observed – rightly so in my view – that the itinerant nature of the prophet’s ministry makes it probable that individual oracles were repeated on many occasions, and were therefore continually reshaped and adapted to the situation and audience at hand, and so not easily recovered. William H. Brownlee, *Ezekiel 1-19*, Word Biblical Commentary 28 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1986), Intro xxxv; Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, 92.

²¹ “[T]he Hebrew textual growth continued after G. [i.e. Septuagint] to result in MT” so Septuagint “often attests an earlier stage in the history of tradition”, Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 30.

²² Who accepts the emendations proposed by Kittel in his *Biblical Hebraica*, 3rd edition, Eichrodt, *Ezekiel: a Commentary*, 11-12; 389-90.

²³ Karl-Friedrich Pohlman, *Das Buch des Propheten Hesekiel (Ezechiel) Kapitel 1-19*, Das Alte Testament Deutsch 22/1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 41; Karl-Friedrich Pohlman, with a contribution from Thilo Alexander Rudnig, *Das Buch des Propheten Hesekiel*

Allen (1994) is more circumspect in his rejection of the MT, demanding that the text-critic provide an explanation for how an error, expansion, or redactional gloss may have appeared in the text, before it can rightly be considered an error, expansion, or redactional gloss, and the text emended on that basis²⁵. Nevertheless his basic stance remains "that one should press rigorously back to the earliest possible form of the text"²⁶, although it is unclear exactly where he places the Versions chronologically.

Cooke's basic reconstructive approach remains, then, the dominant *modus operandi* in approaching the text of Ezekiel. But despite its evident longevity, this reconstructive approach to the text is not immune from serious questions concerning the validity of its methodology (and consequently its conclusions).

The most obvious question raised by this reconstructive approach is how one establishes the accuracy (or otherwise) of one's conclusions, since there is no extant material against which the reconstructed text can be compared (reconstruction would not be necessary if there were!). The necessary corollary of this is that the text-critics have no firm basis upon which to judge whether the criteria they have employed for discerning the 'more original' form are good or bad. That there is no way of judging how good or bad one's criteria are, means that establishing methodologically sound criteria in the first place is an impossibility. So the process of reconstruction becomes an essentially arbitrary enterprise, in which the text-critic picks and chooses between the Hebrew and Greek (and occasionally the other Versions). It is the suspicion of the present author that the outcome of this reconstructive

(*Ezechiel*) Kapitel 20-48, Das Alte Testament Deutsch 22/2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001).

²⁴ E.g. Keith W. Carley, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, The Cambridge Bible Commentary on the New English Bible (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 9; D.M.G. Stalker, *Ezekiel*, Torch Bible Commentaries (London: SCM, 1968), 24-25.

²⁵ Allen, *Ezekiel 1-19*, Intro. xxiii; Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, Intro. xxviii.

²⁶ Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, Intro. xxvii.

approach is not an 'earlier' or 'more original' text, but rather a text that is both eclectic and ahistorical.

This criticism is borne out in the works of those who employ such methodology. Cooke, for example, in cases where the Septuagint and MT differ, says only this: "'to find out which offers the better reading... let the evidence of G [i.e. Septuagint] and M [i.e. MT] be weighed in each case and considered *on its merits*, without a bias in favour of one side or the other'"²⁷ (my italics). And things are no better in more recent scholars: Block (1997), for example, based his commentary on MT but used the Versions when he found the text to be "ungrammatical, incomprehensible, or stylistically problematic"²⁸; while Taylor (1969) adopted the policy of emendation on the basis of the LXX "only where the Hebrew has seemed to be either unintelligible or obviously corrupt". Rarely do such scholars explain how they make such judgments²⁹.

What this highlights is a fundamental weakness in the concept of textual reconstruction. How can emending a later text on the basis of an (supposedly) earlier text result in uncovering a text that is even earlier still? Of course, where the Septuagint and Hebrew versions are obviously dependent on essentially the same *Vorlage* the Septuagint may suggest a better reading than

²⁷ Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, Intro. xli. An fine exemplar of quite how arbitrary Cooke's assessment of "merits" was, can be found in his conjecture that the list of twelve precious stones found in the Septuagint was subsequently rearranged in the MT to avoid a "clash of colours" (317).

²⁸ Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1-24*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 1997), 42.

²⁹ See John Bernard Taylor, *Ezekiel*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (London: The Tyndale Press, 1969), 48. Cf. the omission of the list of precious stones by Wevers and Eichrodt based on the unsubstantiated speculation that it is a later insertion (Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 157; Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 389 n. k). Wilson makes the valid point that, "unless one wishes to believe that the editors were totally unconcerned about the overall meaning of the text, one must assume that they intended their work to clarify or modify the text in a comprehensive way": Robert R. Wilson, "The Death of the King of Tyre: The Editorial History of Ezekiel 28" in John H. Marks and Robert M. Good (eds.), *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope* (Guilford, CT: Four Quarters, 1987), 212.

the Hebrew in points of detail. But in the case of Ezekiel, the generally accepted view is that the form of the Hebrew text evolved over a long period of time until it reached the form we now find in MT. The Septuagint, it is argued, represented a snapshot of the Hebrew text at an earlier stage of its formation³⁰. If this view is accepted then surely the only correct response would be to adhere to the Septuagint text as closely as possible – as Jahn had done in 1905 and Pohlmann, Eichrodt, and Wevers, come closest to doing more recently³¹ – and attempt to recover its *Vorlage*? Making revision to the text of MT on the basis of Septuagint is unlikely to result in an ‘earlier’ or ‘more original’ text, and more likely to result in a hodgepodge text that never actually existed in history.

Allen’s reconstructed text is perhaps the most questionable. He attempts to retain as much of the MT as possible, yet makes emendations mostly on the basis of the Septuagint. Allen appears to argue that while some differences between Hebrew and Greek might be explained by Tov’s view that MT and LXX represent two redactional stages (he does not mention Lust in this regard), very many of the differences, he concludes, represent “the perpetuation of blunders (in both MT and LXX), both by way of the normal errors of confusion of consonants, metathesis and so on, and of the

³⁰ See Emanuel Tov, ‘Recensional Differences between the MT and LXX of Ezekiel’ *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 62 (No. 1 Ap. 1986), 89-101; Johan Lust, ‘Major Divergences between LXX and MT in Ezekiel’ in Adrian Schenker (ed.), *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: the Relationship between the Masoretic text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered*, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 52 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003); Johan Lust, ‘Textual Criticism of the Old Testament and of the New Testament: Stepbrothers?’ in A. Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Criticism and Exegesis. Major Omissions in P967 Ezekiel*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 161 (Leuven, University Press & Peeters, 2002), 15-31, especially pages 20-31; Johan Lust, ‘The use of textual witnesses for the establishment of the text: the shorter and longer texts of Ezekiel’ in his *Ezekiel and his Book*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 74 (Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 7-20; Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 30.

³¹ Jahn, *Das Buch Ezechiel*, Vortwort III–VI; Pohlman, *Hesekiel (Ezechiel) Kapitel 20-48*, 389-90; Eichrodt, *Ezekiel* 389-90; Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 156f.

incorporation of random marginal comments into the text"³². To account for the differences between MT and LXX in terms of scribal errors is to assume a quite exceptional level of incompetence on the part of editors and copyists. MT and LXX differ too much from one another for such a view to hold water. But by essentially declaring both versions of the text to be defective Allen frees himself to adopt an approach akin to Cooke's, whereby each case is weighed *on its merits* "without a bias in favour of one side or the other"³³ in order to restore "as pristine a form of the text as may be achieved" (by which he means "the earliest possible form of the text")³⁴. Again, the present author suspects that only an eclectic text has been achieved.

To employ the Septuagint atomistically in revising the MT in an effort to recover an 'earlier' form of the text of Ezekiel is, quite simply, historically nonsensical. It is to ignore the questions of *Vorlagen*, and it is to ignore the fact that the text of the Greek version has itself not been finally established. I have talked of the 'Septuagint' for convenience's sake only. In reality we have only a number of different Greek versions from among which Ziegler was obliged to choose a base-text in order to produce his 1977 Göttingen volume of the Septuagint.

At the other end of the spectrum from Zimmerli, Wevers, and Eichrodt, stands Moshe Greenberg's commentary on Ezekiel, the first volume of which (*Ezekiel 1-20*) appeared in 1983, the second (*Ezekiel 21-37*) in 1997. Greenberg makes a case for a commitment to the traditional text (i.e. the MT) and produces his commentary on this basis.

First and foremost, Greenberg objects to "the amount of rewriting, reshaping, and reordering of text that every commentator feels is necessary for bringing

³² Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, Intro:xxviii.

³³ Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, Intro. xli.

³⁴ Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, Intro. xxviii & xxvii.

the biblical writing up to his standards”³⁵. His objection is based on an assessment of the Versions as dismal as Cooke’s assessment of the MT. The Versions, he suggests, “serve as the poor man’s equivalent of divergent Hebrew mss” on the grounds that divergences from MT may be the result of a different *Vorlage*, that the texts of the Versions are not finally established, and that retroverting a translation to its *Vorlage* is full of pitfalls, all of which are legitimate concerns³⁶.

But at the other extreme Greenberg’s claims for the MT are overconfident:

“[W]e have no record of Ezekiel’s oracles in Hebrew - the language in which they were certainly delivered - nearer than eight centuries removed from the time when the prophet lived. There is the highest probability that during these centuries changes, inadvertent and deliberate, occurred in the transmission of these oracles by the prophet and by transcribers and copyists; we thus can hardly suppose that the standard text represents a verbatim record of what Ezekiel published to his audience of exiles. But the received Hebrew is the only Hebrew version of his words extant; it must ultimately go back to him [Ezekiel] and therefore must serve as the main - often the sole - primary source for the study of his message - until proved unreliable by anachronism (linguistic, historical, or ideational),

³⁵ Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, 18. Cf. Fisch, *Ezekiel: Hebrew Text & English Translation* (London: Soncino, 1950), Intro xvi, who describes “critical interpretations or emendations of the text” as “far-fetched”, although his commentary is aimed at the ordinary reader rather than the student, and so based on the received text.

³⁶ Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, 19.

or indubitable corruption, or intolerable variations in style or texture”³⁷.

Aside from the obvious retort that “indubitable corruption” is exactly what Cooke, Zimmerli, and others, saw when they read the text, Greenberg is clearly guilty of playing down the significant diversity among the Versions and the massive complexity of the text’s transmission history, to which the Greek versions (above all else) so clearly bear witness.

It is also worth note that Greenberg makes no mention of the vowel pointing, which he follows in his commentary despite his acknowledgement elsewhere that the consonants and vowel pointing are “historically distinct elements”³⁸.

Greenberg is essentially caught in the same historical dilemma as those scholars at Zimmerli’s end of the spectrum. All we have are the texts themselves as they stand, and only conjecture can take us back beyond these texts. My own examination of the Greek versions and what remains of Ezekiel from Qumran and Masada have convinced me that the differences between Hebrew and Greek versions are primarily recensional differences, in other the

³⁷ Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, 19. Cf. Van Dijk, who claims to use “material of both lexical and syntactical nature uncovered by comparative Canaanite and Semitic studies” to overcome “ manifold obscurities and problems” in the text so as to “prove the soundness of the standard Hebrew text”, H.J. van Dijk, *Ezekiel’s Prophecy on Tyre (Ez. 26,1 – 28,19): A New Approach*, *Biblica et Orientalia* 20 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968), Preface. However, his analysis of the text does not bear out this claim and has not been generally accepted as credible. His analysis is methodologically inconsistent: he accepts or rejects the Masoretic pointing as required to support his argument (cf. 114 with 116); he postulates speculative emendations of the text to match his comparative linguistics parallels, which otherwise do not match the text as it stands (e.g. 115); he makes ahistorical use of sources (e.g. 116); and shows little discernment or consistency in his use of comparative linguistic sources. However, van Dijk does provide some useful insights, largely because of his commitment to the Hebrew text as it stands. For further critique, particularly regarding the overall consistency of his approach, see Martin Kessler, review of *Ezekiel’s Prophecy on Tyre (Ez. 26, 1-28, 19): A New Approach*, *Biblica et Orientalia* 20 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968), by H. J. van Dijk, in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 29 (No. 3, Jul. 1970), 213-16.

³⁸ Moshe Greenberg, *Studies in the Bible and Jewish Thought*, Jewish Publication Society Scholars of Distinction Series (Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1995), 191.

Greek is dependent on *Vorlage* distinct from text reflected in the Hebrew³⁹. Consequently, I have not approached either text with the view of knowing what the 'original' text might have looked like. Rather I have taken the view that each version provides us with an insight into how Ezekiel 28:12-19 would have been heard in certain periods and among certain communities.

The two principal versions (Hebrew and Greek) provide us with a snapshot of how the story of Ezekiel 28:11-19 was told in Greek speaking communities in the 2nd Century BCE, and Hebrew speaking communities at around the same time (and possibly earlier). Of course it is not necessary to reject the quest for a reconstructed text in order to value the Hebrew and Greek versions in their own right. But in rejecting the quest for a reconstructed text I am not only demanding that the texts be dealt with *as they are* rather than as we would wish them to be, but I am also suggesting that dealing with the texts as they stand is as far back as we are *able* to go as historians.

In my analysis of the Hebrew text I have also given attention to the consonantal form of the text in its own right (i.e. without the vocalization and accentuation). I explain my reasons for doing this below on page 46, however in summary, this seemed necessary because the vocalization and accentuation are a later addition to the consonantal form of the text (although how much later is debatable). They represent *one possible* reading of the text, but do not necessarily indicate the best or only possible way. As such it seemed important to consider the consonantal text in isolation, and explore possible alternative ways in which the vocalization and accentuation might have been applied.

The corollary of this is that the vocalization and accentuation show us how a later generation thought the consonantal text was best understood. In this

³⁹ See my article 'The shorter and longer texts of Ezekiel', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 32 (No. 2, Dec. 2007).

sense the vocalization and accentuation themselves ought to be properly considered a later layer of interpretation, and so they have not been ignored. Rather they have been given careful consideration in their own right too, not least because they have such a determinative impact on so much that follows. As will become apparent, whether the text of Ezekiel 28:11-19 is read with the vocalization and accentuation or without it has a monumental effect on how the lament is understood.

Who is this figure?

In the lament of Ezekiel 28:11-19 we are presented not with a single figure but with two. There is the figure to whom the lament is primarily addressed, that is the real referent, the "king of Tyre" (subject); and then there is the figure that "king of Tyre" is said to be in the body of the lament (predicate). It is a simple case of conceptual metaphor, in which the first subject is said to be the second subject (e.g. *all the world's a stage, love is blind, laughter is the best medicine, time is money, he is a loose cannon*, and so on).

There is little debate among commentators surrounding the identity of the first subject, the King of Tyre, while explanations of the identity of the second subject (the predicate) are many and varied.

So who is the primary addressee? Most accept that the king of Tyre addressed is an actual historical figure. Most identify the individual as Itobaal (or Ethbaal) II, although a number of scholars reflect Eichrodt's view that "the reproach addressed to him [Itobaal II] does not reveal any personal details about his character or his political policy, but is couched in terms so general

that *any Tyrian king might have served as its target*"⁴⁰ (my italics). As Blenkinsopp (1990) puts it: "the allusions are typical rather than realistic"⁴¹. Allen (1990) has taken this position further suggesting that the particular historical king, Ethbaal II, "functions also as a symbolic figure for the city-state of Tyre"⁴². Others share the view that the primary addressee was simply "a typical figure which represents Tyre", that is to say the people of Tyre as a whole embodied in the person of its king, whilst concluding that no particular monarch was in mind⁴³.

To most commentators, however, the primary addressee is of little interest.

The really interesting question is, Who is the figure of the predicate?

Explanations here are diverse and are intricately bound up with the question of background myth.

Undoubtedly the reason why Ezekiel 28:11-19 has inspired so much interest is its apparent similarities to the account of Adam in Eden from Genesis 2-3.

Critics have recognized these similarities both in the general shape of both texts (e.g. perfection prior to punishment) and in certain common features (e.g. Eden/Garden of God, presence of the cherub – and more tenuously the figure's wisdom⁴⁴ and royalty⁴⁵, and the precious stones⁴⁶). On this basis many

⁴⁰ Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 390; H. L. Ellison, *Ezekiel: The Man and His Message* (London: Paternoster, 1959), 110; Anthony J. Williams, 'The Mythological Background of Ezekiel 28:12-19?', *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 6 (1976), 60-61.

⁴¹ Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, Interpretation (Louisville, KY: John Knox, 1990), 121.

⁴² Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, 93. Cf. Yaron, who argues that at times the king seems to represent an individual, while at other times he is a symbol for the people of Tyre, e.g. vss 16, 18a, 19, Kalman Yaron, 'The Dirge over the King of Tyre', *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* (1964), 45-49; Fisch, *Ezekiel: Hebrew Text & English Translation*, 192, "the prince is identified here [v.16] with the city of Tyre for whose conduct of affairs he is held responsible".

⁴³ Norman C. Habel, 'Ezekiel 28 and the Fall of the First Man', *Concordia Theological Monthly* 38 (1967), 516. Cf. Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 313; Carley, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, 191; Taylor, *Ezekiel*, 197; contra Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 216, "this poem [vss.11-19] probably deals with the person of the king rather than as personification of the city".

⁴⁴ Identified in Adam's naming of the animals by Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 123.

⁴⁵ Dexter E. Callendar Jr, 'The Primal Human in Ezekiel and the Image of God', in M. Odell and J. Strong (eds.), *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*, Society of

scholars have accepted the view that our lament is a “variant of the Eden story known so well from Genesis 2-3”⁴⁷, although, only a tiny handful have concluded that Ezekiel was directly dependent on the account of Genesis 2-3⁴⁸.

The significant differences in points of details between the lament of Ezekiel and the Genesis narrative (e.g. location on the holy mountain; absence of a woman and a serpent; extinction of figure rather than banishment, etc.), required, in the minds of many scholars, a more convincing explanation than that the imagination of the Prophet was to blame⁴⁹. This approach proposed

Biblical Literature Symposium Series 9 (Atlanta GA: SBL, 2000), 184, argued that “seal” (סֹהַר, Ezek.28:12) indicated royalty on the basis of Jer.22:24 and Hag.2:23 (pp.180-86), and that Adam reflects this royal status because he was given dominion over the animals.

⁴⁶ Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 123.

⁴⁷ Carley, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, 191; Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 123, calls it a “parallel version of the myth of the First Man in Genesis 2-3”; John L. McKenzie, ‘Mythological Allusions in Ezek 28 12-18’ *Journal of Biblical Literature* 75 (1956), 322, calls it “a variant form of the tradition which appears in Gen 2-3”; Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 25-48*, Hermeneia, trans. James D. Martin (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 90; Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 156; Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 313; Callender, *Adam in Myth and History*, 14-15, 89; Habel, ‘Ezekiel 28 and the Fall of the First Man’, 522, admits both possibilities but is non-committal as to which he finds more historically plausible, “Either Ezekiel was led to apply the Fall tradition of Gen.2 quite freely to the rise and downfall of the king of Tyre, or Ezek.28 and Gen.2-3 are dependent upon different Fall traditions current in ancient Israel, or both Ezekiel and the writer of Genesis drew upon a common Fall tradition and both applied it to a specific situation of their contemporary audiences”.

⁴⁸ e.g. Taylor, *Ezekiel*, 197; Charles R. Biggs, *The Book of Ezekiel*, Epworth Commentaries (London: Epworth, 1996), 87; Bernard Frank Batto, *Slaying the Dragon: Mythmaking in the Biblical Tradition* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992), 96; apparently also Pohlmann, *Hesekiel (Ezechiel) Kapitel 20-48*, 392. Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, 94, is unclear and consequently difficult to place, but does appear closest to this position. He states that the passage “makes use of a version of the garden of Eden story that appears in Gen 2-3”. All that he adds to this is that we cannot know the “extent Ezekiel is retelling an oral tradition known to him” nor whether “he created other elements that do not belong to the Adam and Eve story in Genesis and/or whether he is fusing different creation myths known to him”. Both these comments seem to imply that he considers Ezekiel to have received the Eden story in a form by and large as it is now found in Genesis 2-3. Cf. Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 124, who is non-committal: “It would be natural to assume that this lament draws on the familiar story of the Garden of Eden in Genesis, but it is equally possible to read both as distinct but related forms of an ancient mythic narrative well known in the ancient Near East”.

⁴⁹ As suggested by Batto, *Slaying the Dragon*, 96; perhaps also Biggs, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 87-88, although he is unclear.

that remnants of an earlier non-Israelite (or pre-Israelite) myth, which told the tale of the Primal Man, had been preserved not only in Ezekiel but also in Genesis 2-3 (and perhaps elsewhere too, e.g. Isa 14:12-20; Ps.82)⁵⁰.

Cooke argued that Ezekiel and Genesis draw on a common myth that originated in Babylonia, which told of a glorious being (who was the first man) gifted with "tokens of favour", who is expelled from his glorious setting in paradise because "he grasped profanely at yet higher honours"⁵¹. The two accounts differed because Genesis had undergone a "purifying process" that had not gone so far in Ezekiel, so Ezekiel could be thought to contain a "larger and cruder element of mythology"⁵².

Zimmerli differed from Cooke in concluding that the pre-Israelite myth concerned the expulsion of primeval man from "a magnificent place on the mountain of the gods", and suggested that the non-Israelite colouring was deliberately retained in Ezekiel because it was addressed to a heathen ruler⁵³.

While Eichrodt accepted the view that a tradition of heathen origin concerning the "beginnings of the human race" was the basis of the Ezekiel and Genesis episodes, he proposed a looser model to account for the differences between the two, concluding that Ezekiel did not feel compelled

⁵⁰ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 2, 90-91; Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 156; Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 392; Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 313-15; Fohrer, *Ezekiel*, 162. Cf. Ellison, *Ezekiel: The Man and His Message*, 110, who suggests the passage in Ezekiel reflects a Canaanite "corruption" of the Eden myth (but who has borrowed from whom?).

⁵¹ Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 315.

⁵² Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 315 & 313 (respectively). See here Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis*, trans. Mark E. Biddle (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997 [1901]), 35, who argued that the account of Ezekiel 28 was older than the Genesis 2-3 account, which represented a somewhat 'demythologized' version of the other.

⁵³ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 2, 90-91. Cf. Ellison, *Ezekiel: The Man and His Message*, 110, who suggests that the king considered himself as the re-embodiment of the first man, "the perfect representative and vice-regent of the gods", claiming that Ezekiel threw the image back at the king as a "mocking use of the king's own beliefs".

to “follow slavishly” the story, which “was told in all sorts of variations conforming some strictly, some more loosely, to Israelite thought”⁵⁴.

McKenzie (1956) objected to the postulation of a foreign myth on the grounds that scholars were unable to cite the myth upon which their claim was based. McKenzie did support the conclusion that a common myth lay behind Ezekiel’s lament and Genesis 2-3, but argued that this earlier myth is a “native Hebrew tradition, not derived from Mesopotamian or Canaanite sources”⁵⁵. But given that he is unable to cite this ‘native Hebrew’ myth other than by reconstructing it from the texts in which it is apparently evidenced, it is difficult to see how his position is any more sustainable than that of Zimmerli, Cooke, *et al.* A similar position was adopted by May (1962), who argued that this myth concerned a “royal First Man, an “Adam” who was king”, and could be reconstructed from numerous biblical passages (e.g. Gen. 1:26-28; Ps. 8; 2:7; 110:3, etc)⁵⁶.

A variation on the common myth notion is presented by John van Seters (1989), who proposed that an explanation could be found in specific Babylonian myth, based on a Neo-Babylonian mythical text in the tradition of Atrahasis. This text presents two quite distinctive conceptions of creation, “that of the creation of mankind to do the hard labor of the gods, and that of the creation of the king who rules the common people in splendor as a superior being and agent of the gods”⁵⁷. Ezekiel has used the latter, he argues, in the lament of 28:11-19, adding to it – as his “own invention” – the notion of

⁵⁴ Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 394, 392. Cf. Gunkel, *Genesis*, 35-40, who argued that the two were expressions of extra-Israelite origin composed of “common material of the entire cultural realm”, i.e. as opposed to a specific individual myth.

⁵⁵ McKenzie, ‘Mythological Allusions in Ezek 28 12-18’, 322 cf. 327.

⁵⁶ Herbert G. May, ‘The King in the Garden of Eden: A Study of Ezekiel 28:12-19’, in B.W.Anderson & W.Harrelson (eds.) *Israel’s Prophetic Heritage* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1962), 169. Cf. Callendar ‘The Primal Human in Ezekiel and the Image of God’.

⁵⁷ John van Seters, ‘The Creation of Man and the Creation of the King’, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 101 (1989), 338.

the king's fall from favour and the setting in and expulsion from paradise⁵⁸. The similarities with Genesis 2-3 are accounted for with the suggestion that the Yahwist combined the two Babylonian motifs whilst making explicit use of Ezekiel⁵⁹.

Others rejected the commonality between Ezekiel 28:11-19 and Genesis 2-3, and postulated as an alternative other non-Israelite myths that provide the background for Ezekiel's lament. Perhaps the most substantiated of these was the suggestion of Pope (1955) that the deposition of the head of the Ugaritic pantheon, El, by the storm god, Baal, was the story at the root of both oracles in Ezekiel 28 (i.e. vss. 1-10 and 11-19), a view supported by Yaron (1964)⁶⁰. Less substantiated arguments had been made by earlier scholars who tried to connect the old myth explicitly with Tyre by suggesting that the Tyrian god Melqart lies behind the biblical text⁶¹, and more recently by Gaster (1969) who implausibly advocated the Prometheus myth as the background⁶². Widengren (1958) demonstrates the dangers of taking this comparative approach too far by creating a syncretistic myth (which conveniently explains every last detail

⁵⁸ van Seters, 'The Creation of Man and The Creation of the King', 340.

⁵⁹ van Seters, 'The Creation of Man and The Creation of the King', 341.

⁶⁰ Marvin H. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955), esp. 82-105; for a neat summary of Pope's argument see Wilson, 'The Death of the King of Tyre', 213-4; Yaron, 'The Dirge over the King of Tyre', in which he argues the Ezekiel used the El myth (as described by Pope) but incorporated elements of Gen. 2-3. Cf. Richard J. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 4 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972), 172.

⁶¹ A. A. Bevan, 'The King of Tyre in Ezekiel XXVIII', *Journal of Theological Studies* 4 (1903), 500-505; Cameron Mackay, 'The King of Tyre', *Church Quarterly Review* 117 (1933-34), 239-58; Jan Dus, 'Melek Sor - Melqart? (zur Interpretation von Ez 28,11-19)', *Archiv Orientalní* 26 (1958), 179-85; cf. Roland de Vaux, 'The Prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel' in his *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971), 242-51; Julian Morgenstern, 'The King-God among the Western Semites and the Meaning of Epiphanes', *Vetus Testamentum* 10 (1960), 152-55.

⁶² Theodor Herzl Gaster, *Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament* (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1969), 622-23.

of Ezekiel) by cherry-picking features from Israelite, Mesopotamian, Canaanite, Phoenician, and Ugaritic myths⁶³.

Against the notions that the passage concerns the First Man (in one form or another), the creation of a king, or the fall of a God, are a number of scholars who identify the figure as the Cherub of verse 14, and derive from this a notion of an 'angelic' fall. James Barr (1992) took this stance on the basis of the traditional reading of the MT (at v 14) as "you are the cherub". He argued in support of this reading that the Masoretes would not have adopted the obscure form of the 2nd person masculine pronoun (אַתָּה) unless a pre-existent phonic tradition had prompted them to do so (he observes that Targum and Jerome support the reading too). This leads Barr to the conclusion that "the story does not so much parallel Adam's disobedience, but the 'angelic' fall, of 'Lucifer, son of the morning' in Isa. 14.12, who is 'fallen from heaven' "⁶⁴.

These diverse positions, which share the view that a self-contained background myth provides the structure for the lament, have been rejected by some scholars who have instead reversed the model, arguing that the political message – the castigation of Tyre for pride induced by delusions of

⁶³ Geo Widengren, 'Early Hebrew Myths and Their Interpretation' in S. H. Hooke (ed.), *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), 165-170; Geo Widengren, *Sakrales Königtum im Alten Testament und im Judentum* (Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1955), 26-33.

⁶⁴ James Barr, 'Thou Art the Cherub: Ezekiel 28.14 and the Post-Ezekiel Understanding of Genesis 2-3' in E. Ulrich, et al (eds.), *Priests, Prophets and Scribes* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), 220. James E. Miller, 'The Maelæk of Tyre (Ezekiel 28,11-19)', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 105 (1993), e.g. 497-501, shares Barr's conclusion that the passage is not about a primal man, but about the fall of a heavenly cherub e.g. Satan / Lucifer (although apparently arrived at independently, as Barr is not cited). He extended the argument to incorporate the reading of the LXX. In MT the figure is said to be the cherub, whereas in LXX he is said to be with the cherub. Miller argues that *cherubim* always come in pairs so the individual most likely to be with a cherub is, in fact, another cherub, therefore the figure is a cherub. Cf. Clements, *Ezekiel*, 128-29, who considers the lament an adaptation of a far older myth that told the story that "on the heavenly mountain abode of the gods, one of the lesser deities chose to rebel rather than accept a subordinate place in the pantheon". He cites Psalm 82 as a variation on this myth of "primordial conflict in heaven and the rebellion of a lesser deity". Cf. also Fisch, *Ezekiel: Hebrew Text & English Translation*, 192, who (following MT) sees the notion of a 'guardian angel', whose protection of the city of Tyre is brought to an end.

invincibility and prosperity – provides the basic structure, which has been fleshed out using mythical language and images to add colour.

Williams (1976) appears to have led the way here. He reached his conclusion that Ezekiel was “not so much bound by the material he is using as employing it in an imaginative way for his own purposes”⁶⁵, largely in reaction to the deficiencies of the theory of earlier scholars that a self-contained story lay behind the lament⁶⁶. The material used was more “a combination of elements from the traditions of the time, mythological as well as contemporary”⁶⁷. This view of a “complex blending” of material, which has been drawn from both inside and outside the Hebrew tradition, is shared by Taylor (1969), Craigie (1983), Hals (1989), and Wright (2001)⁶⁸.

Greenberg (1997) endorsed the view that this is just a political tale given a mythical colouring. That is to say Ezekiel took as his point of departure the “self-apotheosis of Tyre’s king”, but insists the mythical motifs stem from Israelite tradition, drawing primarily on the motifs of Eden and the Jerusalem Temple mount (as well as other passages such as Psalm 82)⁶⁹. Newsom (1984) endorsed Greenberg’s position by suggesting that Ezekiel was deliberately

⁶⁵ Williams, ‘The Mythological Background of Ezekiel 28:12-19?’, 60-61.

⁶⁶ Williams, ‘The Mythological Background of Ezekiel 28:12-19?’, 49-61.

⁶⁷ Williams, ‘The Mythological Background of Ezekiel 28:12-19?’, 54.

⁶⁸ Taylor, *Ezekiel*, 197, “Ezekiel’s imagination wandered freely and drew on a wide variety of symbolical background all interwoven with his message of the fall of Tyre”; Hals, *Ezekiel*, 200; Peter C. Craigie, *Ezekiel*, *The Daily Study Bible* (Edinburgh: The Saint Andrews Press, 1983), 207; Christopher J.H. Wright, *The Message of Ezekiel*, *The Bible Speaks Today* (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 244, “Ezekiel makes colourful poetic use ancient traditions regarding the creation of humanity and the garden of Eden”; cf. Martin Alonso Corral, *Ezekiel’s Oracles Against Tyre: Historical Reality and Motivations*, *Biblica et Orientalia* 46 (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 2002), 159, who although not specific about the source of the imagery, implies that the imagery is drawn upon as required in order to create the picture of the King of Tyre as “a paradigm of prosperity, opulence, and wealth”.

⁶⁹ Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21-37*, *The Anchor Bible* 22A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1997), 592.

making use of these two lines of imagery (Eden and Temple) because they were essentially mutually reinforcing⁷⁰.

Along similar lines, Bogaert (1981) argued that features within the lament (e.g. the stones of the pectoral, the Cherub, the holiness of the mountain) “recall to some degree Jerusalem, its temple and its priesthood (or its high-priest)”, and asks, “is it possible the similarity is accidental?”, concluding “that seems improbable”⁷¹. He explains these similarities with the explanation that the oracle was originally directed against Jerusalem (as is more apparent in LXX, which Bogaert believed to represent an earlier redactional stage of the text), and only later turned against Tyre⁷² after Israel found themselves in Exile, so the message of punishment against Israel was blurred (*estompé*) into a message of consolation in the final redaction⁷³. This fact accounted for the Temple imagery, while the images of the holy mountain and the garden of beginnings were accounted for because “the prophet himself makes use of a

⁷⁰ Carol A. Newsom, ‘A Maker of Metaphors – Ezekiel’s Oracles Against Tyre’ *Interpretation* 38 no.2 (April 1984), 161-62. See Jon Douglas Levenson, “The Mountain of Ezekiel’s Vision as Mount Zion” (7-24) and “The Mountain of Ezekiel’s Vision as the Garden of Eden” (25-36) in *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 10 (Cambridge, MA: Scholars Press, 1976); and Yaron, ‘The Dirge over the King of Tyre’, 40-45; cf. Jon Douglas Levenson, *Sinai and Zion* (San Francisco CA: HarperCollins, 1985); Callender, *Adam in Myth and History*, 50-54; Gordan J. Wenham, ‘Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story’, *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies* 9 (1986), 19-25; Martha Himmelfarb, ‘The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of ben Sira’, in Jamie Scott & Paul Simpson-Housley (eds.), *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York, NY: Greenwood, 1991): 63-78, esp. 64-66.

⁷¹ “rappellent par quelque côté Jérusalem, son temple et son sacerdoce (ou son grand-prêtre). La convergence peut-elle être accidentelle? Cela me paraît invraisemblable”, Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, ‘Montagne Sainte, Jardin d’Éden et Sanctuaire (Hiérosolymite) dans un Oracle d’Ézékiel contre le Prince de Tyr (Éz 28:11-19)’ in H. Limet and J. Ries (eds.), *Le Mythe, son Langage et son Message: Actes du Colloque de Liège et Louvain-la-Neuve 1981*, Homo religiosus 9 (Louvain-la-Neuve: Centre d’Histoire des Religions, 1983), 140.

⁷² “il s’agirait à l’origine d’un oracle contre Jérusalem, ultérieurement retourné contre Tyr”, Bogaert, ‘Montagne Sainte, Jardin d’Éden et Sanctuaire’, 146.

⁷³ Bogaert, ‘Montagne Sainte, Jardin d’Éden et Sanctuaire’, 147.

schema well-known from historians of religions, that of the superimposition of holy places"⁷⁴.

The identification of the figure by these methods is questionable for a number of reasons. All those who share the view that a self-contained background myth provides the structure for the lament, whether that myth is a foreign or pre-Israelite one (e.g. Cooke, Zimmerli, Eichrodt, *et al.*) or a native Hebrew myth (e.g. McKenzie, May, Barr, *et al.*) have no complete extant myth to support their argument. All must reconstruct their putative myth from the biblical sources. Inevitably one will never be disappointed in one's quest to find the myth that lies behind a particular collection of sources if one uses those very sources to reconstruct what the myth must have looked like.

The comparative approach (represented by Pope, van Seters, Bevan, Widengren, *et al.*), on the other hand, does rely on extant material, myths more or less complete. However a serious question hangs over these responses too. How similar does the myth have to be for it to be convincing? Does the myth need to account for particular details in the lament, or just the overall shape? And what imagery needs to be explained as myth, and what is simply derived from the primary addressee (e.g. is royal imagery drawn from myth or from the king?). For example, at one extreme Widengren cherry-picks from a number of myths to exhaust every last detail in the lament; while at the other, van Seters advocates a myth that contains the elements of creation and kingship but nothing of the king's fall from favour or setting in and expulsion from paradise, which he is obliged to consign to "Ezekiel's own invention"⁷⁵.

⁷⁴ "Le prophète s'est servi d'un schéma bien connu des historiens des religions, celui de la superposition des lieux saints", Bogaert, 'Montagne Sainte, Jardin d'Éden et Sanctuaire', 147.

⁷⁵ van Seters, 'The Creation of Man and The Creation of the King', 340.

Finally, the view of a "complex blending" of material removes the unity and cohesion that the postulation of a background myth provides, so the power of the imagery to help make sense of the lament is diminished. This, of course, is no bad thing if it accounts more plausibly for the diversity of the imagery (as I think it does); but it does indicate that I am not alone in the view that seeking answers in materials preceding the text may have run its course without yielding much of use. As a method it does not appear to be getting us very far, nor do I believe it is ever likely to unless new materials come to light. But even were such materials to come to light, it would still be impossible to judge how much these materials ought to impinge on our understanding of what the text is trying to say. When all is said and done, whatever materials the author, compiler, or editor may have employed have now been completely recast into an entirely new context.

The inaccessibility of whatever sources may lie behind the text convinces me that the best we can hope to achieve with any historical credibility is to look within and in front of the text itself, in other words at the two interwoven threads of transmission and interpretation. This, I hope, might help us to understand the text better, together with its interpretative potential, and the process by which we read and respond to it. To this end the primary concern of the thesis will be to ask how the earliest readers received and understood the lament, in particular who they thought the figure in the lament was said to be. I do not wish to forestall the results of our investigation, but needless to say, each of our sources has a very different explanation of who the figure is.

1. ESTABLISHING THE TEXT

The Implications of The Manuscript Finds from Masada and Qumran*

Introduction

It is a well known peculiarity in biblical studies that, while the origins of the Hebrew consonantal texts are early, the *Masoretic* text proper is the product of the early Middle Ages (although preservation of 'standardised' texts seems to have long predated that)⁷⁶. Around the 3rd century BCE Hebrew texts began to be translated into Greek. So, according to conventional wisdom, the pre-hexaplaric Greek bears witness to a much older version of the Hebrew text than the material we find in the Masoretic text. The Greek, however, is a translation that has undergone its own transmission history.

The discoveries in the Judean desert have brought into sharper relief the complexity and implications of this situation. Roughly speaking, among the Hebrew biblical manuscripts from the Judean desert we find three groups of text: texts presenting a consonantal text "virtually indistinguishable" from our Masoretic text; texts related to the *Vorlage* used by the Greek translators; and 'independent' texts reflecting neither⁷⁷.

* The substance of this chapter appears in my forthcoming article, 'The shorter and longer texts of Ezekiel', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 32 (No. 2, Dec. 2007).

⁷⁶ see e.g. Martin Jan Mulder, 'The Transmission of the Biblical Text' in M.J. Mulder (ed.) *Mikra* (Peabody, MA. : Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 107.

⁷⁷ see e.g. William F. Albright, 'New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible' in Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon (eds.), *Qumran and the history of the Biblical text* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975), 140-146. A more up-to-date summary of research can be found in Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*, trans. Wilfred G.E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 73-76.

By and large it appears that the texts of Ezekiel from Qumran and Masada fall into the first group. This poses a problem for the established understanding of the Greek text of Ezekiel. It has been argued that the much shorter Greek of Ezekiel reflects an 'earlier' version of the text. If manuscripts reflecting the longer proto-Masoretic text predate the manuscripts of the shorter Greek text by three hundred or so years, surely the notion that the Greek text reflects an 'earlier' text becomes seriously questionable?

The Texts of Ezekiel at Qumran and Masada

Remnants of Ezekiel manuscripts have been found both at Qumran and at Masada. Tragically only small fragments from six manuscripts of Ezekiel have survived at Qumran (1Q9, 3Q1, 4Q73-75, 11Q4), although the relatively small number of manuscripts does not seem to reflect the evident importance of Ezekiel to the community as the *New Jerusalem* text, the *Temple Scroll*, and its self identification as 'Sons of Zadok' bear witness. The small quantity of manuscripts that has been preserved at both sites, on the whole, reflects the textual tradition of the Masoretic text.

Two small fragments of Ezekiel have been preserved in Cave One (1Q9)⁷⁸. The leather of the scroll has been blackened by the humidity but remains legible. The fragments (with some reconstruction) preserve only fifteen words, which can be identified as part of the text of Ezekiel 4:16-5:1. Given how little of the text has been preserved, it is possible that this may be a citation rather than

⁷⁸ Dominique Barthélemy, 'Ézéchiél (Pl. XII)' in Dominique Barthélemy and Józef Tadeusz Milik, *Qumran Cave 1, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 1* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955).

the remnants of biblical manuscript. Regardless, the extant text agrees with the MT, possibly even in verse division⁷⁹.

Very little remains of the fragment from cave 3 (3Q1)⁸⁰ and what remains can only be read using infra-red photography. Identification with Ezekiel 16:31-33 is based solely on the appearance of the word לִקְלֵס, the only complete word on the fragment. The particular form, לִקְלֵס, is found in the Hebrew Bible only at Ezek. 16.31. If the identification is correct then, considered as part of a wider pool of evidence, this might signal a proto-Masoretic text at this point, but by itself it tells us very little.

Eight fragments from three scrolls of Ezekiel were found in cave four (4Q73-75)⁸¹ and along with the cave eleven finds these are the most interesting. First, there is evidence of some deviation from the Masoretic text; and secondly, there is evidence of agreement with the Masoretic against the Greek versions. The fragments cover the following sections of Ezekiel: 1:10-13, 16-17, 19, 20-24; 10:6-16; 10:17-11:11; 23:14-15, 17-18, 44-47; 24:2-3; 41:3-6.

4QEzek^a (4Q73) is written in a late Hasmonaean script with some tendencies towards the early Herodian semiformal hand, suggesting a date from the middle of the first century BCE⁸². The fragments contain a handful of orthographic variants (reflecting *plene* versus *defective* spelling), one correction

⁷⁹ Barthélemy, 'Ézéchiél (Pl. XII)', 68-9, observes, "the empty space at the end of v.17 corresponds with the Masoretic *petuhah*".

⁸⁰ Maurice Baillet, 'Ézéchiél (Pl. XVIII)', in Maurice Baillet, Józef Tadeusz Milik, and Roland de Vaux, *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumrân: Exploration de la Falaise, les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q, le Rouleau de Cuivre*, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 3i (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 94.

⁸¹ Judith E. Sanderson, 'Ezekiel', in Eugene Ulrich, *et al*, *Qumran Cave 4. 10, The Prophets*, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 15 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 209-20. See also Lust's preliminary presentation and assessment of the finds in Johan Lust, "Ezekiel Manuscripts in Qumran: Preliminary Edition of 4Q Ez^a and b' in his *Ezekiel and his Book*, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 74 (Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 90-100.

⁸² Sanderson, 'Ezekiel', 209, a view supported by Lawrence A. Sinclair in his 'A Qumran Biblical Fragment 4QEZEK^a (EZEK. 10, 17 - 11, 11)', *RdeQ* 14 (1989), 100.

(towards MT), and one apparent error. The fragments reflect the paragraph division of the Masoretic text between 11:1 and 11:2 and between 23:45 and 46, but lack a division where one is to be found in the Masoretic text before 11:1 and 11:7⁸³. Two variants apparently reflect the Greek: 10:8 (4QEzek^a Frg.1 l.6) reads יד where the Masoretic text reads simply ד; and 23:44 (4QEzek^a Frg.3 col. ii l.6) reads ויבאו where the Masoretic reads ויבוא, which reflects the reading of a number of Hebrew manuscripts, Greek, Targum, Syriac, and Vulgate. These agreements do not reflect a different text 'type'; they are probably either corrections by a scribe, or the present Masoretic text is corrupt, which seems more likely. However, this does not call into question the text's basic identity as Proto-Masoretic⁸⁴.

Regarding the Greek Versions, 4QEzek^a maintains several readings against the Greek: in fragment 1, 10:7 (line 4) the lexeme הכרין[ב, which is omitted in the Greek, is retained; and one word from verse 14 (ואר[בעה), line 13), a verse entirely absent from the Greek, is preserved; in fragment 2, 10:18 (line 2) reads מעל מפתן where the Greek reads simply ἀτάς; and 10:21 (line 6) reads וארבעה (MT וארבע), where the Greek reads ἀτάς; finally, in fragment 3 col. ii, 23:46 (line 4) retains כי, which is absent in the Greek.

According to Sanderson the manuscript from which the 4QEzek^b (4Q74) fragments remain would not have contained the whole of the Book of Ezekiel, since the spacing of the text and columns would have resulted in an absurdly long scroll (some 32 meters). Instead Sanderson suggests the manuscript contained 'edited highlights' of the prophet's visions⁸⁵. The manuscript is later

⁸³ For details see Sanderson, 'Ezekiel', 210.

⁸⁴ See Sinclair 'A Qumran Biblical Fragment 4QEZEK^a (EZEK. 10, 17 - 11, 11)' who supports a Proto-Masoretic identification of this fragment. Émile Puech, '4QEz^a: Note Additionnelle', *RdeQ* 14 (1989), 107-8, sees a closer resemblance to Greek, but his argument is based principally on reconstructed sections of the text and as such ought not be granted credence.

⁸⁵ Sanderson, 'Ezekiel', 216.

than 4QEzek^a, written in a Herodian hand from the early first century CE. As with 4QEzek^a a number of orthographic variants and scribal errors appear. Only two variants are of real interest for the present study: in 1:11 (col.iii, frg. 1-4, l.6) the confusing **איש** of MT is omitted; and in 1:22 (4QEzek^b col.v, frg. 6ii, l.4) **ורמות** is found as against **ורמות**, the reading of the Masoretic text and all the principal Versions. Fragment 6ii displays three examples of agreement with the Masoretic text against the Greek, where words are present in the Masoretic text but absent in the Greek: **האופנים** (Ezek. 1:21, Frg. 6 col ii l 3); **הנורא** (Ezek 1:22, col.v, frg. 6ii, l.3); and **להנה** (Ezek. 1:23, col.v, frg. 6ii, l.8). So again the text closely resembles the Masoretic, but contains 'independent' variants probably resulting from 'tidying' by the scribe.

The remaining fragment from cave four, 4QEzek^c (4Q75), is a mere 1.1cm by 1.4cm. It preserves just nine words (only three in full), which show no variants from MT consonantal text. Sanderson dates the script to the early or middle first century BCE.

The last remaining Ezekiel manuscript from Qumran was found in cave eleven (11Q4)⁸⁶. Unfortunately this manuscript remains only as a "heavy solid lump"⁸⁷, having suffered considerably from water damage. Indeed, after extensive work on the scroll with Strugnell and Plenderleith, Brownlee concluded, "[w]hen one considers the total condition of the manuscript, it is a marvel that we can know that it is indeed a copy of the Book of Ezekiel"⁸⁸. Nevertheless a few fragments were recovered, enough to identify this "dense, unopenable mass"⁸⁹ as a scroll of Ezekiel, date it to the late pre-Herodian

⁸⁶ Edward D. Herbert, '11QEzekiel (Pls. II, LIV)', in Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar and Adam S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11. 2, 11Q2-18, 11Q20-31, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 23* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 15-28.

⁸⁷ Herbert, '11QEzekiel (Pls. II, LIV)', 15.

⁸⁸ William H. Brownlee, 'The Scroll of Ezekiel from the Eleventh Qumran Cave', *RdeQ* 4 (1963), 12.

⁸⁹ Herbert, '11QEzekiel (Pls. II, LIV)', 15.

period, and to engender a discussion of its relation to the Masoretic text in length, order, and to a lesser extent, wording.

The text does contain some variants from the Masoretic text. Brownlee notes three occurrences which he suggests demonstrate agreement with the Greek: the omission of the conjunction before בתוכך (5:12, 11QEzek. Frgs. 3b & 6, l.2); the reading והית (5:15, 11QEzek. Frgs. 3b & 6, l.5), which he suggests reflects the underlying the Greek, Syriac, Vulgate, and Targum (Masoretic היתה); and the putative omission of two words between lines three and four (necessitated, according to Brownlee, by a lack of space on the scroll) which are absent in the Greek. But none of Brownlee's conclusions really holds water, as Herbert has rightly argued⁹⁰. While the Greek does omit the copula before בתוכך it also omits the two preceding words, one of which is attested in 11QEzek, so the omission of the copula is unrelated to its absence in the Greek. והית is probably an error, which might conceivably reflect either a second masculine singular or third feminine singular. Finally, regarding line length, the evidence demonstrates only that the lines contained fewer words than the Masoretic, not that they agreed with the Greek (as Brownlee supposed).

Brownlee goes on to observe one instance where the Septuagint's *Vorlage* apparently omitted seven Hebrew words (5:16), three of which are attested in 11QEzek (Frgs. 3b & 6, l.7); and a further instance where the verse order reflects the Masoretic not the Septuagint text (Frg. 7)⁹¹. In general Herbert is correct in his conclusion that 11QEzek is "broadly Masoretic", whilst exhibiting some evidence of deviation from MT, but without any significant agreement with the Greek⁹².

⁹⁰ Herbert, '11QEzekiel (Pls. II, LIV)', 22.

⁹¹ Brownlee, 'The Scroll of Ezekiel', 15-16.

⁹² Herbert, '11QEzekiel (Pls. II, LIV)', 22.

The manuscript finds at Masada are of an equally limited and fragmentary nature. More than fifty fragments of parchment from four columns were found hidden beneath the floor of the synagogue⁹³. According to Talmon, the script is an “early Herodian bookhand” or “formal Herodian script” and can be dated to the second half of the last century BCE. The fragments cover Ezekiel 35:11-38:14 (including 36:23^b-38). Like the fragments from Qumran, the limited evidence appears to point to a text in basic conformity to the Masoretic text.

Talmon has mapped out in some detail the deviations from the Masoretic text. There are the textual variants one might normally expect, such as *defective* versus *plene* spelling and vice versa and supralinear emendations of scribal mistakes (such as the omission of individual letters). Talmon also notes that the appearance of the three letters, ב י ת, above the phrase בגוים אשר in the locution כי אם לשם קדשי אשר חללתם בגוים אשר באתם שם of 36:22 (Col. II, 1. 12), which prompts the conjecture that the scribe began to insert the expression בית ישראל before the word בגוים, either as a result of *lapis calami* (vertical dittography) under the influence of the preceding verse, which seems likely, or on the strength of his *Vorlage*, which differed from MT and the Versions⁹⁴.

Talmon does flag up two instances where a variant (or rather a *possible* variant) might reflect a *Vorlage* underlying the Greek: col. iii, l.12 תקרבו עצמות appears to reflect MT 37:7 ותקרבו עצמות, except for the lack of the *waw*. Talmon observes a *lacuna* preceding עצמות and suggests a letter is missing; he proposes ה- indicating the definite article, the reading of the Greek. Similarly

⁹³ For a description of the excavation see Yigael Yadin, *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1966), 168-189. An analysis of the manuscript finds of Ezekiel is found in Shemaryahu Talmon, '1043-2220 (MasEzek) Ezekiel 35:11-38:14' in J. Aviram, et al (eds.), *Masada: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999) Vol. 6., 59-75.

⁹⁴ Talmon, '1043-2220 (MasEzek) Ezekiel 35:11-38:14', 68

Talmon suggests that the restoration of a *taw* at the end of כשמח in col. I, l. 5 might help explain a *homoioarkton* that appears to have occurred in the Greek of Ezekiel 35:14-15. This argument, however, is somewhat spurious, since in reality the presence or absence of the *taw* would hardly have affected the *homoioarkton*, not only because the alleged confusion has occurred between the שמחה of 35:14 and 35:15, but also because in 35:15 (col. 1 l.6) the form is כשמחתך with final *kaph* against כשמחה(ת) in 35:14 (col. 1 l.5), so the *taw* is not likely to have influenced the scribes.

These examples are not strong, a point Talmon concedes: "the above differences do not obfuscate the basic textual identity of MasEzek with MT"⁹⁵. Talmon supports this view by drawing to our attention pluses and minuses between Masoretic and Greek: two examples where the Greek has additional text not found in MT Ezek or MasEzek, a further ten examples where MT Ezek and MasEzek contain text absent in the Greek version, and a further eleven examples where the Greek has a variant reading where MT Ezek and MasEzek are in accord.

The text fragments from Qumran and Masada exhibit a number of variants that are all rightly classified as 'minor'. While the fragments depart from the MT on some minor points, generally the construction of individual words (perhaps varying the suffix, person, or conjugation), they mostly reflect the present MT. In the case of Qumran, it is interesting given the paucity of the material to note that there are a surprising number of what must be errors. None of those variants displayed in either the Qumran or Masada texts reflect any particular text family; the most likely explanation is that they reflect minor adjustments by individual scribes.

⁹⁵ Talmon, '1043-2220 (MasEzek) Ezekiel 35:11-38:14', 70.

Although we must caution against over-confidence (in total the fragments of Ezekiel from Qumran preserve a mere 340 words, many of which are preserved only in part, sometimes only a single letter, and require reconstruction), what we can say *positively* is that the data that we have *do not* reflect a prototype of the Greek recensions. At both Qumran and Masada we are able to cite examples where the text is in disagreement with the Greek; primarily this is in cases where a text is found in the Hebrew but absent in the Greek. Of course, Qumran and Masada provide only a snap-shot of the state of the text of Ezekiel in the few centuries up to the turn of the eras. Although the fragments do cover portions of chapters from throughout Ezekiel (i.e. chapters 1, 10, 11, 23, 24, 35-38, and 41), the majority of the text remains unattested.

The Historical Precedence of the Greek Text

The question of the relationship between Greek and Masoretic version of Ezekiel was brought into even sharper relief by the publication of Papyrus 967. Papyrus 967 contains a Greek version of Ezekiel that dates to the late second century CE⁹⁶, and therefore predates *Codex Vaticanus* by around one hundred years. By and large Papyrus 967 has been found to support the text witnessed in *Codex Vaticanus*, though it differs in several features (such as the rendering of אֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה). Based on the witness of Papyrus 967 Edmund Kase suggested that the Hebrew of the divine name had systematically been expanded (e.g. from יהוה to אֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה), and that Papyrus 967 in fact reflected an

⁹⁶ Allan Chester Johnson, 'Date' in Allan Chester Johnson, Henry Snyder Gehman, and Edmund Harris Kase, Jr. (eds.), *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1938), 5; P. Leopold Günther Jahn, *Der griechische Text des Buches Ezechiel: nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967*, Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 15 (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1972), 7.

earlier form of the Hebrew text. The Hebrew text was later expanded, so *Codex Vaticanus* reflected an attempt to bring the Greek into line with this expanded Hebrew text⁹⁷.

This basic hypothesis has been accepted, refined, and expanded upon by both Johan Lust⁹⁸, Emmanuel Tov⁹⁹, and others¹⁰⁰. Both accept that a long period of formation of the text *accompanied* the period of transmission (and consequently translation). Thus Papyrus 967 supported the widely held view that the Greek of Ezekiel represents an earlier redactional stage of the Hebrew than the Masoretic text¹⁰¹. As Tov puts it, “we are confronted here with different stages in the literary development of the book (preserved in textual witnesses)”¹⁰². Where Papyrus 967 lacked text present in *Codex Vaticanus* or the Masoretic text (‘minuses’) this was not necessarily to be explained, as Johnson, “by the fact that the scribe or reader often allowed his eye to jump from words or phrases to others in the vicinity”¹⁰³. Rather “they [the minuses]

⁹⁷ Edmund Harris Kase, Jr, ‘The *Nomen Sacrum* in Ezekiel’ in Johnson, Gehman, and Kase (eds.), *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel*, 50-51.

⁹⁸ Lust, ‘Major Divergences’; Lust, ‘Stepbrothers?’, especially pages 20-31; Lust, ‘The Shorter and Longer Texts of Ezekiel’.

⁹⁹ Tov, ‘Recensional Differences’, 89-101.

¹⁰⁰ Most recently Pohlmann, *Hesekiel (Ezechiel) Kapitel 1-19*, 41, “Therefore after the emergence of the Greek translation [as witnessed by P967] the Hebrew text has experienced further considerable change” // “Demnach hat nach der Entstehung der griechischen Übersetzung der hebräische Text noch durchaus beachtliche Veränderungen erfahren”; Jahn, *Der griechische Text des Buches Ezechiel*, 7, “At any rate Papyrus 967 is one of the oldest sources of the pre-hexaplaric text... Moreover 967 brings to many passages by itself the original (ursprünglichen) text.” // “Auf jeden Fall ist der Papyrus 967 einer der ältesten Zeugen des vorhexaplarischen Texts... Darüber hinaus bringt 967 an manchen Stellen allein den ursprünglichen Text”; also Bogaert, ‘Montagne Sainte, Jardin d’Éden et Sanctuaire’, 131-153, esp. 135.

¹⁰¹ See for example Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 30, “the text of G. is usually shorter, but often attests an earlier stage in the history of tradition”; also Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 12, “the terser Septuagint text guides us to an older recension of the Hebrew text, more reliable than the Masoretic text”; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 1, 75.

¹⁰² Tov, ‘Recensional Differences’, 101.

¹⁰³ Allan Chester Johnson, ‘Description of Text’ in Johnson, Gehman, and Kase, *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel*, 7.

are witnesses to an earlier Hebrew text in which these sections were not yet added”¹⁰⁴

In short, the witnesses available to us reflect three successive stages in the literary growth of the Hebrew: earliest is Papyrus 967, which represents a shorter text; next come the pre-hexaplaric Greek sources (e.g. *Codex Vaticanus*), which reflect an adaptation of the shorter Greek towards an expanded form of the Hebrew; finally we find the Masoretic text, which contains significant additional layering¹⁰⁵, as Tov puts it, “rather than taking the LXX as a short text, we should thus take MT as a long one”¹⁰⁶. Lust has provided a discussion of several longer ‘minuses’ or variations in order in Papyrus 967 (e.g. 7:6-9; 12:26-28, 13:7, and 36:23c-38), which he concludes ought to be regarded as insertions in the Masoretic rather than omission in the Greek¹⁰⁷.

The conclusions of Lust and Tov can be thought correct in one respect, namely that while smaller omission can be accepted as being the result of *parablepsis*, larger omissions simply cannot, especially given the fairly ‘literal’ nature of the translation in Papyrus 967 as a whole. Yet as a whole their theory is brought into serious question by the finds at Masada and to a lesser extent, Qumran.

¹⁰⁴ Lust, ‘Major Divergences’, 85.

¹⁰⁵ Tov provides an extensive list of ‘pluses’ in the Masoretic text, broken down into the following categories: Contextually secondary elements; addition of parallel words/phrases; exegetical additions; contextual clarification; harmonizing pluses; emphasis; new material; deuteronomistic formulations; and formulaic language. Tov, ‘Recensional Differences’, 93-99

¹⁰⁶ Tov, ‘Recensional Differences’, 92.

¹⁰⁷ See Lust, ‘Major Divergences’; and Lust, ‘Stepbrothers?’, 23-28; see also Lust, ‘The Shorter and Longer Texts of Ezekiel’, 12-14.

Questions Raised by the Masada Finds

The manuscript finds from Masada include the section Ezekiel 36:23^b-38, which is absent in Papyrus 967. The absence of 36:23^b-38 in Papyrus 967 was explained by Lust as the result of a later insertion into the Hebrew text, composed to form a transition between chapters 36 and 37, in a text where chapter 37 followed 36, not 39 as it had done in earlier versions¹⁰⁸. This viewpoint was supported by the obviously incongruous language of the section in both Hebrew and Greek, something Thackeray had earlier noted and attributed to the presence of a fragment of a different version (resembling Theodotion) due to lectionary usage¹⁰⁹. Tov accepted Lust's explanation of the section's absence¹¹⁰.

The presence of the section among the fragments at Masada is consequently problematic: Papyrus 967 dates from the late second century CE and *does not* contain the section, the Masada text dates from the second half of the last century BCE and *does* contain the section. So ought we to conclude that Lust was wrong in his assessment, and that what we have here is in fact an omission in Papyrus 967? Three factors go against this. First, the size of the omission would require an explanation, as Lust rightly notes: "an omission of 1451 letters is too long for an accidental skip of the scribe's eye"¹¹¹. An explanation for the omission is also required since no *homoioteleuton* is obvious. Secondly, the order of the Papyrus must also be taken into account since the scribe jumps from 36:23 to 38:1 and places chapter 37 after 39.

¹⁰⁸ Johan Lust, 'Ezekiel 36-40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript', *CBQ* 43 (No. 4 Oct. 1981); cf. Lust, 'Stepbrothers?', 22-31.

¹⁰⁹ Henry St. John Thackeray, 'The Greek Translators of Ezekiel', *JTS* 4 (1903), 407-8.

¹¹⁰ Tov, 'Recensional Differences', 99-101.

¹¹¹ Lust, 'Stepbrothers?', 28; cf. Lust, 'Ezekiel 36-40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript', 520.

Finally, the same section of text is omitted in the sixth century AD Codex Wirceburgensis of the *Vetus Latina*. This witness is not apparently dependent on Papyrus 967 (although closer to it than the other Old Latin witnesses), so we must contend with the possibility that Papyrus 967 reflects a textual tradition, rather than simply being an isolated text.

So, we have the unusual situation that the earliest manuscript (Masada) attests a proto-Masoretic text, while the later Papyrus 967 preserves a version that clearly represents a shorter *Vorlage*. If Papyrus 967 represents an 'earlier' or 'more original' text in a linear sequence as Lust and Tov suppose, I do not see how that can be reconciled with the presence of 36:23-38 at Masada. Is the explanation that two (or more) co-existent recensions were in circulation (as we find with Jeremiah at Qumran) not a better explanation of the data? Ought we to say that Papyrus 967 represents a 'different' text rather than an 'earlier' or 'more original' text? Are we right to think of an *Urseptuaginta* at all, let alone an *Urtext*?

It appears that Greek translations arose before the Hebrew text was stabilized, and thus they may reflect different *Vorlagen*. There does not seem to have been a single authoritative translation into Greek from which all other translations derived (an *Urseptuaginta*), although there is an obvious closeness between a number of the Greek versions. From a text-critical point of view, in the case of Ezekiel we ought not really to talk of 'the Septuagint' at all; rather, we can only speak properly of the 'Greek versions'.

The Greek versions may well reflect different redactional stages in the Hebrew; however, the manuscript evidence available to us does not allow the conclusion that these redactional stages were chronologically progressive, with one version of the Hebrew text superseding another (so that we could see in Papyrus 967 an 'earlier' Hebrew text). The assumption lurking in the subtext of Lust and Tov's theory is that at any one point in time only a single

homogeneous text-type could have been in existence, as if the existing text would drop out of circulation as soon as the new text was produced. This, of course, is historically unlikely, and cannot be sustained by the available evidence.

Papyrus 967 and the proto-Masoretic text from Masada (and Qumran) demonstrate that at some point two different versions of the Hebrew were in existence at the same time. The 'longer' (i.e. Masoretic) and 'shorter' (i.e. Greek) text were in circulation *concurrently, and in Hebrew* for at least 200 years. Both versions may have at one time stemmed from a Hebrew *Urtext*, but the data does not allow us to say which is now nearer to that *Urtext*. There was clearly a fluidity in the Hebrew text so that in Papyrus 967 we see a 'different' text, not necessarily an 'earlier' one¹¹².

Concluding Comments

So what is the significance of all this? If my conclusions are correct this will have serious consequences for the way in which we approach and seek to understand the text of Ezekiel. The data from Masada and Qumran make *the Urtext* of Ezekiel a will-o'-the-wisp. Behind the texts of Papyrus 967 and MT lie two distinct *Vorlagen*, and unless new materials come to light, there is no credible way of establishing the historical precedence or originality of either.

¹¹² See Moshe Greenberg, 'The Use of the Ancient Versions for Interpreting the Hebrew Text: A Sampling from Ezekiel ii 1 – iii 11' in International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament. 9th Congress (1977: Göttingen), *Congress Volume: Göttingen, 1977*, Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 29 (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 131-148, especially 144-48, in which Greenberg argues that the hypothesis of a single 'original' text is misleading since some variants between MT and the Versions, particularly in Ezekiel, demonstrably result from ancient non-MT *Vorlagen* rather than from the translators. He concludes that it is not always possible for the critic to derive one version from the other(s). Cf. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, 18-24

The necessary corollary of this conclusion is that any effort to reconstruct an earlier text from these two texts becomes futile. As historians we have to accept that all that the Greek and Hebrew allow us to do is see how the text of Ezekiel 28:12-19 presented itself, among Greek speaking communities on the one hand and Hebrew speaking communities on the other, around the 2nd Century BCE. We cannot get back beyond this point except by unfounded speculation.

2. 'YOU WERE אלהים'

The Masoretic Hebrew Text*

Introduction

The conclusions we have reached in the preceding chapter suggest that the Masoretic Hebrew text as it stands demands our attention, not as the 'most original' form of the text or even as the basis for a reconstructed text, but as a form of the text that we can be reasonably certain was in circulation in Hebrew in the 2nd Century BCE (and possibly earlier). This was a text that Hebrew speaking communities at that time would have read. So what story did the text they read tell?

Of course the first obvious point to make is that what Hebrew speaking communities of the 2nd Century would have read would have been the consonantal form of the text. The Masoretic vocalization and accentuation provides a later layer of interpretation. It shows us how the scribes of the early Middle Ages – although probably following established conventions – read the text (or perhaps, how they thought the text ought to be read). Not only is the vocalization and accentuation much later than the consonantal text, but it has also had a monumental effect on the meaning of Ezekiel 28:11-19, and as such needs to be set aside if we are to see how the Hebrew text presented itself around the 2nd Century BCE.

In setting aside the vocalisation and accentuation of the Masoretes, we are obliged to suggest how the consonantal text might more 'naturally' be read.

* The substance of this chapter appears in my forthcoming article, 'Did the Masoretes Get It Wrong? The Vocalization and Accentuation of Ezekiel xxviii 12-19', *Vetus Testamentum*, 58 (No. 2, 2008).

That last comment will no doubt raise doubts in some minds; but let me offer reassurance: I am not propounding an objectivist approach in which I consider myself to have achieved *the* 'correct reading' of the consonantal text. Rather I am staking a wager that were you or I, or even a Jew in the Babylonian exile, presented with the unpointed consonantal text of Ezekiel 28:11-19 none of us would have read the text as those scribes who added the vocalization and accentuation have done. Of this, of course, we cannot be certain; but I think the evidence from the unvocalized text itself is persuasive.

But while we wish to look behind the vocalization and accentuation to see how the text may have been read around the 2nd Century BCE, we do not wish to discard the vocalization and accentuation altogether, as though they were simply superfluous later accretions. Were the vocalization and accentuation to be stripped away the text would yield a meaning quite different from that created by their presence. But in the context of a study of the reception history of a text, how those scribes responsible for the vocalization and accentuation handled the text tells us something about how this text *was* read at the time of their addition.

Furthermore, the Masoretes' vocalization and accentuation of the text demands our attention not solely because it reflects reading conventions of a later period. Uniquely, the Masoretes were committed absolutely to (and subsequently constrained by) the received form of the text. They did not allow themselves to emend 'corruptions', translate freely, or provide a paraphrase, in order to escape difficulties in the text. As a consequence, their expertise in handling the text as it stands, with all its manifold complexities, is second to none. Not only do they highlight difficulties in the text, they also suggest ways of overcoming them without (generally speaking) emending the text. If they have read the text in a certain way, this will have been done after generations of careful, skilful, and knowledgeable consideration. They are

experts, whose reading is deliberate and purposeful, and as such deserve our respect.

With that said it makes sense to lay out the consonantal text as we have it for ease of reference:

12 בן אדם שא קינה על מלך צור ואמרת לו כה אמר אדני יהוה אתה
חזתם תכנית מלא חכמה וכליל יפי 13 בעדן גן אלהים היית כל אבן יקרה
מסכתך אדם פטדה ויהלם תרשיש שהם וישפה ספיר נפך וברקת זהב
מלאכת תפיד ונקביך בך ביום הבראך כוננו 14 את כרוב ממשח הסוכך
ונתתך בהר קדש אלהים היית בתוך אבני אש התהלכת 15 תמים אתה
בדרכיך מיום הבראך עד נמצא עולתה בך 16 ברב רכלתך מלו תוכך חמס
ותחטא ואחללך מהר אלהים ואבדך כרוב הסכך מתוך אבני אש 17 גבה
לבך ביפיד שחת חכמתך על יפעתך על ארץ השלכתך לפני מלכים נתתך
לראוה בך 18 מרב עוניך בעול רכלתך חללת מקדשיך ואוצא אש מתוכך
היא אכלתך ואתנך לאפר על הארץ לעיני כל ראיך 19 כל יודעך בעמים
שממו עליך בלהות היית ואינך עד עולם

(Ezekiel 28:12-19)

Throughout it is my intention to deal with the consonantal text we have in hand. This is not to ignore the fact that this text has undergone years of transmission at the hands of the *sopherim*, the Masoretes, and others, and in the process may have developed corruptions. The conclusion reached in the preceding chapter excludes the possibility of detecting and removing these 'corruptions' on the basis of the Greek versions, and if we are to do justice to the extreme care that was exercised in the transmission of the Hebrew text, and to our own critical dealings with the text, we must exhaust all other possibilities within the text before we throw up our hands and cry 'textual corruption!'

Let us now turn to the text itself and ask, What story does the text tell?

אתה חותם תבנית מלא חכמה וכליל יפי (28:12)

The dirge over the king of Tyre opens with a syntactically straightforward declarative clause of identification, אתה חותם תבנית¹¹³. While the syntax is straightforward enough the meaning of the predicate is less so. חותם, from the root חתם 'to seal', is read by MT as the *qal* active participle (חותם) – 'you are a sealer, one who seals', or perhaps 'you are sealing...' – while many moderns following the Versions (LXX, Aquila, Samaritan, and Vulgate) and a few medieval Hebrew manuscripts prefer the noun, 'a seal, a signet ring' (חֹתֶם), which is possible in the consonantal text¹¹⁴. תבנית hardly serves to clarify. It may be a corruption of תבנית (graphic confusion between ב and כ) as some Hebrew manuscripts imply, but MT points as the obscure noun, תְּבַנִּית, which occurs elsewhere only in Ezekiel 43:10. There its meaning is still uncertain: it is the direct object of מָדַד, which is normally followed by either the commodity being measured (e.g. Ex. 16:18; Num. 35:5; etc.) or by the quantity of the measurement (e.g. "the man measured a thousand cubits" Ezekiel 47:3; cf. Ezek. 42:19; 47:3,4,5), suggesting that its meaning is other than simply 'measurement'¹¹⁵ (were that the intention one might expect instead the complement, מְדָה¹¹⁶). Zimmerli is probably right in seeing the idea of

¹¹³ Cf. Ex. 6:2, אֲנִי יְהוָה, "I am Yahweh"; 2 Sam. 12:7, אַתָּה הָאִישׁ, "you are the man"; Gen. 24:65, אֲדֹנָי הוּא, "he is my master".

¹¹⁴ e.g. Pohlmann, *Hesekiel (Ezechiel) Kapitel 20-48*, 90; Habel 'Ezekiel 28 and the Fall of the First Man', 518; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 2, 81; RSV. Callender, *Adam in Myth and History: Ancient Israelite Perspectives on the Primal Human*, 96, prefers the reading "seal of resemblance" in light of Gen 1:26. Cf. van Dijk, *Ezekiel's Prophecy on Tyre (Ez. 26,1 – 28,19)*, 115, argues that this is a case of enclitic mem, proposing emending *hwtm* to *hawwat-m*, giving the reading "You, O Serpent...", based on usage in Phoenician and Aramaic. He then suggests that the dual identification of the figure as both serpent and cherub (v.14) could be explained on the basis of Mesopotamian sources, where the two types of creature are said to be interchangeable; but the evidence for all this is very slender, and his case is ultimately unconvincing. Batto, *Slaying the Dragon*, 95-96, adopted the translation 'Serpent' on the basis of Gen. 3:1-5; 13-15.

¹¹⁵ As Fisch, *Ezekiel: Hebrew Text & English Translation*, 191, who suggests for MT 'thou wert one who sealeth measurement' conveying the sense 'he was perfect in physical form'.

¹¹⁶ BHRG 242.

correctness underlying the root חִכַּן ¹¹⁷, so $\text{וּמְדוּדוֹ אֶת־תְּכַנִּית}$ (Ezek. 43:10) might plausibly be understood as the house of Israel's response to their humiliation, perhaps, 'then they will measure out an accurate measure': A similar meaning may well make sense in Ezekiel 28:12 when it is borne in mind that the act of affixing a seal was an act of attestation (e.g. 1 Kings 21:8; Esther 8:8, 10; Neh. 10:1). Affixing your seal to a document meant you supported its contents and agreed to adhere to the conditions laid out within. The King in Ezekiel 28:12 would then be one who gives his support to an accurate (the therefore fair) measure, in other words, 'one who seals an accurate measure' is a figure who was true and trustworthy (perhaps comparable to תְּמִים 28:15). This at least is how the consonantal text seems to have been understood by the Masoretes, but the rarity and uncertainty of תְּכַנִּית cautions us against any over confident conclusions. The following clause $\text{מִלֵּא חִכְמָה וְכִלְיֵל יִפִּי}$ would seem to confirm that, at the very least, תְּכַנִּית חוֹתֵם , is to be taken as a positive attribute (the two clauses either standing in apposition; or else the construction is an asyndeton)¹¹⁸.

A crucial question for our understanding of the primal-figure image is whether the imagery begins at 28:12^b or at 28:13. The act of sealing suggests a royal motif (e.g. 1 Kings 21:8; Esther 8:8, 10; Neh. 10:1) – a signet more so (e.g. Jer. 22:24; Hag. 2:23) – as might wisdom (e.g. 1 Kings 2:9; 3:12; 5:21; Prov. 20:26, and often), which is attributed somewhat satirically to the King in

¹¹⁷ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 2, 81.

¹¹⁸ מִלֵּא חִכְמָה is omitted by some on the basis of LXX (e.g. Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 216) and by Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 389, on this basis and on the grounds that this "is not an expression applicable to a signet". Cf. Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25-48*, *The New International Commentary on the Old Testament* (Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), 105, who takes תְּכַנִּית חוֹתֵם as referring to a seal or signet and too finds מִלֵּא חִכְמָה awkward on the basis that it does not fit as a description of the seal. His solution, however, is that the author's focus shifts away from the seal onto the person whom it represents with מִלֵּא חִכְמָה , then back onto the seal with וְכִלְיֵל יִפִּי , which seems an unnecessary complication when all three might more simply be applied directly to the person. For the beauty of the king see Isaiah 33:17 "your eyes will see a king in his beauty (בִּיפְיֹו)".

Ezekiel 28:3. This has led some to understand 28:12^b as a reference to the present state of the king (the imagery beginning in 28:13)¹¹⁹, or even a secondary insertion (at least in part)¹²⁰. However, it must be borne in mind that the image of the primal-figure is employed here because of the parallelism between his story and that of the King of Tyre: it would be a peculiar logic that would introduce such parallelism with a description of some characteristics attributable only to the King. The addressee throughout is the second person masculine singular, yet the lament appears to relate more obviously to the primal-figure in one place (e.g. “you were in Eden” 28:13), and to the King of Tyre in another (e.g. “in the abundance of your trade...” 28:16, 18). But to understand this in terms of presence or absence of the primal-figure image (as if two people are actually being addressed) is to force a false dichotomy onto the text: throughout, the king is addressed *as* the primal-figure. The imagery is more evident in some parts than others, but it would be a crude over-simplification to dissect the lament into those sections where primal-figure imagery is present and those sections where it is absent, or to speculate that an unknown royal first-man myth must underlie the passage¹²¹. The addressee is not king *or* primal-figure, but king *and* primal-figure. In fact, polymorphism is a characteristic feature of Ezekiel’s imaginative language, as Greenberg has rightly observed¹²². The reality of the King of Tyre and the imagery of the primal-figure are fused together in a single addressee, so 28:12^b cannot be seen to stand apart from the remainder of lament. Indeed, there is nothing in 28:12^b itself or in the surrounding

¹¹⁹ e.g. Pohlmann, *Hesekiel (Ezechiel) Kapitel 20-48*; Knud Jeppesen, ‘You Are a Cherub, But No God!’, *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 5 (1991), 87-88.

¹²⁰ e.g. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 2, 81 & 87.

¹²¹ As May, ‘The King in the Garden of Eden’, 169. Cf. van Seters, ‘The Creation of Man and the Creation of the King’.

¹²² See Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21-37*, 589.

context, that suggests the author considered these attributes belonged first and foremost to the king.

To this it might be added that the problem with applying 28:12^b to the primal-figure is perceived only when one attempts to impose onto the text notions about the first-man, derived from a particular reading of Genesis 2-3. The logic being that in Genesis 2-3 the first-man is not imbued with any special wisdom, and since he is the only human being besides Eve, all talk of being engaged in trade is meaningless. Thus, mention of wisdom or trade in Ezekiel 28:12-19 cannot refer to the first-man, and must refer to the King. Yet, if one of our interests is to discover what first-man tradition Ezekiel 28 might reflect, then we must accept the possibility that the first-man was understood in a way quite different from the first-man we have come to know from our conventional readings of Genesis 2-3. In this respect the attributes of fairness, wisdom¹²³, and beauty may well characterise the first-man in the Ezekiel tradition.

בעדן גן אלהים היית (28:13)

Without apparent division the image is developed, “you were in Eden, the garden of God”. That the terms עדן and גן אלהים are in apposition seems likely, as Ezekiel 31:8-9 appears to confirm, “cedars in the garden of God could not rival it... no tree in the garden of God was comparable to it in beauty... and all the trees of Eden (עצי עדן) that were in the garden of God envied it” (cf. Is. 51:3). It is worth noting here that Ezekiel refers to the garden of Eden more than any other book in the Hebrew Bible outside of Genesis (Ezek. 28:13; עצי עדן 31:9, 16, 18; 36:35). In so doing Ezekiel clearly makes use of common lore,

¹²³ Wisdom is connected to the first-man motif in Job 15:7-8 and 38:2-7, and to (cosmic) creation in Prov. 8:22-31.

which knew of the garden of Eden as the idealised expression of fertility. Like Ezekiel 36:35, “This land that was desolate has become like the garden of Eden (כגן עדן)”, Isaiah and Joel both employ Eden as epitomising the opposite to barrenness. Thus we read in Isaiah 51:3, “He will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord”; and in Joel 2:3 “The land is like the Garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness”.

That גן־אלהים stands in apposition to Eden in contrast to Genesis 2:8 where the garden is located *within* Eden, is of no significance for our current study. It appears to be the case that Genesis and Ezekiel have drawn on a common tradition of a garden of unbounded fertility and luxury, but whether the element of Eden and the garden of God as a *primeval garden* was also taken over from tradition or was a novel association of the two accounts we cannot say with certainty.

(28:13) ... כל אבן יקרה מסכתך

Continuing the theme of luxuriance indicated by the location, Ezekiel introduces a list of precious stones. How these stones relate to the figure is uncertain. מסוכה is obscure. מסוכה correctly translated ‘hedge’ in Micah 7:4 as משוכה is in Isaiah 5:5 and Proverbs 15:19, and can equally be so understood here¹²⁴, although there is nothing in the consonantal text to exclude the possibility that in Ezekiel the noun has been derived from סכך ‘to cover’ – giving the meaning ‘covering’, perhaps referring to a garment – but this

¹²⁴ Cf. Gen.33:17; Job 1:10; Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21-37*, 581; and van Dijk, *Ezekiel's Prophecy on Tyre (Ez. 26,1 – 28,19)*, 116-7, who renders as “defence” and whose observations here are helpful. The pointing also perhaps favours derivation from root סוך, see note BDB 697. Peculiarly, Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 216, accepts סוך is the most likely root, the meaning for which he gives as ‘to fence in, close in’, from which he then extrapolates “and so ‘that which surrounds’, such as a garment or ‘belt’, presumably to defend the rendering of LXX. Symmachus περιεφρασε σε may support a derivation from סוך ‘to fence in, hedge about’.

would be a *hapax legomenon*. Two factors have been unduly influential in promoting the rendering ‘covering’: the witness of the Septuagint (ἐνδέδεσαι), about which we expressed caution above; and the apparent resemblance of the list of stones to the description of the priestly breastplate of Exodus 28:17-20 and 39:10-13 (=LXX 36:17-21)¹²⁵.

All the stones listed do appear in Exodus and the tripartite grouping of the stones (i.e. the second and third noun in each triplet being joined by *waw*, the first two nouns are asyndetic) echoes that list too. But as the comparison below demonstrates the stones appear in a different order and with three missing.

Exodus 28:17-20 Ezekiel 28:13

אדם ¹	אדם ¹
פטדה ²	פטדה ²
ברקת ³	יהלם ⁶
נפך ⁴	תרשיש ¹⁰
ספיר ⁵	שהם ¹¹
יהלם ⁶	ישפה ¹²
לשם ⁷	ספיר ⁵
שבז ⁸	נפך ⁴

¹²⁵ A number of scholars following Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 316-7, explain the list as a much later addition made on the basis of Exodus 28:17-20 and designed to explain the reference to ‘precious stones’. But why such an explanation would ever have been felt necessary, and why the editors would have chosen the stones from the high priestly pectoral to accomplish this task, is not made clear. Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 216-7, follows Cooke’s incredible suggestion that the difference in order is due to “dissatisfaction with the colour arrangement”. The view that the list is a later amplification is accepted by Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 2, 82-84; Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 123; Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 389.

ברקת ³ ⁹ אהלמה

¹⁰ תרשיש

¹¹ שהם

¹² ישפה

Scribal accident does not adequately account for this incongruity¹²⁶. While scribal accident might at a stretch account for the omission of a triplet, it fails to account for the reordering. More problematic still is that this explanation assumes for no good reason that the copyists failed to recognize the list as that of the high priestly pectoral, which seems unlikely. There is a similarity between these two lists, but there is also significant dissimilarity.

Several of the stones appear in other contexts (i.e. פטדה Job 28:19; תרשיש Ezek.1:6; 10:9; Dan. 10:6 cf. Song. 5:14; שהם Gen. 2:12; Ex. 25:7; 28:9; 35:9, 27; 39:6; 1 Chron. 29:2; ספיר often; נפך Ezek. 27:16), and with the exception of הולם and אדם all are probably loan words from Persian or Sanskrit, suggesting they would have been known through trade, which is especially apt in the current context.

¹²⁶ As, for example, Yaron, 'Dirge over the King of Tyre', 37-8 Cf. Callender, *Adam in Myth and History*, 102-3, whose position here is unsustainable. He argues that the list of nine stones of MT are similar enough to "make it obvious" that they are designed to recall the high priestly pectoral, whilst maintaining that "the differences are significant enough to rule out a simple case of literary borrowing". But if the author had such imperfect recollection of the stones that he could neither remember the order nor the total number, how could he possibly be hoping that his readers would recall the twelve stones of the high priestly pectoral. Callender heads off the potential (yet obvious) objection with the conjecture that "it is best to conclude that the two texts are based on an earlier common tradition". Not only is this historically implausible, but it fails to solve the problem, and merely pushes it back a stage. If this putative 'common tradition' enumerated nine stones, how did Exodus end up with twelve; if it enumerated twelve, how did Ezekiel end up with nine? And how do you account for the difference in order? The author is unlikely to have made such changes to the 'common tradition' if his intention were to make an allusion. Cf. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25-48*, 106, who accepts the view that the high priest's chest-piece inspired Ezekiel, but, while noting the differences, he fails to explain them.

In light of this, a better explanation of the list as it stands might be that the author, concerned to demonstrate the abundant luxury of the setting by the introduction of a catalogue of precious gems, drew on a list of just such stones that he knew already from another context. That context would have been the High Priestly pectoral. Yet as the author does not wish to suggest an equivalence between the figure addressed in the lament and the Jewish High Priest, he removes some of the stones and reorders the rest in the hope of obscuring the resemblance.

Isaiah 54:11-12 indicates the type of image at work. Here the future Jerusalem is pictured, built of jewels and surrounded by precious boundary stones. The image is later picked up and elaborated upon in Tobit 13:16-17. The intention is to paint a picture of a glorious location surrounded (reading 'hedge' for מסוכה) with rare, exotic stones, in much the same way that Isaiah and Tobit do. That the figure is said to walk in the middle of "fire stones" from which he is expelled (28:14, 16), may also support the view that the precious stones surround rather than adorn him, if the "precious stones" and "fire stones" are indeed correctly understood as synonymous¹²⁷.

וזהב מלאכת תפיד ונקבדך בך ביום הבראך כונו (28:13)

What follows the description of the precious stones is undoubtedly the most complex of the whole lament. It is here we begin to see the determinative effect of Masoretic vocalization and punctuation on the creation of meaning. Verse division is the critical factor. The Masoretic Text places a division after בך, thus introducing a temporal subordinate clause (ביום הבראך) into the sentence that begun with מלאכת and concludes with the verb כונו. The

¹²⁷ A view supported by van Dijk, *Ezekiel's Prophecy on Tyre* (Ez. 26,1 – 28,19), 118.

Masoretic Text places a *sôph pāsûq* (a verse break) after כונונו, which it points as a *polal* (כונונו), presumably conveying the notion that the workings of the תה and נקב (whatever they might be!) were placed upon or around the figure.

This arrangement gives a literal translation along the lines, '[the] workings of your תה and your נקב upon / around / about you, in the day of your creation, were established', presumably implying, '[the] workings of your תה and your נקב were established upon / around / about you in the day of your creation'¹²⁸. But dividing the verse in this manner creates more problems than it solves¹²⁹.

First and foremost, our suspicions of the Masoretic vocalization should be raised by the highly irregular and cumbersome word order that it creates. Even given the colourful and poetic nature of the composition, it would be highly unusual in Classical Hebrew poetry to find the verb in final position preceded by subject, indirect object (בך), and an intervening subordinate clause¹³⁰. Why the Masoretic vocalizers have acted in such a way becomes apparent in their handling of what follows. The Masoretic vocalizers' deliberately difficult pointing of את כרוב at the start of 28:14 suggests that they considered clarifying their position *vis à vis* 28:14 an absolute necessity, for which they were prepared to sacrifice clarity of expression at the end of 28:13.

Despite considerable uncertainty surrounding the meaning of תה and נקב, the consonantal text favours treating בך as completing a noun-clause that begins with וזהב (i.e. מלאכת תפיד ונקביך בך זהב)¹³¹. The Masoretic pointing includes וזהב with the precious stones (indicated by the 'Athnâch placed with it), but

¹²⁸ Habel, 'Ezekiel 28 and the Fall of the First Man', 518, avoids tackling the issue with an unsatisfactory intermediate position, "... your own engravings. In the day you were created they were made. With an...".

¹²⁹ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 2, 85, resolves this difficulty by treating כונונו as a secondary insertion, based on "metrical" reasons and on its omission in LXX and some Syriac manuscripts. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 390, adopts the same position.

¹³⁰ See Gibson §133.

¹³¹ See GK §140-1.

the consonantal text favours beginning a new clause for two reasons. First, and most obviously, 'gold' is not a stone. Secondly, זהב is isolated structurally from the list of precious stones, which is organized into three groups of triplets, the second and third noun in each triplet being joined by *waw*, while the first two nouns are asyndetic:

אדם פטדה ויהלם
 תרשיש שהם וישפה
 ספיר נפך וברקת
 וזהב

In an unpointed text זהב would most obviously be understood in construct relationship with מלאכת, forming a separate clause the end of which is marked by בך, e.g. "and the gold of the workings of your תף and your נקב were on / around / about you".

In an unpointed text מלאכת might be taken either as being in the construct state or simply as a plural with defective (as opposed to plene) Holem, as heading a list (i.e. 'the gold of your workings, your תף and your נקב')¹³². If this were the case the absence of the definite article would need explanation, however, this explanation is worth noting as a possibility since the semantic range of מלאכת is broader than just 'workmanship'. More frequently, it means 'occupation', as well as 'property, possession', and religious or political 'service'.

Finally, who or what the Masoretic vocalization intended the subject of the passive כונו to be remains uncertain. It is possible the Masoretic vocalizers are

¹³² Callender, *Adam in Myth and History*, 88, emends מלאכת to מלאכה in order to complete the list of stones with "and of gold was (its) workmanship", which allows חפך ונקביך to serve more easily as the subject of כונו. While this move makes it easier to translate into neat English it is open to the same criticism, as far as motive is concerned, as the pointed text.

thinking of the precious stones (and gold) as a breastplate (deriving מסוכה from סכך 'to cover' and taking תף and נקב as a resumptive reference to the list just given, i.e. 'the precious stones were established upon you'). Two factors go against this suggestion. First, is the likelihood that the pointed מסוכה refers to a hedge or fence, rather than a garment. Secondly, מסוכה (along with the precious stones) forms part of a separate clause, as indicated by the 'Athnâch under זהב. It is more likely then, that תף and נקב are the intended subjects of כונו.

While it is uncertain exactly what form a תף might have taken, the noun is reasonably well attested as an instrument, obviously a small rhythmic instrument – perhaps a drum – since it is associated with dancing (e.g. Ex. 15:20; Judg. 11:34; 1 Sam. 18:6; Ps. 150:4) and might be carried in one hand (Ex. 15:20). Jeremiah 31:4 promises the Virgin Israel that she will be 'bedecked' or 'ornamented' (root עדה) by תפים before going forth in dances, so perhaps we ought to think of bells or small symbols. Whatever we imagine a תף to be, Jeremiah makes quite clear that בך in this context could quite conceivably mean 'on you'¹³³. Zimmerli's insistence that derivation of the word from this well known תף ('tambourine, hand drum') "is scarcely to be considered" and his bold assertion that "it must be a technical term from the industrial arts", has no basis: his explanation that נקב refers to a hole or setting for jewels only serves to make a nonsense of תף, the one noun of the pair of whose meaning we can be reasonably certain¹³⁴. Comparable is Wevers' inaccurate claim that

¹³³ Callender, *Adam in Myth and History*, 88, resorts to drastic measures here, removing MT בך as a dittography arising from the sequence נקבך ביום; also Yaron, "The Dirge over the King of Tyre", 33.

¹³⁴ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 84. Callender, *Adam in Myth and History*, 106, rightly notes "there is a dearth of evidence to assign the word *tuppeykâ* a meaning other than 'your timbrels'. Alternative explanations are given by Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25-48*, 110, who derives from the root *wpy* giving "your beauty"; and van Dijk, *Ezekiel's Prophecy on Tyre (Ez. 26,1 – 28,19)*, 118-9, who accepts a derivation of תפיד from Ugarit proposed by Lipiński ("your

these are “unknown words”. On the contrary *ת* is in fact well known, but the form in which it is *well known* (i.e. ‘tambourine, hand drum’), did not fit his arrangement of the verse and explanation that these “were probably technical terms used by goldsmiths”¹³⁵.

ת is almost always accompanied by other instruments (i.e. Gen. 31:27; 1 Sam 10:5; 18:6; 2 Sam. 6:5; 1 Chron. 13:8; Job 21:12; Ps. 81:2; 149:3; 150:4; Is. 5:12; 24:8; 30:32) so it is reasonable to assume that *ת* might fall into this category. Assuming the text is not corrupt, the root *ת* (‘to pierce, bore out’) would more likely imply a hollowed out instrument, a pipe perhaps¹³⁶.

The translations ‘drum’ and ‘pipe’ provide aesthetic reinforcements for our conclusion that a new clause begins at *ת*, since musical instruments would be an odd detail indeed to add to a description of the figure’s creation, and would be an odd choice as the subject of the verb *ת* in its present form.

ת in the *poel* is a verb employed for events of grand or cosmic importance: the *poel* generally has God as subject – founding the royal throne (e.g. 2 Sam. 7:13; 1 Chron. 17:12), his own throne (Ps. 9:8), the sanctuary (Ex. 15:7), the nation of Israel (Deut. 32:6), even the heavens (Prov. 3:19); the single example of the *poel* outside the present verse (Ps. 37:23) also has God as the agent. In

beauty”), which van Dijk himself acknowledges to be problematic; he is then obliged to guess at *ת*, which he translates “splendour” without credible basis; neither of these, he acknowledges, fits with *ת*. It is difficult to see how this provides us with a ‘solution’ to the problem in the text here.

¹³⁵ Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 217. Cf. Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 91, “these two nouns are of uncertain meaning”; Yaron, ‘Dirge over the King of Tyre’, 33, “the expression...is probably corrupt and the meaning is obscure”. The original, he suggests, may well have been *ת* “thou didst fill the inside of thy mouth”, a “free expression” that is apparently given support by the LXX (“thy treasuries and thy storehouses”), and for which v.16 can provide a parallel, but this is only when the text there has been emended too (from *ת* to *ת*).

¹³⁶ A reading popular among a number of earlier English translations, e.g. KJ (1611) whence WB (1833); ASV (1901), whence WEB (1997); DV (1890), YLT (1862); also Callender, *Adam in Myth and History*, 107, on similar grounds.

short, כון in *polel* or *polal* is not a verb for the trivial or frivolous, and it is certainly not a verb that would be used to describe dressing up or musical instruments¹³⁷.

תף always appears as an instrument of joy and celebration (often associated with prophets), and thus it fits neatly with what precedes it and brings the scene to a close. The scene is one of joyful opulence. The preceding train of thought first highlights the original splendour of the location by describing a glorious array of precious stones, then alludes to the luxurious and joyful state in which the figure resided.

A new sense-unit is then begun with a temporal clause, ביום הבראָה¹³⁸, locating the following action in the time when the primal-figure was created (the verb ברא, a technical term for divine activity, is reflected in the so called 'P' creation account of Genesis e.g. 1:1; 2:4 cf. 5:2 etc.). In summary our proposed division of the verse is as follows:

...ספיר נפך וברקת:

וזהב מלאכת תפך ונקבך בכ:

... ביום הבראָה.

... sapphire, nophek, and emerald.

[The] gold of the workings of your drums
and your pipes [were] about you.

When you were created....

¹³⁷ As Fisch, *Ezekiel: Hebrew Text & English Translation*, 191; Callender, *Adam in Myth and History*, 88.

¹³⁸ ביום functioning here adverbially. For preposition ב + Infinitive indicating a temporal clause, see Gibson §124a.

כּוֹנֵנוּ אֵת כְּרוֹב מִמְשַׁח הַסּוּכָךְ (28:13-14)

Without the Masoretic *sôph pāsûq* the אֵת of an unpointed text would most naturally present itself as the definite object marker with כּוֹנֵנִי as the governing verb, not only on syntactical grounds but also for the semantic reasons outlined in the preceding section. Adopting the reading 'with', as many scholars do on the strength of the Septuagint, is questionable because of the uncertain relationship between the Masoretic text and Septuagint, and is meaningless without emending the consonantal text to remove the *waw* preceding נִתְחַדֵּךְ¹³⁹ (which remains problematic even if read as a *waw* explicative¹⁴⁰). Equally reading אֵת as the feminine pronoun (אֵת) is decisively ruled out by the context. Barr's conclusion that the unusual pointing must rest on a pre-existent *phonic* tradition because it is "frankly unbelievable" that the Masoretes would have chosen a very rare form of the masculine personal pronoun¹⁴¹ over the more obvious 'with' or direct object particle, cannot be decisive for an understanding of a unpointed text since it rests on two fragile assumptions: first, that the Masoretic vocalizers did not see this as the easiest solution in the context given the highly complex and confusing nature of the

¹³⁹ As many do, e.g. Pohlmann, *Hesekiel (Ezechiel) Kapitel 20-48*, 390; Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 217; Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, 91; Habel 'Ezekiel 28 and the Fall of the First Man', 518; Yaron, 'The Dirge Over the King of Tyre', 30; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 85; Hals, *Ezekiel*, 198; RSV. Note Barr's critique of the adoption of LXX at this point: Barr, 'Thou Art the Cherub', 219. Callender, *Adam in Myth and History*, 15, adopts the reading 'with the cherub' on the basis of the obvious distinction between Adam and the cherub in Genesis 3:24. This is typical of the muddled methodology that characterises his reading. The aim of his thesis is to "highlight the essential characteristics uniting these biblical traditions [i.e. concerning the primal human]" and to understand "its various manifestations and permutations". Not only does he assume the commonality of these traditions *prima facie*, but he then allows his reading of one biblical tradition to be guided by another with which he hopes to compare it. It thereby becomes inevitable that the two texts will end up looking rather similar, thus reinforcing his *prima facie* assumption. Cf. Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 317, who prefers the LXX on the basis that "obviously the denizen of the garden cannot be identical with the cherub"; a reading overly influenced by Genesis 3:24 perhaps? Cf. van Seters, 'The Creation of Man and the Creation of the King', 336 n.15.

¹⁴⁰ GK §154 note b.

¹⁴¹ Compare, for example, Num 11:15; Deut 5:27(24) etc.; the following are corrected in the *qere* 1 Sam. 24:19; Ps. 6:4.

text in hand; and secondly, that the pointing decisions of the Masoretic vocalizers would not be influenced by ideological presuppositions, or by a conviction as to what the text ought to say and what it could not possibly say¹⁴².

Yet treating אַת as the definite object marker is not without its own problems. The verb (root כּוּן) appears to be in the third person plural. If this is the case and the verb is taken as a passive (*polal* כּוּנָה) the singular form כּוּן needs to be explained. If the verb is taken to be active (*polel* כּוּנֵה), then a subject is absent.

If active, the verb must be in *polel*, since the root is not attested in *qal* or *piel* conjugations, so a 3rd singular with 1st common plural suffix is eliminated. A 3rd singular *polel* with a 3rd singular suffix (כּוּנֵה, 'he established him') is possible, but in a first to second person address this is conspicuous, and therefore highly unlikely. But if כּוּנָה is read as *polel* 3rd plural (כּוּנָה) we must either identify a subject or explain its absence. As there is no possible subject in sight (the precious stones or the חַי and נֶקֶב can hardly be the *subject* of the active verb without reducing the sentence to nonsense), we must seek an explanation for its absence. The only explanation possible for this absence would be an anonymous plural, "they established the cherub", with an implied passive sense, "the cherub was established"; but this would not be well supported.

¹⁴² Barr, 'Thou Art the Cherub', 217. Cf. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25-48*, 100, who argues that an orthographic error for 'attā' has occurred; Jeppesen, 'You Are a Cherub, But No God!', 91, who argues in support of MT on the basis of the use of 'you' plus a predicate elsewhere in the two oracles (28:1-10, 12-19); van Dijk, *Ezekiel's Prophecy on Tyre (Ez. 26,1 – 28,19)*, 119, argues on similar grounds: 'stylistic and idiomatic similarity of vss. 12-13 and vs.14 suggests strongly the vocalization of 'attā'.

The passive (*polal*) might be explained by taking כְּרוּב as conveying a collective sense, which could without much difficulty take a plural verb¹⁴³. A collective sense for כְּרוּב is also possible in 2 Samuel 22:11 / Psalm 18:11, and with more difficulty in Ezekiel 9:3; 10:4 (where LXX reads the plural τῶν χερουβιν)¹⁴⁴. A collective sense might be justified here given that the governing verb (in *polel*, perhaps also *polal*?) generally refers to contexts of grand or cosmic importance. In the context of creation (בְּיוֹם הַבְּרָאָה) this might plausibly be explained as referring to the establishment of the cherubim as a category of being. The clause might then be read: 'When you were created the... cherubim were established', perhaps anticipating the elaborate angelologies and cosmologies that developed in the Second Temple period¹⁴⁵. From a temporal perspective this could easily mean either that the cherubim 'were established at the same time' or 'were already established'. Against this suggestion is the absolute singularity of the כְּרוּב in 28:16.

A more feasible explanation of the singular form of כְּרוּב would be the occurrence of a dittography at the end of כוֹנוֹ. It is a frequently found feature of manuscripts using the Aramaic square script dating from Qumran to the late middle ages that Wāw and final Nûn are almost indistinguishable. It is not impossible that this problem existed in some paleo-Hebrew scripts (compare, for example, the early Meša script), although not all (since Wāw and Nûn have quite a diversity of shapes in the different paleo-Hebrew scripts). It is quite possible that a scribe has repeated the final Nûn, which was then mistaken for a Wāw (כוֹנוֹ being meaningless in the context) by a later scribe. It must be admitted that there are no textual witnesses extant attesting

¹⁴³ Gibson §25.

¹⁴⁴ Based on these verses Yaron, 'The Dirge Over the King of Tyre', 32 goes as far as to suggest that כְּרוּב and כְּרוּבִים are interchangeable forms.

¹⁴⁵ See Barr, 'Thou Art the Cherub', for discussion of Ezekiel's role in the emergence of patterns of thought in the Second Temple period.

to such a variant. This allows one of two explanations: either the dittography occurred at an early period and then became accepted as the standard reading, or our explanation is simply wrong. Assuming the latter not to be the case, we might then read **בוֹנֵן אֶת־כְּרוּב**, 'the...cherub was established / set up / prepared'.

It is a mistake to assume that the presence of the definite object marker (**את**) rules out a passive sense, since examples exist elsewhere of the subject of the passive taking **אֶת** (e.g. Gen. 4:18 **וַיֻּלַּד לְחֵנוֹךְ אֶת־עֵירָד**, 'and Irad was born to Enoch' cf. Gen. 21:5; 2 Sam. 21:22)¹⁴⁶. An active sense is ruled out for **בוֹנֵן** since **את** would indicate the object, leaving a subject wanting.

In the broader perspective of the Hebrew Bible a singular cherub might be thought unusual, and indeed it is a rarity. Outside of Ezekiel the only other example is to be found in the parallel texts of 2 Samuel 22:11 and Psalm 18:11, "He rode upon a cherub and flew, he flew swiftly upon wings of air"¹⁴⁷. As mentioned above, in both these cases the Septuagint reads the plural **χερουβιν**; but there is no justification for this except that these beings normally come in pairs or groups. As our data is limited to this instance, it is impossible to judge with certainty whether **כְּרוּב** could ever have conveyed a collective sense.

Despite the Septuagint, it is quite clear that we are dealing with a singular being in the Hebrew text of Ezekiel 9:3 and by implication in 10:4. Ezekiel 9:3 reads, **וּכְבוֹד אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נֶעְלָה מֵעַל הַכְּרוּב אֲשֶׁר הָיָה עָלָיו אֵל מִפְתָּן...**¹⁴⁸ the singular form **עָלָיו** indicating quite clearly a singular figure. **עָלָיו** is absent in 10:4, which

¹⁴⁶ Gibson §94 R.6.

¹⁴⁷ From Ps. 18:11, **עַל־כַּנְפֵי־רוּחַ וַיֵּרָא** for **וַיֵּרָא** probably through scribal error: many manuscripts read **וַיֵּרָא**.

¹⁴⁸ "And the glory of the God of Israel was taken up from upon the cherub, because it was upon it, to the threshold..." (Ezek. 9:3).

is a near repetition of 9:3, but sense does not require the plural. Most significant of all, however, is Ezekiel 10:7. Here we have our only example in the Hebrew Bible other than in Ezekiel 28 of a singular cherub carrying out an action: “then the cherub stretched forth his hand from the midst of the cherubim to the fire that was in the midst of the cherubim and [the cherub] lifted [it] up and put [it] into the hands of the one clothed in linens”¹⁴⁹. The figure is undoubtedly singular as the following verbs (וישא and ויתן) indicate. The detail in 10:8, “The cherubim appeared to have the something like a human hand under their wings”, confirms that the cherub in 10:7 is the intended agent of the action. The significance for Ezekiel 28 is obvious. There is no reason to exclude the possibility of a singular cherub carrying out action in Ezekiel. Although we have no examples of a destroying כרוב in the Hebrew Bible, the singular destroying messenger (מלאך) is a familiar character (e.g. 2 Sam. 24:16, 17 = 1 Chron. 21:12-30; 2 Kings 19:35 = Is. 37:36 = 2 Chron. 32:21), and of course touching the Ark, which the cherubim covered, resulted in death (e.g. I Chron. 13:9-11 cf. Num. 1:51; 3:38; 17:12). Also noteworthy are the cherubim who guard the entrance to Eden with the whirling flaming sword (Gen. 3:24) – hardly benign doormen! Other divinely ordained agents of destruction are also known in Ezekiel (e.g. פְּקֻדוֹת “the punishers” in Ezekiel 9:1 cf. Hos. 9:7; Is. 10:3; Mic. 7:4), and, of course, cherubim form a distinctive feature of Ezekiel’s writings in general, in his exotic and esoteric visions (Ezek. 10:1-20; 11:22) and as decoration in the future Temple (Ezek. 41:18, 20, 25).

As discussed above the syntax and semantic range of the root כון indicates that the Masoretic vocalizers have stretched the possibilities of the consonantal text to create an unlikely and awkward reading of כונו את כרוב ממשח הסוכך.

¹⁴⁹ (Ezek. 10:7): וישלח הכרוב את ידו מבינות לכרובים אלהאש אשר בינות הכרובים וישא ויתן אל-חפני לבש הבדים.

We have put forward three possible solutions to the difficulty presented by the text, but, after all possibilities in the consonantal text have been exhausted (see comment on page 48) with unsatisfactory results, the explanation that a dittography has occurred provides the most plausible and straightforward resolution to an otherwise intractable problem; and this will be preferred in what follows.

In summary then, our proposed division of the verse is as follows:

...ספיר נפך וברקת:

וזהב מלאכת תפיד ונקבדך כד:

ביום הבראך כונן את־כרוב ממשח הסוכך

ונתחידך...

... sapphire, nophek, and emerald.

[The] gold of the workings of your drums
and your pipes [were] about you.

When you were created, the anointed
covering cherub was established, then I set
you...

ממשח הסוכך (28:14)

In both consonantal and pointed text there is more to be said of the cherub. First the cherub is ממשח, which in the context must be playing an adjectival role. The Masoretic vocalizers take it as a noun (מִמְשַׁח), but this a *hapax legomenon*. The consonantal form could be a participle, but the verb מָשַׁח, 'to anoint, smear' is not known in Hebrew Bible except in *qal* and *niphal*, and this

is therefore unlikely¹⁵⁰. Greenberg connects with the Aramaic homonym מִשָּׁח, ‘measure’, and suggests an analogue to Hebrew אִישׁ מִדָּה, which he takes as ‘a large man’, literally ‘a man of measure’¹⁵¹. But in the present context ‘measure’ is no better than ‘anointed’, or ‘spread out’, since nothing in the text elaborates on מִשָּׁח to guide us. With all other possibilities exhausted (see comment on page 48) we might advance a suggestion of textual corruption. One obvious proposal is that a dittography of the Mēm has occurred, and that we should read a *qal* participle (מִשָּׁח), which in the context would be functioning as an adjective. This would have the advantage of explaining the presence of the definite article preceding סִכַּךְ¹⁵², which would be odd (but not impossible) if סִכַּךְ were a participle being employed adjectivally: סִכַּךְ is in apposition to the preceding definite subject (אֶת־כְּרוּבִים), the definite article would then cause the participle to take on the quality of a relative clause (as Gen. 12:7; 1 Sam. 1:26, and often¹⁵³), e.g. “the anointed cherub, who covers / protects...”¹⁵⁴, a meaning that would transfer to 28:17 without difficulty.

Whether we are right or not מִשָּׁח hardly seems to impinge decisively on the development of the lament, as its absence in 28:17 (כְּרוּבִים הַסִּכַּךְ) suggests (cf. Wevers, who suggests מִשָּׁח is a later, though incorrect, commentary on הַסִּכַּךְ¹⁵⁵). A much more striking feature of the cherub is the appearance of the participle סֹכֵךְ, a choice of verb (root סִכַּךְ) that in conjunction with the noun כְּרוּב strongly evokes those cherubim associated with the Ark and the Temple (e.g. Ex. 25:20; 37:9; 1 Kings 8:7; 1 Chron. 28:18). Whether this connection underlies the image there is no way of knowing, but in conjunction with the

¹⁵⁰ Jeppesen, ‘You are a Cherub, but no God!’, 91, explains as a “unique מ-noun from the root מִשָּׁח, to anoint”.

¹⁵¹ Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21-37*, 583. Cf. Vulg. *extentus et protegens*.

¹⁵² סִכַּךְ is not attested in Niphal.

¹⁵³ Gibson §112.

¹⁵⁴ For root סִכַּךְ denoting protection see, e.g. Ps. 5:12; 91:4.

¹⁵⁵ Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 217; Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 390, omits on the basis it is “an unintelligible word”.

reference to the 'holy mountain' (a familiar synonym for the Jerusalem temple mount) that follows, and given Ezekiel's background, it hardly seems implausible.

(28:16) אַבְדָּךְ כְּרוֹב הַסֶּכֶךְ

One final comment must be made of the relationship between cherub and primal-figure: אַבְדָּךְ (28:16) is problematic. The Masoretic vocalizers read אַבְדָּךְ, a contracted form of *piel* first person imperfect of אָבַד¹⁵⁶ with pronominal suffix, 'I destroyed / banished you', forcing 'covering cherub' into the vocative (e.g. I destroyed you, O covering cherub!). This reading, however, is dependent on the Masoretic vocalizers' division and interpretation of 28:13-14, which identifies the addressee as the כְּרוֹב, a pointing of the text we have rejected. Although the Masoretic vocalizers' reading is possible in a consonantal text it strains the most straightforward reading of the consonantal text, which would favour reading אַבְדָּךְ as a 3rd singular perfect *piel* with pronominal suffix (אַבְדָּךְ) with (singular) כְּרוֹב as subject, 'and [the] cherub, who covers, destroyed you'¹⁵⁷ (there is no need to soften the force of the *piel*, 'to destroy, kill', with 'to banish' on the grounds that the addressee does not die, since 28:18 & 19 also speak of the physical death of the addressee in the past tense). The resultant form, a perfect with weak *waw* after a perfect or consecutive imperfect, accords with other cases in Ezekiel (22:29; 25:12; 37:10; 40:24)¹⁵⁸.

¹⁵⁶ GK §23d.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Ezekiel 10:7; 9:3; 10:4.

¹⁵⁸ Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, 91.

ונתחך בהר קדש אלהים היית (28:14)

Returning to verse 14 then, if our division of the consonantal text so far is correct, then the *waw* preceding נתחך poses no problems: a new clause begins here. The Masoretic vocalizers agree, inserting an 'Athnâch (,). But this creates its own problems for the pointed text. If one treats הר קדש אלהים as a single phrase ('the Holy Mountain of God'), as the Masoretic vocalizers have done, a verb will become redundant, either נתחך חיית or התהלכת¹⁵⁹. The Masoretic vocalizer selects the first option, inserting the disjunctive accent R'bhîa' (')¹⁶⁰. So נתחך 'I set you' is forced to stand alone, a situation that is extremely unlikely given that the verb נתן almost without exception takes an accusative followed by ל-, אל, or על indicating the indirect object¹⁶¹. But for the Masoretic vocalizers such a move was necessary to avoid the obvious division of sense in the consonantal text that reads אלהים היית as a separate predicative clause¹⁶², an appellation that would doubtless have sat uncomfortably when

¹⁵⁹ See Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21-37*, 579, on MT, who argues that "God" stands in the place of the usual pronominal suffix, and makes a comparison with 'the holy vessels of God' in I Chron. 22:19 (584), but note the dislocation necessitated in his translation, 'And I set you / in the holy mountain of God you were'; and Fisch, *Ezekiel: Hebrew Text & English Translation*, 192, who is obliged to add a consequential "so that", which is not reflected in MT, to avoid leaving any verb redundant, "and I set thee, so that thou wast upon the holy mountain of God...". Cf. Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 158, who argues that התהלכת is a later addition on the basis that it is not attested in LXX.

¹⁶⁰ GK §15f.

¹⁶¹ A fact that makes the suggestion of van Dijk, *Ezekiel's Prophecy on Tyre* (Ez. 26,1 – 28,19), 120, and Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25-48*, 100, that נתחך is a case of "postposition of the verb after emphatic waw" with נתן meaning 'to appoint' unlikely, not least because the two examples he cites in support (Ezek. 33:7 and Jer. 1:5) both use ל-. Cf. also Batto, *Slaying the Dragon*, 95, who translates "You are a wing-spread Cherub, I appointed you as the guardian".

¹⁶² Although note the prepositive Yethîbh under קדש, which may simply mark the principal tone, but might also indicate disjunction (see GK §15, I, 8b). Greenberg admits the division of the verse "and I set you in the holy mountain; a divinity you were" as a possibility, Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21-37*, 584. Yaron, 'The Dirge Over the King of Tyre', rightly acknowledges that from a syntactical point of view the reading 'a God thou wast' is "the only possible

coming from the mouth of Yahweh and applied to a heathen king. But the most natural reading of a consonantal text would take בַּהַר קָדֵשׁ as the indirect object of וַנְּחַתִּיד, not only to avoid leaving either verb redundant but also because ‘the Holy Mountain of God’ is an expression not known in Hebrew Bible, except in Daniel 9:20, הַר קָדֵשׁ אֱלֹהִי. All other examples in Hebrew Bible read simply ‘Holy Mountain’ (or ‘Mountain of Holiness’) often with a pronominal suffix (e.g. Ps. 2:6; 3:5; 15:1; 43:3; 48:2; 99:9; Is. 11:9; 27:13; 56:7; 57:13; 65:11, 25; 66:20; Jer. 31:23; Dan. 9:16; 11:45; Joel 2:1; 3:21; Obad. 1:16; Zeph. 3:11; Zech. 8:3); this is exactly what we find in the only other example in Ezekiel, בַּהַר קָדֵשׁ (20:40). The appearance of the ‘Mountain of God’ in 28:16 (and elsewhere of Horeb, e.g. Ex. 4:27; 18:5; 24:13; 1 Kings 19:8) or ‘Mountain of Yahweh’ (e.g. Ps. 24:3; Is. 2:3; 30:29; Mic. 4:2) cannot justify reading ‘The Holy Mountain of God’ here; on the contrary, those references only reinforce the fact that, excluding the one exception from Daniel, the mountain is either ‘of Holiness’ or ‘of God / Yahweh’, never both. Zimmerli recognises that the mountain cannot be both ‘holy’ and ‘of God’, yet rather than seeking a solution in the text he assumes קָדֵשׁ to be “metrically superfluous” and thus a

reading of the verse without alteration of MT” (29), he then rejects this reading in favour of LXX for a number of reasons: first, he finds it difficult to reconcile with his view that “Ezekiel could not possibly nurse such a heathen idea” (29), a view that is not only unsubstantiated but also ignores the well known semantic complexity of the noun אֱלֹהִים; secondly, he detects parallelism between בַּהַר קָדֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים חַיִּית and בַּעֲדָן גַּן אֱלֹהִים חַיִּית (v.13) which he wishes to maintain; thirdly, he agrees with Cooke that the inhabitant of the garden obviously cannot be identified with the Cherub, yet like Cooke fails to explain why this is so obvious; and finally, he holds the view that the differences between LXX and MT are “very small” (31), a position that is impossible to sustain. Yaron’s objections to the reading necessitated in MT are little more than unsubstantiated conjecture or unqualified presumption. Widengren, *Early Hebrew Myths and Their Interpretation*, 166, does translate “a god thou wast”; but his choice of translation is not based on syntactical necessity or close attention to the text itself, rather it is motivated by his desire to expose the residue of foreign myths, in which the ideas of divinity, kingship, and primal humanity intersect – or so Widengren claims. Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah: the Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite kings*, Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 8 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1976), 270-1, supports the basic view that הַר קָדֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים cannot be taken as a single phrase, but places the division after ‘mountain’ giving the rather strained “You were the holy property of God” to fit with his identification of the figure as a cherub in v.14.

secondary addition (following Cooke)¹⁶³, effectively falling into the same trap as the Masoretic vocalizers have done.

Furthermore, a reading 'you were אֱלֹהִים' makes perfect sense in the context.

The issue of the dividing line between divine and human is what is at stake in the preceding oracle (28:2-10). There the king had claimed divinity for himself (28:2), and Yahweh goes to extraordinary lengths to prove, 'you are but a man and no god' (28:9). The logic in the present lament is similar: while the primal-human figure might have been a 'god' (perhaps 'divine being?') in a now past ideal state, his injustice caused Yahweh to transform him: אֱלֹהִים הָיִיתָ becomes בְּלִהוֹת הָיִיתָ ('you are terrors / calamities / destructions' 28:19). As for the consonantal text, then, the following is to be preferred:

ביום הבראך כונן את־כרוב ממשח הסוכך

ונתתך בהר קדש אלהים ה'ית בתוך...

When you were created, the anointed cherub,
who protects, was established, then I set you
upon the Holy Mountain, you were an אֱלֹהִים,
in the midst of...

It is not clear what is meant by אֱלֹהִים here. Within the biblical corpus אֱלֹהִים most frequently connotes the God of Israel, but it also commonly refers to foreign gods and idols. There are also a small number of puzzling uses that suggest a broader semantic range. Famously Yahweh promises to Moses בְּנִי אֱלֹהִים לְפָרְעָה (Exod 7:1), although this may be hyperbole; in Zechariah it is said that the house of David will become like אֱלֹהִים, which is set in apposition to מְלֹאךְ (Zech. 12:8); a number of examples exist of the בני אֱלֹהִים, characters who apparently form part of a divine council; in 1 Samuel 28:13 the

¹⁶³ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 2, 85; Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 319.

term is used to refer to an apparition. The scattered examples suggest אלהים can refer to figures occupying the divine realm generally, but capable of being immanent within the material world, a meaning that became commonplace among the Qumran Yahad (particularly in Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, e.g. 11QShirShab 5:3; 4QShirShab^b 5:4, etc.). It is difficult to ascertain from this whether the figure is actually thought of as a divine being or whether the expression is hyperbolic.

In textual terms the remaining description is comparatively straightforward: it describes the ideal state the figure initially occupied, the reason for his destruction, and the subsequent punishment: The figure is described as having had integrity (תמים cf. Enoch, Gen. 5:22, 24; Noah, Gen. 6:9; Abraham, Gen. 17:1) in his actions (בדרכיך) from the time of his creation, until the moment injustice (עולה) is discovered in him¹⁶⁴. The source of this injustice is two fold: interpersonal (unrighteous or violent trading, “In the abundance of your merchandise your midst was full of violence and you sinned” 28:16; “Because of the abundance of your iniquities, by the unrighteousness of your merchandise” 28:18)¹⁶⁵, and personal (arrogance and pride, often described as hubris, “Your heart became exalted because of your beauty; you ruined your wisdom on account of your splendour” 28:17). An element of corruption of the sacred is also involved (e.g. “and I excommunicated you from the mountain of God”, ואחלקך מהר אלהים, 28:16; “you profaned your sanctuaries”, חללת מקדשיך 28:18).

In summary then, the pointed text is divided and best translated as follows:

¹⁶⁴ That a masculine verb should precede a feminine subject is not a rarity (GK §145o).

¹⁶⁵ Note: the expression “filled with violence” is employed in Gen 6:11.

Division of Pointed Text

Son of man,	בן אדם
raise a lament over the king of Tyre	שא קינה על מלך צור
and say to him,	ואמרת לו
Thus says my lord Yahweh:	כה אמר אדני יהוה
You were a sealer of an accurate measure,	אתה חותם תכלית
full of wisdom and entirely beautiful.	מלא חכמה וכליל יפי:
You were in Eden, the garden of God, every precious stone was your hedge:	בעדן גן אלהים היית כל אבן יקרה מסכתך
carnelian, topaz, and onyx;	אדם פטודה ויהלם
yellow jasper, beryl, and jasper;	תרשיש שהם וישפה
sapphire, nophek, and emerald, <i>and gold;</i>	ספיר נפך וברקת חהב
<i>[The] workings of your drums and your pipes about you</i>	מלאכת תפיד ונקביד בך
<i>were established on the day of your creation.</i>	ביום הבראך כוננו:
<i>You were an anointed cherub who covers,</i>	את כרוב
<i>and I set you,</i>	ממשח הסוכך
<i>on the Holy Mountain of God you were,</i>	ונחתיך
<i>in the midst of fire stones you walked.</i>	בהר קדש אלהים היית
You had integrity in your deeds	בתוך אבני אש התהלכת:
from the day of your creation	תמים אתה בדרכיך
until injustice was found in you.	מיום הבראך
	עד נמצא עולתה בך:

In the abundance of your merchandise
your midst was full of violence and you
sinned,
so I cast you as a profanity from the
mountain of God *and I destroyed you, O cherub
who covers,*

from the midst stones of fire.

Your heart became exalted because of your
beauty;

you ruined your wisdom on account of your
splendour.

Upon the ground I cast you,

before kings I set you so as to see you.

Because of the abundance of your iniquities,
by the unrighteousness of your merchandise,
you profaned your sanctuaries.

So I brought forth fire from the your midst, it
consumed you,

then I made you into ashes upon the earth,

before the eyes of all who saw you.

All who know you among the peoples

are appalled because of you:

you are terrors

and you shall be nothing forevermore.

ברב רכלתך

מלו תוכך חמס ותחטא

ואחללך מהר אלהים ואבדך כרוב הסכך

מתוך אבני אש:

גבה לבך ביפוך

שחת חכמתך על יפעתך

על ארץ השלכתך

לפני מלכים נתתך לראוה כך:

מרב עוניך

בעול רכלתך

חללת מקדשך

ואוצא אש מתוכך היא אכלתך

ואתנך לאפר על הארץ

לעיני כל ראך:

כל יודעך בעמים

שממו עליך

בלהות היית

ואינך עד עולם:

It is proposed that the consonantal text would favour the following division
and translation:

Proposed divisions

Son of man,	בן אדם
raise a lament over the king of Tyre	שא קינה על מלך צור
and say to him,	ואמרת לו
Thus says my lord Yahweh:	כה אמר אדני יהוה
You were one who seals an accurate measure,	אתה חותם תכלית
full of wisdom and entirely beautiful.	מלא חכמה וכליל יפי:
You were in Eden, the garden of God, every precious stone was your hedge:	בעדן גן אלהים היית כל אבן יקרה מסכתך
carnelian, topaz, and onyx;	אדם פסדה ויהלם
yellow jasper, beryl, and jasper;	תרשיש שהם וישפה
sapphire, nophel, and emerald.	ספיר נפך וברקת:
<i>[The] gold of the workings of your drums and your pipes [were] about you.</i>	זהב מלאכת חפך ונקביך קד:
<i>When you were created</i>	ביום הבראך
<i>[then] the anointed cherub, who covers, was established,</i>	כונן את כרוב ממשח הסוכך
<i>then I set you on the Holy Mountain,</i>	ונתתך בהר קדש
<i>you were אלהים,</i>	אלהים היית
in the midst of fire stones you walked.	בתוך אבני אש התהלכת:
You had integrity in your deeds	תמים אתה בדרכך
from the day of your creation	מיום הבראך

until injustice was found in you.

In the abundance of your merchandise

your midst was full of violence and you sinned,

so I cast you as a profanity from the mountain of God,

and a cherub who covers destroyed you,

from the midst stones of fire.

Your heart became exalted because of your beauty;

you ruined your wisdom on account of your splendour.

Upon the ground I cast you,

before kings I set you so as to see you.

Because of the abundance of your iniquities,

by the unrighteousness of your merchandise,

you profaned your sanctuaries.

So I brought forth fire from your midst, it consumed you,

then I made you into ashes upon the earth,

before the eyes of all who saw you.

All who know you among the peoples

are appalled because of you:

you are terrors

and you shall be nothing forevermore.

עד נמצא עולתה כד:

ברב רכלתך

מלו תוכך חמס ותחטא

ואחללך מהר אלהים

ואבדך כרוב הסכך

מתוך אבני אש:

גבה לבך ביפך

שחת חכמתך על יפעך

על ארץ השלכותך

לפני מלכים נתחך לראוה כד:

מרב עונך

בעול רכלתך

חללת מקדשך

ואוצא אש מתוכך היא אכלתך

ואתנך לאפר על הארץ

לעיני כל ראך:

כל יודעך בעמים

שממו עליך

בלהות הית

ואינך עד עולם:

Conclusions

So for the Masoretic scribe responsible for the vocalization and accentuation the figure is the cherub itself, surrounded by precious stones and adorned with gold, set on the “Holy Mountain of God”, which is also the garden of God, Eden, from which God expels him on account of his injustice. But we are now able to conclude confidently that this reading of the text is awkward and contrary to the ‘intended meaning’ of the consonantal text (see comments on page 47 for the necessary caveats that go with such a statement). Even with the vowel points and verse division stripped away, however, we have a highly complex text to deal with. There are no easy answers here, but we have been able to put forward, with only one minor emendation of the text in hand (כוננו for כונן) necessary, a consistent reading of the consonantal text that more accurately reflects the conventions of syntax and the semantic range of the vocabulary employed.

Our proposed reading of the consonantal text presents quite a different picture from that with the vocalization and accentuation: according to the consonantal text the figure is an אֱלֹהִים, who was created alongside a special protective cherub. Just as in the case of the pointed text, the figure is imbued with special wisdom and beauty. The figure dwells in a ‘paradise’ in the modern sense of the word. The location is a garden of abundant fertility, its name (עֵדֶן) quite literally indicating its nature (adj. עֵדֶן), and like the future Jerusalem (Isaiah 54:11-12), it is surrounded by rare and exotic stones. The pleasure of the setting is reflected in the figure’s instruments, used to express joy. The garden is also located on the Holy Mountain, a familiar synonym for the Jerusalem temple mount, where we find the mysterious ‘stones of fire’ (אבני־אש), presumably a further indicator of the mysterious nature of the location. It is from this ‘paradise’ that the figure is expelled on account of his

iniquity and reduced to an utter desolation. This punishment is executed by the cherub.

3. THE FALL OF THE HIGH PRIEST

The Greek Versions

Introduction

In turning our attentions to the Greek versions our primary concern is to know something of how the Greek speaking audiences for which these translations were made might have understood Ezekiel 28:12-19. To this end the Greek versions provide us with two resources: first we have the final form of the text; and secondly, we have the translation's assumed *Vorlage(n)*. Of the former we can ask: What picture does this text present as it now stands? What is this text trying to say? How might one understand this text if one just sat down and read it? Of the latter, we can ask: How has the translator deviated from his *Vorlage* and what might have been their reason for so doing? This also will tell us something of how the translator understood the passage.

Of course the situation on the ground, so to speak, is not that straightforward. We have no way of gaining access to the translators' *Vorlagen* except through the translations themselves. While this is problematic in itself, it is compounded by the inconsistencies we find between the various Greek manuscripts of Ezekiel. In other words, our only source for what lies behind the Greek is the Greek itself, but it is almost impossible to work out what constitutes 'the Greek'. It will be useful, therefore, before we discuss details of the text, to sketch in outline a probable picture of the text as a whole.

I have suggested in Chapter 1 that the earliest Greek version of Ezekiel worked from a *Vorlage* that was of a non-Masoretic recension. The evidence from Ezekiel 28:12-19 supports this conclusion. It is not that papyrus 967 witnesses an earlier text in a linear sequence; rather, it witnesses a Hebrew

text of a different recension, which for some time existed alongside the proto-Masoretic recension. Whether an *Urtext* is at the root of both recensions is a moot point given the current state of the evidence. It is impossible to know at this distance in time whether the Greek recension, the Hebrew recension, or neither represents the 'more original' text. Even if both recensions had branched off from a single text, that single text is now lost in the prehistory of the texts we have at our disposal.

The version of *Vaticanus* is dependent on a text by and large similar to that used by 967 but containing some minor differences, which are preserved in the translation. As the proto-Masoretic recension increasingly came to dominate as *the* authoritative text, the Greek version gradually underwent a process of revision towards that text. The growing importance of the proto-Masoretic form of the text is most clearly demonstrated by Symmachus, Theodotion, and Aquila all of whom make a fresh translation from the Hebrew of their day, thus giving us an insight into the state of the Hebrew around the second century CE. But these three also confirm the diversity amongst Hebrew texts at that time, at least in the case of Ezekiel 28:12-19.

While it is clear that different *Vorlagen* are responsible for some of the most significant features of the earlier Greek versions, the translators did their bit too. On the whole they demonstrate their desire to be faithful to their *Vorlage*; thus at one or two points they produce clumsy or uncomfortable Greek in order to preserve, for example, a pronoun present in the Hebrew. Yet on the whole the translators have produced a text that flows, and is much more readable than the Masoretic Hebrew. There is never the need for the reader to work over a clause to make sense of it, the sense can always be fairly readily grasped.

The story that the Greek text tells is also quite different from that expressed in the Masoretic (with or without the pointing). The Greek versions make a

primary identification of the character described in Ezekiel 28:11-19 with the High Priest. The implications of this for the overall shape of the narrative will, I hope, become clear as the analysis proceeds. I have made some suggestions as to the possible broader significance of and motivation behind this identification in my concluding remarks.

It will be useful at the outset to lay out the Greek text. I have used here the text of Ziegler's Göttingen Septuagint edition¹⁶⁶, simply because to lay out all the major Greek versions would be a Herculean undertaking, though I have drawn attention to all the variations that appear significant in the course of my discussion. Details of each of the manuscripts and manuscript grouping can be found in Ziegler's introduction.

12 Ὡς ἀνθρώπου, λάβε θρῆνον ἐπὶ τὸν ἄρχοντα Τύρου καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ Τάδε λέγει κύριος	Son of man, raise a lament over the prince of Tyre and say to him, Thus says the Lord,
Σὺ ἀποσφράγισμα ὁμοιώσεως καὶ στέφανος κάλλους	You are an impression of an image and a beautiful crown
13 ἐν τῇ τρυφῇ τοῦ παραδείσου τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγενήθης·	You were in the luxury of the paradise of God;
πᾶν λίθον χρηστὸν ἐνδέδεσαι,	Every precious stone you bound on,
σάρδιον καὶ τοπάζιον καὶ σμάραγδον καὶ ἀνθρακα καὶ σάπφιρον καὶ ἰασπιν καὶ ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον καὶ λιγύριον καὶ	sardius, and topaz, and emerald and carbuncle, and sapphire, and jasper, and silver, and gold,

¹⁶⁶ Joseph Ziegler (ed.), *Ezekiel, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum*, Vol.16, 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977).

ἀχάτην καὶ ἀμέθυστον καὶ χρυσόλιθον
καὶ βηρύλλιον καὶ ὄνυχιον,

and amber, and agate, and
amethyst, and chrysolite, and
beryl, and onyx;

καὶ χρυσοῦ ἐνέπλησας τοὺς θησαυροὺς
σου καὶ τὰς ἀποθήκας σου ἐν σοί.

and you filled full with gold
your treasure-stores and your
storehouses by yourself.

¹⁴ ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἐκτίσθης σύ, μετὰ τοῦ
χερουβ ἔθηκά σε ἐν ὄρει ἀγίῳ θεοῦ,
ἐγενήθης ἐν μέσῳ λίθων πυρίνων.

From the day [when] you were
created, I placed you with the
Cherub on the Holy Mountain
of God, you were in the midst
of fiery stones.

¹⁵ ἐγενήθης ἄμωμος σὺ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις
σου ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας σὺ ἐκτίσθης ἕως
εὐρέθη τὰ ἀδικήματα ἐν σοί.

You were blameless in your
days from that day [when] you
were created until wrongdoings
were found in you.

¹⁶ ἀπὸ πλήθους τῆς ἐμπορίας σου
ἐπλησας τὰ ταμιεῖά σου ἀνομίας καὶ
ἥμαρτες καὶ ἐτραυματίσθης ἀπὸ ὄρους
τοῦ θεοῦ,

By the multitude of your trade
you filled your treasuries with
lawlessness and you sinned and
you were wounded from the
Mountain of God

καὶ ἤγαγέ σε τὸ χερουβ ἐκ μέσου λίθων
πυρίνων.

and the Cherub led you from
the midst of the fiery stones.

¹⁷ ὑψώθη ἡ καρδία σου ἐπὶ τῷ κάλλει
σου, διεφθάρη ἡ ἐπιστήμη σου μετὰ τοῦ
κάλλους σου

Your heart was elevated because
of your beauty, your knowledge
was corrupted by (per. with)

διὰ πλῆθος ἀμαρτιῶν σου ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἔρριψά σε,	your beauty because of the multitude of your sins I hurled you upon the earth,
ἐναντίον βασιλέων ἔδωκά σε παραδειγματισθῆναι.	I presented you before kings to be made an example.
¹⁸ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν σου καὶ τῶν ἀδικιῶν τῆς ἐμπορίας σου ἐβεβήλωσα τὰ ἱερά σου·	because of the multitude of your sins and the injustices of your commerce I profaned your temples;
καὶ ἐξάξω πῦρ ἐκ μέσου σου, τοῦτο καταφάγεται σε·	and I will expel fire from your midst, this will consume you;
καὶ δώσω σε εἰς σποδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς σου ἐναντίον πάντων τῶν ὁρώντων σε.	and I will make you into ashes upon your land before all those who see you.
¹⁹ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐπιστάμενοί σε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι στυγνάσουσιν ἐπὶ σέ·	And all those who know you among the nations will be disgusted by you;
ἀπώλεια ἐγένου καὶ οὐχ ὑπάρξεις ἔτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.	you have become waste and of no substance for ever.

(Ezekiel 28:12-19)

Analysis of the Text

¹² Ὑιὲ ἀνθρώπου, λάβε θρη̄νον ἐπὶ בן אדם שא קינה על מלך צור ואמרת לו כה
 τὸν ἄρχοντα Τύρου καὶ εἶπον αὐτῶ אמר אֲדֹנֵי יהוה
 Τάδε λέγει κύριος (28:12)

These opening words reflect the Hebrew closely. Ὑιὲ ἀνθρώπου always translates בן אדם in Ezekiel except at 17:12 and 18:2, where the Greek¹⁶⁷ reads υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου where בן אדם is absent in the Masoretic text. There is one case, 33:12, where בן אדם is not represented in the Greek. Likewise θρη̄νος always translates קינה¹⁶⁸. The same Hebrew phrase (... על קינה על) in 32:2 is rendered by the same Greek, υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου λάβε θρη̄νον ἐπὶ...

Two words that have generated much discussion over the translation and transmission history of Ezekiel are of interest in this verse, Τύρος and κύριος. Both, in their own way, were used by Thackeray to support his multiple translator hypothesis.

The use of Τύρος in chapters 28-29 and the use of the alternative Σὸρ in chapters 26-26 is a linchpin for Thackeray's division of the 'translation'. Indeed, he says of this feature: "it was the difference between the appellation of the city in the earlier part of this section, where it is rendered Σὸρ, and that in the later part, where it becomes Τύρος, that first drew my attention to the change in Greek style"¹⁶⁹. But the appearance of Papyrus 967 disrupted Thackeray's schema. While Codex Vaticanus supported Thackeray's division of the text, switching from Σὸρ to Τύρος at the beginning of chapter 28, Papyrus 967 used Τύρος at 27:32, a section that Thackeray assigned to the first translator (who otherwise used Σὸρ).

¹⁶⁷ I avoid the term 'Septuagint' here for the reasons explained above on page 43. I refer to Ziegler's text on all occasions, except where I explicitly state otherwise.

¹⁶⁸ In 2:10 θρη̄νος translates קנים, probably a textual error for קינה.

¹⁶⁹ Thackeray, 'The Greek Translators of Ezekiel', 400.

As Kase rightly observed, “the occurrence of Τύρος in a section ascribed to the first translator is a remarkable addition to the numerous cases of overlapping noted by...Thackeray”¹⁷⁰. Thackeray had explained away these overlaps with the suggestion that “the second translator, before beginning his own work, read over the last portion of the work of his predecessor... while reading over these pages, he introduced some corrections of his own”¹⁷¹. But this only begs the question, Why did he not either adopt Σός or substitute Τύρος consistently¹⁷²? Kase put forward an alternative hypothesis (stressing that it was only a hypothesis!) that the variation resulted from the text being spread across two scrolls, with revision towards the Hebrew being made in one scroll but not the other¹⁷³. But perhaps a better hypothesis might be sought in the *Vorlage*. The Hebrew renders ‘Tyre’ with a mixture of *plene* and *defective* spelling (צור, צר). Although in its current form there is not a correspondence between צר and Σός and צור and Τύρος, perhaps there was in the *Vorlage* from which the Greek translators worked, and the scribe wished to do something to reflect that. Like Kase, though, I emphasise this is but a hypothesis.

The reading κύριος, where the MT reads אדני יהוה, is not the uniform reading of the Greek textual witnesses. Papyrus 967 and *Codex Alexandrinus* read κύριος by itself; the Lucianic recension (almost universally) reads αδωναι κύριος, and most of the remaining manuscripts read κύριος κύριος. Kase’s explanation for this phenomenon was that אדני יהוה has systematically

¹⁷⁰ Kase, “The Translator(s) of Ezekiel” in Johnson, Gehman, and Kase *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel*, 70; see Thackeray, ‘The Greek Translators of Ezekiel’, 406.

¹⁷¹ Thackeray, ‘The Greek Translators of Ezekiel’, 406.

¹⁷² Kase, “The Translator(s) of Ezekiel” in Johnson, Gehman, and Kase *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel*, 71.

¹⁷³ Kase, “The Translator(s) of Ezekiel” in Johnson, Gehman, and Kase *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel*, 72.

displaced the earlier reading יהוה in the MT and that the Greek had been sporadically revised towards the MT¹⁷⁴.

The important question for the present discussion is this: Would a Greek audience have recognized any distinction between Σὸρ and Τύρος, or between κύριος and ἀδωναι κύριος or κύριος κύριος? It seems unlikely that the shift in divine name would be heard as anything other than a stylistic variant: whether one hears κυριος or κυριος κυριος, there is little doubt who is being referred to. Σὸρ and Τύρος on the other hand could conceivably have caused confusion: was it one or two kings being lamented? This may have affected the wider literary context, but in the current verse the ancient Phoenician city, Tyre, would have been understood.

Σὺ ἀποσφράγισμα ὁμοιώσεως καὶ στέφανος κάλλους אתה חותם תכנית מלא תכמה וכליל יפי

As the lament opens we begin to see some more significant differences emerge. Improving on the Greek as it stands, a number of later Greek and Latin sources introduce the verb ‘to be’ (εἶ) after the pronoun σὺ, thus highlighting that earlier translators had echoed the Hebrew idiom (i.e. using the personal pronoun to express the verbal idea) at the expense of good Greek¹⁷⁵. But this close resemblance to the MT is short lived.

The noun ἀποσφράγισμα fairly literally renders the noun חֶתֶם, ‘a seal, a signet ring’ (a reading supported by all the major versions and some Hebrew manuscripts), which is a perfectly obvious reading of the consonantal text, although the MT reads the *qal* active participle (חֹתֵם). ὁμοιώσεως on the other hand does not reflect the consonantal Masoretic text, which reads תְּכַנִּית. This

¹⁷⁴ Kase, “The ‘*Nomen Sacrum*’ in Ezekiel” in Johnson, Gehman, and Kase *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel*, 51.

¹⁷⁵ See Conybeare §66.

occurs elsewhere only in Ezekiel 43:10 and is obscure in both places. *ὁμοίως* would fairly literally render תְּבִיטָה, which we must assume was either in the *Vorlage* (many Hebrew manuscripts in fact read תְּבִיטָה) or was understood by the translator. The former seems more likely. Indeed, of three other occurrences of תְּבִיטָה in Ezekiel, one forms part of a phrase absent in the Greek (8:10), and the remaining two are rendered by *ὁμοίωμα*, a near synonym of *ὁμοίως* from the same root (8:3; 10:8).

Aquila reads the apparently odd σφραγίς ἐτοιμασίων, “a seal of preparations”. σφραγίς, like ἀποσφράγισμα, translates חֹתֶם fairly literally, while ἐτοιμασίων is more obscure. Aquila was clearly working from a text that read תְּבִיטָה (or similar), not תְּבִיטָה, since ἐτοιμασία must ultimately be derived from בָּן, ‘to prepare, be ready’. It is possible that Aquila had the noun תְּבִיטָה before him in his *Vorlage*.

Alternatively, he may have derived his reading from the form תְּבִיטָה, by association with 43:10 where the same form (תְּבִיטָה) occurs. At 43:10 the Vulgate and Targum understand the perplexing form by apparently adopting the form תְּבִיטָה (in place of MT’s תְּבִיטָה) from the following verse (43:11).

Perhaps Aquila, failing to understand תְּבִיטָה in its context in 28:12, looked to the only other occurrence of this form (in 43:10) for guidance. Finding that the form תְּבִיטָה in 43:10 could easily be understood in light of the form תְּבִיטָה in the following verse (43:11), he was then able to transport this meaning back into 28:12.

A final possibility is that he simply took תְּבִיטָה as an otherwise unknown noun form derived from בָּן. Whichever is the correct explanation, Aquila (and also Theodotion who reads ἐτοιμασίας) attest the presence of a *Kaph* not a *Beth* in the word in their *Vorlagen*.

Many of the later witnesses (e.g. hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions) insert here πλήρης σοφίας to reflect חכמה מלאה in the MT. Ziegler is undoubtedly correct in seeing a later revision towards the MT here: the most reliable and earliest Greek versions do not witness it. For this there are three possible explanations. Either the earliest Greek versions omitted it, or we have a later insertion into the Hebrew; or we have a case of the MT and Greek versions reflecting two distinct recensions (as we concluded was the case with Ezek. 36:23b-38. See my discussion above, Chapter 1). The first or second explanation requires us to answer the questions, What difference does the wisdom of the figure make? Why might the Greek translators want to exclude it? Why might a scribe wish to add it to the Hebrew? I see no reason whatsoever for the Greek to exclude it. After all the translator is happy to translate “you ruined your wisdom” (שחת חכמתך) in 28:17, so why should wisdom not feature here? Nor does *homoioarkton* seem a likely explanation in the context. 28:17 might provide an explanation for its appearance in the MT: perhaps a scribe felt he needed to remedy a perceived inconsistency, if ‘beauty’ and ‘wisdom’ both appeared in verse 17 but only ‘beauty’ appeared in verse 12. Of course one might then expect the two abstract nouns to appear in the same order. The figure of Hiram from Tyre, who worked on Solomon’s temple, may also have been lurking in the back of the scribe’s mind, since he is described as וימלא אתה חכמה (‘and he was full of wisdom’). Neither, I believe, provide a sufficient explanation for the ‘expansion’, and given the likelihood that a different *Vorlage* is at work later in the lament, it seems more likely that the MT and the Greek versions have simply followed two distinct recensions.

The translator’s use of στέφανος to translate the Hebrew כלייל raises some questions. στέφανος usually translates עטרה ‘crown’, and this is what it translates in the three other occurrences in the Greek of Ezekiel (16:12; 21:26

[31]; 23:42) and all other examples in Hebrew Bible (2 Sam 12:30; 1 Chron 20:2; Esther 8:15; Job 19:9; 31:36; Ps.21:4; 65:12; 103:4 participle; Prov. 4:9; 12:4; 14:24;16:31; 17:6; Zech 6:11, 14; Lam 5:16; Isa 28:1, 3, 5; 62:3; Jeremiah 13:18; Song 3:11) with the following exceptions: Proverbs 1:9, Isaiah 22:18, 22:21, and Lamentations 2:15.

Proverbs 1:9 is of little significance: there, στεφᾶνος is translating לִוְיָהּ 'wreath'. Likewise at Isaiah 22:18, where it seems the translator has been perplexed by צִנּוּף יִצְנַפֵּךְ צִנּוּפָה, rendering it τὸν στεφάνον σου τὸν ἐνδοξόν, we learn little to assist us in elucidating the Greek of Ezekiel. Isaiah 22:21 and Lamentations 2:15, however, are of greater significance.

Lamentations 2:15 translates כָּלִיל יָפִי כָּלִילָה with στεφᾶνος δόξης (context: 'All who pass along the way clap their hands at you; they hiss and wag their heads at the daughter Jerusalem; "Is this the city that was called the perfection of beauty, the joy of all the earth?")¹⁷⁶. But how did the Greek get στεφᾶνος from the Hebrew כָּלִיל? One possible explanation is found in the Aramaic, which has כָּלִיל, כָּלִילָה 'circle, wreath, crown' and the verb כָּלַל, both of which are used for the Hebrew noun עֲטָרָה and verb עָטַר respectively in the targumim (e.g. noun Tg. Isa. 28:5; Tg. Job 31:36; verb Tg. Cant. 3:11; Tg. Ps 65:12 [LXX 64:12]). Perhaps the similarity in form and sound caused confusion. It is true that there are verbal notions in Hebrew that might be held to explain the translation 'crown' (כֹּל 'to contain', כָּלַל 'to complete', כָּלָה 'to be complete'), but such an explanation would be tenuous.

Isaiah 22:21 translates אֲבִנְטָךְ 'girdle' with τὸν στεφάνον σου, στεφᾶνος ultimately meaning 'that which encircles' deriving from the root στέφω. What makes this translation particularly notable is the rarity of אֲבִנְטָ, which apart from this one occurrence in Isaiah occurs only in the description of the

¹⁷⁶ Cf. LXX Jer 13:18, which has στεφᾶνος δόξης for עֲטָרַת תְּפֹאֲרוֹתֶיךָ 'crown of your glory'.

costume of priests (Ex 28:40; 29:9; Lev 8:13) or the High Priest (Ex 28:4, 39; 39:29; Lev 8:7; 16:4). An association with Isaiah 22:21 seems more likely when one considers its context, in which a description of God’s servant nestles among a series of oracles against nations, and is immediately followed by an oracle against Tyre. Did the translator(s) of Ezekiel know the Greek version of Isaiah? If an association of some kind between the two texts does indeed exist here, its significance will become apparent in the Greek of Ezekiel 28:13 where, as we shall see, an allusion to the High Priest is explicit.

¹³ ἐν τῇ τρυφῇ τοῦ παραδείσου τοῦ
θεοῦ ἐγενήθης·

בעדן גן אלהים היית

The Greek translator(s) handle the consonantal Hebrew here fairly literally (assuming their *Vorlage* resembled MT at this point), but understands it in a different way from the Masoretes. MT reads בעדן without the definite article (i.e. בְּעֵדֶן), taking עֵדֶן as referring to the location, Eden, and setting עֵדֶן and גן אלהים in apposition (i.e. “in Ēden, the garden of God”). Equally true to the consonantal text, the Greek translator(s) read with the definite article (ἐν τῇ), understanding τρυφή as the noun ‘luxury, delight’ in the construct state.

παράδεισος is used in the Greek of Eden (e.g. Genesis 2:8, 9, 10, 16; 3:1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 23, 24; Isaiah 51:3; Joel 2:3), of the garden of God / the Lord (Genesis 13:10; Ezekiel 31:8) as well as of normal gardens (e.g. Numbers 24:6; 2 Chronicles 33:20; Ezra 12:8; Ecclesiastes 2:5; Isaiah 1:30; Jeremiah 29:5). Which connotation, if any, did the translator(s) intend to convey here?

Outside of Ezekiel there are two interesting examples. In Genesis 2:15 the Greek translators render בְּגֵן־עֵדֶן simply by ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ. Of course the context of Genesis 2:15 means that there is little doubt about which garden is being referred to but, assuming the translator’s *Vorlage* to be the same as MT and that this is not simply a scribal error, this usage might imply that

παραδείσος could indicate the garden of *Eden*, as a kind of shorthand; so Ezekiel 28:13 might have meant “the garden (i.e. of Eden) of luxury”. Perhaps this is what is intended in Genesis 3:23 and 24, where παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς translates גֶּן־עֵדֶן, a parallel to Ezekiel 28:13. Given the context, there can be no doubt whatsoever that the translator knew the reference was to the particular garden, Eden. There is a reason for the Genesis translator’s choice to be found in the Hebrew: where גֶּן is immediately preceded by a preposition (2:8, 10) or a noun functioning as a preposition (גֶּן־תְּמָר, 4:16) the translator used the proper noun, Εδεμ. In those cases where Εδεμ is not used in the Greek, גֶּן is preceded by the noun ג in construct state (e.g. 2:15; 3:23, 24).

Within Ezekiel the handling of גֶּן is very telling. Nowhere is it translated as a proper noun, Εδεμ, indicating a location. Instead the translator reads the homonym and translates with the noun τρυφή. So Ezekiel 31:16 גֶּן־עֵדֶן־לְבָּ is rendered by πάντα τὰ ξύλα τῆς τρυφῆς; and 31:18 גֶּן־עֵדֶן־תְּמָר by μετὰ τῶν ξύλων τῆς τρυφῆς. Ezekiel 31:9 and 36:35 are more complex. 31:9 reads עֵצֵי־הַגֶּן־הַזֶּה גַּם רָשָׁה גֶּן־עֵדֶן־לְבָּ וְהֵאָנְקוּ, “all the trees of Eden, which were in the garden of God, envied it” for which the Greek has, και ἐζήλωσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ξύλα τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς τοῦ θεοῦ, “the trees of the garden of the delight of God envied it”. The translator has clearly sought to smooth out the awkward placing of the relative clause after the verb, but in so doing makes it unclear whether it is ‘the garden of the delight of God’ or ‘the garden of the delight of God’. In 36:35 גֶּן־גְּמָה הָיְתָה הַמִּשְׁמָה הַזֶּה לְגֶן־עֵדֶן “The land that was desolate became like the garden of Eden’ is rendered by the Greek ἡ γῆ ἐκεῖνη ἢ ἠφανισμένη ἐγενήθη ὡς κήπος τρυφῆς, ‘this obliterated land become like a garden of delight’. Theodotion also uses κήπος for ג in 28:13.

In all these cases the grammatical convention identified in Genesis fits perfectly. As in Genesis, גֶּן is preceded by another noun in the construct

state, and is therefore appropriately translated with the noun τρυφή. To this collection might be added the one example from LXX Joel (2:3) in which רַעֲוֹב is rendered $\omega\varsigma \text{παράδεισος τρυφῆς}$.

There are, however, two important exceptions to this convention: Isaiah 51:3 reads $\omega\varsigma \text{παράδεισον}$ where the MT reads רַעֲוֹב , and of course Ezekiel 28:13 reads $\epsilon\nu \tau\eta \text{τρυφῆ}$ where the MT reads רַעֲוֹב . This raises serious questions for the current discussion. Why does the translator not use the proper noun, Eden? Did the translator of Ezekiel know a Greek translation of Genesis? If so, why would he avoid the proper noun, Eden? Would the Greek reader have understood 'the garden of delight' as a reference to Eden? Would the translator of Ezekiel have thought of this as a reference to the primeval garden, without the need to identify the location? Or is another sort of garden in mind (perhaps the garden of God of Ezekiel 31:8)? Did the translator have a reason to obscure a reference to the garden of Genesis 2-3?

These are not easy questions to answer. 'Eden' does not appear to have assumed any major significance in Israelite religious literature until the rise of apocalyptic literature, when it began to become associated with the eschatological 'paradise', e.g., 1 Enoch 23-28 (second century BCE); Apocalypse of Sedrach 4-9, especially 9:1 (date uncertain, 150 – 500 CE); 2 Esdras 8:52 (end 1st Century CE); Revelation 2:7 (end 1st Century CE), cf. b.Taanith 31a¹⁷⁷. Given our dating of the translation of Ezekiel (i.e. middle of the second century BCE) it is difficult to know with any certainty what significance, if any, our translator would have found in the noun Eden, and as such the question as to whether he was deliberately avoiding it or not becomes a moot point.

¹⁷⁷ Said Ula Biraah in the name of R. Elazar: "In the future the Holy One, blessed be He, will make a ring of the righteous, and He will sit among them in the garden of Eden, and they everyone will point to Him with their fingers, as it is written (Isaiah, 25:9): 'And men will say on that day, Lo, this is our God, for whom we have waited that He would help us: this is the Lord, for whom we have waited; we will be glad and we will rejoice in His salvation'".

The Greek version continues:

πᾶν λίθον χρηστὸν ἐνδέδεσαι,
σάρδιον καὶ τοπάζιον καὶ
σμάραγδον καὶ ἄνθρακα καὶ
σάπφιρον καὶ ἰασπιν καὶ ἀργύριον
καὶ χρυσίον καὶ λιγύριον καὶ
ἀγάτην καὶ ἀμέθυστον καὶ
χρυσόλιθον καὶ βηρύλλιον καὶ
ὄνυχιον

כל אבן יקרה מסכתך אדם פטדה ויהלם
תרשיש שהם וישפה ספיר נפך וברקת

While πᾶν λίθον χρηστὸν renders כל אבן יקרה reasonably literally, it is hard to see quite how ἐνδέδεσαι might relate to מסכתך, an obscure form. There are a number of possible Hebrew verbal roots from which מסכתך might be derived (סכך 'to cover, protect'; סכך 'to weave together'; סוך 'to hedge, fence'; סוך 'to pour, anoint'; סנן 'to pour out'; נסך 'to weave'; מסך 'to mix'). None, however, could conceivably reflect ἐνδέω ('to bind, tie'). The solution is to be found in the stones. The Greek alludes to the high-priest's pectoral of Exodus 28:17-20 and 39:10-13 (=LXX 36:17-21); whereas the Hebrew creates a picture of a glorious location hedged round about by exotic stones (see above on page 56).

Papyrus 967 has the twelve stones, enumerated in the order of the high-priest's breastplate as in Exodus, where the stones are arranged over four rows:

- 1: σάρδιον, τοπάζιον καὶ σμάραγδος
- 2: ἄνθραξ καὶ σάπφιρος καὶ ἰασπιδ
- 3: λιγύριον, ἀγάτης καὶ ἀμέθυστον
- 4: χρυσόλιθος καὶ βηρύλλιον καὶ ὄνυχιον

Exodus 28:17-20

With few exceptions, the majority of the Greek versions read 'gold and silver' in the middle of the list, between the second and third triplet of stones. The Greek versions, therefore, are quite distinct from the Masoretic text, which has only nine stones, in an order quite distinct from Exodus (see above on page 54). What are we to make of all this?

Had the Greek translators been working with the text witnessed in the MT, their translation would have looked similar to the following:

σάρδιον, τοπάζιον καὶ ἰασπιν, χρυσόλιθον,
βηρύλλιον καὶ ὄνυχιον, σάπφιρον, ἄνθρακα καὶ
σμάραγδον.

So either the Greek translators had before them a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, or their translation has been very clumsy or creative.

Johan Lust, on the grounds that Papyrus 967 reflects the earliest stage in the growth of the Hebrew text, concluded that the oracle originally applied to the Jerusalem and its high-priest, not to Tyre and its king. Lust supports Bogaert's view that the 'gold and silver' were inserted when the lament was transferred from Jerusalem to Tyre, and suggested that the Masoretic text had truncated the list of precious stones to avoid a direct association with the high-priest¹⁷⁸. Bogaert supported the conclusion that the lament was originally addressed to Jerusalem by using details from the text itself: whether in the Hebrew, with its nine disorganised stones or in the more explicit Greek, Bogaert saw the allusion to the pectoral as unmistakable, and added to this the Cherub and the holiness of the mountain, as being features indicative of Jerusalem¹⁷⁹.

We have already rejected Lust's picture of a linear progression of versions (with Papyrus 967 predating the Masoretic consonantal text) on the basis of

¹⁷⁸ Lust, 'Stepbrothers?', 24.

¹⁷⁹ Bogaert, 'Montagne Sainte, Jardin d'Éden et Sanctuaire', 136-40.

the finds from Masada (see my discussion in Chapter 1): yet even were we to accept his explanation of the development of the Greek version, his explanation that the Masoretic tradition has meddled with the text to obscure a reference to the high-priest would still be difficult to accept. If a scribe is prepared to remove three stones from a list and confuse the order, why would he not eliminate any possible confusion by changing the section entirely so that not even the faintest hint of the high-priest's pectoral remained? Without an adequate response to this, Lust's thesis on this point is weak. In short, if we were to assume that the MT reflects the earliest text of Ezekiel 28:11-19 at this point one can see how and why the Greek translation might have ended up with the text it now has. However, if we assume that the Greek reflects an earlier or 'more original' version of the text, there is no good reason why a Hebrew scribe would have transformed it into what we now find in the MT.

Zimmerli at this point makes an altogether less plausible suggestion: on the grounds that "the enumeration of them [the nine stones of MT] destroys the parallelism between the two parts of M... כל אבן יקרה מסכתך // זהב מלאכת תפיד" it should be removed as a secondary insertion"¹⁸⁰. Wevers also sees this as a secondary insertion based on Exodus. Zimmerli and Wevers, like Bogaert, do not see the omission of three stones and disorder of the remaining list as obscuring its basic identity with the breast plate of the high priest. This makes their suggestion that the stones are a later insertion all the more perplexing. If a scribe were making an insertion into the text to create a reference to Exodus, surely that scribe would have done it more convincingly? Cooke seeks to resolve the problem. Cooke accepts that the stones are a secondary insertion, added by "some reader who was tempted to specify them [the gems]"¹⁸¹. To explain the omission and disorder Cooke suggested that the Greek "had given

¹⁸⁰ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 82.

¹⁸¹ Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 316.

equivalents which involved a clash of colours, and to avoid this some rearrangement was made, and three of the twelve stones dropped out in the process"¹⁸². This is a purely subjective impression, lacking any supporting evidence; it is astonishing that Wevers even countenances this suggestion¹⁸³. I do not object, on principal, to the possibility that the catalogue of the stones represents a later insertion into the text, but if that were indeed to be the case surely it can only have been inserted into the form attested in the Greek.

Considering the Greek versions and MT, Bogaert comes much closer to the mark when he observes "it is difficult to decide which is the original text in a case such as this one"¹⁸⁴. But Bogaert's own conclusion that the oracle must originally have been addressed to Jerusalem is questionable on two counts. First, the allusion to the pectoral in the Masoretic text is not strong despite Bogaert's protestations to the contrary¹⁸⁵. There is significant *dissimilarity* between the lists of Exodus and Ezekiel that requires an explanation if an association or allusion is to be maintained. Secondly, Bogaert's theory fails to take into account the intermingling of 'paradise' and Temple imagery. According to 1 Kings 7-6 and 2 Chronicles 3-4 the decoration of Solomon's temple resembled a garden, including palm trees, blossoming flowers (צצים) and lilies, gourds, and pomegranates, all in abundance. In fact, Bogaert undermines his own argument when he observes that, "the superimposition of Eden, of the holy mountain and the temple is a common feature of religious language"¹⁸⁶. So it seems clear that (in the Hebrew at least) an allusion could

¹⁸² Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 316-7.

¹⁸³ Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 217.

¹⁸⁴ "Il est délicat de décider où est le texte original dans un cas comme celui-ci": Bogaert, 'Montagne Sainte, Jardin d'Éden et Sanctuaire', 137.

¹⁸⁵ "le texte hébreu reçu d'Éz 28,13 offre avec la description du pectoral dans l'Exode une ressemblance impressionnante": Bogaert, 'Montagne Sainte, Jardin d'Éden et Sanctuaire', 137-8.

¹⁸⁶ "La superposition de l'Éden, de la montagne sainte et du temple est une donnée commune du langage religieux": Bogaert, 'Montagne Sainte, Jardin d'Éden et Sanctuaire', 139.

not be made to the primeval garden without in some sense bringing to mind the Temple. Consequently, while it seems irrefutable that an allusion to the Jerusalem temple is evident in the Greek versions, no such allusion can be said necessarily to exist in the Hebrew.

If fact, any attempt to seek out an alternative addressee for the lament on the grounds that the lament contains 'Israelite' imagery yet refers to a pagan monarch reflects a fundamental failure to apprehend the literary device at work: that of analogy. A parallel is being drawn between the king of Tyre and some other figure, who provides the model for the king of Tyre's downfall.

Given that it is implausible to suggest that the MT has dramatically altered a Hebrew text now reflected in Papyrus 967, and given that the overall shape of Papyrus 967 (and some of its successors) strongly suggests it was working from a *Vorlage* distinct from the MT, and given that Papyrus 967 generally reflects a shorter text, we must fall back on our conclusion reached previously that the MT and Papyrus 967 do not mark stages on a single linear continuum, but rather reflect two independent recension traditions (see my discussion in Chapter 1). This is probably how the differences between the Greek and MT at this point are to be accounted for, although of course the possibility remains that the Greek translator had recourse to the tradition of Exodus. Regardless of whether we see this as an editorial emendation or reflecting a 'more original' text, what appears in Papyrus 967 is a clear and unequivocal reference to the high-priest, and no such reference is present in the MT.

One question remains at this point. Why do many manuscripts, including *Codex Vaticanus*, add "gold and silver" in the middle of the list of precious stones? The argument that "gold and silver" were added when the lament was transferred from Jerusalem to Tyre is inadequate: if the intention was to obscure an allusion to the high-priest then surely it has failed in its aim (given

the prominence of the Pentateuch, it is hard to imagine that the presence of gold and silver in the middle of the list would have led many to miss the similarity), and if the intention were to emphasise opulence, then surely twelve precious stones would be enough to indicate that! One possible alternative is that a corruption has occurred in the Greek. In Exodus 28:19 a handful of (admittedly rather late) manuscripts reads ἀργύριον where the main text reads λιγύριον. Whether these manuscripts reflect much earlier manuscripts cannot be known; but they at least demonstrate that corruption from λιγύριον to ἀργύριον is possible. Finding ‘silver’ in the middle of a list of stones might well have confused a scribe, who revising the text restored λιγύριον (either based on the Hebrew or another Greek version), then supplied ‘gold’ to create a neat couplet (perhaps transposing from the following clause), consequently rescuing gold from isolation.

καὶ χρυσοῦ ἐνέπλησας τοὺς
 θησαυροὺς σου καὶ τὰς ἀποθήκας
 σου ἐν σοί

והב מלאכת תפיד ונקבדך בד

The Hebrew here is difficult. The division and punctuation of the section in the MT results in a reading along the following lines, ‘[the] workings of your $\eta\eta$ and your $\eta\eta$ were established upon / around / about you in the day of your creation’. The Greek versions come up with something quite different, “and you filled full with gold your treasure-stores and your storehouses by¹⁸⁷ yourself”.

The key factor affecting the Greek is the extent and division of the verse. Whereas the MT includes the ‘gold’ with the precious stones the Greek recognizes that ‘gold’ does not form part of this list, and so the new clause

¹⁸⁷ For ἐν expressing instrumental see Conybeare §91.

begins with χρυσίου. The MT places the division after the verb כונו, creating the clause מלאכת תפיד ונקבדך בך ביום הבראך כונו, with כונו as the main verb.

Given the near impossibility of making sense of the consonantal MT as it stands, it would be understandable if at some stage כונו had simply been omitted for the sake of ease, although it is difficult to know whether the Greek translators or their *Vorlage* were responsible for this (I can imagine a Hebrew scribe as much as a Greek translator wishing to make such an omission).

So here, in starting the clause with the gold (זהב) and ending with (בך), the Greek translator has made more sense of the consonantal Hebrew at this point than it seems the Masoretes have done (see above on page 57). However this is not to say they have rendered the Hebrew slavishly or even understood it fully, although the presence of ἐν σοί (for בך), which is clumsy in the Greek (and probably for this reason omitted in the Ethiopic), suggests they have at least attempted to be reasonably truthful to whatever *Vorlage* they had.

The Greek versions either found written in their *Vorlage*, or decided to read, מלאח (or possibly מלאך, the infinitive construct + suffix) for MT מלאכת. It seems likely that the Greek or its *Vorlage* abandoned the noun (מלאכה) in favour of the verb, perplexed by תפיד ונקבדך and with בך to contend with at the end of the clause. In other words, the clause needed a verb, so the Greek translator obliges. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, probably working sometime in the second century CE, all reflect the noun of the MT (reading ἔργον), suggesting that this particular discrepancy may be rightly attributable to the translator, not his *Vorlage*.

θησαυρούς σου καὶ τὰς ἀποθήκας σου attempts to render תפיד ונקבדך, but is clearly nothing more than a guess based on the context and association with what the Greek translator identified as the verb מלא. Elsewhere θησαυρός normally translates אוצר (Deut. 28:12; 32:34; Josh. 6:19, 24, and a further 58 examples), and occasionally translates מטמון (e.g. Gen. 43:23; Job 3:21; Prov.

2:4; Jer. 41:8 [48:8]), עָצַר (Judges 18:7), תְּבוּאָתָה (Prov. 3:14), and בְּגוּי (Ezek. 27:24). None of these words shows even a passing resemblance to תָּפִיךְ. The observation is valid for ἀποθήκη too, which translates (ל)מִשְׁמֶרֶת (Exodus 16:23, 32), טָנָא (Deut 28:5, 17), חָצַר (1 Chron 28:11, 12), (ל)אֹצֵר (1 Chron 29:8), and (מ)אֲבוֹס (Jer. 50:26 [27:26]).

¹⁴ ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἐκτίσθης σύ,

ביום הבראך

The slight clumsiness created in the Greek by ἐν σοί (see above on page 99) is here reflected by the appearance of the pronoun after the verb, at least in the major early witnesses, e.g. Papyrus 967, *Vaticanus*, *Alexandrinus*. The second singular aorist passive verb by itself would have done the job quite adequately. That the MT has the *niphal* infinitive construct with suffix and not a *niphal* perfect obviously complicates matters. Either the Greek translator had before him a *niphal* perfect followed by a pronoun and has rendered that faithfully or, as seems more likely, the translator has attempted to express the sense intended by the Hebrew infinitive construct without feeling slavishly bound to replicating the form of the verb, but without wishing the pronominal suffix to go unacknowledged.

μετὰ τοῦ χειροῦ β' ἔθηκά σε ἐν ὄρει
ἀγίῳ θεοῦ

כוננו אֶת־כְּרוֹב מִמֶּשַׁח הַסּוּבָךְ וְנִתְתִּיךְ בְּהַר
קֹדֶשׁ אֱלֹהִים

With the exception of the main manuscripts of the late Lucianic recension, none of the manuscripts shows knowledge or recognition of כוננו, and so picks up the Hebrew at אֶת־כְּרוֹב. The reading of אֶת as the preposition 'with', as opposed to the direct object marker, is universal among the Greek versions. This strong preference for the preposition would suggest that כוננו was absent in the recension from which earliest translations into Greek were made.



The witness of Symmachus and Aquila here is instructive. Symmachus reads *κατεσκευάσθης* ‘you were prepared’ (reading *polal* כּוֹנֵן?) and Aquila reads the participle *ἐτοίμασας* (root *ἐτοιμάζω* ‘to prepare’, thus giving *σύ* a function), both pointing to the presence of כּוֹנֵן (or similar) in the recension from which they worked sometime in the second century CE. כּוֹנֵן is unlikely to be an explanatory addition to the Hebrew (as Cooke¹⁸⁸) since it only makes the text more confusing. Symmachus and Aquila were motivated by a desire to eliminate the deficiencies of the Greek Bible of the Christians by producing new translations from the Hebrew. By the time they came to make their translation a proto-Masoretic text had become dominant for the rabbinic world they most probably inhabited. This is the text they used, so they represent a fresh translation from a Hebrew text of the second century CE. I have argued that two different recensions lie behind the Greek and Masoretic Hebrew, and the witness of Symmachus and Aquila at this point would seem to support that view.

Assuming כּוֹנֵן was absent in the *Vorlage* of the majority of the early Greek witnesses then the most obvious reading of the Hebrew אִת would be as the preposition ‘with’; but this would have presented the translator with a problem if his *Vorlage* was otherwise the same as MT, since ‘with a cherub’ could not have stood as a phrase by itself. The translator finds his required verb in נָתַתְּ, ‘I set you’, which the majority of witnesses render with the root τίθημι, which accurately captures the idiom (other late witnesses prefer the slavishly literal δίδωμι). The Hebrew קָדַשׁ אֱלֹהִים בְּהַר then forms a neat indirect object clause for the translator.

Although the final product in the Greek is a neat and tidy sentence the two words מִמֶּשַׁח and הַסּוֹכֵךְ are absent, as is the *waw* preceding נָתַתְּ. Were these

¹⁸⁸ Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 317.

absent in the *Vorlage* or did the translator choose to admit them? If כונו were absent in the *Vorlage*, as I have suggested, then we might expect that the *waw* would also be absent. ממשח and הסוכך are less straightforward. As we might expect, a small number of manuscripts, principally from the Lucianic recension, revise towards the MT, inserting κεχρῖσμενος (perhaps reading Qal מִשָּׁח) τοῦ κατασκήνουντος καὶ ('anointed [cherub] of covering and...') at the appropriate juncture. This is also the reading of Symmachus and Origen's emended Theodotion (marked by the asterisk), so a proto-Masoretic Hebrew text was evidently in existence by the second century CE. When the Cherub is again mentioned in verse 16 more or less the same witnesses add τὸ σκιάζον ('the covering, shading [cherub]').

These later witnesses tell us something of what kind of Hebrew text was in existence from the second century CE and onwards, but tells us nothing regarding the earliest Greek versions and their *Vorlage*, which with one exception show no evidence of ממשח and הסוכך in verse 14 or הסכך in verse 16. That one exception is Papyrus 967, which reads in verse 16 τοσεχ. We will discuss this in detail later; here we need only observe that it shows evidence of the existence of a word obviously similar to the הסכך of the MT in the *Vorlage* from which 967 worked. So we cannot dismiss out of hand the presence of ממשח and הסוכך in the *Vorlage* of the earliest Greek manuscripts. But if ממשח and הסוכך were present, why does 967 attempt to render הסכך (or similar) in verse 16 (if that is what is going on) but not in verse 14? If it were there in the *Vorlage* of the earliest Greek manuscripts what would be the translator's motivation for omitting it? It is possible that verse 16 provides a clue: the Greek versions read אבדך as a 3rd singular perfect with pronominal suffix, with the Cherub as subject (κατήγαγεν σε τὸ χερουβ). Perhaps the logic ran something along these lines: if the cherub is doing the expelling, how can he be a *protecting* cherub? The association with the Ark-cherubim

(e.g. Ex. 25:20, etc), triggered by the presence of the root (סכך), may also have provided a motivation for avoiding ממשח and הסוכך altogether: the Ark-cherubim shadow the mercy seat, and do not go hither and thither expelling self-inflated individuals from God's paradise. But while there is reason for the Greek translators to avoid such implications in the Hebrew, is it really likely that the Greek translator would have simply omitted two words? They struggle to make sense of תף and נקב in verse 13, would they not also have sought some equivalent here?

Whether in the *Vorlage*, or in the work of the translator, the effect created by the absence of ממשח and הסוכך is the same, and the contrast between the Masoretic and the Greek portrayal of the cherub is stark. In the MT, the addressee is identified with the cherub and is characterised in a positive way, anointed and, like the Ark-cherubim, a guardian. Thus in the Masoretic text the addressee's fall from grace is emphasised by these appellations. In the Greek versions the cherub's role is entirely different: he is a mere functionary, a divine agent who is there to perform one job, the expulsion. In other words, there is nothing special about this cherub.

ἐγενήθης ἐν μέσῳ λίθων πυρίνων.

היית בתוך אבני אש התהלכת

In the Masoretic text **קדש אלהים** בהר קדש אלהים was read as a single phrase, I have argued, to avoid the obvious identification of the addressee as אלהים in the consonantal text (see above on page 70f). In the Greek versions the same logic is at work, except for the Greek translators the notion that the addressee might be אלהים is never even considered at this point, because the addressee has already been identified with the high-priest in verse 13. Of course where the text appeared disturbed, the Greek translators were able to use the freedom afforded to them by the process of translating to create a smooth, flowing, text in a way the Masoretes were not able to do.

That the Greek versions retain בהר קדש אלהים as a single phrase (ἐν ὄρει ἁγίῳ θεοῦ) best explains what follows. We observed in our discussion of the MT that the retention of בהר קדש אלהים as a single phrase caused נתתך to become redundant, so the passage becomes divided as follows (underlining indicates the verbal idea):

כוננו

את כרוב ממשח הסוכ

ינתתך

בהר קדש אלהים היית

בתוך אבני אש התהלכת

But for the Greek translator this cannot be so. Without כוננו he would have needed a verb to make sense of את כרוב. This he finds in נתתך, which turns בהר קדש אלהים into an indirect object phrase that no longer requires its own verb. The translator is then left with היית בתוך אבני אש התהלכת. One of the verbs must disappear for the clause to make sense, so the translator opts for the latter¹⁸⁹. What was four clauses in MT becomes just two in the Greek.

כוננו את כרוב ממשח הסוכך-נתתך בהר קדש אלהים

היית בתוך אבני אש התהלכת

There may be no particular reason for the choice of verb, however, התהלכת may well have reminded the translators of the divine presence that accompanied Israel in the tent sanctuaries (e.g. Lev. 26:12; Deut. 23:15; 2 Sam. 7:6-7), or as seems more likely, the Lord God "moving about" (מתהלך) in the garden of Eden. In opting for the more neutral verb the translator avoids any unwanted connotations.

¹⁸⁹ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 86, who generally gives the Greek precedence, supports the view of an omission in the Greek here, "התהלכת... may simply have been omitted because the preceding words were taken with היית".

But while **התהלכת** has to be omitted from the clause to avoid an excess of verbs, it need not have left the text by necessity. As Papyrus 967 witnesses, it can equally be taken with what follows (reading *ἐγενήθη ἐν μέσῳ λίθων πυρίνων ἐπορεύθη ἄμωμος σὺ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις σοῦ*). So it seems likely that the verb has been deliberately omitted by the translators here, since it was clearly present in the *Vorlage* from which 967 worked.

¹⁵ ἐγενήθη ἄμωμος <u>σὺ</u> ἐν <u>ταῖς</u>	תמים אתה <u>בדרכך</u> מיום הבראך עד נמצא
<u>ἡμέραις</u> σου ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας σὺ	עולתה בך
ἐκτίσθη ἕως εὐρέθη τὰ ἀδικήματα	
ἐν σοί.	

The major Greek witnesses omit reference to **התהלכת** altogether, yet 967, the Lucianic recension, and a great many Latin sources, find a home for it at the beginning of verse 15. The text 967's translator had before him would probably have looked as follows:

את כרוב ~~ממשה הסוכך~~ ונתתך בהר קדש אלהים
 היית בתוך אבני אש התהלכת תמים אתה...

Facing such a text the translator experiences the same problem as the Masoretes had done at this point: too many verbs (including pronouns with 'verbal' force; see above on page 70f). For the Masoretes the verb stands (uncharacteristically in biblical Hebrew) at the end of each clause (which renders **נתתך** otiose); for the Greek translators the verbs fall at the start of each clause (as is more often the case in biblical Hebrew). 967 follows this pattern in dealing with **התהלכת תמים אתה**. Whereas the majority of Greek witnesses assume both **התהלכת** and the preceding **היית** refer to the 'stones of fire', and so omit **התהלכת**, 967 rightly observes that **התהלכת** might just as well refer to what follows reading, *ἐπορεύθη ἄμωμος σὺ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις*. One problem remains in the Hebrew: **אתה**. The pronoun is here taken by the

majority of Greek witnesses to be acting predicatively ('you were...'), and hence they conclude that התהלכת goes with the fire stones. The Masoretes take אתה the same way, starting a new sentence with תמים אתה, 'you were blameless'. Having preserved התהלכת, 967 now finds אתה to be superfluous yet translates it all the same, creating Greek that is not at all easy to translate sensibly, with σὺ sitting incongruously in the middle.

Strangely, those witnesses that supply the verb (ἐγενήθης) also read the pronoun. It is impossible that they read היית for התהלכת, so they must have understood אתה as supplying the verbal idea. A number of manuscripts transpose ἄμωμος σὺ, so σὺ simply emphasises the verb, but those that do not transpose ἄμωμος σὺ demonstrate their desire to reflect their *Vorlage* at the expense of their Greek.

Symmachus and Aquila in their translation direct from the rabbinically approved Hebrew of their day also acknowledge התהלכת: Symmachus with the root ἀναστρέφω, 'to turn every way', and Aquila with the root ἐμπεριπατέω, 'to walk about'. Theodotion complicated matters somewhat at this point reading ἡτοίμασθης, second singular aorist passive from the root ἑτοιμάζω, 'to make oneself ready, to prepare oneself'. What makes Theodotion's reading so odd is that in all likelihood he derives this from the root כן, probably in the *hiphil* (in the second person, הכינות or possibly הכינת), cf. Gen. 43:25; Ex. 15:17; 23:20; Jos. 1:11; 1 Sam. 7:3, etc. He had used the same root for כונונו at verse 13. I can think of no good reason why Theodotion might have wanted to read ἡτοίμασθης for התהלכת; on the other hand, it does not seem particularly likely that התהלכת would have become corrupted into הכינות.

However they deal with this verb, all the Greek versions bar 'the three' (οἱ τρεῖς i.e. Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion) read ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ('in the days'), where the MT reads בדרכיך, 'in your ways'. It seems unlikely that בימך

would have corrupted into or been a corruption from בדרבך. Nor could such an emendation to the text have been thought necessary for the sake of sense by any scribe, since 'in your days' and 'in your ways' would both be perfectly acceptable idioms in the context in both Greek and Hebrew. A Greek translator might have been tempted to read 'days' on account of the following clause, which begins 'from the day...', but given that not even Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, or the Lucianic texts, read 'in your ways' it would be improper to suggest we have an editorial change by the Greek translators here.

So if the Greek translators had בימך in their *Vorlagen*, how did the MT end up with בדרבך? That a Hebrew scribe should have adjusted the text to read בדרבך for בימך seems as unlikely as a Greek scribe having read בימך for בדרבך. The difference simply carries no weight, or particular significance. There is no good reason for making the change either way. Corruption of דרך into ימי (or visa versa) also seems extremely unlikely in Hebrew script of any age. So again it seems that the data is best explained by the suggestion that two different recensions underlie our divergent texts here.

By and large, the remainder of the Greek text does not diverge from the Hebrew of MT as dramatically as it does up to this point. There are a number of small differences that are worth noting, if not just to get a fuller flavour of the relationship between Greek versions and MT, and between the various Greek versions.

16 ἀπὸ πλήθους τῆς ἐμπορίας σου	ברב רכלתך מלן תוכך חמס ותחטא ואחללך
ἐπλησας τὰ ταμειῖά σου ἀνομίας	מהר אלהים
καὶ ἥμαρτες καὶ ἐτραυματίσθης ἀπὸ	
ὄρους τοῦ θεοῦ,	

The Greek versions here appear to have based their understanding of this verse on verse 13. מלו is irregular (if the root is correctly identified as מלא), so the Greek versions read מלאת, 'you filled', as they had done in verse 13 for מלאכת. Similarly, although the terminology is different, τὰ ταμειῶν 'storehouses, treasuries' of this verse reflects τοὺς θησαυρούς and τὰς ἀποθήκας of verse 13 more closely than it does תוכך of the MT. There is no reason to suppose the Greek had anything other than תוכך in his *Vorlage* at this point since תוכך could quite easily have been understood as a metonym here.

The verb τραυματίζω often translates the root חלל (e.g. Gen. 34:27; Num. 19:16, 18; 23:24; 31:8; Deut. 21:1-3, 6; 32:42; Judg. 9:40; 16:24; 20:31, 39; 1 Sam 17:52; 31:1; and often), so it is safe to assume that it is this root that underlies the Greek. But whereas the MT reads the first singular with second singular suffix (חללתי), the Greek reads the second singular passive ἐτραυματίσθης (reading the *pual* חללתי or perhaps the *niphal* חללתי). In any case corruption of the text cannot adequately explain this. It is better understood as the tidying hand of the Greek translator: surely it is not the Lord who exacts the punishment that leads to expulsion, this is the job of the Cherub, as we learn in the following clause. So to avoid confusion the translator simply puts the verb into the passive: in the Greek we are not told who done it, only that it was done!

καὶ ἤγαγέ σε τὸ χερουβ ἐκ μέσου
λίθων πυρίνων.

וּמַבְדֵּךְ כְּרוּב הַסֶּכֶךְ מִתּוֹךְ אֲבְנֵי אֵשׁ

The majority of Greek manuscripts read καὶ ἤγαγέ σε τὸ χερουβ, 'and the cherub led you away'. Curiously though, 967 and the Lucianic recension, leave out the conjunction (καὶ) and read instead κατήγαγε(ν) σε (root = κατάγω 'to lead down, bring down'). At first sight one might be tempted to suggest that καὶ ἤγαγέ has been corrupted into κατήγαγε(ν); but given the

historical precedence of 967 the reverse would more likely be the case: *κατήγαγε(ν)* has been corrupted into *καὶ ἡγαγέ*, perhaps under the influence of a Hebrew text containing a conjunctive *waw*. The appearance of the reading *κατήγαγε(ν)* in the Lucianic recension complicates matters further still, given the Lucianic recension's tendency to revise towards MT.

Less explicable still is the Greek versions' universal dependence on the root *ἄγω*, which simply bears no resemblance to the fearsome Hebrew *אבד*, 'to perish, die, destroy'. The root *בוא* must be the source of *αγω*. One might get from *באך* to *אבדך* by a transposition of the *aleph* and *beth* and a duplication of the final form of the *kaph* to give the *dalet*, but such an explanation hardly seems more than creative speculation. Even were one able to explain the verb in this way one must also provide an explanation for the absence of the conjunction in 967. The best explanation for the data, I suggest, is that 967 has worked from a *Vorlage* that read *באך*, and that this *Vorlage* represented a recension distinct from that which underlies the MT.

If further proof were required to demonstrate the diversity of Hebrew *Vorlagen* at the earliest stages of Greek translation then Aquila provides it. Aquila reads *καὶ περὺγια χερουβ ἐσκέπασεν σε*, 'and with respect to wings¹⁹⁰ the Cherub sheltered you'. Aquila stands on his own here, reflecting neither the MT nor any of the Greek versions, so he has obviously not borrowed this reading from elsewhere as far as we can know. Given the generally slavishly-literal nature of Aquila's rendering, it also seems unlikely he would have supplied this noun if there were nothing corresponding to it in the Hebrew. Similarly, *περὺγιον* must ultimately derive from *בגן*, so Aquila can hardly have read such a word for *אבדך* (if that is what he had before him). We can only assume he had *בגן* in his *Vorlage*.

¹⁹⁰ Accusative of respect.

Of course the Greek versions and Aquila might make the MT look like ‘the odd one out’, bringing that text under suspicion, but Symmachus provides support for a proto-Masoretic text here, reading *καὶ ἀπολέσει σε χερουβ*, ‘and a cherub will destroy you’. There can be no doubt that Symmachus had before him the form *וְאֶבְרָךְ* since he casts the clause into the future tense, taking the form to be perfect with *waw* consecutive. So in the second century CE we appear to have possibly three distinct Hebrew texts at this point at least.

Concerning the absence of *הַסֶּכֶךְ* in the Greek versions, 967 again causes trouble. Prior to the discovering of 967 it would have been easiest to assume that *הַסֶּכֶךְ* was absent in the Greek translators’ *Vorlagen*, and was thus a later insertion by a Hebrew scribe. But 967 overturns this explanation: whereas most of the Greek witnesses read simply *τό χερουβ(ιμ)*, 967 adds *τοσεχ* or *τό σεχ*¹⁹¹. Gehman’s explanation is as follows: “in the Sch[eide] version, or its predecessor, it is evident that the Hebrew text was incorrectly read, and that *הַסֶּכֶךְ* [sic] was taken as a proper name and incorrectly transliterated as *τοσεχ*”¹⁹². I think Gehman must be correct here; so how do we explain the absence of *τοσεχ* in verse 13? The explanation must be that *מִמְשַׁח הַסֶּכֶךְ* was absent in 967’s *Vorlage*: if the translator was prepared to offer a confusing Greek translation of verse 16 for the sake of his *Vorlage*, then surely he would have been able to proceed in a similar way in verse 13 too.

The picture from Origen’s Hexapla complicates matters of *Vorlagen* further still. Origen used an *asterisk* to call attention to words or lines wanting in the Greek, but present in the Hebrew. In Symmachus and Theodotion, Origen adds *ὁ σκέπασα* and *τό συσκιάζον* respectively, to bring them into line

¹⁹¹ The Latin Codex Constantiensis follows the Scheide tradition, understanding *τό σεχ* (not *τοσεχ*), *cherubin sech de medio lapidum igneorum*.

¹⁹² Gehman, ‘Observationes Criticae’ in Johnson, Gehman, and Kase *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel*, 106.

with his Hebrew text. Likewise, an alternative version of Aquila is found in some codices, reading ἀπώλεσεν σε χερουβ ό συσκιάζων. All this suggests that although Origen had clearly known of a text containing חכסה (or similar), and had taken it as a relative clause, Symmachus, Theodotion, and Aquila had not done so. This is an important peculiarity given the tendency of these witnesses to reflect a proto-Masoretic text.

17 ὑψώθη ἡ καρδία σου ἐπὶ τῷ	גבה לבך ביפיד שחת חכמתך על יפעתך על
κάλλει σου, διεφθάρη ἡ ἐπιστήμη	ארה השלכתך לפני מלכים נתתך לראוה ב
σου μετὰ τοῦ κάλλους σου· <u>διὰ</u>	
<u>πλήθος ἀμαρτιῶν σου ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν</u>	
ἔρριψά σε, ἐναντίον βασιλέων	
ἔδωκά σε παραδειγματισθῆναι.	

The phrase διὰ πλήθος ἀμαρτιῶν σου is the only difference of note in this verse. Origen flags it with an *obelus* (+), indicating it was wanting in the Hebrew, and therefore, from Origen's point of view, of doubtful authority. Other than *Codex Vaticanus* and 967 the majority of Greek manuscripts add in the definite articles (τό πλήθος τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν), presumably to harmonise this verse with what follows.

It is almost impossible to know whether this phrase should be considered an addition in the Greek or an omission in the MT. Of course, one explanation would be that חכסה has simply disappeared as a result of clumsy copying, more likely, however, is the possibility that חכסה was an addition (either by the translator or his predecessor), on the grounds that the preceding two clauses show a pattern consisting of an outcome and a reason for that outcome (i.e. 'Your heart was elevated as a result of your beauty, your knowledge was corrupted as a result of your beauty'), so a scribe or translator

supplied a reason (i.e. 'as a result of the multitude of your sins') to match the remaining outcome (i.e. 'I hurled you upon the earth').

18 διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν σου מרב עוניך בעול רכלתך חללת מקדשך ואוצא
καὶ τῶν ἀδικιῶν τῆς ἐμπορίας σου אש מתוכך היא אכלתך ואתנך לאפר על הארץ
ἐβεβήλωσα τὰ ἱερά σου· καὶ ἐξάξω לעיני כל ראיד
πῦρ ἐκ μέσου σου, τοῦτο
καταφάγεται σε· καὶ δώσω σε εἰς
σποδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς σου ἐναντίον
πάντων τῶν ὀρώντων σε.

Like verse 16 the differences here are relatively minor. Most noticeable is ἐβεβήλωσα for the MT's תללת. The first singular is the reading of *Codex Vaticanus* and 967. I see no particular ideological reason why a translator would have wanted to shift the verb from the second person singular to the first person singular, so it seems likely that their *Vorlage* read תללת here. A *god* could easily have dropped off the end of the Hebrew here, leaving the second singular form (תללת) now found in MT. Probably correcting towards MT, a number of manuscripts read the second person singular form ἐβεβήλωσας. As in the case of verse 16 (see above), the correction towards the MT may have been enthusiastically adopted by these manuscripts to dissociate the Lord from active involvement in what is being described.

19 καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐπιστάμενοί σε ἐν כל יודעך בעמים שממו עליך בלהות היית
τοῖς ἔθνεσι στυγνάσουσιν ἐπὶ σέ· ואינך עד עולם
ἀπώλεια ἐγένου καὶ οὐχ ὑπάρξεις
ἔτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

The concluding verse is a perfectly sound rendering of what we find in the MT, with the single addition of καὶ at the start of the clause; an addition made quite freely by the Greek translators to aid sense.

Concluding Remarks

The picture presented by the Greek versions is complex to say the least. We are dealing with so many interwoven issues concurrently that it is often difficult to separate them. As I mentioned at the outset, I have been concerned with three principal issues: first, the relationship between the Greek versions and the MT; secondly, the relationship between the various Greek versions themselves; and finally, what might this passage have meant to Greek speaking Jews in the second century BCE. To conclude I will try to say something of each of these issues.

The Greek versions and the Masoretic Hebrew do present similarities, but they also display significant differences that cannot be adequately explained by additions, omissions, or inaccurate translation. There is a good case to be made that in all likelihood the Greek translators have made some changes to their *Vorlage*, not least because the Greek translators produce a smoother and more palatable reading. At the same time, there is also a good case to be made that their *Vorlage* was quite different from the Masoretic text at a number of points.

I have suggested that the evidence from the book of Ezekiel as a whole indicates that the Greek versions have worked from a non-Masoretic recension, and the text of Ezekiel 28:12-19 would seem to support this conclusion. The earliest Greek version (papyrus 967) does not stand in a linear sequence with the MT. 967 does not reflect an earlier text and MT a later version of essentially the same text: the differences between them are simply too great. Rather, 967 and MT represent two independent recensions that must have been, for a prolonged period, chronologically co-existent.

To complicate matters further, the Greek versions provide an inconsistent text. It is evident that *Codex Vaticanus* had as its source a *Vorlage* largely

similar to that used by 967, but which contained some minor differences from that *Vorlage*: these are preserved in the translation. A general picture emerges of a basic Greek text that has been constantly altered towards an evolving Hebrew text, with the later versions being altered towards a text that is more and more clearly Masoretic in character.

This 'evolving' Hebrew is not to be thought of as a single continuous thread – the picture Lust assumes. Rather, there appears to have been an array of texts in circulation, and there was clearly a significant degree of inconsistency between Hebrew manuscripts even as late as the second century CE. Verse 16, more than any other, demonstrates this fluidity: somehow an apparently proto-Masoretic reading (הסכך) has appeared in 967, but is absent in Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.

That papyrus 967, Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion are all roughly contemporary yet reflect markedly different *Vorlagen* strongly supports the view that two related but independent recensions of the Hebrew were in existence at that time. 967 may of course be a copy of an earlier manuscript and would therefore reflect a Hebrew text that is earlier still, but would no one have noticed how different this manuscript was from the Hebrew of the day? If I am correct in assuming two independent recensions, this brings the legitimacy of the synchronistic enterprises of Zimmerli, Allen, and others into serious question. It may be the case that the evidence we have is insufficient to lead us back to any *Urtext*.

The text critical picture is extremely complex, and many of the judgements I have made will be open to discussion. I have put forward what I consider to be the best explanation for the data in Ezekiel 28:12-19. This is certainly not the only possible explanation, but in my view it seems the most likely.

The text as it stands says something quite different from what we find in the Masoretic Hebrew (pointed or unpointed). The unpointed MT, we have

argued, presents a picture of a primal-human type figure with some elevated mythical status (אֱלֹהִים); in the vocalized MT it is unclear who the figure is, except that he is a cherub. The Greek versions make a clear, explicit, and I would add, deliberate, allusion to the high-priest¹⁹³.

It may seem odd that we should find a comparison being made between the coming fall into ignominy of the king of Tyre and the fall into ignominy of the high-priest. Let me make two suggestions why this might be. Either the author(s) of Ezekiel wanted to make an allusion to the high-priest (so this feature might be considered early or 'original'); or the earliest Greek translator or his predecessors wanted to make such an allusion to fit his historical context, in which case this feature would be an addition around the second century BCE.

Ezekiel had an axe to grind when it came to the priesthood. Ezekiel himself was a priest (Ezek. 1:3), and felt strongly about the legitimacy of the priesthood. The Levitical priests, as far as Ezekiel was concerned, had become a source of impurity in the temple and needed replacing by Zadokite priests, "This shall be for the consecrated priests, of the sons of Zadok, who kept my charge, who did not go astray, as the Levites did" (RSV Ezek. 48:11). In Ezekiel's schema the Zadokite priests were to have exclusive control over the central temple ordinances, "and the chamber which faces north is for the priests who have charge of the altar; these are the sons of Zadok, who alone among the sons of Levi may come near to the Lord to minister to him" (RSV Ezek. 40:46). The breast plate that is so clearly alluded to in verse 13 is that of Aaron and succeeding high priests, yet for Ezekiel the leadership of the

¹⁹³ Wilson, 'The Death of the King of Tyre', 217, supports this basic conclusion, although he first emends the Hebrew text based on LXX, and then suggests this emended text is "so laced with allusions to the Israelite high priest that the real thrust of the dirge could not possibly have been missed by Ezekiel's audience". See Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25-48*, 111-12 for a critique of Wilson's position.

Levitical priesthood was to be restricted to the house of Zadok. In Ezekiel 40-48 Zadok, not Aaron, is the eponym of the priestly line. So it would not be entirely unexpected if Ezekiel were attempting here to portray the downfall of the Aaronic priesthood, albeit through subtle allusion.

An alternative suggestion would relate to events that occurred around the time the earliest translation of the Hebrew into Greek was probably being made. We have accepted as a working hypothesis a date for the first translation into Greek of the fifty or so years around the middle of the second century BCE. This would make the translation contemporaneous with the disruption surrounding the Jerusalem temple that ended in the Maccabean revolt. In 167 BCE Matthathias launched a revolt against the Seleucids under Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who was pursuing a policy to enforce Hellenistic practices on the Jews, robbing the Temple of its candlestick, golden altar, table of showbread, and veils (e.g. 1 Macc 1:21-23), and compelling the priests to sacrifice swine upon its altar to the Greek deities (e.g. 1 Macc 1:45-48). The struggle ended with the rededication of the Temple through Matthathias' son Judas, nicknamed Maccabeus (1 Macc 4:36-59). But in wresting the Temple back from the Seleucids the priestly family of Hasmoneans also effectively usurped the Zadokite priesthood in the Temple. This caused considerable disquiet with the Temple in certain quarters, most notably amongst the community at Qumran (see for example 4QMMT). Perhaps the Greek translator too felt a pang of regret at the change of administration. The translator of the pro-Zadokite book Ezekiel may well have seen an opportunity here to attack, albeit subtly, the new Temple administration: the (new) priesthood is doomed to humiliation! If this were the case, then the enumeration of all twelve stones could well be a later insertion by the translator, based on a *Vorlage* that perhaps had only the nine stones. On this explanation, the nine stones by themselves may be unrelated to the stones of

Exodus, instead simply serving to emphasise prosperity and opulence; but to the Greek translators they served as a trigger for an expansion of the text that had the potential to make a pertinent polemical point.

It is hard to know which of these two scenarios is the more likely, but both demonstrate that the identification of the figure in Ezekiel 28:11-19 with the high-priest can plausibly be explained as deliberate and polemical. The second explanation has two features that commend it over and above the first: the transformation from nine disorganised stones to twelve ordered gems provides a more sensible explanation of the data than *vice versa*; and secondly (assuming the translator has made the change) it has the advantage of explaining the lingering presence of 'first man' features. The MT clearly attests a primal-human tradition, and it would be difficult to explain the sudden appearance of high-priestly features in that text, whereas in the Greek translations the first-man ideas are played down as much as possible to allow the allusion to the high-priest to take centre stage.

4. "PRIDE GOETH BEFORE DESTRUCTION"

The Targum to Ezekiel

Targum in the Continuum of Interpretation

The Targum of Ezekiel holds a unique position in our present study in two respects. We have so far examined the Hebrew and Greek texts with a view to discerning how those texts present Ezekiel 28:11-19, in other words what their authors and audiences might have understood Ezekiel 28:11-19 to be saying. As such we have tried to understand the interpretative slant that, in the case of the MT has been applied to the text by the Masoretic vocalization and punctuation; and in the case of the Greek, by the translation choices and deviations from a likely *Vorlage*. Later, we will look at the material from a number of rabbinic sources (Midrash, Talmud, etc) that employ dis-located passages from Ezekiel 28 in order to support or develop a particular point of *haggadah*.

Since Targum by its very nature contains both translation and interpretation the Targum to Ezekiel takes a unique place in a territory between those materials in the *form* of primary text (i.e. the MT and Greek versions) and those materials in the *form* of interpretation. It is important to emphasise that this is a question of form *not* of content, since both types of material (i.e. 'text' and 'interpretation') contain interpretative elements. Rather we refer to the fact that in material taking the form of a primary-text interpretative elements are hidden, whereas in Midrash, Talmud, and so on, those interpretative elements are made explicit. So in Targum we find an explicitly interpretative approach to the text that, nonetheless, adheres to the existing structure of the

text: the aim of Targum is to produce a translation that *explains* the Hebrew text.

The Nature of Targum

Targum, as a *genre*, provides a level of freedom to its creators that a translator or scribe vocalizing the text does not have to the same extent. There is the freedom to apply interpretative material directly to the text as is deemed necessary by the targumist to explain the base-text to an Aramaic speaking audience. The purpose of Targum is "to translate *and* explain the Hebrew Scriptures into Aramaic"¹⁹⁴ (my italics). It seeks to make *the meaning* of the Hebrew clear to a non-specialist audience¹⁹⁵ by combining translation with explanation and commentary. But Targum is *not* simply a haggadic paraphrase.

Generally speaking in Targum the source text can be discerned with relative ease. More often than not in Targum it is almost as if the targumist has first produced a word-for-word translation of his *Vorlage*, and then having completed that exercise has returned, spliced the text apart and inserted the interpretative material. As Philip Alexander rightly puts it, frequently expansions "can be bracketed out"¹⁹⁶.

In other words, in Targum we find a translation *with* exegetical expansions, not an interpretative paraphrase, although there is inevitably a degree of blurring between these two categories (i.e. translation and expansion). This is

¹⁹⁴ Zeev Safrai, 'The Targums as Part of Rabbinic Literature' in Shmuel Safrai, *et al* (eds.), *The Literature of the Sages*, Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Part 2, Section 2 (Philadelphia PA: Fortress, 2006), 243.

¹⁹⁵ Sofrim 18:5 "...And he translates in order that the rest of the people may understand, as well as women and children".

¹⁹⁶ Philip S. Alexander, 'Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scriptures' in Martin Jan Mulder (ed.), *Mikra* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 2004), 231.

an important distinction, because when we look at Targum in a study of biblical interpretation (such as this thesis aims to be) we are in fact looking at two distinct modes of interpretation: interpretation resulting from the process of translation, and explanatory material incorporated into that translation. As Samely has rightly put it the Aramaic is “in exegetical dependence on its [the biblical text’s] wording”¹⁹⁷.

Nevertheless the element of translation in Targum is itself never slavishly literal. The flow of Targum is never sacrificed for the sake of using an exact Aramaic equivalent for the underlying Hebrew and where the text is obscure or difficult the targumist sometimes resorts to loose or paraphrastic renderings. Yet the base-text is never lost entirely. There is always purpose behind the targumist’s choice of language. Sometimes the connection to the Hebrew is rather abstract or convoluted, but there is *almost always a purposeful connection nonetheless*.

One final additional factor to consider is that of *Vorlage*. The Targum of Ezekiel broadly reflects MT, but this is not always certain when one gets down to the level of individual words. We face the same question we faced with respect to the Greek versions: Where the wording differs from MT, is this attributable to differences in the *Vorlagen* or to the targumist’s creativity (or even a later editor)?

Finally, we must note that the Targum to Ezekiel also has a unique position in early rabbinic literature as the only systematic exposition of the whole of the book. On the whole, the early rabbis shied away from the esoteric Ezekiel (as a quick count of the references to Ezekiel compared with, say, Isaiah, in the Talmud will demonstrate cf. also b.San. 13b; Men. 45a; Hag. 13a), and where it does occur it occurs in isolated snippets, dis-located from the overall context

¹⁹⁷ Alexander Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuchal Targums*, Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 27 (Tübingen: JCB Mohr, 1992), 180.

of Ezekiel. By its very format the Targum to Ezekiel, by contrast, works systematically through the text.

Date of The Targum to Ezekiel

Before we proceed to an examination of the text itself it is necessary to locate Targum Ezekiel chronologically within the continuum of biblical interpretation covered in this thesis. To do this we must say something of its date and something about the purpose behind its creation.

It is not my intention here to carry out an exhaustive summary of the available literature, and given what we know of the transmission history of the targumim generally, I do not think it profitable for our current study to expend too much time attempting to pin down Targum Ezekiel as a whole to a narrow date range, since on the whole in Targum only individual passages can be dated with any degree of probability. However, I think we can say something about the historical context out of which Targum Ezekiel may have emerged and this in turn will be useful for appreciating more fully the lines of interpretation that the targumist follows.

The Targum to Ezekiel along with the other targumim to the prophets forms the collection commonly referred to as Targum Jonathan. Various dates have been proposed on various grounds for Targum Jonathan to the Prophets.

Few would disagree with the assessment that "TJ [Targum Jonathan] reflects the events and conditions of the centuries coinciding with, and following, the destruction of the Second Commonwealth"¹⁹⁸. The end of the Second Commonwealth is certainly a preoccupation for Targum Jonathan and

¹⁹⁸ Leivy Smolar and Moses Aberbach, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (New York: Ktav: Baltimore Hebrew College, 1983), 63.

obvious allusions to conflict with Rome abound (although whether these references more broadly reflect events surrounding the Roman-Jewish war of 66 CE or the Bar Kochba revolt of 132-5 CE is hard to tell¹⁹⁹). While this observation provides only a *terminus post quem*, since a writer may allude to earlier events, the obvious preoccupation of the targumist with these historical events adds up to a plausible case for at least a good portion of the material stemming from the second century, a case which is strengthened if one accepts the conclusion that “the language of TgYonatan on the Prophets is essentially early Palestinian Aramaic”²⁰⁰.

Looking specifically at the Targum to Ezekiel Smolar and Aberbach have catalogued a number of linguistic features, which they claim reflect Roman life²⁰¹, and a number of additional allusions to specific historic events or episodes²⁰², including a specific reference to Rome in 39:16 (in a prophecy against Gog the targumist reads “into that place [the valley of the rioting-crowds of Gog] shall be thrown the slain of Rome”²⁰³). The targumist clearly

¹⁹⁹ See chapter ‘Historical and Geographical Allusions’ in Smolar and Aberbach, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 63-128, which provides an survey of historical allusions and their possible referents.

²⁰⁰ Safrai, ‘The Targums as Part of Rabbinic Literature’, 271; Abraham Tal, *The Language of the Targum of the Former Prophets and its Position within the Aramaic Dialects* (Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, 1975), 13-20.

²⁰¹ e.g. Tg. Ezek. 32:8 = the Roman road; Tg. Ezek. 30:9 “in legions” (בלגיונין) for MT “in ships” בציים; frequent reference to military auxiliaries סומכותא or סומכותא, e.g. 24:5; 31:4, 5, 7, 8, 12; 32:2; Tg. Ezek. 23:41a reflects Roman dining practises; פנקס (Tg.Ezek. 9:2a, 3b, 11a) = the *pinax*, a folding writing tablet of the Roman period; the ‘capital’ (כותרתא) that tops columns, attributed by the targumist to the future temple of Ezekiel’s vision (Ezek. 40:16, 22, 31, 34, 37; 41:18, 19, 20, 25, 26), refer to the capitals of Corinthian columns familiar in the Hellenistic and Roman period. See Smolar and Aberbach, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 107.

²⁰² e.g. Ezekiel 24:3-5 alludes to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70CE; the vocabulary of Tg. Ezek. 7:7 ‘there is no way to be spared in the mountain fortresses’ (לית לאשתויבא במצדי טוריא) alluding to the incident at Masada in 73CE; the removal of the Shekinah in Tg. Ezek. 7:22 alluding to the destruction of the Temple.

²⁰³ “The reference in T. to Ez. [Targum to Ezekiel] 39:16 to the destruction of Rome is interesting. It suggests that T. took Rome as גוג. As Gog is the Messianic foe of Israel, one feels that in the time of either the Great or the Bar-Kochba Rebellion, the revolutionaries, in their

has in mind a period of civil unrest so serious it lent itself to the apocalyptic (in the popular sense) image of Ezekiel 39.

The capture of Jerusalem by Pompey 63BCE might well account for the allusion to a siege and to the desecration of the Temple, but does not provide a good fit for the theme of the removal of the Shekinah or the allusions to the events of Masada. Likewise, the Bar Kochba revolt and the Hadrianic persecution and plans for the redevelopment of the Temple site might provide a fit for some of the allusions, but on the whole neither of these scenarios offer as complete a match as the events surrounding 70CE²⁰⁴.

Whilst it is now certain that Targum as a *genre* was established as early as Qumran²⁰⁵ – its emergence doubtless the result of demographic pressures equivalent to those that gave rise to the Septuagint in the second century BCE – much of the material in Targum Ezekiel probably stems from the second century CE.

It is without doubt that Targum Jonathan underwent a process of transmission and transformation that appears, as with almost all targumim, to have continued until a relatively late date. Churgin is almost certainly correct in setting the *terminus ante quem* prior to the Arabic invasion of Babylonia (c.640CE), since there are no references to the Arab conquest²⁰⁶. It is on this basis that Levey's suggestion of a date based on apparent reflections of Islam in the first half of the 10th Century CE, suggesting the influence of Saadia

pious and Messianic mood, would take Rome as the prophetic \mathfrak{m} , so that its overthrow is sure to come", Churgin, 'Targum Jonathan to the Prophets', 254.

²⁰⁴ A view supported by Samson H. Levey, *The Targum of Ezekiel*, The Aramaic Bible 13 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 4.

²⁰⁵ García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II: (11Q2–18, 11Q20–31)* and de Vaux and Milik, *Qumrân Grotte 4.II: I. Archéologie, II. Tefillin, Mezuzot et Targums (4Q 128–4Q157)*.

²⁰⁶ Churgin, 'Targum Jonathan to the Prophets', 256-58.

Gaon²⁰⁷, is thought unconvincing²⁰⁸. McNamara and Hayward push the *terminus ante quem* of the present form back further still into the period before the 5th Century CE, on the grounds that it is cited as authoritative in the Babylonian Talmud and a number of other early sources, although Hayward adds the necessary caveat that this date can be applied *with certainty* only to "those verses which are cited"²⁰⁹.

The subtleties involved in attempting to fix a final date for redaction preclude certainty and I do not intend to enter into a discussion of the matter here. For our present study the date of the final redaction itself is of less importance than keeping in mind the reservation that the some features under scrutiny may be later (possibly even much later) than the Roman period.

Fixing the date of Targum Ezekiel 28:11-19 cannot be done with any certainty. In my examination of the exegesis of the Targum to Ezekiel below I argue that it offers, first and foremost, a political message that imperial aggressors will be defeated, which is equally applicable to a number of periods in history.

Sitz im Leben of the Targum to Ezekiel

The *Sitz im Leben* out of which the targumim emerged is a somewhat vexed question and this is all the more so in the case of Ezekiel. Statements scattered throughout classic rabbinic literature provide three possible settings for the various targumim: the synagogue, private devotion and study, and education in schools. Ezekiel poses its own set of challenges in fixing a *Sitz im Leben*

²⁰⁷ Samson H. Levey, 'The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets' *Vetus Testamentum* 21 (no.2 Apr. 1971), 192-6.

²⁰⁸ For a critique of his position see Bruce D. Chilton, *The Glory of Israel*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 23 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982), 6-7, 123.

²⁰⁹ C. T. R. Hayward, *The Targum of Jeremiah*, The Aramaic Bible 12 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 34 cf. 35; Martin McNamara, *Targum and Testament* (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1972), 207.

since the book was regarded with some suspicion by rabbinic authorities: the Mishnah prohibits the reading of chapters 1 and 16 in the synagogue (M.Meg. 4:10 cf. Tos.Meg. 3:34); Hananiah b. Hezekiah had to make extraordinary efforts to reconcile chapters 40-48 with the Mosaic laws, eventually ensuring Ezekiel's acceptance as authoritative (b. San 13b, b. Men 45a, b.Hag 13a); the Talmud (b.Baba Bathra 15a) even goes so far as to suggest Ezeḳiel did not write his own book since it was not accepted that a prophet could prophesy outside Israel. All of which makes it less likely that the Targum to Ezekiel was composed for use in the synagogue or for private study, than that it was primarily for an educated audience who could be supervised with such a dangerous text, i.e. in the *beth midrash*²¹⁰.

Analysis of Targum to Ezekiel 28:12-19

With all those comments in mind we can now approach the text of the Targum to Ezekiel 28:12-19 as translation, textual witness, and interpretation. It makes sense to first lay out the Aramaic text²¹¹:

12 בר אדם טול אליא על מלכא דצור ותימר ליה כדנן אמר יוי אלהים את דמי
למנא דצורתא דמתקן בחכמתא ומשכלל בשופריה: 13 בסגי טוב ותפנוקין את
מתפנק כאילו בעדן גינתא דיוי את שרי עותרא גיזתא ויקרא מתיהיב לך כל
אבנין טבן מסדרן על לבושך סמקן ירקן וסבהלוס כרום ימא בורלא ופנתרין
שבזיז אומרגדין וברקן משקען בדהב כל אלץ עבדית תקונך בכין ראים לבך
ברם לא אסתכלתא בפגרך דאת עביד חללין ונקבין דאינון צורכך דלא אפשר
לך דתתקיים בלא בהון מיזמא דאתבריתא עמך מתקנין: 14 את מלך מרבא

²¹⁰ Josep Ribera-Florit, 'Some Doctrinal Aspects of the Targum of Ezekiel' in Paul V.M. Flesher (ed), *Targum and Scripture: Studies in Aramaic Translations and Interpretation in Memory of Ernest G. Clarke* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 149.

²¹¹ According to Alexander Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*, Vol 3, *The Latter Prophets According to Targum Jonathan* (Leiden: Brill, 1962). Variations are discussed where relevant.

למלכו ויהיבית לך רבותא ואת על טור קודשא דיזי בסרתא ובעמא קדישא
 סברתא למשלט: 15 שלים את באורחתך מיומא דאתבריתא עד דאשתכח
 שקר בד: 16 בסגיאות סחורתך אתמליאו אוצרך חטוף וחבתא ואפסינך על
 דבסרתא על טור קדשא דיזי ואבדינך מלכא ררבתנא על דסברתא למשלט
 בעמא קדישא: 17 ראיס לבך בתוקפך אתחבלת חוכמתך על זיו אימתך על
 ארעא רטשתך אזהרא למלכיא יהבתך לאסתכלא בד: 18 מסגי חובך בשקר
 סחורתך אפיסתא מקדשך ואיתי עממיא דתקיפין כאישתא מחובי זדונך אנון
 ישיציןך ואתנינך כקטס על ארעא לעיני כל חזך: 19 כל ידעך בעממיא צדיאו
 עלך כד לא הוית אתנינך וכין תהי עד עלמא:

(Tg.Ezek. 28:12-19)

Of the whole of Ezekiel, chapter 28 seems to have posed the targumist with a particularly challenging task. This perhaps comes as no surprise having examined the Hebrew text of the MT in some detail earlier on.

For ease of reference I have presented the unit of text under discussion alongside the Hebrew of MT (indicating alternative vocabulary with a single underline and additions or omissions by a double underline, both marked by italics in the English).

Targum	12 בר אדם טול אליא על מלכא דצור וחימר ליה כדנן אמר יי אלהים את דמי למנא דצורתא דמתקן בחכמתא ומשכלל בשופריה:
MT	12 בן אדם שא קינה על מלך צור ואמרת לו כה אמר אדני יהוה אתה חותם תכנית מלא חכמה וכליל יפי
My translation	12 Son of <i>Adam</i> raise a lament over the king of Tyre and say to him, Thus says <i>The Lord God</i> , 'You are likened to the format of the figure who was set up in wisdom and founded in his splendour.
Levey	12 "Son of <i>Adam</i> , take up a lamentation over the king of Tyre, and say to him, Thus says the Lord God, You were like the sculptural mold, fashioned in wisdom and perfect in its beauty.

The form of address to the prophet, Son of Adam, is a distinctive feature throughout Tg. Ezek. While אדם in Biblical Hebrew might refer to either (the individual man) Adam or humankind generally, in Aramaic it retains only the role of proper noun (אָנוּשׁ usually translates אדם where the meaning is 'humankind').

The frequency with which the expression בן־אדם occurs in MT Ezekiel is striking: the expression occurs 87 times throughout the book. This unusually frequent occurrence of this rather striking form of address must, I think, have provided the initial impetus for the targumist. Such frequency would surely have suggested that the phrase was imbued with a special significance, beyond its mundane meaning of 'mortal', as it is employed elsewhere (e.g. Number 23:19, "God is not man (אִישׁ) that he should lie, nor a mortal (בן־אדם) that he needs to repent", cf. Job 25:6).

The targumist has already demonstrated a somewhat unexpected interest in Adam in his rendering of Ezekiel's description of his vision of the figure sat upon the divine throne: "and above the likeness of the throne there was the likeness of the appearance of Adam" (Tg. Ezek. 1:26). Although the targumist imports the consonants of the Hebrew text here (דמות כמראה אדם) into Aramaic, the meaning of אדם becomes transferred (from BH 'man' to 'Adam' Tg. Aram.).

The targumist's address for Ezekiel, בר אדם, suggests the prophet possesses a unique or especially privileged status. Adam was a spectacular figure in rabbinic folklore (as we will see in the next chapter) and in Second Temple Literature (see esp. Life of Adam and Eve 25 in which Adam recounts his own vision of the heavens²¹²), so by employing the title בר אדם for Ezekiel the

²¹² This text is notoriously difficult to date: see M. D. Johnson, 'Life of Adam and Eve: A New Translation and Introduction' in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol 2 (London: Doubleday, 1985), 252.

targumist appears to be suggesting that Ezekiel had a level of access to the divine realm unprecedented among the classical prophets.

Having removed any possibility that the identity of the speaker might be mistaken (reading the familiar *יְי אֱלֹהִים* for the idiosyncratic MT *אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה*), the address to the king of Tyre begins with some confusion. The MT, *חֹתֶם תְּכַנִּית* is unclear, and several Hebrew manuscripts as well as the Versions make adjustments in an attempt to clarify. What is peculiar about Tg. Ezek. here is that its translation barely makes the situation any better.

The targumist, like many Hebrew manuscripts and the Versions, must have read *תְּכַנִּית* where MT has *תְּכַנִּית* (it seems likely that this is what he found in his *Vorlage*) and translated as literally as he could with the noun *צוּרָה*, which commonly means ‘form, shape, figure, or painting’. How he reached *דְּמֵי לְמֹנָא* — which is difficult but must mean something similar to “*likened to the format*” — from the MT *חֹתֶם* is unclear. It is possible the targumist has taken his idea from the notion of a seal leaving its impression. However derived, there is clearly no exegetical motivation behind it, since it conjures up no allusions.

Levey falls into the temptation here of suspecting the targumist of making an allusion to Adam, but this is unjustified. Levey’s conclusion that the targumist “renders the entire phrase as an allegorical reference, “like the (original) sculptural mold” i.e. the Primal Adam”²¹³ is unwarranted. Had the targumist wished to make such an association he would surely have made this clearer.

For Levey’s conclusion to work he is forced to supply the adjective “original”, of which there is no hint in the Aramaic; and secondly he is obliged to turn to Talmudic and Midrashic sources to support his view that this verse refers to Adam. His argument runs as follows: because the rabbis of the Talmud and Midrash thought this was a reference to Adam, the targumist no doubt did so

²¹³ Levey, *The Targum of Ezekiel*, 83.

too. But this viewpoint is highly problematic since the targumist's overall understanding of the text is significantly detached from the traditions represented in Talmud and Midrash (as we shall see in the next chapter). To overstate the point somewhat, there is little common ground between the targumist's understanding of the text and the various understandings of the text held by rabbis of the Talmud and Midrash.

In fact the targumist's choice of wording in the following verse, "you were living in luxury *as though* (כאילו) you dwelt in Eden", seems to suggest a disassociation from Adam. We might even question whether Levey's choice of "Eden" is really appropriate: does the targumist have the garden of Genesis 2-3 in mind or the transferred sense of 'paradise' (i.e. of the hereafter)?

There is nothing in the targumist's choice of (somewhat oblique) vocabulary (דמי למנא דצורתא) to encourage an association with *Adam*, and given the freedom with which the targumist handles the text at this point, had that been his intention he would no doubt have established his allusion more clearly. Indeed the targumist's choice of צורתא for Hebrew תבנית would suggest a playful pun on the addressee's title (מלך צור), rather than an intertextual allusion to Genesis 2-3.

Something too must be said of the roots שכלל and תקן here. The verbal form שכלל is used by Neofiti and Onqelos to describe the "completion" or "perfection" of creation in their rendering of Genesis 1-3 (i.e. Tg.N.Gen.1:1; Tg.O.Gen.2:1) and is used frequently among the targumim to refer to the completion of the heavens and the earth (e.g. Tg.PJ.Gen.7:11; 22:13; Tg.PJ.Ex.31:17; Tg.PJ.Num.22:28; Tg.Isa.42:5). But much more frequently it refers to the founding of buildings or the completion of a project. The phrase שפר ותקן ("beautiful and fit for use") appears in Targum Neofiti to Genesis too (1:25, 31 cf. Tg.Ezek. בשופרית ומשכלל בחכמתא דמתקן) and once again it is creation that is being described. But like שכלל, the root תקן is employed many times

reference to Eden that follows. In the following lines of verse 13 the targumist makes explicit the central hermeneutical thread that he is drawing through the entire lament: “because of this your heart became elevated” (בכין ראים לבד). The targumist wants this to be a political message, a lesson about feeling over-inflated on account of material advantages. Having the king actually living in Eden, simply makes no sense in the context of the targumist’s central hermeneutical thread.

The first expansion (בסגי טוב ותפנוקין את מתפנק כאילו) is both hyperbolic and unspecific. The targumist aims to create a general sense of gratuitous abundance. The repetition of the root פנק (ותפנוקין = ‘delicacies’ and מתפנק = ‘living in luxury’), not only shows the targumist to be a consummate wordsmith, but successfully conveys an hint that the luxuriance is unwarranted: in the present context פנק conveys the sense ‘spoilt by indulgence’ as it does frequently elsewhere (cf. Gen.R. 22), in the sense that we would use the phrase ‘a *spoilt brat*’!

In making this move the targumist removes the element of the mythical and replaces it with the metaphorical. The king is not in Eden, nor like any figure who *is or was* in Eden; rather, he is possessed of such super-abundance that it *is as though he were* (כאילו) dwelling²¹⁴ in Eden, the garden of the Lord (בעוזן גנתא דיין). His life is so good he might as well be in Eden.

The expression “Eden, the garden of the Lord” clearly mimics the Hebrew of MT, but it is probable that to the targumist this location indicated primarily Paradise, the place of future reward, the opposite of Gehenna (e.g. b.Pesahim 54a, b.Nedarim 39b, and frequently), and not the garden of Genesis 2-3. This is not to say that the targumist would not have been cognisant of the garden

²¹⁴ As is typical of this Targum, the targumist moves to eliminate any possible confusion, rendering the Hebrew היית with שרי.

of Genesis – after all it is that garden that provides the basis for the notion of Paradise – rather that “Eden, the garden of the Lord” would have first conjured Paradise, and only the garden of Genesis at a level of abstraction.

As if to reinforce his point that this is to be an exemplary political tale, a moral not a myth, the targumist closes the brackets around Eden with a second expansion: “wealth, status, and honour were given to you”. There is no basis for this in the Hebrew; but the targumist clearly felt it a necessary addition lest anyone should miss his central hermeneutical thread: “*because of this your heart became elevated*”.

Targum כל אבנין טבין מסדרין על לבושך סמקין ירקון וסבהלום כרום ימא בורלא ופנתרין שבזין אזמרגדין וברקון משמעו בדיהב כל אלן עבידת חקונד בכין ראים לבך

MT 13 בעדן גן אלהים היית כל אבן יקרה מסכתך אדם:פטדה ויהלם תרשיש שהם וישפה ספיר נפך וברקת וזהב מלאכת תפיד ונקבד בך ביום הבראך כוננו

My translation Every precious stone was arranged *upon your garment*: carnelian, a green jewel, and diamond; aqua-marina, beryll, and a spotted-stone; sapphire, emerald, and berek; *being set in gold. Of all of these your adornment was made, because of this your heart became elevated.*

Levey Your robe was adorned with all kinds of jewels, carnelian, topaz and diamonds; beryl of the sea and spotted stones; sapphire, emerald and smaragd; *inlaid in gold. All these were made for your adornment; as a result, you have become arrogant*

The aim of Targum as a *genre* was to translate in such a way that the meaning of the text became clear, as far as might be possible. The present targumist does just that: the MT מסכתך is unclear (see above on page 53), so the targumist clarifies. The targumist derives מסכתך from the root סכך ‘to cover’ (cf. Gk ἐνδένεσαι), then translates with מסדרין. Whereas one might conceivably guess that מסכתך was talking about a garment, as is typical, this targumist

wants no ambiguity, so adds in a little expansion to mitigate any possible confusion: arranged *upon your garment* (על לבושה).

However, it seems unlikely that the targumist's etymology of this debatable term led him to this reading. Rather, it feels as though the targumist employed this etymological explanation *in order to reinforce* his central hermeneutical thread ("*because of this your heart became elevated*"). The etymology is the excuse for the targumist's reading, not its cause. Treating מסכתך as referring to a garment suited the targumist's purpose nicely: here is the king all dolled up in his glad rags – not only is he rich beyond the bounds of decency but he likes to show it off! The targumist's reading conjures an enjoyable, whimsical, mental image of this figure for his audience.

The precious stones present a problem. The stones with which the king's cloak is decorated match those of the MT. There are nine, not twelve as we find in the Greek. It is beyond doubt that the targumist would have been aware of the twelve stones of the high-priest's breastplate, especially given the many rabbinic traditions that surrounded them, so his decision to retain the nine – especially given that it is not the present targumist's style to shy away from *haggadic* expansion – is puzzling.

The first thing that we note is that the present targumist has used the same translation equivalents as are used in Targum Onqelos to Exodus, so where the MT of Exodus and Ezekiel reads אדם both targumim translate with סמקן; where the MT of both reads פטדה both targumim translate with ירקן, and so on.

The correspondence between Targum Ezekiel and Onqelos cannot simply be coincidence. While the equivalence between some of the names might be

attributed to the presence of an Aramaic cognate or other equivalent²¹⁵, or to an obvious derivation from the *sense* behind the Hebrew²¹⁶; the translation of two of the nouns cannot be explained in this way²¹⁷. Furthermore, neither Targum Neofiti nor Pseudo-Jonathan to Exodus use the same equivalents. Both use three Aramaic names not used by Onqelos, and Neofiti has a further two unique translation equivalents. However, even where Neofiti or Pseudo-Jonathan do use Aramaic words also used by Onqelos, they do not necessarily correspond to the same Hebrew noun. So for example, Onqelos uses עין עגלא to translate MT אוחלמה (Exod. 28:19), while Neofiti uses עין עגלה to translate יהלם (Exod.28:18).

That Neofiti and Pseudo-Jonathan do not use the same translation equivalents as each other or as Onqelos leads to the conclusion that the word for word correspondence between Onqelos and Targum Ezekiel must be deliberate. If Targum Ezekiel is looking back to Onqelos on Exodus, then it is clear the connection to the high priest was not lost on him. This only serves to make his retention of the nine stones more puzzling.

Three possibilities present themselves: Either the targumist was unsure how to translate them so, knowing of an equivalent list in Exodus, turned to Onqelos for guidance; or the targumist thought the nine stones provided sufficient allusion to the High Priest that it was not necessary to correct the order and replace the missing three to bring it in line with Exodus; or he wanted to reinforce a reference to the high priest, whilst retaining the nine for polemical or satirical reasons, perhaps to suggest that the figure is only three

²¹⁵ i.e. ברקת = ברקן, ספיר = שבזיז, ישפה = פנתרין, שהם = בורלא, יהלם = סבהלום.

²¹⁶ i.e. אדום verbal root סמק 'to be red' for BH כרום ימא lit. 'a sea green jewel' where BH is obscure, presumably derived via 'Tarshish', a port with well known maritime trade links, e.g. Isa 2:16; 23:1, 14; 60:9; 1 Kg 22:49 etc. See esp. Ezek.27:25 where Targum reads 'ocean-going freight-ships' אנית תרשיש for MT 'ships of Tarshish' ספיני ימא.

²¹⁷ i.e. נפך = אומרגדן; פטדה = ירקן.

quarters of a High Priest and even then in the wrong order, as if to make a mockery of any pretension to priestly status.

One thing perhaps favours the first of these options: Onqelos ends its list with *מִרְמָצֵן בְּדָהָב*, meaning 'set in gold', while Targum Ezekiel ends its list *מִשְׁקָעֵן בְּדָהָב*, meaning exactly the same thing. Admittedly the two are not translating the same Hebrew verb, but had the Ezekiel targumist wished to strengthen the allusion to Exodus, *מִרְמָצֵן* would have served just as well as *מִשְׁקָעֵן*.

On the other hand the use of the verb *סָדַר* in conjunction with the precious stones might favour the second explanation. *סָדַר* is a ritual word (e.g. b.Yoma 45b; b.Men. 95a; and frequently) and it is the word used by Onqelos, Neofiti, and Pseudo-Jonathan of the ordering of rows of the twelve stones on the high-priest's breastplate at Exodus 28:17-20. But the retention of the nine stones (and the choice of *מִשְׁקָעֵן*) remains a sticking point for this position, and of course *סָדַר* is widely attested elsewhere with the mundane meaning 'to arrange, order', so is perhaps an obvious choice.

The last of the three possibilities – the satirical explanation – seems the most plausible. An attack on the king's pretension to priestly status fits nicely with the twice repeated accusation, "you had contempt for the Holy mountain of the Lord" (Tg.Ezek. 28:14, 16), as well as the use of the singular, contra MT, in "you desecrated your sanctuary" (Tg.Ezek.28:18; see note 225 on page 148), and sits more comfortably with the overall political agenda of the Targum to Ezekiel.

In closing the list of stones, unlike those responsible for the accentuation of the MT the targumist is sensitive to this rhythm and correctly identifies that 'gold' does not form part of this list. Quite justifiably the targumist takes the Hebrew of MT ('the gold of the work') as referring to the work of the artisan

who had created the garment. In order to clarify as he typically does, the targumist rearranges the word order and replaces the awkward מלאכה ('the work of') with the clear משקען ('being set').

A marginal note in *Codex Reuchlinianus* cites "another Targum" and "another scribe", who provide a drastically different explanation of the precious stones:

"All kinds of jewels adorned your robe. You saw with your own eyes ten canopies which I made for the Primal Adam, made of carnelian, topaz and diamonds; beryl of the Mediterranean Sea and spotted stones, sapphire, emerald, smaragd and fine gold. They showed him at his wedding all the works of Creation, and the angels were running before him with timbrels and flutes. So, on the day when Adam was created they were prepared to honour him, but after that he went astray and was expelled from there..."²¹⁸

This, however, is to be considered a later intrusion into the Targumic tradition, based on a well established classical rabbinic interpretation of this passage (e.g. *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* 12; *Leviticus Rabbah* 20.2; *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* 8.2; *Genesis Rabbah* 18.1; b. *Talmud: Baba Bathra* 75a-75b; *Pesikta Rabbati* 14:10).

The remaining Hebrew of verse 13 is extremely difficult (see above on page 56) and the targumist has been forced to take drastic measures to squeeze any intelligible sense out of it whatsoever. Out of necessity he takes תפיד ונקבד בד ביום הבראך כונו between the words as a whole unit, and jumps back and forth between the words as though he were carefully unpicking a puzzle.

The targumist begins with a simple resumptive phrase, כל אליך ('all of these'), which simply serves to make explicit the subjects of the following discussion

²¹⁸ Levey's translation.

and as such they do not have a direct basis in the Hebrew. The semantic range of the root כּוּן can quite easily incorporate the notion of making (although the *polet* is unlikely to refer to the making of a garment: see my discussion above on page 60), and this is sufficient for the targumist to read עבִידָתָא (disregarding the form temporarily).

It is however difficult to see quite how the targumist has arrived at תְּקוּנָא ('your adornment'). Perhaps an answer lies in בכִּין תְּקוּנָא taken together. Together בכִּין תְּקוּנָא offers a loose phonetic resemblance of the Hebrew וּנְקִבֵּד בְּךָ. The targumist may even have had in mind the principle of 'al tiqrei, normally identified in Midrash by the formula "do not read X but Y" (hence Heb. אַל תִּקְרֵי, "do not read"). 'al tiqrei is a somewhat loosely defined and flexible category, typically characterised by such features as the switching between homophonous words or homographs; division of a word into several parts or grouping together of several words into one; metathesis (i.e. the transposition of sounds or letters of a word); reading plene or defective, etc.²¹⁹ Of course in the absence of the introductory formula we cannot be certain the targumist is invoking the principle,²²⁰ nonetheless, the targumist already had the idea of a garment in mind (לְבוּשָׁא), and there seems to have been just enough of a clue for him in the Hebrew וּנְקִבֵּד to reach תְּקוּנָא.

I have argued that "because of this your heart became elevated" indicated the targumist's key hermeneutical tool, but where has the targumist got this phrase from? Again the targumist has begun with the bigger picture (i.e. overall the oracle is about a king whose hubris results in his degrading

²¹⁹ Roger Le Deaut, 'Usage Implicite de l' 'Al Tiqré dans le Targum de Job de Qumrân' in Domingo Muñoz Leon, *Salvacion en la Palabra* (Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1986), 421-22; Abraham Arzi, 'Al Tikrei' in Fred Skolnik, et al (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (2nd ed., London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 2, 20.

²²⁰ Philip S. Alexander, *The Targum of Canticles, The Aramaic Bible 17A* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2002), 32.

destruction) and moves to pin that bigger vision into points of detail. Moving forward from ונקביך, the targumist easily finds use for בך: the preposition plus pronominal suffix in Hebrew easily morphs into the adverbial בכי, expressing consequence. Again the resemblance is an audible one. בך comes into play once again for the targumist, and again in the form of an audible pun, by simply prefixing a *lamedh*: 'On you' (בך) becomes 'your heart' (לביך). It is as though the targumist wished to create points of contact with the Hebrew text, little hooks upon which his reading could hang, as if to indicate that this is still *exegesis* and not *eisegesis*.

ראים is more abstract. Only one possible explanation presents itself to me here: the targumist may have taken his prompt from תפיד, seeing an allusion to נוף, attested in BH only in the form of two nouns (נוף 'elevation, height' Ps.48:3; and נפה 'height'? Jos. 11:2, 12:23; 1 Kg. 4:11). The looseness of the connection here, however, makes this derivation uncertain. However, the 'elevation of the heart' is a familiar enough idiom in biblical Hebrew for misplaced pride and hubris (e.g. Ez. 31:10; leading to apostasy, Deut 8:14; Hos. 13:6), that having arrived at לבך, ראים could well have followed quite naturally (cf. Tg.Ezek.28:2).

Targum	<u>לא אסתכלתא בפגור דאת עביד חללי ונקבין דאינו צורכך ולא אפשר לך דתחקים בלא בהו מיזמא דאתבריתא עמך מחקנין:</u>
MT	והב מלאכת תפיד ונקבך בך ביום הבראך כוננו
My translation	<i>But you did not reflect wisely on your body, which is made of hollows and holes of which you have need since it is not possible that you exist without them; from the day that you were created they were arranged within you.</i>
Levey	<i>however, you did not reflect wisely on your body, which consists of orifices and organs of which you have need, for it is impossible for you to survive without them.</i>

They were designed for you from the day on which you were created.

Continuing his explanation of verse 13, the targumist begins a new consequential clause. He employs the same technique of jumping back and forth between the words we identified above in order to give תפיד ונקביך individual attention. So the targumist begins with תפיד ונקביך then creates an explanation around them. נקביך gives the targumist his cue. The root נקב in BH means to 'to pierce, perforate', and this sense transfers across into Aramaic, where נִקְבָּ ('hole, perforation, incision') is a well attested noun. From this point of certainty the targumist looks back at תפיד. Knowing what he is looking for, the targumist again employs a process of *'al tiqrei*, takes the Aramaic root פתי 'to open' (BH פתח), and provides a synonymous root (חלל), which is considerably clearer than anything the root פתי could provide.

The exact phrase "hollows and holes" is found again in the Babylonian Talmud (Berakoth 60d), in a slightly peculiar discussion of how one ought to pray prior to and immediately following a visit to the lavatory! The late third, early fourth century Babylonian *amora*, Abayye, suggests that upon emerging from said facilities one should pray as follows: "Blessed are you...who has formed man with wisdom and created in him various sorts of holes and hollows (חללין ונקבין). It is clear before your glorious throne that if one of them [that should remain closed] should open, or if one of them [that should remain open] should close, it will not be possible to arise before you".

Abayye's instruction clarifies exactly what the targumist had in mind: the excretory organs. The targumist's aim is to remind the prince of Tyre of his mortality. The message is a little crude, but effective: you may be adorned with glory on the outside, but on the inside you are just like the rest of us.

Having established that the text is concerned with the ‘hollows and holes’ that make up our bodies, the targumist develops from this a warning against allowing your riches to give you a feeling of immortality. Because of his excessive wealth the king of Tyre’s heart has become *so* elevated that he has forgotten (i.e. לא אסתכלתא) that he is – like everyone else – just a mortal creation dependent on the vital functions of the human body (‘of which you have need as it is not possible that you exist without them’). The targumist expands this point quite freely, but does attempt a loose resemblance to the MT in אסתכלתא (for MT מלאכת).

The odd form כונו (see my discussion above on page 60f) gets a double interpretation at the hand of the targumist. The Aramaic קוס in the *ithpael* ‘to be preserved, sustained’ provides the targumist a legitimate opportunity to emphasise the mortality of the king (i.e. “it is not possible that you exist without them”). It is also a useful amplification and clarification of the point the targumist is implying in הללן and נקבין.

After his prolonged expansion the targumist picks up the MT, מיומא דאחבריתא עמך. The targumist acknowledges the ambiguity of את at the beginning of verse 14 with עמך (this is probably not a reflection of the Gk μετά, since the Cherub is absent in Tg. Ezek.). Wishing to pick up the order of the MT the targumist must now provide a second interpretation for כונו. The semantic range of the Aramaic root תקן is close to the BH בון, so the targumist now has an opportunity to do justice to the plural form of כונו: the targumist asks what were “arranged”, and having cast הלל and נקב in the plural he finds his answer, “hollows and holes...were arranged within you”.

Targum 14 את מלך מרבא למלכו ויהבית לך רבותא ואם על טור קדישא דיו בסרתא ובעמא קדישא
סרתא למשלו:

MT את כרוב ממשח הסוכך ותתיד בהר קדש אלהים היית בתוך אבני אש החהלכת 14

My translation You are *a king anointed for leadership* and I gave you *greatness yet you had contempt* for the Holy mountain of *The Lord* and you *hoped to rule over the Holy People*.

Levey 14 You are *a king anointed for the kingdom*, and I have given you *greatness*, but you *looked with contempt* upon the holy mountain of *the Lord*, and you *planned to exercise dominion over the holy people*.

The targumist's resolution of the ambiguity of MT את (i.e. is it "you (fem.)", the preposition "with", or the definite object marker?) is eloquent in its simplicity: he simply retains the consonants and allows the shift in language to do its work. את ("you" feminine) of biblical Hebrew becomes את ("you" common) in Targumic Aramaic. But for the targumist the king of Tyre could in no sense be a *cherub*. In Tg. Ezek the *cherubim* of chapter 1 are a vision "of the glory of the Shekinah of the Lord" (1:1); elsewhere in the Hebrew Scriptures *cherubim* appear as forming a divine chariot (Ps. 18:11 = 2 Sam 22:11), as the throne of Yahweh (e.g. 2 Sam 6:2), atop the Ark (e.g. Ex. 25:18-22), and often as decorative features in the Temple. Clearly the king of Tyre cannot fall into any of these categories, so the targumist assumes that there must be a secondary level of meaning.

The targumist has arrived at מלך מרבא למלכו ("You are a king anointed for leadership") from MT את כרוב ממשח הסוכך ("You were an anointed cherub who covers") most obviously via the root ממשח, which is well attested in biblical Hebrew with the sense of anointing kings (e.g. Judg 9:8, 1 Sam 16:3, 12, 13; 1 Kgs 1:39; 2 Kgs 11:12; 23:30; 2 Chron. 22:7; 23:11; Ps 89:20).

The loose phonetic resemblance between כרוב (MT) and מרבא (Tg.) suggests that the Targumist transposes the order so that ממשח (MT) becomes the basis

for מלך (Tg.), while כרוב (MT) serves as the basis for מרבא (Tg.). In abandoning the *cherub* of MT, it seems the targumist wanted an echo of the Hebrew כרוב to remain. This he achieves with the verb רבי, which in Aramaic appears frequently with the sense 'to appoint (to office)' or 'to anoint (as priest or king)' (e.g. Tg.O.Ex. 37:2; Tg.Isa. 42:6, etc.).

Whence has the targumist arrived at למלכו? Is this just an elaboration of משה?

No. The targumist pulls out all the exegetical stops with respect to MT כרוב ממשח הסוכך to achieve a binary translation: one Hebrew word, for one Aramaic. כרוב (MT) becomes מרבא (Tg.), supported by the Aramaic root רבי (derived from כרוב), and ממשח (MT) is transformed into מלך (Tg.). So whence למלכו? Quite straightforwardly the targumist finds in הסוכך (MT) the root סוך, which in Targumic Aramaic (and Tosefta, Mishnah, Yerushalmi, etc.) has the sense of 'to pour out or anoint with oil' (e.g. Tg.Ruth 3:3; Tg.Onk.Deut. 28:40; Tg.Onk.Ex. 30:32), just as one does for a king.

The targumist (like the Masoretic scribe responsible for the punctuation and accentuation, above on page 70) clearly found ונתחיד בהר קדש אלהים היית too difficult to treat in the same binary fashion. As was the case for the Masoretic scribe who provided the punctuation, to the targumist there appeared to be too many verbs (יית אלהים could not possibly be the intended sense!).

The targumist begins with the conclusion that ונתחיד cannot mean "I put you on the Holy Mountain...". Why would God put the king of Tyre on the Temple mount? So the targumist reverts to the primary sense of the root נתן, 'to give'. The targumist is now in need of an indirect object (i.e. what did God give him?). As it stands בהר makes no sense as the indirect object, but through 'al tiqrei the targumist finds the biblical Hebrew root רבה 'to be or become great', רבי in Aramaic, hence רבותא (literally 'greatness').

The same process might also account for *בסרתא* (“you had contempt”), since *רבה* in the *ithpael* can mean ‘to boast’ or ‘claim superiority’ in Aramaic (e.g. Yerushalmi Sabbath 6:7^d). The same is true of its cognate root *רַבַּב*, where this usage appears more frequently, e.g. Tg.Num.16:3, 13; Tg.Ex. 5:15; Tg.Jer. 48:42). Switching just one letter (*בסר* for *בהר*) gave the targumist the concept he needed.

Despite the fact God had given him greatness, the king of Tyre had nothing but contempt for God’s greatest gift, the Temple (*טור קודשא דיין*). Again we return to the central hermeneutical thread that the targumist is drawing through the entire lament: “because of this [your extravagant wealth] your heart became elevated”.

At first sight it is almost impossible to see how the targumist has arrived at *למשלט* (“you hoped to rule over the Holy People”) from *בתוך אבני אש* (“in the midst of fire stones you walked”). One possibility is that the targumist has arrived at ‘holy people’ from ‘stones of fire’ by analogy with Zechariah 9:16 “And the LORD their God will save them in that day // As the flock of His people // For they are as *the stones of a crown* (*אבני־נזר*) // Sparkling in His land”. Here the stones clearly refer to the chosen people, Israel. The Targum to Zechariah²²¹ reinforces this point, identifying the stones here with those of the high-priest ephod (Ex.28:9-12), which in turn are identified in the targumim to Exodus as corresponding to the twelve tribes of Israel (e.g. Tg.Neof.Ex. 28:17-21; Tg.PJ.Ex. 39:10-14; etc.). By analogy then, to our present targumist ‘stones of fire’ might have provided a sufficient hint to produce, Israel, the Holy People (cf. Tg.Ezek. 28:16).

²²¹ The written form of which may date from the end of the first century CE or earlier: see Kevin J. Cathcart and Robert P. Gordon, *The Targum to the Minor Prophets, The Aramaic Bible 14* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989), 16-18.

There is no obvious connection between *התהלכת*...*בתוך* and *למשלט* and between *היית* and *סברתא*. The targumist has probably simply taken the two verbs as metaphorical: taking the 'stones of fire' as the 'Holy People' the targumist asks, What was the king of Tyre doing 'in their midst' (*היית בתוך*) 'walking to and fro' (*התהלכת*)? No doubt, given the targumist's presentation of the king of Tyre as someone with a seriously over-inflated sense of their own importance, the answer was clear: trying to appoint himself emperor.

Targum 15 שלים את באורחתך מימא דאתבריתא עד דאשתכח שקב בד:

MT 15 תמים אתה בדרכיך מיום הבראך עד נמצא עולתה בך

My translation You were perfect in your ways from the day that you were created until *falsehood* was found in you.

Levey You were perfect in your ways from the day you were created, until *falsehood* was found in you.

For the targumist verse 15 is perfect as it stands: the king was blessed in every way, if only he had not let that go to his head! The only (albeit subtle) adjustment the targumist makes is to alter the nuance of the king's crime. MT has *עולתה*, meaning 'injustice', the targumist prefers *שקר*, which conveys a more particular sense of a 'lie' or 'falsehood' (e.g. Tg.1 Sam. 12:3; Tg.Onk.Ex. 20:7; b.Sabb. 104^a; and frequently).

Targum 16 בסגיאות סחורתך אתמליאו אנוצך חטוף וחבתא ואפסידך על דברתא על טור קדשא דיני ואבדיך מלכא רבתנא על דסברתא למשלט בעמא קדישא:

MT 16 ברב רכלתך מלו תנבך חמס ותחטא ואחללך מהר אלהים ואבדך ברוב הסבך מתנד אבני אש

My translation Because of the great quantity of your trade your *storehouses*²²² were filled [with] stolen-goods and you sinned. So I broke you because *you had contempt for the Holy Mountain of The Lord* and I destroyed you, *O noble king*²²³, because you hoped to rule over the Holy People.

Levey Because of your abundant commerce, your treasuries were filled with *what you had taken by violence*. You sinned; and I made you profane, because you *looked upon the holy mountain of the Lord with contempt*; and I destroyed you, *O noble king, because you planned to exercise dominion over the holy people*.

The targumist opens his translation of verse 16 with some simple points of clarification: **אוצרך** ('your storehouse') clarifies **תוכך** ('your midst'), and **חטוף** 'stolen goods' – the verbal sense implying 'goods acquired through violent robbery' – clarifies **חמס** (i.e. how can an individual's midst be full of violence?).

The targumist's interpretation of verse 14 provides him with the tools to translate the remainder of verse 16. **על דבסרתא על** ('because you had contempt for...') is triggered by **הר אלהים**. Having established in verse 14 that the king of Tyre had looked with contempt on the Holy Mountain, the targumist assumes the same thought is implied here in verse 16: so 'you had contempt for...' can be simply imported direct from verse 14. Exactly the same process is at work with respect to **אבני אש**. The targumist has already established in verse 14 that 'the stones of fire' are a metaphor for the Holy People, Israel, again alludes back to verse 14, so again 'you hoped to rule over...' can simply be imported.

The targumist does diverge from his previous exegesis with **מלכא ררבתנא** (for MT **כרוב הסבך**). As in verse 14 the root **סוך** ('to pour out or anoint with oil')

²²² Whether the Greek Versions ('LXX' **τα ταμεια**) inspired **אוצרך** or whether the targumist has arrived here by his own deductions is a moot point, although given the targumist's distinction from the Greek on a number of significant points (e.g. the stones, the cherub, etc.) borrowing on points of details seems unlikely.

²²³ Ms. p. 116 of the Montefiore Library, Jews' College, London, reads 'like a great king'. A number of Tiberian manuscripts and the early printed editions read 'king of nobility'.

produces מלכא, but ררבתנא is a new spin on כרוב. As in verse 14 the targumist uses the consonants in the loosest way to inspire ררבתנא – artfully choosing a verbal root (רברב) whose semantic range takes in not only an idea of greatness but also of boastfulness and pride.

Finally, it is worth noting that the targumist takes ואבדך of the MT as the first, and not the third person singular (ואפסינך). In this respect the targumist supports the reading of the Masoretic scribe responsible for the punctuation and vocalisation, who vocalises אבדך as a contracted *piel* first person imperfect (see my discussion above on page 69), which may support an early date for this reading convention. Although for the targumist, of course, this reading has been necessary (because the cherub has vanished from the scene) in a way that it was not for the scribe who punctuated and vocalised the MT.

Targum	17 ראים לבך בתוספת אתחבלת חוכמתך על זיו אימתך על ארעא רטשתך אזהרא למלכיא יהבתך לאסתכלא בך:
MT	17 גבה לבך בפיבך שחת חכמתך על יפעתך על ארץ השלכתך לפני מלכים נתתך לראוה בך
My translation	Your heart was elevated by your <i>strength</i> , you corrupted your wisdom ²²⁴ because of your fear-inspiring splendour, I drove you out upon the earth, I presented you as a <i>forewarning</i> to kings to learn from you.
Levey	You grew arrogant because of your might; your wisdom was ruined because of your awesome splendor (sic), <i>I have driven you out over the earth</i> ; I have given you as a warning to kings to ponder over you.

There does not seem to be anything exegetically sophisticated about the targumist's choice of 'strength' (תוקף), for MT's 'beauty' (יפי). Given that the targumist is attempting to create a caricature of the king of Tyre in terms of an

²²⁴ Several early printed editions read 'you were corrupted by your wisdom'.

imperial aggressor, 'strength' fits this new context much better than 'beauty'. Likewise the targumist's choice of אזהרה ('forewarning, prohibition') for MT לפני (idiom = 'before') is simply clarification.

Targum 18 מסג' חובך בשקר סחורתך אפיסתא מקדשך ואיתי עממיא דתקיפין כאישתא מחובי ודונך
אנן ישעצנד ואתנינד בקטס על ארעא לעיני כל חזך:

MT 18 מרב עונך בעול רכלתך חללת מקדשיך ואוצא אש מתוכך היא אכלתך ואתנך לאפר על
הארץ לעיני כל ראיך

My translation Because of the greatness of your sin in the falsehood of your trade you desecrated your *sanctuary*²²⁵, and I will bring forth *nations, strong like fire, because of your deliberate sins they will destroy you*. I will make you like ashes upon the earth before all who see you.

Levey Through the multitude of your sins in dishonest trade you have profaned your sanctuary; *and because of your deliberate sins* I brought *nations who are as strong as fire. They shall destroy you*; and I will reduce you to ashes on the ground in the eyes of all who see you.

The targumist is able to stick relatively closely to the Hebrew here since it mostly supports his central hermeneutical theme. However אכלתך ('I brought forth fire from your midst, it consumed you') does cause the targumist some confusion. The targumist's approach here appears to have been to take the whole phrase as metaphorical (rather than deriving his exegesis through individual words – as has characterised his treatment of the lament elsewhere).

אש ('I brought forth fire') becomes עממיא דתקיפין כאישתא ('I brought forth nations, strong like fire'), on the principal, well attested in the Hebrew

²²⁵ The targumist's reading 'your sanctuary' (singular) where MT has 'your sanctuaries' (plural) is probably not exegetical but due to the *Vorlage*, since multiple manuscript editions (including Cairo Genizah) and the Syriac read מקדשך.

Bible and a Targumic cliché, that nations can become God's agents for the execution of punishment (e.g. with the Babylonian exile, Lam. 1:5; Ezek. 39:23; and frequently).

The transformation from מתוכך ('from your midst') to מחובי זדונך ('because of your deliberate sins'), provides the targumist with an opportunity to clarify the cause of the king of Tyre's annihilation: surely, the targumist asks, eradicating the king into nothing but ashes is a bit over the top for sins and falsehood alone! There must be something more to it than that: זדון explains. The king's sins are no average sins, rather they are premeditated sins committed wilfully (זדון), which according to a common *halakah* recorded in the Talmud, are rightly punished by extinction (e.g. b.Sabbath 69a, and frequently).

The targumist arrives at אנון ישיציןך ('they will destroy you') from היא אכלתך ('it consumed you') via the well attested figurative sense of the verb אכל in biblical Hebrew, meaning 'to devour (i.e. with the sword), slay, destroy' (e.g. Deut. 32:42; 2 Sam 2:26; Isa. 1:7; Jer. 8:16; 30:16; and frequently). The targumist throws in the pronoun אנון here to clarify the subject (עממיא) – since his desire to follow the order of the MT has resulted in the subject and verb becoming separated – and to provide a counterpart to the MT היא.

Again demonstrating his desire to adhere as closely as possible to the MT in this verse the targumist picks up the Hebrew with 'I will make you like ashes upon the earth before all who see you...' The targumist makes two subtle changes. First, the targumist casts the verb into the future tense to fit with what precedes. The targumist has cast all the verbs in this verse in the first person imperfect (debatably, Levey takes איתי as the *afel* perfect²²⁶). There is no clear motivation for this in the text, other than in the case of ואתנך, where a

²²⁶ Levey, *The Targum of Ezekiel*, 84.

switch of tense enables the targumist to minimize the consonantal changes required (ואתנינד). Secondly, in line with his overarching political agenda the targumist transforms the MT 'into ashes' into a simile 'like ashes' (the root תני has the sense of 'change' here, cf. e.g. Tg.Job 14:20)²²⁷.

Targum 19 כל ידעך בעממיא צדיאו עלך בד לא הוית אתנינד ובז תהי עד עלמא:

MT 19 כל יודעך בעמים שממו עליך בלהות היית ואינד עד עולם

My translation Everyone who knows you among the nations will be astounded because of you. I will make you *as though you do not exist*, and *thus you will be* for eternity.

Levey All who know you among the nations are astounded over you. *I will make you as though you had never been, and so you shall be, forever.*

The final verse of the lament requires very little alteration from the targumist. One minor adjustment that the targumist does make, which will be obvious to all readers, is the apparent duplication of the verbal root 'to be' (תהי and הוית). This is implied in the MT by the particle of negation (אינ) with pronominal suffix (i.e. 'and you [shall be] nothing forevermore'), but mere implication is not enough to satisfy our current exegete. The targumist gets his second 'to be' from בלהות, 'terrors', which is otherwise not represented in the Aramaic. By the simple insertion of a space he produces the adverb בל, and הות, which with the addition of a *yod* becomes הוית, hence לא הוית. Following the trend we noted above (e.g. בקטם 28:18, באילן בעדן 28:13) the targumist inserts כד to create the simile – he is not *actually* going to be turned into ashes, reduced to non-existence, rather his punishment will be *so* bad he might as well be. The

²²⁷ But cf. Ms. p. 116 of the Montefiore Library, Jews' College, London, which reads בקטם.

targumist demonstrates his tendency to create phonetic resonances by converting וְאִינֶךָ into אֲתִינֶכָּ.

Concluding Remarks

It cannot be disputed that the targumist of Ezekiel has put his own, quite distinct, spin on the narrative as we find it in the Masoretic Hebrew text. Yet under close examination this targumist has not simply played free and loose with the text he has had before him to bring forth his own pre-conceived reading. Rather he shows supreme reverence for the text he is handling, his attention to detail is quite astounding and every exegetical step he takes is firmly rooted in the Hebrew text that lay before him. To recap, the Targum reads as follows (italics indicating variation from MT):

¹² Son of Adam raise a lament over the king of Tyre and say to him, Thus says The Lord God, 'You are likened to the format of the figure who was set up in wisdom and founded in splendour. ¹³ With an abundance of good things and delicacies you were living in luxury as though you dwelt in Eden, the garden of The Lord. Wealth, status, and honour were given to you. Every precious stone was arranged upon your garment: carnelian, a green jewel, and diamond; aqua-marina, beryll, and a spotted-stone; sapphire, emerald, and berek; being set in gold. Of all of these your adornment was made, because of this your heart became elevated. But you did not reflect wisely on your body, which is made of hollows and holes of which you have need since it is not possible that you exist without them; from the day that you were created they were arranged within you. ¹⁴ You are a king anointed for leadership and I gave you greatness yet

you had contempt for the Holy mountain of The Lord and you hoped to rule over the Holy People. ¹⁵ You were perfect in your ways from the day that you were created until *falsehood* was found in you. ¹⁶ Because of the great quantity of your trade your *storehouses* were filled [with] stolen-goods and you sinned. So I broke you because *you had contempt for the Holy Mountain of The Lord* and I destroyed you, *O noble king, because you hoped to rule over the Holy People.* ¹⁷ Your heart was elevated by your *strength*, you corrupted your wisdom because of your fear-inspiring splendour, I drove you out upon the earth, I presented you as a *forewarning* to kings to learn from you. ¹⁸ Because of the greatness of your sin in the falsehood of your trade you desecrated your *sanctuary*, and I will bring forth *nations, strong like fire, because of your deliberate sins they will destroy you.* I will make you *like ashes* upon the earth before all who see you. ¹⁹ Everyone who knows you among the nations will be astounded because of you. I will make you *as though you do not exist, and thus you will be* for eternity.

This targumist is a consummate wordsmith and a highly refined exegete. I cannot help feeling that my own inadequate grasp of Hebrew and Aramaic has meant some of the targumist's more subtle and sophisticated manoeuvres must have passed me by.

As my analysis has demonstrated quite clearly, the targumist's Hebrew *Vorlage* appears to have been something relatively close to the text of the MT. There are a couple of points of detail (which I have noted above) where the reading of Tg.Ezek and some of the Greek versions are in agreement. However, any sustained use of a *Vorlage* of a Greek recension seems unlikely.

First, since on each occasion it has been possible to demonstrate how or why the targumist may have derived his reading from a *Vorlage* reflecting our MT; and secondly since there are some key features of the Greek Versions (e.g. precious stones, cherub, etc.) that are entirely absent in the Targum. On the whole, the targumist's exegesis seems to have been thoroughly grounded in a MT-type text.

From this base the targumist develops a straightforward political warning, that "pride goeth before destruction" (AV, Prov. 16:18). The king's ill-founded hubris, inspired by ill-gotten material wealth, and aggressive imperial ambitions directed against Israel, ultimately result in God's punishing intervention.

For the targumist this is a clear-cut political message that would ultimately be encouraging to an audience suffering persecution, or imperial subjugation. The closing decades of the first century CE provide an obvious context for such a message, but ultimately there are a number of periods when this might be applicable.

To convey successfully this political message the targumist finds it necessary to play down some of the more mythical features. He does this by transforming some of the language into metaphor. We see this in "as though you dwelt in Eden" (28:13), "strong like fire" (28:18), and "like ashes" (28:18). But the most obvious outcome of this is the omission of the cherub. We can be confident that the targumist found כְּרוּב in his *Vorlage*, since it inspired a number of allusions (via verbal roots רָבַב, רָבַב 28:14; and רָבַב 28:16); yet the idea that the king might either be or be with a cherub did not fit the targumist's political agenda. To the targumist this clearly was not the intended meaning of the text, so the targumist probes deeper, employs the exegetical tools at his disposal, until he finds what (to his mind) the text is really getting at.

It is interesting to speculate whether the targumist's omission of the cherub was in part an attempt to avoid confusion with the myth of the fallen angels, attested in the Enochic tradition (e.g. 1 Enoch 1-39; 11Q11; 4Q180) and ultimately derived from Genesis 6, or an attempt to counter early Christian interpretation of the verse, which took the verse to be describing the fall of Satan (see Chapter 6). Sadly though, for want of documentary evidence, this remains pure speculation.

The targumist develops his political message through a number of exegetical strategies. As with many of the targumim, the current targumist employs symbolic and metaphorical understandings of words and phrases (hence, 'Holy People' from 'stones of fire' in verse 14). The most notable of the targumist's exegetical strategies, though, is word-play, which is manifest in a variety of forms. The targumist is keen on creating phonetic resonances (particularly, as we have noted, around the word כְּרוּב) and rearranging or adding consonants to produce a new sense, as we noted to be the case with the Hebrew תַּפִּיךְ in verse 13 and רְבוּתָא in verse 14. For convenience I have often described this with the term *'al tiqrei*, but in truth this category "is flexible and somewhat ill defined"²²⁸, and we ought not to think of it as being a formal, clearly structured, interpretative technique that the targumist could follow step-by-step. Rather the targumist appears to have found hints and suggestions in the text that were sufficient to point him in this or that direction.

Finally, we must ask, Does the interpretation of the Targum match rabbinic interpretation? The answer to this question will become apparent in the next chapter, but in short the answer is 'No'. Although certain of the Targum's themes do appear elsewhere (e.g. this lament crops up in Mekhilta de Rabbi

²²⁸ Alexander, *The Targum of Canticles*, 32.

Ishmael and occasionally in Midrash as an example of self-aggrandisement, see Chapter 5), among those sources examined in this thesis, the targumist's representation of the *whole* lament of 28:12-19 as a moral-political fable ("pride goeth before destruction"!) is unparalleled.

5. THE WISDOM OF ADAM AND THE ARROGANCE OF HIRAM

Ezekiel 28 in Rabbinic Literature

Introduction

As we progress chronologically through the continuum of interpretation we now reach a point where we move away from materials that are structured around the text (i.e. Hebrew text, Greek versions, and Targum). In form at least, the rabbinic materials discussed here follow an explicitly interpretative schema. In other words, they are not bound by the structure of the text of Ezekiel 28:12-19. In fact without exception Ezekiel 28:12-19 is not the text under discussion in the various rabbinic sources we address. Rather, it is always adduced to prove a particular point of *aggadah* or to provide an example for the ongoing argument.

Arranging this rabbinic material in a discussion of the history of interpretation presents its own unique challenges. Often one is able to date the final *redaction* of a text with a modicum of certainty, but dating the actual traditions crystallised within those text is extremely challenging. This is particularly clear in cases where a saying or argument is attributed to a scribe who predates the actual compilation of the text under discussion by several hundred years. Frequently we have no way of verifying the text's attribution²²⁹.

This is to be set against two principal aspects of rabbinic culture. First, there is a clear rabbinic self-perception of being heirs to an oral tradition which

²²⁹ See Jacob Neusner, *In Search of Talmudic Biography: The Problem of the Attributed Saying*, *Brown Judaic Studies* 70 (Chico CA: Scholars, 1984).

ultimately stemmed from Sinai²³⁰, so traditions were carried in an oral tradition – often for centuries – before crystallising into a text. Secondly, there is an inclination towards the collection of anthologies as opposed to recording the works of individual authors. This is the inevitable outcome of the overwhelming emphasis on the oral nature of the tradition, but it means that we are unable to extrapolate a dating for the whole from the dating of smaller individual units.

Given the difficulty in fixing certain dates to individual traditions I have concentrated on grouping the texts thematically and focusing on the common *haggadic* traditions, rather than getting too absorbed in prolonged discussion regarding who said what first, and when, and who borrowed what from whom. This thematic arrangement has the added benefit of bringing into focus the many points of correspondence and interdependence between the various texts since texts from different periods display common traditions of *aggadah*.

With all that said it is worth briefly introducing the texts we will be dealing with in order to set them, as far as possible, within their historical context, and to provide a flavour of their overall structure and exegetical aims. It seemed sensible to me to introduce the texts in as much of a chronological order as can be managed under the circumstances. This I hope will provide some sort of indication of the chronological framework we are dealing with.

²³⁰ Marc Hirshman, 'Aggadic Midrash' in Shmuel Safrai, *et al* (eds.), *The Literature of the Sages*, Part 2, *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, Section 2 (Philadelphia PA: Fortress, 2006), 107.

Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael (2nd – 3rd Century CE)²³¹

An apparently tannaitic *midrash* on Exodus²³², Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael presents a running exegesis on Exodus 12:1-23:19, ending with an exposition of two passages on the Sabbath in Exodus 31 and 35. There is some indication that the work (or an early form of the work) was known to the Babylonian Talmud (e.g. Yoma 74a; B. B. 124b), although not under the title 'Mekhilta'. Although "there is little doubt that Mekhilta as we have it has undergone numerous redactions, beginning in the *amoraic* period" and "therefore it is difficult to determine the date of its origin as an exegetical collection"²³³, most scholars accept that the bulk of the redaction took place as early as the second half of the third century²³⁴.

Although the Mekhilta is essentially a *halakhic* midrash, large parts of it do deal with *haggadic* matters, containing at points some more abstract theological reflections. All of this is set within the framework of Scripture. Although it contains a mixture of exegetical comments and midrashic material, the order in which the material appears is dictated by the book of Exodus, so there is little discursive continuity and no sustained argument or position emerges.

²³¹ Dates given are indicative of the date of compilation or final redaction as indicated in the discussion. For a general introduction to the problems associated with dating rabbinic writings see Hermann L. Strack and G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, trans. M. Bockmuehl (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 52-4

²³² Jacob Lauterbach, *Mekilta de Rabbi-Ishmael* (Philadelphia PA: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933), Vols 1, xix; John Westerdale Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 70; but see Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 278, who questions how much of the tannaitic core remains.

²³³ Gary G. Porton, 'Rabbinic Midrash' in Jacob Neusner (ed.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity*, Part 1, *The Literary and Archaeological Sources* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 229.

²³⁴ Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 279; Gary G. Porton, 'Rabbinic Midrash' in Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson (eds.), *A History of Biblical Interpretation*, Vol 1, The Ancient Period (Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2003).

Genesis Rabbah (c. 400-450 CE)

Genesis Rabbah is a collection of Midrashic homiletic comments to Genesis, and is generally considered the earliest of the *amoraic* homiletic midrashim, having been finally redacted in the first half of the fifth century²³⁵.

Genesis Rabbah follows the structure of the Hebrew, working through the text verse by verse. It includes exegetical comments, parables, biblical narrative expansions, and *haggadic* stories transmitted by rabbinic sages of the Mishnaic and Talmudic period.

Its basic method of interpretation is to present at the beginning of each section an extended exposition of a verse unconnected to the Genesis verse under discussion (called a proem or *petihah* pl. *petihot*), which is subsequently related to the Genesis verse. Exegesis of this type “begins by citing a verse from elsewhere and then proceeds through a chain of interpretations until it arrives at the very first verse of the Torah reading, which it then identifies as echoing the notions derived in the previous exegesis”²³⁶. In other words, the implicit premise is that the two units are mutually illuminating.

Although the method of subjecting the *petihah* verse to extensive discussion, which is then used to shed light on the verse in Genesis, is by far the most common in Genesis Rabbah, the text also makes use of a second technique in which the verse in Genesis is subject to extensive discussion, and the argument that develops is supported by various proof texts drawn from elsewhere in the Hebrew Scriptures. There is clearly a fundamental principal undergirding both these activities: that of the ultimate unity of Scripture.

²³⁵ Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 304; Moshe David Herr and Stephen G. Wald, ‘Genesis Rabbah’ in Fred Skolnik, et al (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (London: Thomson Gale, 2007), 448-449

²³⁶ Lawrence H. Schiffman, *From Text to Tradition: a History of Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1991), 236.

Unlike some of the other examples of Midrash examined here, Genesis Rabbah presents a coherent and original account of the book of Genesis, shaped around a theology of history. The deep-seated premise guiding much of the exegesis is that Israel's past points towards the message that lies in Israel's future, as Neusner neatly summarizes: "The Torah tells us not only what happened but why. The Torah permits us to discover the laws of history. Once we know those laws, we may peer into the future and come to an assessment of what is going to happen to us – and, especially, of how we shall be saved from our present existence"²³⁷

Babylonian Talmud or Bavli (pre 427 CE, editing continued until 6th/7th CE)

The Babylonian Talmud, which Avery-Peck has rightly called "the *magnum opus* of Rabbinic Judaism in its formative age"²³⁸, is a collection of the teachings and debates of the major Jewish scholars who flourished between the 3rd and 6th centuries CE (the *amoraim*). It is the record of discussion and debates of those scribes who were engaged in the intensive study and interpretation of the Mishnah (edited c.200 CE) in Babylon, one of two centres for rabbinic scholarship in the period (the other being Palestine).

The date of the final redaction (or 'closure') of the Babylonian Talmud (also known as the Bavli) is difficult to establish. The tannaitic and most of the amoraic literary strata of the Bavli are by and large understood to have been formulated and accepted as authoritative by the time of Rav Ashi (d.427 CE), with whom we are told the instruction (הוראה) ended (b.Bava Mezia 86a); however, most scholars have accepted the view that work continued on the Bavli into the sixth or early seventh century CE²³⁹.

²³⁷ Jacob Neusner, *What is Midrash?* (Philadelphia PA: Fortress, 1987), 52.

²³⁸ Avery-Peck, 'The Mishnah, Tosefta, and the Talmuds', 198.

²³⁹ Stephen G. Wald, 'Talmud, Babylonian' in in Fred Skolnik, *et al* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 19, 478; Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, 64;

The impetus behind both Talmudim (i.e. Babylonian and Palestinian, also known as Bavli and Yerushalmi respectively) is the extension of the Mishnaic laws into general legal principles. However, the Babylonian Talmud achieved a much greater level of abstraction than the Yerushalmi, and consequently contains much more *haggadic* material. This is reflected in the fact that of the two Talmudim only Bavli actually cites Ezekiel 28. Ultimately the Babylonian Talmud is concerned with the underlying principle, not the rule, and it is this quest for the underlying principle that enables scribes of the Babylonian Talmud to develop abstract concepts from concrete Mishnaic *halakha*²⁴⁰.

The style of the Babylonian Talmud is to present a succession of questions and answers put and answered by (usually) named scribal authorities. These *amoraic* statements or disputes often serve as the point of departure from the Mishnaic *halakha* to the broader principle and application.

This continual process of debate allows every position to be examined and challenged, re-examined and challenged afresh. The Babylonian Talmud is almost unique in literature since it provides a fair representation of contradictory positions without wishing necessarily to lend its support to one position over another. It has a tendency to develop "possible" views even if they are not very compelling, as if to exhaust the potential ramifications of the Mishnah. It is concerned to uncover the principles, the philosophical truth, behind the Mishnah. In this sense it shows a great measure of independence towards the Mishnah (compared at least to the Yerushalmi).

Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 213-4. For a fuller discussion of recent scholarly debate on the date see Alan J. Avery-Peck, 'The Mishnah, Tosefta, and the Talmuds' in Jacob Neusner (ed.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity*, Part 1, *The Literary and Archaeological Sources* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 198-203.

²⁴⁰ Abraham Goldberg, 'The Babylonian Talmud' in Shmuel Safrai (ed.), *The Literature of the Sages*, Part 1, *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, Section 2 (Philadelphia PA: Fortress, 1987), 330.

There was a great deal of interaction between Palestinian schools and Babylonian schools²⁴¹ and most of the haggadic traditions contained within the Babylonian Talmud are in fact attributed to Palestinian rabbis. However the Babylonian Talmud has obviously exercised a good deal of freedom in recasting the *aggadoth*. Consequently it remains unclear exactly how much of the aggadah is the responsibility of the Palestinian sources and how much the Babylonian editors²⁴². At one extreme Goldberg, for example, has argued that both Talmudim were originally similar and that those features we recognize as the specific characteristics of the Babylonian Talmud in fact stem from later developments²⁴³.

These questions aside, there is no doubt that the Bavli remains “the single most important document of rabbinic literature – and, as a matter of fact, of Judaism”²⁴⁴.

Leviticus Rabbah (c.5th century CE)

Leviticus Rabbah, in essence a homiletic midrash, shares many parallels with Genesis Rabbah, both in terms of language and material, as well as with Lamentations Rabbah. Based principally on citations of other rabbinic sources, it is generally accepted that the present form was probably initially redacted in the 5th century CE²⁴⁵.

Like Genesis and Lamentations Rabbah it contains exegetical comments, parables, and stories, but it also contains many elements of popular folklore.

²⁴¹ Goldberg, ‘The Babylonian Talmud’, 324-5.

²⁴² Hirshman, ‘Aggadic Midrash’, 130. Cf. Avery-Peck, ‘The Mishnah, Tosefta, and the Talmuds’, who explores the wider question of the relationship between the text and the tradition.

²⁴³ Goldberg, ‘The Babylonian Talmud’, 324-5.

²⁴⁴ Neusner, *Introduction to Rabbinic Literature*, 187.

²⁴⁵ Joseph Heinemann, ‘Leviticus Rabbah’ in Fred Skolnik, *et al* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica, Second Edition* (London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 12, 740; Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 316

These various exegetical elements often coalesce around a single theme, so that the work is marked with a remarkable degree of thematic homogeneity despite the heterogeneous nature of the aggadic material²⁴⁶.

Leviticus Rabbah departs from the form of Genesis Rabbah, in that it does not cover every verse of the biblical book. Rather it takes the form of a collection of 37 homilies, engaging a selection of key verses that enable focus to be drawn onto the sustained argument that is being made. Although like Genesis Rabbah it also makes extensive use of the method of *petihot*.

Pesikta de Rav Kahana (5th - 6th century CE)

So called because it deals with only selected passages (hence, Aramaic *pesiqta* 'section') from the Torah and *haftarah* readings, and opens with the name of Rav Kahana, Pesikta de Rav Kahana is distinctive because it bases its midrash around the liturgical calendar, rather than a single biblical book. Each 'section' contains an implicit proposition, which is developed by applying the 'one verse in light of another' principle.

The bulk of the material had its basis in independent homilies delivered in the synagogue²⁴⁷, and as a result a complete literary work does not truly emerge until the arrival of printing. The core of the material, however, is thought to date from approximately the 5th century²⁴⁸.

The overall aim of the work was to provide reassurance to Israel of God's ongoing concern for them and the emphasis the moral action and obedience that the special relationship between God and Israel required²⁴⁹. It offered reassurance that God will save Israel personally in the future, and argued that

²⁴⁶ Heinemann, 'Leviticus Rabbah', 741.

²⁴⁷ William G. Braude and Israel J. Kapstein (trans.), *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975), Intro x; Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 321.

²⁴⁸ Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 321.

²⁴⁹ Braude and Kapstein, *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana*, Intro xi.

Israel may know what this will be like because of the redemption from Egypt. This is indicative of the text's broader concern with "the theme of man's, particularly Israel's, spiritual journey from the creation to the coming of the Messiah"²⁵⁰.

Lamentations Rabbah (c. 5th century CE)

Similar to Genesis Rabbah in many respects, Lamentations Rabbah follows the verse order of the biblical book verse by verse, expounding the text with the aid of exegetical comments, parables, biblical narrative expansions, and haggadic stories. It utilizes the now familiar method of *petihot*.

The work draws on earlier tannaitic literature including the Jerusalem Talmud, Genesis Rabbah, and Leviticus Rabbah and cites primarily Palestinian sources, none of which is later than the fourth century CE. In view of this and on the basis of its language (a mixture of mishnaic Hebrew and Galilean Aramaic) it was apparently compiled, probably by a single redactor, during the fifth century CE, although there are some later additions²⁵¹.

The biblical book of Lamentations bewails the destruction of the First Temple. Lamentations Rabbah expounds this theme, often referring, in midrashic fashion, to the destruction of the Second Temple and the Bar Kochba Revolt, while introducing many *aggadot* with a message of comfort. Similar to Pesikta de Rav Kahana in this respect Lamentations Rabbah conveys the message that covenant governs Israel's relationship with God, so Israel is not utterly helpless but has control over its own destiny through its response (or otherwise) to the covenant.

²⁵⁰ Braude and Kapstein, *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana*, Intro xv.

²⁵¹ Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 310; Moshe David Herr, 'Lamentations Rabbah' in Fred Skolnik, et al (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica, Second Edition* (London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 12, 451-2.

Ecclesiastes Rabbah (c. 8th century CE)

Covering almost every verse in the biblical book, Ecclesiastes Rabbah draws heavily on earlier *haggadic* compositions such as Genesis Rabbah, Leviticus Rabbah, and Lamentations, as well as the Jerusalem Talmud. The composition has an anthological nature, being in essence a compendium of *haggadic* traditions arranged under heading of verses of Ecclesiastes, with little or no systematic program. The present form of the text was probably redacted no earlier than the 8th century CE²⁵².

Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer (c.8th century CE)

Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer is a pseudepigraphic narrative midrash ascribed to *tanna*, Eliezer ben Hurqanos (1-2nd century CE), whose life story is told in the first chapter. The work is clearly not from his hand however, since a number of authorities are cited which in fact post-date him. The composition of much of the work is dated to the 8th or 9th century, on the basis of, for example, citations of Arabic legends and references to halakhic customs current in the Land of Israel at the beginning of the *geonic* period.

The author(s) draws on a broad range of older sources including, midrashim, Talmud, targumim, and so on, as well as Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Second Temple period, particularly the books of Enoch and Jubilees, to create an *haggadic* narrative, the avowed purpose of which is to “declare glory of God”. Consequently many of the sections are devoted to the Creation or history of the patriarchs²⁵³.

²⁵² Moshe David Herr, ‘Ecclesiastes Rabbah’ in Fred Skolnik, *et al* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica, Second Edition* (London: Thomson-Gale, 2007), Vol 6, 90-91.

²⁵³ Gerald Friedlander (trans.), *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1916), Introduction; Moshe David Herr, ‘Pirkei de Rabbi Eliezer’ in Fred Skolnik, *et al* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica, Second Edition* (London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 16, 182-3.

Midrash Tanhuma-Yelammedenu (5th – 11th century CE?)

The title *Tanhuma Yelammedenu* does not refer to a single 'text', as is the case with the other midrashim under discussion. Rather, it designates a collection of homiletic midrashim to the whole Pentateuch that is known in several collections. It derives its name from the number of proems transmitted in the name of *Tanhuma* and the expression *yelammedenu rabbenu* 'let our master teach us', which introduces much of the halakah. So the title *Tanhuma-Yelammedenu* reflects the structure of the material, in which a *halakhic* unit (introduced by *yelammedenu rabbenu*) is followed by a closely connected *haggadic* unit (delivered in the name of *Tanhuma*).

Two recensions are recognized in the published versions. The version first published in Constantinople (1520/22) is thought to represent a redaction of geonic Babylonian extraction, whilst the version published by Salomon Buber (Wilna, 1885), is a compilation of material from several manuscripts, and seems to represent a European recension of the text²⁵⁴. In what follows I refer to the Constantinople version simply as *Midrash Tanhuma*, and the Buber recension as *Midrash Tanhuma Buber*.

Concerning the date then, we can say only that versions of the *Tanhuma-Yelammedenu* midrash appear to have *begun* to crystallize towards the end of the Byzantine period (5th – 7th century CE) but continued to undergo revisions²⁵⁵.

Exodus Rabbah (c.10th century CE).

Exodus Rabbah is a composite work: Sections 1-14 cover chapters 1-10 of the biblical book and are exegetical midrash, containing Midrashic comments to

²⁵⁴ Marc Bregman, *The Tanhuma-Yelammedenu Literature: Studies in the Evolution of the Versions* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2003), 3-4.

²⁵⁵ Bregman, *The Tanhuma-Yelammedenu Literature*, 3; for a discussion of the problem see, Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 332-3.

almost every verse. It is a relatively late redaction (c.10th century CE)²⁵⁶, intended to bridge the gap between Genesis Rabbah and Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael, which begins only at chapter 12.

Sections 15-52 cover chapters 12 to the end of Exodus and are an example of homiletic midrash. This second section belongs to the Tanhuma-Yelammedenu category of midrashic literature (see above for a discussion of the problems involved in fixing a date). Herr ventures a date for the compilation of the majority of the work in the ninth century CE, while accepting the presence of later material²⁵⁷.

Numbers Rabbah (c. 12th century CE)

Like Exodus Rabbah, Numbers Rabbah is a composite work. The first section (chapters 1-14) seems to have been edited around the 12th century CE²⁵⁸. This section makes extensive use of earlier material and contains both exegetical and homiletic type material. The second section is more homiletic in character and forms part of the Tanhuma-Yelammedenu group of texts (see above).

Pesikta Rabbati (6/7th – 13th century CE?)

Pesikta Rabbati is a composite work, much later than Pesikta de Rav Kahana, containing some literary strata thought to have found form as early as the sixth century, and other units thought to enter the work as late as the 13th century²⁵⁹. It draws heavily upon Pesikta de Rav Kahana and Midrash

²⁵⁶ Moshe David Herr, 'Exodus Rabbah' in Fred Skolnik, *et al* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Second Edition (London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 6, 624

²⁵⁷ Herr, 'Exodus Rabbah', 624

²⁵⁸ Moshe David Herr, 'Numbers Rabbah', in Fred Skolnik, *et al* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Second Edition (London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 15, 338; Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 338

²⁵⁹ Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 325-6; Daniel Sperber, 'Pesikta Rabbati', in Fred Skolnik, *et al* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Second Edition (London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 16, 12-13

Tanhuma. It arranges material topically rather than exegetically, but really only copies earlier material, so there is no strong systematic structure.

Except where indicated otherwise, translations given below of Talmud and Midrash Rabbah are taken from the Soncino Press editions; Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael from Lauterbach; Pesikta de-Rab Kahana from Braude and Kapstein; and Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer from Friedlander. Translations of Midrash Tanhuma and Tanhuma Buber are my own.

Ezekiel 28 in Rabbinic Literature

The writings using Ezekiel 28 in rabbinic sources are almost always *aggadic* in character, and this explains why the more *halakah*-orientated Palestinian Talmud is not among our collection. Suspicion of the book of Ezekiel as a whole may be one reason why it was avoided in *halakah* (Palestinian Talmud cites Ezekiel only a handful of times), but it is also the case that the content of the lament could not lend itself easily to legal discussion.

Two strong traditions run through the *aggadoth* that do make use of Ezekiel 28. Each *aggadah* is developed by associating the addressee of the lament (the Prince of Tyre) with another biblical character: the first and most obvious association is with Adam; the second is with Hiram, the king of Tyre allied to David and Solomon.

With the Hiram *aggadoth* the focus of the materials is on hubris, false claims of divinity, and subsequent punishment for which Hiram serves as an example. The Adam *aggadoth* are almost at the other end of the extreme. In this tradition the Ezekiel text is adduced to demonstrate Adam's glory and wisdom, prior to his expulsion from the Garden. Concerning Adam we also find a well attested tradition concerning his wedding to Eve.

Hiram: Divine Claims and Destruction

Hiram's leading role in assisting Solomon with the building of the Temple (1 Kg. 5:1-18; 9:10-28; 2 Ch. 2:1-16 etc.) projected him into the forefront of rabbinic imagination²⁶⁰, providing the genesis for the association with the king of Tyre mentioned in Ezekiel 28. In Genesis Rabbah 85.4 we find a dispute between R. Judah and the Rabbis who accept without question that the Hiram of Kings-Chronicles is one and the same as the figure mentioned in Ezekiel 28, but cannot agree whether the Hiram mentioned in Genesis 38:1 is also the same person²⁶¹. In either case an exceptionally long life is attributed to Hiram, and this is understood as his reward for the assistance he gave to Solomon in building the Temple²⁶².

The tradition that identified the Hiram of Kings-Chronicles with the King of Tyre of Ezekiel 28 must have predated the rabbis' reflections on the Ezekiel 28 figure's hubristic pride and blasphemous claims. This is doubtless the case because there would be no need to identify the figure of Ezekiel 28 with Hiram in order to make a point about hubristic self-delusion. In fact, the

²⁶⁰ Traditions surrounding Hiram are diverse, particularly in the later Midrashim. See Ginzberg, IV, 335-6; VI 424-6. Perhaps the best indication of the significance Hiram took in the rabbinic imagination is the speculation that he was among nine who entered paradise alive, e.g. Yalkut Shimoni (Parasha Lech Lecha, 247).

²⁶¹ Genesis Rabbah 85.4

"AND TURNED IN TO A CERTAIN ADULLAMITE, WHOSE NAME WAS HIRAH (Gen. 38:1). The Rabbis said: The Hiram mentioned here is the same that lived in the days of David; *For Hiram was ever a lover of David* (1 Kings v, 15) – this man was well accustomed to be a lover of this tribe [Judah]. R. Judah b. R. Simon said: Hiram was a different person. In the view of the Rabbis he lived close on eleven hundred years, while in R. Judah's view he lived close on five hundred years."

²⁶² The obscure word תְּקִיָּוָה in Ezek. 28:12, may have confirmed for the Rabbis the association between Hiram and the figure of Ezekiel 28. תְּקִיָּוָה occurs only twice in Ezekiel, once in 28:12 (אחה חותם תְּקִיָּוָה) and once in 43:10 (ויכלמו מעוטתיהם ומידו אחר תְּקִיָּוָה). In 43:10 the word appears to describe the symmetry of the Temple's proportions (although the meaning is uncertain). The association with the building of the temple is then carried into 28:12 by תְּקִיָּוָה. Hence we arrive at Hiram. On the relationship between these two occurrences, see my discussion above on page 49.

identification only makes the figure of Hiram a more perplexing character (is he a hero or a villain?). But the priority of the identification of the two figures also seems the most likely historical scenario. Given that the common identity of the two figures is *presupposed* in the discussion recorded in Genesis Rabbah 85.4, this identification may date from as early as the second century, if the *tannaic* attribution were assumed to be trustworthy²⁶³.

This preliminary discussion is necessary because all rabbinic lore concerning Ezekiel 28 proceeds with Hiram as the *de facto* identification of the figure, in other words the identification is presupposed *rather than developing out of interpretation of Ezekiel 28*.

This rabbinic lore revolving around the 'Hiram' of Ezekiel 28 is concerned exclusively with the figure's false claims of divinity, his arrogance, and the destruction that this brings upon him. One of the most widely attested of these *aggadot* concerns Hiram's false claim of divinity. According to the tradition such claims are somewhat typical of powerful foreign kings, and Hiram is repeatedly listed in a quartet of royal blasphemers along with Pharaoh, Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar.

Forming one of a number of alternative interpretations (דבר אחר) of the exclamation "who is like unto thee among the gods, O Lord" (Exod. 15:11), Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael (Shirata 8:32) provides our earliest witness to and clearest expression of this tradition:

Who Is Like unto Thee Among the Gods, O Lord (Exod. 15:11).

Who is like unto Thee among those who call themselves gods? Pharaoh called himself a god, as it is said: "The river is mine" (Ezek 29:9); "And I have made myself" (Ezek. 29. 3). Sennacherib called himself a god, as it is

²⁶³ Attribution to a specific rabbinic authority should only be accepted with serious caution.

said: "Who are they among the gods of these nations," etc. (Isa. 36:20). Nebuchadnezzar called himself a god, as it is said: "I will ascend above the heights of the clouds," etc. (Isa. 14:14). The prince of Tyre called himself a god, as it is said: "Son of man, say unto the prince of Tyre: Thus saith the Lord: 'Because thy heart is lifted up,' etc." (Ezek. 28:2).

Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael (Shirata 8:32)

The discussion centres on the specific topic of claims of divinity made by these four characters. The same quartet of blasphemers that we find here (i.e. Hiram, Pharaoh, Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar²⁶⁴) appear again in Midrash Tanhuma Buber (וארא, 16); however, there the point is developed a little further to clarify that these claims are, in fact, false. The verses under discussion in Tanhuma Buber are Exodus 9:13 ("The Lord said to Moses, 'get up early in the morning and present yourself before Pharaoh etc.' ") and Exodus 9:14 ("because at this moment etc."), for which the expression "Make them fearful, O Lord!" from Psalm 2:21 is adduced as the *petihah* (with the typical rabbinic device זש"ה = שאמר הכתוב i.e. "this refers to what is written"). A series of interpretations of Psalm 2:21 are introduced clustered around the concept of rebellion, and it is in this context that Hiram is introduced:

The nations knew that they were men, yet they made themselves gods. Hiram king of Tyre made himself into a god, as it is said, "*because your heart grew exalted and you said, I am a god*" (Ezek. 28:2) The Holy One – blessed be He – made known that he was a man, as it is said, "*upon the earth I cast you, I set you before kings, to look upon you*" (Ezek. 28:17), The Holy One – blessed be He – make known that

²⁶⁴ On Nebuchadnezzar cf. Num.R. 9:24.

he was flesh and blood, hence *"the nations know that they are [only] human. Selah"* (Ps. 9:21).

Midrash Tanhuma Buber (תנ"ך, 16)

The balance in Midrash Tanhuma Buber between the false claims of divinity (Ezek. 28:2) and the ensuing destruction of the figure reflects the concept of hubris leading to destruction that we found in the Targum, and which occurs elsewhere in the rabbinic literature. In contrast to the concise *aggadah* of Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael cited above we also find in the Mekhilta a fuller version in which the theme of hubris leading to destruction is made more explicit:

For He Is Highly Exalted. He is exalted above all those who exalt themselves. For with the very thing with which the nations of the world pride themselves before Him, He punishes them...

... And you find it also in the case of the prince of Tyre, that by means of the very thing with which he prided himself, etc. For it is said: *"Son of man, say unto the prince of Tyre: Thus saith the Lord God: Because thy heart is lifted up, and thou hast said: 'I am a God, etc'."* (Ezek. 28:2). What does it say further on? *"Thou shalt die the deaths of the uncircumcised by the hand of strangers"* (Ezek 28:10) – Thus by means of the very things with which the nations of the world act proudly before Him, God punishes them, as it is said: *"For He is highly exalted"*.

Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael (Shirata 2:12-91)

This forms the conclusion of a lengthy *aggadah* on the phrase *"for He is highly exalted"* (Ex. 15:1), which presents a lengthy list of examples of pride, arrogance, and self-dependence. This extensive list takes in the generation of flood, the people of Sodom, the Egyptians, Sisera, Samson, Absalom,

Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar (for whom Isa. 14:13-14 is again employed), and the personified city of Tyre, all of whom received punishment for acts of proud defiance, meted out by God. The King of Tyre is saved till last, the conclusion of the list but also its climax: no act of defiant pride could be greater than claiming divinity for oneself.

The quartet of blasphemers that we observed in Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael (i.e. Hiram, Pharaoh, Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar) is also found in a handful of other contexts with some interesting variation. Midrash Tanhuma / Tanhuma Buber (אָרָו, 8) records the tradition of “the four sons of men who made themselves god” but introduces an otherwise unknown tradition that they all married similar women who (the text suggests) bring about their destruction. In the case of Hiram this is derived from Ezek. 28:17 “*You ruined your wisdom on account of your beauty*”. In this passage from Tanhuma Buber and in Exodus Rabbah 36.2 (both late sources) we find that the Sennacherib has dropped out of the quartet to be replaced by Joash, King of Judah. But for Hiram the story is just the same as elsewhere: his pride brings about his destruction.

Pharaoh was one of four men who claimed divinity and thereby brought evil upon themselves. These were: Hiram, Nebuchadnezzar, Pharaoh, and Joash, King of Judah. Hiram, as it says: *Say unto the prince of Tyre... Because thy heart is lifted up, and thou hast said: I am a god* (Ezek. 28: 2). Whence do we know that he brought destruction upon himself? Because it says: *Thy heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness; I have cast thee to the ground, I have laid thee before kings, that they may gaze upon thee* (Ezek. 28:17).

Exodus Rabbah 36.2 (Exodus 27, 20)

The notion in both these examples however remains the same: these *historical* figures brought destruction upon themselves. But it is not the claims of divinity *per se* that are the problem here; rather, it is the pride that underlies them. Of course the notion that pride can invoke God's destructive punishment is not novel in the rabbinic literature (e.g. "*Rise up, O judge of the earth; give to the proud what they deserve!*" Ps. 94:2; "*I will put an end to the pride of the arrogant, and lay low the haughtiness of ruthless*" Isa. 13:11 cf. 2 Chron. 32:26; Prov. 11:2; 16:18; 29:23; Isa. 10:12; 11:19; Ezek. 32:12.; Dan. 4:37; Zech. 10:11; Luke 1:51).

In the Babylonian Talmud it is the question of misplaced pride that comes to the fore and the claims of divinity are set aside. Hiram, Pharaoh, Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar, are here joined by Nimrod, and all five are set in contrast to Abraham, Aaron, Moses, and David, who are lauded for their virtuous humility:

It was not because you were greater than any people that the Lord set His love upon you and chose you. The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Israel, I love you because even when I bestow greatness upon you, you humble yourselves before me. I bestowed greatness upon Abraham, yet he said to Me, I am but dust and ashes; upon Moses and Aaron, yet they said, And we are nothing; upon David, yet he said, But I am a worm and no man. But with the heathens it is not so. I bestowed greatness upon Nimrod, and he said, Come, let us build us a city; upon Pharaoh, and he said, Who is the Lord? upon Sennacherib, and he said, Who are they among all the gods of the countries? upon Nebuchadnezzar, and he said, I will ascend above the

*heights of the clouds; upon Hiram king of Tyre, and he said,
I will sit in the seat of god, in the heart of the seas*²⁶⁵.

b.Hullin 89a

In the Babylonian Talmud it becomes clearer that what concerns the rabbis is more than simply pride: it is the failure to acknowledge God as the author of one's worldly success (cf. Ben Sira 10:26-11:6). All these characters bring destruction upon themselves not simply because they claim to be divine, nor simply because they exalt themselves. Rather it is because the grounds on which they exalt themselves come not through their own efforts but are granted by God, yet they systematically fail to acknowledge this. If they are great it is because God has made them so. Their failure to recognize this is the cause of their downfall. In a different context it is exactly this kind of misplaced pride that Paul warned the new Christians in Rome (i.e. the newly grafted-on 'branches') against: "remember it is not you that support the root, but the root that supports you... so do not become proud but stand in awe" (Rom. 11:18-20 RSV).

The virtue of humility for which the heroes of Israel are applauded in the Babylonian Talmud appears again in a slightly different incarnation in Genesis Rabbah 96.5 and Midrash Tanhuma Buber (ויחי, 97). Here it is Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar who are the examples for which Hiram serves as the parallel.

BURY ME NOT, I PRAY THEE, IN EGYPT. Another reason why Jacob did not wish to be buried in Egypt was they should not make him an object of idolatrous worship; for just as idolaters will be punished, so will their deities too be punished, as it says, And against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgments (Ex. 12:12). You find similarly in

²⁶⁵ This *aggadah* is attributed to R. Eleazar bar R. Jose (3rd Cent.).

the case of Daniel. When he interpreted Nebuchadnezzar's dream, what is said? *Then the king Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face, and worshipped Daniel and commanded that they should offer an offering and sweet odours unto him* (Dan. 2:46). He indeed commanded that they should offer to him, but Daniel declined, saying, 'Just as idolaters will be punished, so will their gods be punished'. You find the same in the case of Hiram. When he made himself a god, what is written of him? *Because thy heart is lifted up, and thou hast said: I am a god* (Ezek. 28:2). The Holy One, blessed be He, chided him: *'Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel!* (Ezek. 28:3). For you find that Nebuchadnezzar wished to make offerings to Daniel, but he declined, yet thou makest thyself a god!' What was his fate? It is written of him, *I have cast thee to the ground, I have laid thee before kings, that they may gaze upon thee* (Ezek. 28:17)²⁶⁶.

Genesis Rabbah 96.5

In this example the midrash weaves together the tradition of Daniel and Ezekiel via the reference to Daniel in Ezekiel 28:3. As in the Babylonian

²⁶⁶ Cf. Hippolytus, *Commentary on Daniel*, Alexander Roberts & James Donaldson (eds.), *Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers Down to a.d. 325* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), Vol. 5, 187:

"Then king Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face." Nebuchadnezzar hearing these things, and being put in remembrance of his vision, knew that what was spoken by Daniel was true. How great is the power of the grace of God, beloved, that one who a little before was doomed to death with the other wise men of Babylon, should now be worshipped by the king, not as man, but as God! *"He commanded that they should offer manna"* (i.e. in Chaldee, "oblation") *"and sweet odours unto him."* Of old, too, the Lord made a similar announcement to Moses, saying, *"See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh;"* (Ex. 7:1) in order that, on account of the signs wrought by him in the land of Egypt, Moses might no longer be reckoned a man, but be worshipped as a god by the Egyptians.

Talmud (Hullin 89a) the humility of Daniel is contrasted with the hubristic folly of Hiram. Daniel's humility is based on his sage reflection. As the midrash puts it quite explicitly, to claim divinity for oneself is nothing less than idolatry – *those who worship vain idols forsake their true loyalty* (Jonah 2:8) – and that invokes the wrath of God.

One final observation is warranted concerning Hiram and his claims of divinity. Of the four (or five) characters accused of claiming divinity for themselves (i.e. Hiram, Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar, Pharaoh, and Joash) Hiram stands out. Pharaoh, Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar are obvious villains for their actions against the people of Israel. Joash allowed himself to be worshiped by the Princes of Judah as part of his regime that forsook the Lord in favour of the old pagan gods, and subsequently invoked the destruction of Judah by the Syrian army (i.e. 2 Chron 24:17-19; cf. Exod.R. 8:3). Hiram, on the other hand, has no particularly villainous credentials.

However, the relation of Sennacherib to Nebuchadnezzar, in rabbinic lore at least, is closer than their shared claims of divinity. According to some relatively early sources Nebuchadnezzar was the son-in-law or grandson of Sennacherib (i.e. Targ. to Isa. 10:32 and Lam. R., Intro, 23 respectively), with whom he took part in the expedition of the Assyrians against Hezekiah (b.Sanh. 95b); and according to Leviticus Rabbah, Hiram is the step-father of Nebuchadnezzar at whose hand he suffered death:

Another exposition on WHEN ANY MAN HATH AN ISSUE OUT OF HIS FLESH, etc. This [i.e. the lesson to be derived] is indicated in the following passage: *He is terrible and dreadful; his judgement and his destruction proceed from himself* (Hab. 1:7)...

... Another exposition: '*He is terrible and dreadful*' refers to Hiram, king of Tyre, as it is written, *Son of man, say unto*

the prince of Tyre: Thus saith the Lord God: Because thy heart is lifted up (Ezek. 28:1). – ‘His judgement and destruction proceed from him’ refers to Nebuchadnezzar. R. Simon said: There is a traditional Haggadah that Hiram was the husband of the mother of Nebuchadnezzar who rose against him and killed him; hence it is written, I have brought forth a fire from the midst of thee, it hath devoured thee (Ezek. 28:18)

Leviticus Rabbah 18:2

So, in sum, we find in many rabbinic texts that, although the Hiram of Kings-Chronicles is a hero not a villain, a tradition, which had been developed, perhaps at a relatively early period, conflated this Hiram with the figure of Ezekiel 28. This in turn gave rise to a series of interrelated negative portrayals of Hiram. The principal charge laid against Hiram is that along with Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar, Pharaoh and/or Joash, he claimed divinity for himself. With Hiram, Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar there was an added connection: claiming divinity for oneself, it seems, was in the blood. The common notion throughout is that for Hiram these idolatrous claims lead to destruction. This to some extent reflects the principle we identified in the Targum (i.e. “*pride goeth before destruction*”), although in midrash and Talmud there is of course the added dimension of claims of *divinity*, which are absent in Targum. Hiram’s idolatrous claims are based on his material advantages contrasted with the virtuous, humble, heroes of Israel²⁶⁷, and this, it seems,

²⁶⁷ Cf. the (presumably late) Exodus Rabbah 36.1 which records the city of Tyre declaring its own beauty, only to be upstaged by Jerusalem.

Of Tyre, it says: *Thou, O Tyre, hast said: I am of perfect beauty (Ezek. 28:3) – thou hast said it, but not others. Concerning Jerusalem, however, all sing her praises, as it says, Is this the city that men called the perfection of beauty, the joy of the whole earth? (Lam. 2:15).*

highlights the rabbis' underlying concern: that all these false claims tell of a fundamental failure to acknowledge God as the source of worldly success.

Adam

It hardly needs saying that Adam was the source of diverse and extensive speculation in late antiquity among many groups. One would need a life as long as Hiram's to catalogue them all. Our concern here is only with those Adam traditions that make use of Ezekiel 28. We cannot say with any certainty when Ezekiel 28 began to be thought of as referring to the Adam of Genesis, but on the whole it appears likely that apparent links between Genesis 1-3 and Ezekiel 28:11-19 would have been noted from the early rabbinic period. The tradition is attested in some of our earliest sources (i.e. Genesis Rabbah, Pesikta de Rav Kahana, Leviticus Rabbah, Babylonian Talmud), with traditions attributed to the tannaim of the Mishnah (i.e. "The Rabbis") and from the third century (i.e. R. Hama b. R. Hanina; R. Simeon b. Lakish). We also find that Ezek 28:13-19, 25 serves as the *haftarah* to Genesis 3:22-4:26 in the triennial cycle of Torah reading employed in the synagogues of ancient Palestine and Egypt (according to Perrot's reconstruction at least)²⁶⁸. There was a great deal of variation in the *parashiyot* and *haftarot* employed in the triennial cycle according to age or regional custom – even between one synagogue and another – and this makes it difficult to date an association between an individual *parashah* and *haftarah*; but as a whole the formation of a triennial cycle appears to fall in the period between the Mishnah (which displays no knowledge of it) and the Babylonian Talmud (which records the tradition, b.Megilla 29b).

²⁶⁸ Charles Perrot, 'The Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue' in Martin Jan Mulder (ed.), *Mikra* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 2004), 141.

Those traditions that associate Adam with the figure of Ezekiel 28 cluster around two principal themes: first is the notion, widespread in rabbinic lore, that Adam possessed a superabundance of wisdom prior to his consumption of the fruit and expulsion from the garden – for which the phrase “*You were an accurate seal, full of wisdom*” (Ezek. 28:12) is adduced in support; and the second concerns a series of debates over the number of ‘canopies’ (חופות) that God created for Adam in Eden, for which the list of precious stones (Ezek. 28:13) is the nub of the discussion. Before we precede to these two principle threads of tradition however, we must first examine two sources in which the Hiram and Adam traditions intersect.

Adam’s Vicarious Punishment

The tradition that identified the figure of Ezekiel 28 with Hiram and accused him of falsely claiming divinity for himself, for which he got his just deserts, generally depends on the use of Ezekiel 28:2 (“*because your heart grew exalted and you said, I am a god*’”) and Ezekiel 28:17 (“*I have cast thee to the ground, etc.*”). This traditional identification of the figure in Ezekiel as Hiram lies behind a tradition, recorded in Genesis Rabbah 9.5 and b.Baba Bathra 75^{a-b}, which is exegetically based on different parts of Ezekiel 28:13, and therefore introduces the actions of Hiram into the story of Adam. The exegetical focus of each of these two sources is different, but the basic assertion of both is the same: that Adam was punished for Hiram’s future claims of divinity, which God foresaw.

R. Hama b. R. Hanina²⁶⁹ said: Adam deserved to be spared the experience of death. Why then was the penalty of death decreed against him? Because the Holy One, blessed

²⁶⁹ 3rd Cent., Palestinian amora.

be He, foresaw that Nebuchadnezzar and Hiram would declare themselves gods; therefore was death decreed against him. Thus it is written, *Thou wast in Eden the garden of God* (Ezek. 28:13): was then Hiram in Eden? Surely not! But He said thus to him: 'It is thou who causedst him who was in Eden [i.e. Adam] to die'.

Genesis Rabbah 9.5

The exegesis concerning Hiram and Adam here proceeds on a similar basis to the exegesis we observed in the Targum (although the targumist does not make the connection with Hiram): the targumist also asks himself 'was then this figure in Eden?' and also answers 'Surely not!'. According to the Targum the figure was not actually living in Eden, but living *as if he were* in Eden (Tg. Ezek. 28:13). For Genesis Rabbah, Hiram simply cannot have been in Eden, but unlike the Targum, where the punishment remains confined to the individual addressed, Genesis Rabbah goes so far as to claim that Adam suffers Hiram's punishment vicariously. Were it not for Hiram's actions, Adam (and presumably his descendents) would have enjoyed eternal life.

This tradition from Genesis Rabbah is alluded to rather tersely in a section of the Babylonian Talmud (Baba Bathra 75a-75b) that also deals with the topic of the 'canopies' (see below), which reads simply "Others say: Thus said [the Holy One, blessed be He], 'I looked upon thee [Hiram] and decreed the penalty of death over Adam' ". This throw away comment is, however, preceded by a rather curious tradition:

What is [implied] by *the work of thy timbrels and holes?* – Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Hiram, the King of Tyre, '[At the creation] I looked upon thee, [observing thy future arrogance], and created [therefore] the excretory organs of man'.

The excretory organs of man, we are lead to believe, are our vicarious punishment for Hiram's misdemeanours.

These traditions recorded in b.Baba Bathra and Genesis Rabbah form part of a wider pool of rabbinic reflection on the creation of Adam. Of interest to our present study is Genesis Rabbah 8:4, which records a tradition attributed to R.Berekhiah, in which God foresees that Adam's descendents will be both righteous *and wicked*, but, after wrestling with his conscience, God concludes that it is better to create Adam (rather than leave him uncreated) on the grounds that "if I do not create him, how are righteous men to be born?". A similar tradition is recorded in Genesis Rabbah 8:5 and b.Sanhedrin 38a, in which we see the ministering angels, at God's request, questioning the wisdom of creating Adam²⁷⁰, only to be consumed with fire or ignored by God when they do so!

The Wisdom and Splendour of Adam

The first of our two principal threads of interpretation that identify the figure of Ezekiel 28 with Adam concerns Adam's superabundance of wisdom prior to his consumption of the fruit and expulsion from the garden. There is no more obvious place for such a tradition to surface than in Ecclesiastes Rabbah.

Another interpretation of "Who is as the wise man?" This alludes to Adam of whom it is written, *Thou seal most accurate, full of wisdom ... thou wast in Eden the garden of God* (Ezek. 28:12). *And who knoweth the interpretation of a thing? Because he gave distinguishing names to all things.*

²⁷⁰ Cf. Pirke de Rabbi Eleazer 11 and freq. where Torah personified is the interlocutress.

Ecclesiastes Rabbah, however, is not our earliest witness to this tradition: the tradition first occurs in its present form in *Pesikta de Rav Kahana* (4:4) one or two centuries earlier (and given the anthological nature of *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* and tendency to draw on earlier compositions, this is not surprising), and frequently throughout the midrashim, where we even find a tradition – ascribed to R. Aha (4th Cent.) – in which God asks the angels and then Adam to name to animals in order to demonstrate that Adam’s wisdom is greater than the angels (*Pesikta Rabbati* 14:9 cf. *Gen.R.* 17:4; *Num. R.* 19:3; *Midrash Tanhuma Buber* תקח, 57).

The naming of animals by Adam appears elsewhere (e.g. *Num.R.* 12:4), and outside the rabbinic corpus a preoccupation with the ‘rule’ of Adam is widely known (e.g. *Ps.* 8:5-9; *Jubilees* 3:1-3; 2 *Enoch* 58; *Life of Adam and Eve* [Apocalypse] 11; 4Q422 *Paraphrase of Genesis-Exodus*, Col.1 Fg.1 l.8-9; 4Q504 *Words of the Luminaries*), although the idea that Adam’s rule indicated his wisdom is not developed in those contexts. Other sources do make the connection between Adam and wisdom at creation: *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* on *Genesis* 2:25 states quite explicitly “they [Adam and Eve] were wise”; *Ben Sira* states that God filled Adam with “knowledge and understanding” (17:7, 11) but concludes that “the first man did not know her [Wisdom] perfectly” (24:28); and *Wisdom of Solomon* portrays personified Wisdom as providing Adam with the support that enabled him to rule over the animals (1:1-4 cf. 9:2; *Sibylline Oracles* 1:33-4). However, on the whole, “[t]here is remarkably little speculation about the original nature of Adam in the authors of Early Judaism”²⁷¹.

²⁷¹ John R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*, *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 1* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1988), 152.

Ecclesiastes Rabbah 8.2 and Pesikta de Rav Kahana 4:4 (whence Pesikta Rabbati 14:10 and Midrash Tanhuma Buber תקח, 57) both go on to record a tradition, attributed to R. Levi (late 3rd Cent. Palestinian *amora*) that Adam's wisdom caused the heel of his foot to outshine the sun:

Who is as the wise? (Eccles. 8:1) – that is, as wise as Adam, to whom it was said, “Thou seal most accurate, full of wisdom and beauty” (Ezek. 28:12). *And who knoweth the interpretation of a thing?* Adam. For it was he who gave names interpretive of the natures to all creatures, as is said “Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air” (Gen. 2:20). *Man's – Adam's – wisdom maketh his face to shine* (Eccles. 8:1). R. Levi said in the name of R. Simeon ben Menasya: The very round of Adam's heel outshone the globe of the sun. And do not wonder at this! Human nature is such that when a man has two salvers made for him, one for himself and one for his steward, whose salver does he have made more beautiful? Not his own? So Adam was created for the service of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the globe of the sun was created for the service of creatures. Does it not follow, then, that the very round of Adam's heel outshone the globe of the sun? And if the round of Adam's heel outshone the globe of the sun, how much more brightly shone the countenance of his face!

Pesikta de Rav Kahana 4:4

The physical brilliance of Adam is well known in *aggadah* and elsewhere²⁷².

Undoubtedly the most well known *aggadah* attributes gigantic dimensions to

²⁷² See for example, Aaron, David H., 'Shedding Light on God's Body in Rabbinic Midrashim: Reflections on the Theory of a Luminous Adam', *Harvard Theological Review* 90 (1997), 299-314 and Alon Goshen Gottstein, 'The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Judaism', *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994), 171-95.

Adam's body (e.g. Gen.R. 8:1; 21:3; 24:2; PRE 11; Lev.R. 14:1; 18:2 and frequently, cf. Philo, who maintained that Adam was an entirely perfect creature, *De Opificio Mundi* 47:136-41). Both Ecclesiastes Rabbah and Pesikta de Rav Kahana (and Gen.R. 11:2; 12:6) go on to recount that Adam lost his splendour (and all things their perfection) following his sin (cf. Tg.PJ.Gen. 2:25 "And the two of them were wise, Adam and his wife, but they did not remain in their glory").

The superabundance of his wisdom and the radiance of his heel, along with the tradition concerning the 'canopies' to which we now turn, form a triptych of Adam's overwhelming splendour in Eden from which he is brought shattering down: "Yet despite the splendor that was bestowed upon Adam, [he was told] '*For dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return*' (Gen. 3:19)" (Pesikta Rabbati 14:10). Adam was wise, physically brilliant, and decorated with all God's good blessing, but nonetheless he ended up as nothing more than dust.

Nowhere is the great splendour enjoyed by Adam prior to his expulsion more apparent than in the tradition that God created a number of 'canopies' for Adam. The dispute between the rabbis as to the enumeration of the canopies is well attested throughout rabbinic literature. Leviticus Rabbah presents the rabbinic debate with the greatest clarity:

R. Levi said in the name of R. Hama the son of Hanina: the Holy One, blessed be He, fitted up for him thirteen canopies in the Garden of Eden, as it says, *Thou [Adam] wast in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the cornelian, the topaz, and the emerald, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the carbuncle, and the smaragd, and gold; the workmanship of thy settings and of thy sockets was in thee, in the day that thou wast created they were prepared* (Ezek. 28:13). R. Simeon b. Lakish said there were

eleven canopies, and our Rabbis say there were ten. And they are not in disagreement [on principles]. The authority who reckons them as thirteen makes the expression '*Every precious stone was thy covering*' represent three. The authority who reckons them as eleven makes these words represent one, while the authority who reckons them as ten does not make the words represent even one. And after all this glory he is told: *For dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return* (Gen. 3, 19)!

Leviticus Rabbah 20:2

Exactly the same dispute is recorded in Genesis Rabbah 18:1; Ecclesiastes Rabbah 8:2; b.Baba Bathra 75^{a-b}; Pesikta de Rav Kahana 4:4; Midrash Tanhuma (אזחריי, 2); and Pesikta Rabbati 14:10, with a few minor variations²⁷³. All record the same three sources (i.e. R. Hama b. Hanina, R. Simeon b. Lakish, and the Rabbis) except b.Baba Bathra (75^{a-b}), which records only the views of R. Hama b. Hanina (3rd Cent. Palestinian *amora*) and Mar Zutra (5th Cent.), attributing the view that God created *ten* (not thirteen as elsewhere) canopies to the former, and eleven to the latter.

Exactly what the rabbis had in mind when discussing these 'canopies' was also subject to some variation, and b.Baba Bathra 75a is particularly interesting on this point. In the *midrashim* and the two *talmudim* the noun חופה generally refers to the covering of the bridal chamber or similar (and this appears to be most of our *midrashim* had in mind, as we will see). However, in

²⁷³ Midrash Tanhuma Buber (אזחריי, 29) alludes to this tradition here but does not enumerate the canopies:

R.Levi said in the name of R.Hama son of Hanina, there is a variant reading, the Holy One blessed be He built canopies over Adam the first-man in the garden of Eden as it is written, "*You were in Eden the garden of God: Every precious stone was your covering*" (Ezek. 28:13), and after all this glory "*you are dust and to dust you shall return*" (Gen. 3:19).

b.Baba Bathra 75^{a-b} the idea seems to be of some kind of canopied seat (cf. PR 37:1), which connoted honour and status. The dispute concerning the number of canopies made for Adam is immediately preceded in b.Baba Bathra 75^{a-b} by another tradition concerning canopies (attributed to R.Johanan, late 3rd Cent.):

Rabbah in the name of R. Johanan further stated: The Holy One, blessed be He, will make seven canopies for every righteous man; for it is said: *And the Lord will create over the whole habitation of Mount Zion, and over her assemblies, a cloud of smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for over all the glory shall be a canopy.* This teaches that the Holy One, blessed be He, will make for every one a canopy corresponding to his rank.

b.Baba Bathra 75^{a-b} (cf. Num.R. 21:22)

There are strong eschatological overtones here (in fact the text goes on to discuss the "World to Come" in more detail), and this should not come as a great surprise given the common conception of Gan Eden as paradise (e.g. b.Taanit 31a, b.Sotah 22a) prepared at creation for the righteous (e.g. Tg.PJ.Gen. 2:8; 3:24; Tg.Nf.Gen. 3:24; 2 Enoch 8:1-8; 9:1; Matt 25:34; PRE 18). So in the case of Adam (according to b.Baba Bathra) the canopies are not mere decoration, but an indication not only that he was a righteous man, but that God judged him to be so. In other words, the inference made in b.Baba Bathra is that Adam will be among the righteous in the World to Come, and this of course confers a degree of honour and status upon him.

That our other sources for this tradition (Gen.R. 18:1; Eccl.R. 8:2; PRK 4:4; and PR 14:10) refer to wedding canopies is made reasonably certain in a number of our sources. Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer does not recount the debate concerning enumerating the canopies, but, as part of a prolonged discussion of Adam,

makes crystal clear what sort of canopies with we are dealing with and why the enumeration is important:

The Holy One, blessed be He, made ten wedding canopies for Adam in the garden on Eden. They were all (made) of precious stones, pearls, and gold. Is it not a fact that only one wedding canopy is made for every bridegroom, whilst three wedding canopies are made for a king? But in order to bestow special honour upon the first man, the Holy One, blessed be He, made ten (wedding canopies) in the garden of Eden, as it is said, "Wast thou in Eden the garden of God; was every precious stone thy covering, etc" (Ezek. 28:13). Behold these are the ten canopies. The angels were playing upon timbrels and dancing with pipes, as it is said, "The workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was with thee" (Ezek. 28:13).

Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 12

None of our other sources make this quite as clear, but Genesis Rabbah (18:1) and Midrash Tanhuma Buber (חיי שרה, 58) hint in this direction: Genesis Rabbah prefaces the debate concerning the enumeration of the canopies with a teaching (ascribed to R.Benaiah and R.Simeon b.Yohai, 2nd Cent.) that God adorned Eve "like a bride" before bringing her to Adam²⁷⁴; and Tanhuma Buber repeats the idea that God adorned and led Eve like a bride to Adam (citing Gen 2:22 "He brought her to Adam" ²⁷⁵), then simply states that thirteen canopies were made for Adam *and Eve*.

²⁷⁴ On Eve's legendary beauty see b.Baba Bathra 58a.

²⁷⁵ Cf. Genesis Rabbah 18:3.

Genesis Rabbah is particularly worthy of note for the double interpretation of the list of precious stones in Ezekiel 28:13 it records. Immediately preceding the debate concerning the enumeration of the canopies Genesis Rabbah reads:

R. Aibu – others state the following in R. Bannayah's name, and it was also taught in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai – said: He [God] adorned her like a bride and brought her to Him, for there are places where coiffure is called building²⁷⁶. R. Hama b. R. Hanina said: What think you, that He brought her to him from under a carob tree or a sycamore tree! Surely He first decked her out with twenty-four pieces of finery [those mentioned in Isa. 3:18-24] and then brought her to him! Thus it is written, *Thou wast in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the carnelian, the topaz, and the emerald, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the carbuncle, and the smaragd, and gold; the workmanship of thy settings and of thy sockets was in thee, in the day that thou wast created they were prepared* (Ezek. 28:13).

Genesis Rabbah (18:1)

The quotation from Ezekiel 28:13 is not given in full in the midrash (it is curtailed by the classic rabbinic וגר = וגמר "et cetera"), but as the number of Hebrew words in verse 13 is 25 it seems likely that R. Hama b. R. Hanina took either גר-אלהים or כל-אבן (i.e. those phrases joined with a *maqfeph* in MT) as counting as a single word (i.e. giving 24).

Whether wedding canopies or the eschatological canopies of b.Baba Bathra, the point being made is that Adam was graced with hyperbolic glory prior to his sin. The glory of Adam is known outside of rabbinic lore (e.g. Ben Sira

²⁷⁶ Cf. b.Ber 61a; b.Er 18a both of which recount a tradition that God plaited Eve's hair prior to bringing her to Adam.

49:16; Sibylline Oracles 1:24; Apoc. Adam 1:2; references to “the glory of Adam” among the DSS are disputed²⁷⁷ e.g. 1QS 4:23; CD 3:20; 1QHa 4:15).

Concluding Remarks

To summarize, we find in the rabbinic literature a number of traditions (mostly attributed to Palestinian authorities) concerning Adam that draw on Ezekiel 28 to develop and illuminate their *aggadah*. We hear of the wisdom that Adam displays in naming the animals, and of the radiance of the round of his heel; we learn of the numerous canopies that mark Adam as being among the righteous and provide a glorious setting for his wedding (to Eve, bedecked with precious jewels). But throughout, the message remains the same: all this abundant wisdom, physical brilliance, and glory is lost as a result of his sin. As Midrash Tanhuma Buber succinctly puts it: “after all this glory ‘you are dust and to dust you shall return’ ” (Mid.Tan.B אחרֵי, 29)

From this vantage point we are able to see the obvious connections between the traditions concerning Adam and those concerning Hiram, which employ Ezekiel 28. Both traditions draw a contrast between a state of glory and devastating humiliation that follows (there is a clear echo of the Targum to Ezekiel here too).

In the wider material concerning the original state, sin, and expulsion of Adam preserved in rabbinic, targumic, and pseudepigraphic literature of post-biblical Judaism we find a number of traditions that draw these threads

²⁷⁷ Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), who built his thesis around the reading “glory of Adam” (not “glory of man”), which is widely considered heavy handed and unconvincing: See reviews by Matthew Goff (JBL 122, no.1 Spr 2003, 172-75); J.J.Collins (JSJ 34, no.1 2003, 73-79); G.J.Brooke (JSOT 27, no.5 2005, 167-68). Cf. also Alexander Golitzin, ‘Recovering the ‘Glory of Adam’ in James R. Davila (ed), *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 46 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 279-308.

closer together by suggesting that for Adam misplaced pride was perhaps his error. The Tosefta (Sanhedrin 8:9) records the view that Adam was created last so that he would not become conceited, lest it could be said to him: “*the gnat was created before you*”. In Targum Pseudo-Jonathan we find just the subtlest of hints that Adam suffered from a false pride derived from his worldly possessions (cf. the figure in Targum Ezekiel), for on Genesis 1:28 the targumist reads: “increase and multiply and fill the earth with sons and daughters, and become powerful *in possessions*”. A simple addition, and certainly nothing more than a hint, but it strikes a chord in light of the Targum to Ezekiel 28.

The highly fragmentary Qumran Paraphrase of Genesis-Exodus (4Q422 Fg.1 l.11-12) suggests Adam’s open rebellion, if Elgvin and Tov’s translation (“he [Adam] rose against Him [God]”) of the difficult Hebrew (וַיִּקְוֶם עָלָיו) is accepted (the text appears to fluctuate between the plural and singular)²⁷⁸, while the Testament of Adam (probably originally a Jewish work that has since undergone heavy Christian redaction²⁷⁹) even records that Adam aspired *to be god*, an aspiration for which God punishes him with death (3:2 cf. Jn 10:33-v36)

I do not suggest that there is any necessarily historical connection between these pseudepigraphic works and our rabbinic sources; but by looking more broadly at post-biblical Adam speculation we are able to suggest some ways in which we might fill in the gaps left by the terse delivery in the rabbinic

²⁷⁸ T. Elgvin and E. Tov ‘Paraphrase of Genesis and Exodus’ in Harold Attridge, *et al*, *Qumran Cave 4, VIII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 13 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 421-22.

²⁷⁹ Stephen Edward Robinson, ‘Testament of Adam’ in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol 1 (London: Doubleday, 1983), 990-91; Stephen Edward Robinson, *The Testament of Adam: An Examination of the Syriac and Greek Traditions*, SBL Dissertation Series 52 (Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982); J. J. Collins, ‘Testaments’, in Michael E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, Section 2, Volume 2 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 327-8.

literature. They allow us grasp more fully the fundamental synergy between the Hiram and Adam traditions, and the portrayal of the figure of Ezekiel 28 in the Targum to Ezekiel: all three are blessed, all rebel, and all are brought low.

6. THE FALL OF SATAN AND OTHER DEMONS

Ezekiel 28 in the Church Fathers

Introduction

In turning to the Church Fathers we step for the first time outside of the world of Judaism with which we have been concerned up to now. The results we have gained in reviewing the literature of the Fathers are interesting in their own right, but they also deepen our understanding of the interpretative material we have covered up to this point. The Fathers represent the first point of disjunction in what has otherwise been a continuum within the evolving traditions of Judaism, and as such they provide us with an opportunity to set contemporary (or at least near-contemporary²⁸⁰) traditions side by side for comparison. By looking at the quite different conclusions their Christian contemporaries derived from the same eight verses of Ezekiel – although they obviously did not always have an identical text before them – we see more clearly the unique manner in which the Rabbis operated and the unique set of priorities they held. Of course in making such a comparison we learn something of the Fathers too: specifically, how their gentile education and Christian faith formed their own set of lenses through which the biblical text is read and understood.

This excursion into the world of Christian biblical exegesis also allows us to date more accurately the emergence of some of the Rabbinic traditions. For example, both Jerome (quite explicitly) and, even earlier, Origen (less explicitly), cite and criticize the rabbinic tradition that associated the figure of

²⁸⁰ See my discussion concerning the difficulty of dating the rabbinic material, above on page 156f.

Ezekiel 28 with Hiram, allowing us to establish that the tradition was in wide circulation by the mid third century CE and must have originated some years before that.

Of the pre-Nicene Fathers we encounter Tertullian, Hippolytus, and Origen; of the post-Nicene Fathers, Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine of Hippo concern us here. There is not space here for a full-scale bibliography of each, but a brief résumé will be useful to set the historical scene.

Little is known with certainty of the life of Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus, or **Tertullian** (c. 160 – 225?), one of the founding minds of Latin theology. According to Jerome he was the son of a centurion serving in Roman North Africa. Tertullian's works attest his wide ranging education, and he may have pursued a legal career in Rome prior to his conversion to Christianity in middle age, although this is disputed. He applied his learning to his Christian apologetics, producing a pugnacious, aggressive style. He produced a number of works attacking the ideas of the Gnostics and Marcion in particular (i.e. *Against Marcion*, *Against Hermogenes*, *The Resurrection of the Flesh*, *The Flesh of Christ*), and it is among these we find his sole citation of Ezekiel 28 (i.e. *Against Marcion* iii.305), composed in the first decade of the third century²⁸¹.

It is difficult to provide a biography of **Hippolytus** (end 2nd – mid-3rd century CE), since it remains unclear whether we are dealing with a single individual

²⁸¹ Paolo Siniscalco, 'Tertullian' in Angelo Di Berardino, *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, trans. Adrian Walford (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1992), Vol. 2, 818-20; Claudio Moreschini and Enrico Norelli, *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature: A Literary History*, Vol 1, *From Paul to the Age of Constantine*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005), 332-57.

or two contemporary persons who happened to share the same name (as seems more likely)²⁸².

Eusebius tells of an eastern bishop, who “presided over a church, somewhere or other” (*Hist. eccl.* 6.20.2), probably in Asia Minor, and was active during the time of Septimius Severus (193-211 CE), Caracalla (211-217 CE), and Severus Alexander (222-235 CE). Jerome makes repeated mention of the same writer and expands on the list of works attributed to this eastern Hippolytus by Eusebius. Little can be added by way of biography to these few details.

Two sources from the fourth century (i.e. an epigram of Damasus, Bishop of Rome from 366 to 384, and a Roman calendar, known as the *Chronograph of 354*) tell of another Hippolytus, a presbyter of Rome, who along with his bishop, Pontian, was deported in 235 to Sardinia where they ultimately faced martyrdom.

A fuller biography of the Roman Hippolytus is possible. As a theologian he must have been well regarded since Origen travelled to Rome in 212CE to attend his lectures. The Roman Hippolytus clashed with Callistus, the then pope. He conceived of the Church as a community of the pure elect, against the view, supposedly held by Callistus, of the church of sinners following the path to repentance; and like Tertullian, he emphasised the distinction between the persons of God and Jesus, to the extent that Callistus accused him of ditheism, suggesting he was disciple of the schismatic, Novatian, an accusation that ultimately led to his deportation²⁸³.

²⁸² A full and detailed discussion can be found in Moreschini and Norelli, *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature*, Vol 1, 232-38.

²⁸³ Pierre Nautin, ‘Hippolytus’ in Angelo Di Berardino, *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, trans. Adrian Walford (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1992), Vol. 1, 383-5; Moreschini and Norelli, *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature*, Vol 1, 233, 235, 237; John A. McGuckin, *The SCM Press A-Z of Patristic Theology* (London: SCM, 2005), 164-5.

Two of Hippolytus' works concern us here, the *Commentary on the Book of Daniel* and the treatise *On Christ and Antichrist*, which draws heavily on the book of Daniel. Both of which display a preoccupation with eschatology, particularly in calculating a schema of future events²⁸⁴.

The uncertainty over biography means that the attribution of many works formerly attributed to Hippolytus has now been questioned²⁸⁵, however, the *Commentary on the Book of Daniel* and the treatise *On Christ and Antichrist* are among those attributed to the eastern Hippolytus by Eusebius and Jerome, so we can be reasonably certain we are dealing with the works of a single author (a conclusion borne out by the similarity of the two works) writing in Asia Minor in the early–mid second century.

Without doubt the most influential of all Greek theologians is **Origen of Alexandria** (c. 185 – 254). Origen was given a thorough education, both Greek and biblical, by his father Leonides, who was later (202 CE) to suffer martyrdom during the persecutions of Septimius Severus. Origen taught literature for a time to support his family, but once his help was no longer required he gave it up to dedicate himself to catechesis. He began to write in earnest in the second decade of the third century, encouraged by the financial support of Ambrosius, an adherent of Valentinianism converted to the catholic faith by Origen²⁸⁶.

²⁸⁴ Adolf Martin Ritter, 'Church and State up to c.300 CE' in Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young, *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, Vol. 1, *Origins to Constantine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 531.

²⁸⁵ Jean Daniélou and Henri Marrou, *The Christian Centuries*, Vol. 1, *The First Six Hundred Years*, trans. Vincent Cronin (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1964), 145-6; Moreschini and Norelli, *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature*, Vol 1, 232-38.

²⁸⁶ Henri Crouzel, 'Origen' in Angelo Di Berardino, *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, trans. Adrian Walford (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1992), Vol. 2, 619-23; Birger A. Pearson, 'Egypt' in Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young, *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, Vol. 1, *Origins to Constantine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 343-4.

Fundamental to Origen's thinking was the view that the goals of philosophy were reconcilable with the mysterious plan of divine wisdom, believing that human enlightenment and divine revelation could meet in the Scriptures, a pattern of thought undoubtedly influenced by Origen's enthusiasm for the works of Philo²⁸⁷. Consequently Origen dedicated his life almost exclusively to biblical exegesis, treating the Scriptures as a single, coherent, entity emanating from a single source, the divine Logos. His views on the unanimity of Scripture led naturally to the view that texts contained several mutually compatible layers of meaning (i.e. historical, moral, mystical or 'flesh, soul, and spiritual law'), with allegorical readings his preferred *modus operandi*.²⁸⁸

Three of Origen's works concern us here: *On First Principles*; *Against Celsus*; and *Homilies on Ezekiel* (preserved only in Latin), as well as a handful of fragmentary sources. *On First Principles* was Origen's first major work (c. 229 CE), in which he set out an ambitious programme to introduce the entirety of Christian faith, demonstrate its compatibility with philosophy, and to provide a definitive answer to most of the major critical issues of the day. The issuing of *On First Principles* upset Origen's bishop, Demetrius, and this, along with his alleged denial that the resurrection body would be material, and accusation of Gnosticism, led him to take refuge in Palestine in 231CE²⁸⁹. It was here that he composed a great number of homilies for use in the Church, among them his series of homilies on Ezekiel (probably composed in the

²⁸⁷ Joseph W. Trigg, *Origen, The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 1998), 11-12.

²⁸⁸ Trigg, *Origen*, 1-66; Frances M. Young, 'Towards a Christian *paideia*' in Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young, *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, Vol. 1, *Origins to Constantine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 493-500 esp. 498.

²⁸⁹ Trigg, *Origen*, 15.

240's²⁹⁰), and it was shortly after this, while settled at Caesarea, that he began his refutation of Celsus (c. 250)²⁹¹.

Cyril of Jerusalem (b.313-315 – d.387) was a priest and then a bishop of the Jerusalem church. Cyril was generally a supporter of the *homoiousian* position, and was consequently regarded with some suspicion by Arians and supporters of Nicaea alike. On account of this he suffered no less than three exiles (the first in 357), but was eventually able to return to Jerusalem, apparently only after aligning himself more closely with Nicene theology²⁹².

Cyril of Jerusalem is most famous for his twenty-four homilies on the Church's sacramental life, which he delivered to candidates being admitted to baptism. It is in the *Eighteen Catecheses*, in effect a stanza by stanza commentary on the creed delivered to candidates during Lent, that we find discussion of Ezekiel 28.

Born the son of a civil servant in Antioch, **John Chrysostom** (c. 349-407)²⁹³, went on to become archbishop of Constantinople in 398 and one of the central authorities of the theological traditions of Byzantium. Chrysostom (whose name means "Golden Mouth" in honour of his brilliant oratory) studied under Diodore, the great Syrian biblical exegete, and later Meletius, the bishop. He used this training to draw out the historical and contextual meaning of the text, whilst emphasising its moral significance without resorting to elaborate allegory. His time as archbishop was short-lived. In 403

²⁹⁰ Marcel Borret (ed.), *Origène: Homélie sur Ézéchiel*, Sources Chrétiennes 352 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1989), 7.

²⁹¹ Trigg, *Origen*, 52-3.

²⁹² Manlio Simonetti, 'Cyril of Jerusalem' in Angelo Di Berardino, *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, trans. Adrian Walford (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1992), Vol. 1, 215; Moreschini and Norelli, *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature*, Vol 2, 47-9; David J. Melling, 'Cyril of Jerusalem' in Ken Parry et al. (eds.), *The Blackwell Dictionary of Eastern Christianity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 151.

²⁹³ For a discussion of dates see J.N.D.Kelly, *Golden mouth : the Story of John Chrysostom : Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (London: Duckworth, 1995), Appendix B, 296-8.

he was deposed by the politically ambitious Theophilus of Alexandria at the Synod of the Oak at Chalcedon and subsequently exiled by the royal court, with whom Chrysostom had fallen out by offending empress Eudoxia with his outspoken remarks on the rich²⁹⁴.

Among the Fathers Eusebius Hieronymus, or Jerome (c.331/347-420)²⁹⁵, is perhaps the most interesting for our present purposes on account of his competence in Hebrew and knowledge of rabbinic sources.

Jerome was born in Stridon on the Dalmatian border of the empire. He studied Latin grammar and later rhetoric in Rome before converting to Christianity in 366. He moved to Antioch in 372 to live as a hermit. Here he advanced his study of Greek and learnt Hebrew²⁹⁶. Jerome tells us that he was commissioned by Damasus, bishop of Rome, to produce a revised version of the Latin Bible in light of the Greek, which would supersede the innumerable text forms of the Old Latin versions, a project he began in 383/4²⁹⁷.

In executing this project Jerome became increasingly aware of the discrepancy between the Hebrew and Greek Bible and designed to make fresh translation from the Hebrew, which he regarded as *hebraica veritas*. In addition to this *magnum opus*, the Vulgate, he produced a great many biblical commentaries as well as translations, including of Origen (from whom he is alleged to have cribbed exegetical material²⁹⁸).

It was towards the end of his life that Jerome produced his *Commentary on Ezekiel* (completed between 411 and 414), which Kelly has rightly called "a

²⁹⁴ Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen, *John Chrysostom, The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 2000), 3-11; Moreschini and Norelli, *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature*, Vol 2, 146-60.

²⁹⁵ On Jerome's date of birth see, J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome* (London: Duckworth, 1975), 337-39; Stefan Rebenich, *Jerome, The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 2002), 4, 163 n.3.

²⁹⁶ Kelly, *Jerome*, 1-45; Rebenich, *Jerome*, 3-20.

²⁹⁷ Kelly, *Jerome*, 86.

²⁹⁸ On Jerome's use of Origen specifically in his *Commentary on Ezekiel* see Kelly, *Jerome*, 306.

diffuse, unweildy work"²⁹⁹. Indeed, as will become apparent in our examination below, the exposition of Ezekiel 28 contained in the work is better characterised as an eclectic collection of reflections rather than a thoroughgoing exposition.

Perhaps needing no introduction, **Augustine of Hippo** (354–430), is the single most important writer in the history of the Christian West, having provided the basis for the standard theological system of the Latin West endorsed by Gregory the Great in the late sixth century. Augustine was born in Thagaste in Roman North Africa to a pagan father, Patricius, and a catholic mother, Monica, who enrolled her son as a *catechumen*. In 371 he went to Cathage to study rhetoric (sponsored by a wealthy patron, Romanianus), and went on to hold posts briefly in Rome and later in Milan as a rhetorician. Unwilling to submit to the doctrines of the Catholics, Augustine became a member of the Manichean movement, but lost hope in the movement when he found the famous Manichean bishop, Faustus, unable to answer his questions concerning the faith satisfactorily. Whilst in Milan, disillusioned with the Manicheans, experiencing ill health, and lovesick after a marriage of convenience (pressed upon him by his mother) that had separated him from the mother of his son and partner of fifteen years, he underwent something of a breakdown (described later on in his *Confessions*). His move to Milan, however, also brought him into contact with Ambrose, the then bishop of Milan, a contact that led, after much intellectual reflection, to his conversion to Catholic Christianity in 386, at the age of 32. This turning point led him eventually to return to Africa (in 388), where in 391, at the seaport of Hippo

²⁹⁹ Kelly, *Jerome*, 305–6.

Regius, he was seized by local Christians and forcibly ordained. It was after this event that Augustine's literary output truly began³⁰⁰.

Augustine wrote extensively: he composed treaties against the Manicheans; he famously argued against Pelagius, asserting that humanity was reliant on a free gift of God and could not achieve salvation by its own efforts; he recorded his own psycho-sexual and spiritual struggles in an autobiography (*Confessions*); he defended Nicene Christology against Arianism in *The Trinity*; and many other treaties. It is in his *The City of God*, produced between 412 and 427, that we find his discussion of Ezekiel 28. This monumental work attempts to lay out what an ethical and political view of Christianity might look like, stressing that human society is radically disassociated from the eschatological realisation of the kingdom (i.e. the true city of God)³⁰¹.

Translations used are those of Roberts & Donaldson (eds.), *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, and Schaff & Wace, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, except for Origen (*Homilies on Ezekiel* and *Fragments on Ezekiel*) and Jerome, where the translation is my own.

Ezekiel 28 in the Church Fathers

One similarity to the rabbinic material we reviewed in the previous chapter immediately confronts us from a survey of the Church Fathers: they do not have a lot to say about Ezekiel 28. It was clearly not a wellspring for major theological speculation for the Fathers. As with the rabbis, we find Ezekiel 28 being used to support a point being made, more often than forming the basis for the discussion itself. Only Origen and Jerome provide any extended

³⁰⁰ Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (London: Faber & Faber, 1979 [1969]), 16-181; 7-14; Serge Lancel, *St Augustine*, trans. Antonia Nevill (London: SCM, 2002), 1-152.

³⁰¹ Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*, 299-312; Lancel, *St Augustine*, 396-412.

discussion of chapter 28 as a whole in the form of a homily and letter (respectively). Yet in spite of this, what the Fathers draw from Ezekiel 28 has consistency. The most persistent interpretation offered by the Fathers is that Ezekiel 28 describes the fall of Satan. For Hippolytus, it centres on the coming Antichrist, and for Origen it concerns hostile forces more generally. Chrysostom stands alone in reflecting more generally on morality and mortality.

Tertullian, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Augustine: The Fall of Satan

Tertullian is the earliest of our writers to take up Ezekiel 28 as demonstrating the origin of evil in the world. The passage occurs in Tertullian's extensive denunciation of Marcion, whose views are one of the most well known of all the early heresies. Marcion was concerned, as so many others were at that time, with the question of the origin of evil. To oversimplify somewhat, Marcion was convinced that the god of the Old Testament was completely different from the Father of the Lord Jesus. In fact he regarded this god as an evil demiurge who had involved all humanity in sin through his incompetence at creation. As an apparently wealthy and powerful man, Marcion's ideas disseminated rapidly and he quickly became a serious rival to the Catholic Church. Tertullian clearly felt Marcion's ideas posed enough of a threat that they required a serious, reasoned, response.

Tertullian's reflections on the role of Satan occur in a long series of passages in which he meets a number of accusations that seek to show the indirect responsibility of God for sin. In the present passage Tertullian is addressing the accusation that the Devil, in encouraging Adam and Eve to eat of the

forbidden tree, caused sin to enter the system, and as God created the Devil, responsibility ultimately lay with God³⁰².

You choose to transfer the account of evil from man to the devil as the instigator of sin, and in this way, too, throw the blame on the Creator, inasmuch as He created the devil... Now, whence originated this malice of lying and deceit towards man, and slandering of God [by the devil]? Most certainly not from God, who made the angel good after the fashion of His good works. Indeed, before he became the devil, he stands forth the wisest of creatures; and wisdom is no evil. If you turn to the prophecy of Ezekiel, you will at once perceive that this angel was both by creation good and by choice corrupt. For in the person of the prince of Tyre it is said in reference to the devil: *"Moreover, the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, take up a lamentation upon the king of Tyrus, and say unto him, Thus saith the Lord God: Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, perfect in beauty" (this belongs to him as the highest of the angels, the archangel, the wisest of all); "amidst the delights of the paradise of thy God wast thou born" (for it was there, where God had made the angels in a shape which resembles the figure of animals). "Every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, the topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle; and with gold hast thou filled thy barns and thy treasuries. From the day when thou wast created, when I set thee, a cherub, upon the mountain of God, thou wast in the midst of stones of fire; thou wast irreproachable in thy days, from the day of thy creation, until thine iniquities were discovered. By the abundance of thy merchandise thou hast*

³⁰² Cf. Apocalypse of Sedrach, 4:4-5:2 "God said to him [Sedrach], "I created the first man, Adam, and placed him in Paradise in the midst of (which is) the tree of life, and I said to him, 'Eat of all the fruit, only beware of the tree of life, for if you eat from it you will surely die.' However, he disobeyed my commandment and having been deceived by the devil he ate from the tree." Sedrach said to him [God], "It was by your will that Adam was deceived, my Master...If you loved man, why did you not kill the devil, that artificer of all iniquity?"

filled thy storehouses, and thou hast sinned," etc. This description, it is manifest, properly belongs to the transgression of the angel, and not to the prince's: for none among human beings was neither born in the paradise of God, not even Adam himself, who was rather translated thither; nor placed with a cherub upon God's holy mountain, that is to say, in the heights of heaven, from which the Lord testifies that Satan fell; nor detained amongst the stones of fire, and the flashing rays of burning constellations, whence Satan was cast down like lightning (Luke 10:18). No, it is none else than the very author of sin who was denoted in the person of a sinful man: he was once irreproachable, at the time of his creation, formed for good by God, as by the good Creator of irreproachable creatures, and adorned with every angelic glory, and associated with God, good with Good; but afterwards of his own accord removed to evil. *From the day when thine iniquities, says he, were discovered, -* attributing to him those injuries wherewith he injured man when he was expelled from his allegiance to God, - even from that time did he sin, when he propagated his sin, and thereby plied "*the abundance of his merchandise*" that is, of his wickedness, even the tale of his transgressions, because he was himself as a spirit no less (than man) created, with the faculty of free-will. For God would in nothing fail to endow a being who was to be next to Himself with a liberty of this kind. Nevertheless, by pre-condemning him, God testified that he had departed from the condition of his created nature, through his own lusting after the wickedness which was spontaneously conceived within him; and at the same time, by conceding a permission for the operation of his designs, He acted consistently with the purpose of His own goodness, deferring the devil's destruction for the self-same reason as He postponed the restitution of man. For he afforded room for a conflict, wherein man might crush his enemy with the same freedom of his will as had

made him succumb to him (proving that the fault was all his own, not God's), and so worthily recover his salvation by a victory; wherein also the devil might receive a more bitter punishment, through being vanquished by him whom he had previously injured; and wherein God might be discovered to be so much the more good, as waiting for man to return from his present life to a more glorious paradise, with a right to pluck the tree of life.

Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, II.10

The argument is relatively straightforward: God created the Devil, but not as the Devil, rather as a glorious angel, to serve as His right-hand man. This angel was, like humankind, created good, and being superior to humankind was also entrusted with free-will (*liberi arbitrii institutus*: cf. James 1:13-14). But this angel sinned and caused man to sin too, but in order to give humankind a chance to crush evil with that same free-will and win an even greater reward, God postponed his destruction.

Ezekiel 28 forms the entire structure for this argument, with each component of the argument being pinned down to the text, and lest anyone should suspect that Ezekiel 28:12-19 was actually addressed to a prince, Tertullian explains: "for none among human beings was... born in the paradise of God, not even Adam himself, who was rather translated thither".

Unfortunately we have no record of how Marcionites or other 'gnostic' groups used Ezekiel 28, or even if they used it at all. The manner in which Tertullian introduces the extract ("If you turn to the prophecy of Ezekiel, you will at once perceive that this angel was both by creation good and by choice corrupt") and proceeds to expound it, however, suggest that he is not responding to a Marcionite exegesis of the text. Rather he appears to introduce this text into the discussion himself as a 'proof text', in order to demonstrate that Marcion's opinion is erroneous.

Tertullian's response to the accusation of the Marcionites ('God created the Devil, the Devil caused sin, therefore God caused sin') is simple: God *did* create the Devil, but the Devil was not simply God's robot, programmed to carry out his commands. Rather, he had the same freedom of choice and action as God had graciously granted to humankind, which although obviously imbued with certain risks, Tertullian argues, leaves open the possibility of even greater victory and reward.

This same concern (is God responsible for evil because he created the devil?) is found again in the fourth century in the second of Cyril of Jerusalem's Catechetical lectures, ('On Repentance and Remission of Sins, and concerning the Adversary'). Cyril's explanation of sin to the Catechists is two fold: in the first instance, he argues, sin results from humankind's free will, not through any predisposition to sin – and here he sounds close to Pelagianism³⁰³ – and as such God is absolved from blame: "*The planting was good, the fruit coming from the will is evil; and therefore the planter is blameless*" (Para.1), but secondly the free will is prompted to sin by the Adversary: "*yet thou art not the sole author of the evil, but there is also another most wicked prompter, the devil*" (Para.3), but lest the Catechists fall into the trap of Marcionite thinking, Cyril must clarify that the devil's sins too are the result of his free will (i.e. sin is not inherent in his created nature):

The devil then is the first author of sin, and the father of the wicked: and this is the Lord's saying, not mine, *that the devil sinneth from the beginning* (1 John 3:8; John 8:44): none sinned before him. But he sinned, not as having received necessarily from nature the propensity to sin, since then the cause of sin is traced back again to Him that made him so; but having been created good, he has of his

³⁰³ Cf. Apocalypse of Sedrach, 6:1, "And God said to him, 'Be it known to you, that everything which I commanded man to do was within his reach'".

own free will become a devil, and received that name from his action... And this is not my teaching, but that of the inspired prophet Ezekiel: for he takes up a lamentation over him and says, *Thou wast a seal of likeness, and a crown of beauty; in the Paradise of God wast thou born: and soon after, Thou wast born blameless in thy days, from the day in which thou wast created, until thine iniquities were found in thee.* Very rightly hath he said, *were found in thee;* for they were not brought in from without, but thou didst thyself beget the evil. The cause also he mentions forthwith: *Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty: for the multitude of thy sins wast thou wounded, and I did cast thee to the ground.* In agreement with this the Lord says again in the Gospels: *I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven* (Luke 10:18). Thou seest the harmony of the Old Testament with the New. He when cast out drew many away with him. It is he that puts lusts into them that listen to him: from him come adultery, fornication, and every kind of evil. Through him our forefather Adam was cast out for disobedience, and exchanged a Paradise bringing forth wondrous fruits of its own accord for the ground which bringeth forth thorns.

Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures*, Lecture 2, 4

Unlike Tertullian, Cyril does not hint that the verses cited from Ezekiel 28 might in fact be addressed to the prince of Tyre: Cyril de-contextualises the passages, and presents them as if addressed to Satan directly, thereby eradicating the problem of identifying the addressee. Cyril is more specific than Tertullian in specifying the Devil's crime here too (i.e. his heart was lifted up), but he is less successful in diverting the blame away from God. Where Tertullian argues that free-will afforded the opportunity for a more glorious victory in the end, Cyril has no such explanation. This is perhaps in part because his primary concern in this lecture is to impress upon his

listeners the need for repentance (he goes on to detail numerous biblical examples of God forgiving those who truly repented).

Under similar circumstances to Tertullian we find Augustine making the same argument in the early fifth century. In the case of Augustine the heresy being countered is that of Manichaeism – of which Augustine was a one time adherent – which (again to oversimplify somewhat) shared Marcion's basic dualistic outlook. Like Tertullian, Augustine was concerned to demonstrate that blame for sin could not be placed at the door of the Creator:

As for what John says about the devil, "*The devil sinneth from the beginning,*" (1 John 3:8) they who suppose it is meant hereby that the devil was made with a sinful nature, misunderstand it; for if sin be natural, it is not sin at all. And how do they answer the prophetic proofs, – either what Isaiah says when he represents the devil under the person of the king of Babylon, "*How art thou fallen, O Lucifer, son of the morning!*" (Isa. 14:12) or what Ezekiel says, "*Thou hast been in Eden, the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering,*" (Ezek 28:13) where it is meant that he was some time without sin; for a little after it is still more explicitly said, "*Thou wast perfect in thy ways?*" And if these passages cannot well be otherwise interpreted, we must understand by this one also, "*He abode not in the truth,*" (John 8:44) that he was once in the truth, but did not remain in it. And from this passage, "*The devil sinneth from the beginning,*" (1 John 3:8) it is not to be supposed that he sinned from the beginning of his created existence, but from the beginning of his sin, when by his pride he had once commenced to sin.

Augustine, *The City of God*, 11:15

Faced with the same problem as Tertullian, Augustine makes the same basic assertion. The Devil was not sinful by nature; and like Cyril he specifies the cause: pride (referring to Ezekiel 28:17, '*Your heart was lifted up...*').

For all three the handful of verses from Ezekiel 28 serve to demonstrate a wider theological point: that human sin is not inherent in the created order, but a perversion of that order, and the “prompter” of that sin, the Devil, was likewise not created with an evil nature, despite what 1 John 3:8 might imply. It is the transition from glory, status, honour, perfection even, of the character in Ezekiel 28:12-19 to destruction and punishment that fits so neatly in the Fathers’ minds to Jesus’ description in Luke 10:18 (“*I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven*”). According to all three Fathers the figure referred to, without doubt, is Satan.

Hippolytus: The Coming Antichrist

Hippolytus’ avowed purpose in his *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist* is to

“take the Holy Scriptures themselves in hand, and find out from them what, and of what manner, the coming of the Antichrist is; on what occasion and at what time that impious one shall be revealed; and whence and from what tribe (he shall come); and what his name is, which is indicated by the number in the Scripture; and how he shall work error among the people, gathering them from the ends of the earth; and (how) he shall stir up tribulation and persecution against the saints; and how he shall glorify himself as God; and what his end shall be; and how the sudden appearing of the Lord shall be revealed from heaven; and what the conflagration of the whole world shall be; and what the glorious and heavenly kingdom of the saints is to be, when they reign together with Christ; and what the punishment of the wicked be fire”.

Hippolytus, *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist*, Para 1

It is in addressing the question of which tribe the Antichrist will come from that Ezekiel 28 enters the discussion. Hippolytus only makes use of the first of

the two oracles in Ezekiel 28 (i.e. vv.2-10 not 12-19), but what he has to say fits neatly in the ideas that we find in Tertullian, Cyril of Jerusalem, Augustine, and Origen, and this ensures that his contribution is worth consideration here. Hippolytus seeks to demonstrate that the Antichrist will rise from the tribe of Dan, and quotes a number of texts to demonstrate this point (e.g. Deut. 33:22; Gen. 49:16, 17³⁰⁴; Jer. 8:16). Uncertainty obviously lingers as to whether these texts actually refer to the Antichrist, so “that these things, then, are said of no one else but that tyrant, the shameless one, and adversary of God, we shall show in what follows”. This is the section in which Ezek. 28 appears (preceded by Isa. 10:12-17 and 14:4-21 and followed by a lengthier exposition of the Book of Daniel):

Ezekiel also speaks of him to the same effect, this: “Thus saith the Lord God, Because thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am God, I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the sea; yet art thou a man, and not God, (though) thou has set thine heart as the heart of God. Art thou wiser than Daniel? Have the wise not instructed thee in their wisdom? With thy wisdom or with thine understanding hast thou gotten thee power, and gold and silver in thy treasures? By thy great wisdom and by thy traffic hast thou increased thy power? Thy heart is lifted up in thy power. Therefore thus saith the Lord God: Because thou hast set thine heart as the heart of God: behold, therefore I will bring strangers upon thee, plagues from the nations: and they shall draw their swords against thee, and against the beauty of thy wisdom; and they shall level thy beauty to destruction; and they shall bring thee down; and thou shalt die by the death of the wounded in the midst of the sea. Wilt thou yet say before them that slay thee, I am God? But thou art a man and no

³⁰⁴ About which he says: “What, then, is meant by the serpent but Antichrist, that deceived Eve and supplanted Adam?”.

God, in the hand of them that wound thee. Thou shalt die the deaths of the uncircumcised by the hand of strangers: for I have spoken it, saith the Lord"

Hippolytus, *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist*, 18

As with Cyril of Jerusalem and Augustine a few centuries later it is the hubristic, overconfident claims, that makes the identification with the Antichrist clear to Hippolytus.

We need also bear in mind that Ezekiel, Isaiah, and the other texts from both Testaments that Hippolytus cites are really of a secondary order of interest for him. His primary interest is in the book of Daniel (and to a lesser extent, Revelation). In his *Commentary on Daniel*, Hippolytus works through the text systematically, demonstrating how its prophecies have been fulfilled by identifying them with past historical events, starting from the rise of Babylon, and working through the Persian and Greek empires, the Maccabean revolt, and the war between Ptolemy and Antiochus. Having demonstrated that the text is reliable in so far as it refers to external reality, Hippolytus can then use the text to talk with confidence of what the future will hold. This he does both in his *Commentary on Daniel* and in *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist*, the majority of which is dedicated to an exposition of Daniel.

It is his confidence that the future can be constructed with confidence from Daniel that frees him from the need to demonstrate that other text's, such as Ezekiel, refer to the Antichrist too. The logic being that an accurate schema of what will be the case in the future can be established from the Book of Daniel, Ezekiel's oracle fits into that schema so must speak authoritatively of future events too, so any additional detail from Ezekiel can be accepted with equal confidence.

Returning to Ezekiel 28, Hippolytus does elaborate on the cause of the hubris he identifies, although in somewhat esoteric terms:

“And when he has overmastered three horns out of the ten³⁰⁵ in the array of war, and has rooted these out, viz. Egypt, and Libya, and Ethiopia, and has got their spoils and trapping, and has brought the remaining horns which suffer into subjection, he will begin to be lifted up in heart, and to exalt himself against God as master of the whole world³⁰⁶. . . . These things, then, shall be in the future, beloved; and when the three horns are cut off, he will begin to show himself as God, as Ezekiel has said aforetime: *“Because thy heart has been lifted up, and thou hast said, I am God.”* (Ezek. 28:2) And to the like effect Isaiah says: *“For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of heaven: I will be like the Most High. Yet now thou shall be brought down to hell (Hades), to the foundations of the earth”* (Isa. 14:13-15) In like manner also Ezekiel: *“Wilt thou yet say to those who slay thee, I am God? But thou (shalt be) a man, and no God”* (Ezek. 28:9).”

Hippolytus, *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist*, 52-3

Hippolytus’ argument can be summarised briefly as follows: in the final conflict with the Antichrist, the Antichrist will begin to win a limited victory. This will induce in him pride, and through his pride, false claims of divinity. His claims of divinity will expose him, and once exposed he will be destroyed. The picture Hippolytus paints is that the final conflict will in essence be a repetition of Satan’s initial expulsion from his position of glory (as Tertullian, Cyril, and Augustine portrayed it).

³⁰⁵ The horns are drawn from Daniel 7:7-8 (whence Revelation, e.g. 13:1).

³⁰⁶ Cf. Hippolytus’ commentary on Daniel v.178 (Frg.2 Para. 2), which is nearly identical up to this point.

Origen: Hostile Powers

Origen is the last of the pre-Nicene Fathers to employ Ezekiel 28. He discusses it a number of times in his writing, indeed we even find an entire homily delivered on the second of the two oracles of chapter 28 (i.e. vv.12-19). It was obviously a passage that intrigued him, no doubt for the most part because the esoteric nature of the text promised, with hard work and application, to yield up those 'secret mysteries' (ἀπόρρητα μυστήρια) which constituted the most profound level of meaning (e.g. *On First Principles* I. 2:3, 8)³⁰⁷.

In his *On First Principles, Against Celsus*, and his first homily on Ezekiel, Origen echoes Tertullian in understanding Ezekiel 28 to be referring to the fall of Satan as an explanation for the origin of evil:

With more propriety, however, is he [Satan] called "adversary", who was the first among those that were living a peaceful and happy life to lose his wings, and to fall from blessedness; he who according to Ezekiel, walked faultlessly in all his ways, "until iniquity was found in him," (Ezek. 28:15) and who being the "seal of resemblance" and the "crown of beauty" in the paradise of God, being filled as it were with good things, fell into destruction, in accordance with the word which said to him in a mystic sense³⁰⁸:
"Thou hast fallen into destruction, and shalt not abide for ever."

Origen, *Against Celsus* (6:43-44)

He echoes Tertullian (and Augustine) too in meeting the objection that in creating Satan, God is made culpable for sin.

³⁰⁷ For a fuller discussion of Origen's understanding of 'secret mysteries' see Jean Daniélou, *A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea*, Vol. 2, *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*, trans. John Austin Baker (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1980 [1973]), 465-500, esp. 465-9.

³⁰⁸ See Daniélou, *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*, 465-9

According to our view, there is no rational creature which is not capable both of good and evil...For in our view not even the Devil himself was incapable of good; but although capable of admitting good, he did not therefore also desire it, or make any effort after virtue. For, as we are taught by those quotations which we adduced from the prophets, there was once a time when he was good, when he walked in the paradise of God between the cherubim.

Origen, *On First Principles* (I. 8:3)³⁰⁹

For Origen too the transition from glory to ignominy that the figure of the second oracle of Ezechiel 28 (vv.12-19) records, expresses perfectly the transition that Satan too must have experienced if God is indeed blameless for the entry of evil into his creation. As Origen himself puts it, evil "derived its existence from some who had lost their wings, and who had followed him who was first to lose his own"³¹⁰.

Of all the Fathers Origen is the only one to work in a systematic way through the entire lament of Ezekiel 28:12-19 (in his eighth Homily on Ezekiel) and it is to this that we now turn our attention. Quite logically Origen's first question is, Who is this prince to which the oracle is addressed? The problem as he sees it is that:

No man *was created in the midst of cherubim* and no man was *brought up in the paradise* of God, if we simply follow what is written. Yet while we said nobody could have been *in the paradise of delight*, here it is said, *in the paradise of delight the prince of Tyre (was) born and in fact raised*. Who is this prince of Tyre?

Origen, *Homily xiii*, 1:5-10.

³⁰⁹ Cf. *Origène: Homélie sur Ézéchiél*, Homilie I, 3, lines 89-108 (p.54).

³¹⁰ *Against Celsus* (6:43).

This, of course, is that same problem Tertullian identifies (see above on page 205). Origen had reached this conclusion a decade or so earlier in *On First Principles* in which he states that the oracle of Ezekiel 28:12-19 is “manifestly of such a kind as cannot be at all understood of a man, but of some superior power which had fallen away from a higher position, and had been reduced to a lower and worse condition” (I. 5:4).

Origen’s next move is to bring together citations from Daniel (10:13, 20), Paul’s letters (Rom. 2:10; 1 Cor. 2:6-8), the Psalms (2:2; 81:6-7), and the books of Moses (Deut. 32:8-9) to demonstrate that Israel has an angelic prince (Michael), as do the Greeks and Persians according to Scripture. So too, he concludes, must Tyre have an angelic prince, and this is the prince that Ezekiel 28:12-19 refers to (*Homily xiii*, 1:17-68). Again we find this conclusion already formulated (although much more succinctly) in *On First Principles*: “these words [Ezek.28:12-19, which he has just cited in full] are spoken of a certain angel who had received the office of governing the nation of the Tyrians, and to whom also their souls had been entrusted to be taken care of” (*On First Principles*, I.5:4)³¹¹.

These spiritual princes that Origen identifies are further defined as hostile powers: “our battle is against these princes” (*Homily xiii*, 1:79-80³¹²). Origen tells us that the Apostles had suffered persecution in Tyre, Antioch, etc., and argues that it is these hostile powers that are ultimately responsible. In just the same way Judas “is not reckoned to be the principal betrayer of the Saviour... since it is written concerning Judas: *And after the mouthful Satan entered into that one*” (*Homily xiii*, 1:87-91). Just as Judas was a mere puppet for

³¹¹ Daniélou, *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*, 69-76

³¹² Cf. *On First Principles* III.2:1 where Ezek.28:12-19 appears as one of a number of examples of “hostile powers” found in the Old Testament.

Satan, the argument goes, so it is actually these “hostile powers”, the angelic princes assigned to nations, who are battling against the Apostles.

Like Satan, this particular hostile power (the prince of Tyre) fell from a condition of love, hence “a seal of likeness, a crown of honour, raised in the paradise of delights” (Homily xiii, 2:4-5, 22-23). Drawing on Luke 10:18, Origen continues the comparison with Satan. Satan, he argues, “did not descend from heaven, nor would any evil have befallen him if he had descended. Listen to what Jesus says: *I saw Satan falling* (root = *cado*), not descending (root = *descendo*), *out of heaven like lightning*” (Origen, Homily xiii, 2:26-30). The angels of the nations, the hostile powers already identified, have fallen (i.e. been forcibly cast down³¹³) too just like Satan. Again the same conclusion is expressed in *On First Principles*, although there Origen is concerned to stress that evil enters through the free actions of the hostile power, not by God’s design:

We have shown, then, that what we have quoted regarding the prince of Tyre from the prophet Ezekiel refers to an adverse power, and by it is most clearly proved that that power was formerly holy and happy; from which state of happiness it fell from the time that iniquity was found in it, and was hurled to the earth, and was not such by nature and creation.

On First Principles (1.5:4)

However, Origen exhorts his congregation to draw from this a message of hope: they are heading in the opposite direction:

Unlike the angels who have fallen, you have been raised, so the mysteries which were entrusted to them at one time will be entrusted to you, as it is

³¹³ Cf. Jacques-Paul Migne (ed.), *Origenis, Opera Omnia*, 3, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, 013 (Paris, 1862), 821 “*Because of the multitude of your sins I threw you down upon the earth. [It was] from heaven [that] he who was cast down (νῆπιπτω) upon the earth was cast down (νῆπιπτω)*”.

said: *How has Lucifer, who rises in the morning, fallen? But you were made a light to the world, hence you were made into Lucifer*³¹⁴; only Lucifer, who fell from heaven, was from out of the stars, yet you, since you are among the seed of Abraham, you will be reckoned among the stars of heaven.

Origen, *Homily xiii*, 2:53-60

Here the homily takes an explicitly Christian direction, and the phrase “*a seal of likeness, a crown of honour, raised in the paradise of delights*” gets a second interpretation. Those who are raised, are raised because they have received the seal of the Lord, hence “*you are a seal of likeness*”, in baptism by the Holy Spirit, at which, Origen argues in this homily, one receives “*the image of heaven*”, and loses “*the image of earth*”³¹⁵. But although we achieve the “*image*” we do not gain the likeness, “*only a few will receive the likeness, such as the Apostles*” (*Homily xiii*, 2:125-6). Similarly the beauty and wisdom mentioned in Ezekiel 28:12 are to be found in true form in Christ too (*Homily xiii*, 2:171-6), since Christ enables us to be transformed (metaphorically speaking) from an old man into a youth (*Homily xiii*, 2:165-9). The precious stones even become the Christian virtues (faith, temperance, etc) which “*are built upon the foundation of Christ*” (*Homily xiii*, 3:33-34).

This double interpretation offered by Origen in this single homily indicated his appreciation of the versatility of this particular text. But for Origen the meaning is not exhausted: the text also has a simple warning against unwarranted human pride. In one of the fragments on Ezekiel Origen reflects on the phrase “*you were clothed (ἐνδεδέσσαι) with every precious stone*” (28:13). The high priest, he observes, was adorned with these stones (denoting the

³¹⁴ i.e. ‘Lucifer’, meaning literally, ‘the light bearer’.

³¹⁵ Much the same is said in a fragment on Ezekiel: “*You are a seal of likeness. Truth is a seal and beauty a crown. He who is in this [i.e. truth] will be made into it [i.e. a seal], and those who receive the truth are made in it [i.e. the seal].*” Although the Greek is difficult: Σὺ ἀποσφραγισμα ὁμοιώσεως. Ἀλήθεια σφραγίς ἐστὶ καὶ στέφανος κάλλους. Ὁ ἐν ταύτῃ ὦν ποιωθήσεται ἐν αὐτῇ· καὶ οἱ δεχόμενοι τὴν ἀλήθειαν γίνονται ἐν αὐτῇ. Migne (ed.), *Origenis, Opera Omnia*, 821.

twelve sons of Israel and the trees of paradise), and the gates of Jerusalem were built with them. The prince of Tyre too received this material glory, but his error was to mistake a gracious gift for his own achievement.

The prince of Tyre was clothed with all of them, not by his own hard-work, but by grace, as was also the case with Jerusalem and a priest of God. But because these things happened he fell, saying in the heart: *"because I am God; I have dwelt in the dwelling place of God, in the heart of the sea"*.

Origin, Fragment in Migne (ed.), *Origenis, Opera Omnia*, 435

From the place of self-glorification this figure is cast down³¹⁶. There is no suggestion in the fragment of spiritual powers, it is a simple moral tale, similar in intent to that which we observed in the Targum (i.e. *"pride goeth before destruction"* see Chapter 4). John Chrysostom, in a homily reflecting in part on mortality and the human body, neatly complements Origen's point here. Chrysostom recalls the "barbarian king" who said "I will be like unto the Most High" (cf. Isa. 14:13-14) and the prince of Tyre who was "ambitious to be considered as a God" (cf. Ezek. 28:2). Chrysostom reminds his listeners that despite these grand claims they both died in the end (citing Isa. 14:11 and Ezek.28:9). He concludes: "God, in making this body of ours as it is, hath from the beginning utterly taken away all occasion of idolatry" (*Homily xi*, 4 cf. Acts 12:20-23; 2 Thes 2:4). Death, as the proverb has it, is the great leveller. This, of course, is strongly reminiscent of some of the rabbinic material discussed earlier, particularly the discussion concerning the excretory organs (Tg.Ezek. 28:14, b.Berakhoth 60d, see above on pages 139-140) and the vicarious punishment of Adam for Hiram's future claims of divinity (Genesis Rabbah 9.5; b.Baba Bathra 75a-b, see above on page 181).

³¹⁶ Cf. Migne (ed.), *Origenis, Opera Omnia*, 821.

Jerome: Eclectic Reflections on the Text

Earlier I remarked that Origen was the only Father to have worked in a systematic way through the entire lament of Ezekiel 28:12-19. However, Jerome also produced a commentary on chapter 28 (both oracles in fact), but it would be perfectly fair to say that calling his commentary systematic is generous. What we find in Jerome's commentary on Ezekiel 28 is a collection of loosely connected reflections on individual points of interest within the text, some textual, some theological, some moral, some Christological. The work also contains some quite extensive abstract discussions. There is little overall cohesion. This is in part indicative of how complex the text becomes when you have (as Jerome did) the Hebrew, Greek, and Old Latin texts in mind. For our present purposes we cannot possibly engage in an exhaustive analysis of Jerome's commentary. We have attempted to deal only with the highlights.

Jerome's treatment of the first of the two oracles of Ezekiel 28 (vv.1-10) is relatively straightforward (as the oracle itself is more straightforward). Having provided his own translation of the Hebrew and the Septuagint versions, Jerome introduces Nebuchadnezzar and Pharaoh into the discussion as examples to be usefully compared to the Prince of Tyre. He cites Nebuchadnezzar's now familiar "*I will be like the Most High*" (Isa. 14:14) and Pharaoh's "*Mine are the rivers and I made them*" (Ezek 29:3) to which the Prince of Tyre's "*I am God and in the seat of God I sat*" (Ezek.28:2) is added. The introduction of this trio is strongly reminiscent of the discussions concerning Hiram that we observed earlier among the rabbinic sources (see above on page 169). Of the grand claims of these three, Jerome says that although they seem "to be the sayings of mad demons and not men, we ought to accept [them] as hyperbole" (1.77-79). These are not other-worldly powers, he argues, but men "swollen with pride" who "do not acknowledge their limitations, so

that, having become puffed up with the success of the world and the power of sovereignty, they now believe the positive effect to be perpetual; they do not acknowledge that they themselves are men and lay claim to everlasting sovereignty for themselves" (1.77-83). Their crime was simple: they forgot that their honour depended on the authority of another (i.e. God), who had entrusted them with provinces and power in the first place.

Half way through this discussion of worldly powers there is an interjection in which Jerome seems to endorse a secondary level of meaning. He appears to have in mind something akin to the hostile powers discussed by Origen, and he may well be borrowing from Origen here, given that he cites exactly the same passages in support of his view as does Origen (1.83-100, i.e. Dan. 10:13, 20; 1 Cor. 2:6-8; Deut. 32:8-9). These figures, he says, are the *principes et potestates* against which, according to Paul, we fight (81-82; Eph. 6:12). But it is difficult to ascertain exactly what he understands these *potestates* to be. There is no explanation of what he thinks these hostile powers (*potestates adversariae*) are: he simply quotes the passages without providing any explanatory discussion whatsoever, other than the blunt introductory phrase "under the figure of royal princes and of individual cities or provinces, the hostile powers (*potestates adversariae*) are indicated" (83-84).

Jerome then moves on to discuss the second of the two oracles (Ezek. 28:12-19), introduced by a translation of both the Hebrew and the Greek as before. This is where things get really complicated. Jerome suggests that the lament is concerned with bewailing the loss of the prince's "former glory" (*pristina gloria*; 187), indicated by "you were a seal of likeness". This phrase leads Jerome to bring together a number of biblical citations concerning sealing or likeness:

just like that which John the evangelist said appropriately concerning the Saviour: *truly God the Father puts his seal to this one*, and concerning humankind too: *he seals, because God is true*, and in

the Psalms: *the light of your countenance is sealed upon us, O Lord*, and in another place: *dearly beloved, now we are sons of God, and it is not yet apparent what we will become, we know because when it becomes apparent, we will become his likeness*, whence concerning God it is said: *who will be like you?*

In Hiezechielem IX, xxviii, l.190-196

This is followed by a discussion defending the equality in nature and substance of Christ and the Father (*ubi autem aequalitas est, ibi eadem natura unaque substantia*, l.203-4) against what Jerome calls “the most ferocious heresy” of acknowledging in Christ only the likeness of the Father. One eventually gets to what appears to be the conclusion being drawn from these passages: that the likeness of Christ, which is lost through sin, is regained through baptism (l.204-5 citing Gal. 4:19 “*my little children, with whom I am in travail until Christ be formed in you*”). After a second tangential excursion into the Old Latin, which reads “an unsealing” (*resignaculum*) for “a seal” (*signaculo*) of the Hebrew and LXX, Jerome concludes this section with the phrase “*full of wisdom and perfect in beauty (or a crown of beauty i.e. LXX)*” which he explains: “where the true likeness of God is, there great wisdom and perfect beauty are too” (i.e. in Christ, and by abstraction in those baptised, l.219-21).

Jerome move on to “*you were in the delights of the paradise of God*”. This he concludes

is called the paradise ‘of God’ that it might show that there is an opposite paradise ‘not of God’, among those who change truth into falsehood and boast that they possess paradise; by this discussion it is demonstrated that it is not man about whom it is written, but about a opposing force [i.e. Satan] which once dwelt in the paradise of God

In this somewhat complex yet oddly terse manner Jerome appears to be thinking of the *potestates adversariae* identified earlier on; but here the singular number suggests that we are probably to think of Satan specifically. But it is difficult to be more certain: this is all he has to say on “*you were in the delights of the paradise of God*”.

Next come the precious stones, which introduce a lengthy disquisition. After some text-critical reflection on the versions (“there are often discrepancies between Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion in the present location among themselves, and compared to the Septuagint, not only with regard to order, but also over number and names” l.249-53) we enter a prolonged series of overtly Christian and Christological allusions and reflections: the stones are those with which Jerusalem in the Apocalypse of John is built; the stones are those of the high-priestly breastplate indicating Christ as the high-priest “*after the order of Melchizedek*”; the twelve stones represent the apostles; Christ as the living stone upon which the church is founded; the precious stones represent treasures in heaven; and the precious stones indicate the Holy Spirit (l.252-301). After over fifty lines Jerome brings the speculation to a close, conceding that of the stones’ “colour and nature and individual effects there is not enough time to discuss, since they would require their own book” (l.301-3).

It is in the figure of the cherub that we find Jerome again taking up the idea of *potestates adversariae*. The reference to the cherub (whether the Hebrew “*you were the Cherub*” or Septuagint “*who was alone with an anointed Cherub when he was created*”)

“cannot refer to the man who is the prince of the city of Tyre, rather to that once holy and special force (*fortitudinem*) which was designated as the prince of Tyre”

Jerome clearly has in mind something akin to the angelic princes assigned to each nation that Origen had outlined clearly (see above on page 215), and that Jerome had apparently alluded to (see above on page 220, 1.83-100).

Jerome now begins to move through the text at breakneck speed. This angelic prince was located in paradise, which is how Jerome understands "*the holy mountain of God*" (1.334-5); that the figure walked among "burning stones" is taken to mean among God and the angels, who are called "a consuming fire" and "burning stones" respectively; that the figure was "*perfect in your ways from the day of your foundation until iniquity was found in you*" show that "every creature was created good by God", the "blemish" or "fault" (*macula*) being the result not of nature but of will (*non naturae sit, sed voluntatis*, cf. Origen, *On First Principles* I.5:4 cited on page 216; Tertullian, above page 216).

But now the picture becomes less clear. Jerome identifies the reason for the "fault" and subsequent punishment as being that the figure filled the "storerooms and interiors of his own breast" (1.367; Jerome takes his lead from the Septuagint here) with "iniquity on account of the greatness of his trade" (1.375-6). Why this angelic prince would be trading in heaven, and with whom, is a question Jerome ignores. The figure's iniquity is specified as pride, "*your heart is elevated by your beauty*", and self-deification "you considered yourself to be that which God is" (*tuum putas esse quod Dei est*, 1.390-1), for which the figure, just like Adam, is expelled from paradise. Jerome concludes his exposition of the punishment with two citations: the words of Isaiah, "*How has Lucifer, who rose up early in the morning, fallen?*" (Isa. 14:12 LXX), and the words of the Saviour, "*I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven*" (Luke 10:18). But has the figure become Satan all of a sudden?

Jerome's commentary is dense, complex, and lacking cohesion. Is the figure Satan, the angelic prince of Tyre, some other "hostile power", or just a vain man? Jerome seems to explore all these ideas to a greater or lesser extent

without any clear concluding synthesis. He cites a number of passages from scripture that are only superficially related to the lament of Ezekiel with little or no explanation of what they tell us, pursues side issues on the topics of Christ and the Christian life often at great length and with little or no reference to the text under discussion, and vacillates between diverse viewpoints. That being said, we do see in Jerome recurring themes which are now familiar from other sources, and his commentary does incorporate a vast array of material, some of which is evidently not novel to Jerome.

Engaging Rabbinic Traditions

Jerome is important to us in one other way: the explicit reference he makes to the traditions of the *Hebraei*. At the end of his commentary Jerome adds the following:

The Hebrews, among their discussions, genealogies, and innumerable questions, are accustomed to understand those things as having been said against Hiram the king of Tyre, but from Solomon all the way to Ezekiel there are many years, and men do not live that long; they are accustomed to proclaim, that with irony the prophet said concerning him: 'Were you not a seal of the likeness of God, full of wisdom and complete in beauty, did you dwell adorned with stones, were you a Cherub, or created with the Cherub, since you sinned on the other hand, and were reduced to ash?'; so they add to their story a miracle, so that, against scripture or rather without scriptural authority, they say: Hiram lived a thousand years. Truly this does violence to the interpretation.

In Hiezechielem IX, xxviii, l.434-446

The rabbinic tradition that Hiram live for a thousand years first appears in Genesis Rabbah 85.4, where the view is attributed to the *tannaim* of the

Mishnah (1st-2nd Cent.). That we find Jerome displaying a knowledge of the particular details of this rabbinic legend suggests that it was widespread and well known by his day, which strengthens the attribution to the *tannaim* although it does not confirm it by itself.

Aside from the specific tradition concerning Hiram's longevity, it is clear that the identification of the king of Tyre with Hiram is an early association in Judaism. Jerome alludes to this again earlier on in his commentary, "the Jews think that this [passage] through the mode that is called *hyperbole* is a prophecy concerning Hiram the king of Tyre" (*In Hiezechielem IX, xxviii, 1.234-5*). This is an aside, a throw away comment, which unfortunately he does not elaborate on.

More significantly we find Hiram appearing in Origen's discussion, so that it can be made clear that this is not what the text concerns, "the prophecy is not teaching us about *Hiram* – that one whose name is written in the third book of *Kings* – nor is it about another prince of Tyre nor some other human being" (*Homily xiii, 1:103-6*). Origen is not explicit in attributing this tradition to the Jews as Jerome does, but there seems little cause to introduce Hiram only to dismiss him, unless there is an already circulating tradition that he wishes to counter.

We can detect the influence of the rabbinic traditions on both Jerome and Origen in another way. In the rabbinic sources, Nebuchadnezzar and Pharaoh are named again and again as examples of hubristic crimes comparable to that of Hiram (e.g. MRI, Shirata, VIII, 32; Exod.R 36.2; b.Hullin 89a; Mid.Tan.B וַאֲרָא, 12). The same quotations repeatedly appear in support of this argument: Isa. 14:13-14 for Nebuchadnezzar ("I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High") and Ezek. 29:3 for Pharaoh ("my river is mine own, and I have made it for myself"). What is noteworthy is that these two figures and associated quotations all occur repeatedly in Origen (e.g. *Homily xiii, 1:67,*

70-1, 76; cf. "I have not yet mentioned the passages in Ezekiel, where he speaks, as it were, of Pharaoh, or Nebuchadnezzar, or the prince of Tyre" *Against Celsus* 6:43 cf. Hippolytus, *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist*, 52-3), and Jerome may well be indebted to the rabbis for this too:

It is written in Isaiah concerning the king of Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar, that he made himself equal to the power of God and being exalted he became so arrogant that he dared to say: *I will ascend above the stars of heaven and I will be like the Most High* – when he was cast down from the throne, he deserved to hear: *how has Lucifer, who rose early in the morning, fallen?* –, and concerning Pharaoh in this same prophecy: *Mine are the rivers, and I made them*, and concerning the prince of Tyre, with an elevated heart he said arrogantly: *I am God and in the seat of God I sat (or in the dwelling-place of God I dwell)*, yet he is man and not God

In Hiezechielem IX, xxviii, 1.67-76

It seems likely then that the rabbinic traditions that connect this verse with Hiram and compare him to Nebuchadnezzar and Pharaoh not only predate Jerome but in all likelihood go back to before the days of Origen, writing in the early to mid third century.

The use of Isaiah 14:4-21 invites further reflection, since we find this oracle against Babylon employed in tandem with Ezekiel 28 in both rabbinic and patristic discussions. In the rabbinic material the Isaiah oracle is employed to provide an example of Nebuchadnezzar's hubristic claims of divinity (e.g. MRI, Shirata, II, 91; MRI, Shirata, VIII, 32; Exod.R 36.2; Mid.Tan.B וּמָרָא, 16), to which the rabbis understood Hiram's claims in Ezekiel 28 to be a parallel. We find this same basic pattern of exegesis in operation in Chrysostom. We noted in our earlier discussion the similarity between Chrysostom's exegesis of Ezekiel 28 and the rabbinic reflections on mortality (see above on page 218); to

that we ought to add now the similarity between Chrysostom's and rabbinic use of Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 in conjunction, as mutually illuminating examples of hubristic claims of divinity.

It is, of course, conceivable that Chrysostom is not indebted to Jewish circles for this association, but simply recognized unprompted a similarity between the two oracles, though coincidence seems a weak explanation for the broader similarities between his work and that of the rabbis.

We need also to consider the use of Isaiah 14:4-21 in tandem with Ezekiel 28 by Jerome, Augustine, and Hippolytus. These three use the oracle from Isaiah to support their argument that the oracle from Ezekiel 28 speaks of the Devil or Antichrist (Jerome, *In Hiezechielem* IX, xxviii, l.394-404; Augustine, *City of God*, ii, 213; *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist*, v, 208 and 215). This is of course quite distinct from any conclusion reached by the rabbis. Nonetheless, for Jerome and Augustine that Ezekiel 28 speaks of Satan is apparently made clear by the fact that the Latin text of Isaiah 14:12, which they cite, reads '*lucifer*' (lit. 'light-bringer' following LXX and Symmachus, ὁ ἑωσφόρος, lit. 'morn-bringer').

It is not entirely clear why Ezekiel 28 came to be thought of by Christians as referring to Satan, yet if we assume that the connection between Ezekiel and Isaiah was adopted from Judaism at an early stage, the reasoning that Jerome and Augustine make explicit may perhaps provide us with an answer. Could it be, for example, that Tertullian, versed in both Latin and Greek, was prompted to read Ezekiel as he did (i.e. as referring to Satan), in light of the oracle of Isaiah 14, which we know he understood to be speaking of the Devil (*Against Marcion*, V.11.11, 17.8)? He does not make the connection between the two texts overt, never discussing the two passages together, nor does he use '*lucifer*', talking instead of '*satnam*' and '*diabolus*', but nevertheless the

suggestion seems possible and would serve to explain what is otherwise an oddity.

The connection between the two texts in the Mekhilta also gives credence to the notion that an association is early, and this conclusion may find some support in the targumim. We observed in our discussion of Targum Ezekiel the political shaping that the targumist gives to the oracles by identifying the 'stones of fire' (28:14, 16) with the 'Holy People' (see above, pages 144–144). In the Isaiah Targum we find the same transition at work: 'the stars of God', become 'the *people* of God' (14:13); 'I will ascend above the heights of the clouds' becomes 'I will ascend above all the *people*' (14:14). Of course this sort of move is hardly without precedent among the targumim, but nonetheless it does suggest a closer parity between the two oracles than we find in MT or in the Greek versions, and it is certainly germane to ask whether the rendering of one passage has not been influenced by the other.

Conclusion

The story that John Milton tells in his *Paradise Lost* may be only very loosely biblical, but it comes remarkably close to what many of the Church Fathers evidently thought about the origins and responsibility for evil, which we glimpse a snapshot of in their handling of Ezekiel 28:12-19.

Who first seduc'd them to that foul revolt?
Th' infernal Serpent; he it was, whose guile
Stirr'd up with Envy and Revenge, deceiv'd
The Mother of Mankind, what time his Pride
Had cast him out from Heav'n, with all his Host
Of Rebel Angels, by whose aid aspiring

To set himself in Glory above his Peers,
He trusted to have equall'd the most High
Against the Throne and Monarchy of God
Rais'd impious War in Heav'n and Battle proud
With vain attempt. Him the Almighty Power
Hurl'd headlong flaming from th'Ethereal Sky
With hideous ruin and combustion down
To bottomless perdition, there to dwell
In Adamantine Chains and penal Fire,
Who durst defy th'Omnipotent to Arms.

John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, Book I, 33-49

Pride, claims of equality with God, and fiery expulsion from heaven: these are the qualities that the Fathers saw in Ezekiel 28:12-19 that convinced them that this oracle was not just about a bad prince. They found support in the Old Testament too, "*How art thou fallen, O Lucifer, son of the morning!*" (Isa. 14:12), but it is ultimately the New Testament that prompts their reading of the oracle: "*I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven*" (Luke 10:18) primarily; "*that the devil sinneth from the beginning*" (1 John 3:8) to a lesser extent; perhaps they had Revelation 12:9 in mind too, although they never quote it: "*the great dragon was thrown down, that ancient serpent, who is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world - he was thrown down to earth, and his angels were thrown down with him*" (Rev. 12:9). As Cyril of Jerusalem puts it: "thou seest the harmony of the Old Testament with the New"³¹⁷.

Outside of Ezekiel, the concept of the fall of Satan is well known. There was much in the two testaments to inspire the Fathers (e.g. Isa.14:12-15; Ps. 82:6-7;

³¹⁷ Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures*, Lecture 2, 4.

Lk 10:18; Jn 12:31; Rev.12:9; 2 Peter 2:4) and the episode appears repeatedly among the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical texts (e.g. 2 Enoch 29:4-5; Vitae Adae 12-16), frequently in rabbinic sources (e.g. PRE 14, 24, etc.), and elsewhere in early Christian writings (e.g. Tertullian, *de Patientia* 5; Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, IV, 40:3; Augustine, *de Genesis ad Literam* XI, 81, etc.); and the emphasis is always much the same:

“He [Satan] thought up the impossible idea, that he might place his throne higher than the clouds which are above the earth, and the he might become equal to my power. And I [God] hurled him out from the height, together with his angels.”

2 Enoch 29:4-5 (cf. Vitae Adae 12-16)

The desire, as Milton puts it, “To set himself in Glory above his Peers” or to seek equality with God is always identified as the cause of the downfall.

For the Fathers then Ezekiel 28:12-19 is primarily an oracle about hostile spiritual forces (Satan, angels, and powers) and cosmic battle. It is only really Origen and Chrysostom who derive any moral message from it, and then only fleetingly. Yet for the rabbis (in the arrogance of Hiram) and the targumist the warning about self-glorification had been central. It goes without saying that those Christological features which may be derived from features in the text (e.g. regaining the ‘likeness’ of Christ in baptism in Origen and Jerome) are unique to the Fathers.

What the Fathers demonstrate more clearly than any of our other sources is that because the overall outline of this text is clear – a state of glory becomes a state of destruction – it becomes re-appropriated by analogy into a new context which demonstrates the same rough outline, even where the details do not match up. Moreover the Fathers demonstrate that where the language is esoteric, uncertain, or unclear, it serves as fertile soil for a wealth of

speculation. Because it is not obvious what this or that phrase *does* mean, it is also not obvious what this or that phrase does *not* mean either.

CONCLUSION

What is the text trying to say? Specifically, who is the figure that is being portrayed in the lament? What was the text heard to say by its early readers? And in what way can a study of reception history inform our discussion of hermeneutics?

Results

The aim of this thesis has been to examine the transmission and subsequent reception in Judaism and Christianity, in Late Antiquity, of the lament against the king of Tyre found in Ezekiel 28:11-19. In pursuing this aim we have covered a great deal of material, often in great detail; so it will be useful in conclusion to draw some of the strands together, highlight some of the most important findings, and provide an overview of our results.

In Chapter 1 we laid the foundations for a study of the text itself by reassessing the relationship between the Hebrew and Greek witnesses in light of the manuscript data from Masada and Qumran. Our examination led to the conclusion that behind the texts of Papyrus 967 (the earliest Greek witness) and MT lie two distinct recensions (hence two distinct *Vorlagen*), a conclusion that defeats any attempt to reconstruct an earlier text from these two sources. As historians, all that the Greek and Hebrew allow us to do is see how the text of Ezekiel 28:12-19 presented itself, among Greek speaking communities on the one hand and Hebrew speaking communities on the other, around the 2nd Century BCE.

On this basis we turned first to the Masoretic text (Chapter 2). The question that has preoccupied readers, both ancient and modern, has been the identification of the figure described in Ezekiel 28:12-19. For the Masoretic

scribes responsible for the vocalization and accentuation the figure was the cherub itself, surrounded by precious stones and adorned with gold, set on the “Holy Mountain of God”, which is also the garden of God, Eden, from which God expels him on account of his injustice. We argued that this reading strains the conventions of syntax and the semantic range of the vocabulary employed. On this basis we suggested an alternative reading of the consonantal text, which identified the figure as an אֱלֹהִים, who was created alongside a special protective cherub, and located in the holy topos of ‘paradise’.

This gives us a picture of how two Hebrew speaking communities might have encountered the text: the pointed text representing a reading from the early Middle Ages (and possibly earlier), the consonantal text representing a reading from approximately the 2nd Century BCE (again, possibly reflecting an earlier reading).

Our third encounter with the text is found among Greek speaking Jews also around the 2nd Century BCE (Chapter 3). We have been obliged to proceed with the Greek witnesses tentatively, primarily because the various Greek versions provide an inconsistent text, but also because some important witnesses, among them Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, indicate that there was a significant degree of inconsistency between the Hebrew manuscripts in circulation even as late at the second century CE, so that distinguishing between those features resulting from a particular Greek *Vorlage* and those resulting from the process of translation becomes conjectural. In spite of these difficulties, a consensus emerges among the Greek versions, which plays down the ‘first man’ features and identifies the figure as the Israelite high-priest. I have argued that this identification is clear, explicit, and deliberate, and have made the provisional suggestion that the

purpose of this may be as a polemical attack on the new Temple administration following the Maccabean revolt.

Next we turned our attention to the Targum (Chapter 4), the unique structure of which forms a bridge between those materials in the *form* of primary text and those in the *form* of interpretation. Working from an MT-type text, the targumist demonstrates a supreme reverence for the text he is handling. His attention to detail is quite astounding and every exegetical step he takes is firmly rooted in the Hebrew text that lay before him. He is a consummate wordsmith and a highly refined exegete, as is demonstrated by his use of highly sophisticated word-play, such as *'al tiqre*.

Through these exegetical methods, and by transforming some of the language into metaphor, the targumist re-presents the narrative in a quite distinct way, developing a political warning, that “pride goeth before destruction” (AV, Prov. 16:18). So, the figure is transformed into an exemplar, the archetype of a ruler whose ill-founded hubris and aggressive imperial ambitions against Israel will ultimately result in God’s punishment. Although there are a number of periods when such a message might be encouraging to an audience suffering subjugation, we noted that the closing decades of the first, or the first half of the second century CE, provide a possible context.

In contrast to the preceding material, the classical rabbinic literature (Midrash, Talmud, etc), covered in Chapter 5, does not offer a continuous reading of the text. Rather it draws on Ezekiel 28 (as a whole, rather than exclusively on the lament in verses 11-19) to illuminate its *haggadoth*. Among these *haggadoth* (mostly attributed to Palestinian authorities) we learn of Adam’s superabundance of wisdom, the radiance of his heel, and the canopies connoting his glorious status, all of which he loses as a result of his sin. We also learn of Hiram and his false claims of divinity and subsequent punishment. The contrast between a state of glory followed by devastating

humiliation in Ezekiel 28:11-19 provides an obvious model for both characters' story.

In the Church Fathers (Chapter 6) we find a radically different reading once again, in which Ezekiel 28:12-19 is thought to be an oracle about hostile spiritual forces – primarily Satan, but also angels and other powers – and cosmic battle. This identification of the figure with Satan is prompted by the lens through which the Fathers read Ezekiel: the New Testament. Their thoroughgoing commitment to the unity of the two Testaments, made explicit by Cyril of Jerusalem ("Thou seest the harmony of the Old Testament with the New", *Catechetical Lectures*, 2:4), creates an opportunity for texts such as Luke 10:18 ("I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven") to exert influence over how the Ezekiel text was read.

In summary then, we see in these various sources the figure morph from an מְלֹאֲכָיִם (Hebrew, 2nd Century BCE), into the High Priest (Greek, 2nd Century BCE), a political exemplar (Targum, 1st Century CE?), a mythical cherub (pointed Masoretic text, early Middle Ages), Adam or Hiram (Rabbis, 2nd Century CE – late Middle Ages), and finally, Satan (Church Fathers, 2nd – early 5th Century CE).

Thinking back to our review of contemporary critical responses in our introduction (see discussion on page 8f), a certain irony presents itself: almost all of our modern critical responses to the problem of the identity of the figure find their counterpart in Late Antiquity. We find the figure identified as a fallen god (e.g. Pope, Yaron, Bevan, Dus, Mackay, Morgenstein), as the High Priest (e.g. Bogaert, Wilson), as an angelic figure to a greater or lesser extent comparable to Satan (e.g. Barr, Miller, Clements), a political warning given mythical colouring (e.g. Greenberg, Williams, Taylor, Craigie, and Hals), and finally we find the Primal Man, with varying degrees of resemblance to the Adam of Genesis 2-3 (e.g. Cooke, Zimmerli, Eichrodt, Wevers, McKenzie,

May, Blenkinsopp, Allen, Carley). We have had more than two millennia to think about it, yet still the text refuses to yield up its secrets.

Implications

This highlights a number of important implications of the present study for our understanding of Ezekiel 28:11-19. The first, and most obvious, is the massive complexity and strangeness of the text, and the fact that the text was found to be massively complex and strange in Antiquity too. This in turn serves to highlight the organic link between text and interpretation, specifically in the Judaism of Late Antiquity. In other words, there is no clear way of seeing where the 'text' ends and the 'interpretation' begins:

Transmission and reception have become intermingled.

This state of affairs brings into sharper relief a tension that exists in all the readings of this text we have seen between specific details and the overall 'story' of the narrative. In some cases the overall shape of the narrative – a state of glory becomes a state of destruction – appears to prompt the reading, in other cases it is specific details – such as the precious stones – which provide the starting point. This situation is true of both ancient and modern readings.

But perhaps the most significant outcome of the present study has been to highlight the power that the controlling conceptual framework can have on a reader's determination of the text's meaning. As a problematic text, Ezekiel 28:11-19 gives us some extreme examples of this, with readings that are odd or alien to our own sensibilities. The Rabbis and the Church Fathers demonstrate this most clearly, because their own conceptual frameworks –

the unity of Torah and the unity of the two Testaments respectively – are so readily apparent.

This in turn allows us to appreciate more fully the sophistication of ancient interpretation and exegesis. None of the readings we have encountered have been found to be naïve. They are bound by, and operate within, their own conceptual frameworks. These ancient exegetes are *no less sophisticated than us*. They simply do not share our conceptual framework.

Broadening the discussion

The present thesis is a detailed historical study of a very small fragment of biblical material and its reception among a limited number of communities over a relatively short period of time. To attempt to say anything theoretically groundbreaking on the basis of these results would be foolhardy.

Nonetheless, as reception history is an area of growing interest within the field of biblical studies, it may be useful to provide some pointers for further study and reflection.

Two important interrelated questions present themselves as demanding further evaluation. Why is reception history important for Biblical Studies? And, How might the study of the history of interpretation inform the ways in which we read biblical texts today? These are questions demanding further reflection: I do not even hope to come close to answering them here. I do however, wish to put on paper some of ways in which this limited historical study has shaped my own thinking on these important questions.

The shift in biblical scholarship away from modernity's failed attempts to retrieve the 'original authorial intent' to post-modernity's interest in more

subjective responses to biblical texts has revitalized reception history in recent years – aided by the popularity of reader-response theory in the field of literary studies. But in abandoning hope for a purely ‘objective’ position, the question of how readings can be legitimated has been thrown into the arena. Surely such a move can only lead down a slippery slope to pure subjectivity, where ‘anything goes’ and all readings are equally valid, or so the argument goes.

It is at this sticking point, at this moment of potential paralysis, that the study of reception history is of use. First and foremost a study of the history of interpretation forces us to recognize that the reader is no passive participant. Without a reader the text lies dormant. The author writes for an audience and expects the audience to fill in the gaps in order to animate the text. The study of reception history allows us to appreciate how potent an impact the reader has in bringing the text to life as an animate whole.

Not only this, but the study of reception history actually allows us to see exactly that process *in practice*. We can see how readers have *actually* brought the text to life, created meaning, in history. There is little point talking about what ought to be done, unless we are willing and able to study what has *actually* been done historically. Unless we can appreciate fully the process of reading and come to understand what it actually consists of, all the ink spilt on hermeneutical theory will go to waste.

The study of reception history also makes us more aware of the decisive impact the reader’s operative conceptual framework will have on any reading too. What assumptions, answers, beliefs, critical positions, and so on, lead the reader to his or her particular conclusion?

In turn, a picture emerges of the acceptance of the meaning of a specific text occurring when a group of readers have a degree of commonality between their individual conceptual frameworks, and so interpret the text in similar

ways. Any theory of reading must take account of the similarity in the conceptual frameworks of individuals and the community of readers this engenders.

The implication of this is that every reading can be legitimate in the right context to the right people. If, by-and-large, I share your conceptual framework I am likely to accept your reading, if our conceptual frameworks are dramatically different your reading will appear foolish, deluded, misleading. Where enough people hold a sufficiently similar conceptual framework a reading – or rather a mode of reading – will become legitimate. So the legitimization of readings becomes an essentially democratic process.

The study of reception history has the power to make us more aware of our own controlling conceptual framework, to humble us into the acceptance of its frailty and ultimate transience, and to recognize that another's position will appear more legitimate to us when we appreciate the conceptual framework upon which it is hung. Though this does not eliminate the need for us to continue to critique others readings, and more importantly, their conceptual frameworks.

It is only when one is asking these texts to speak with a particular kind of authority that their polyvalency and the democratic legitimization of readings of them becomes problematic. The study of reception history demonstrates that biblical texts *do*, in fact, function in this way, just like any other kind of text does; and this should not be surprising since it is not the texts themselves that cry out to be read with a particular kind of authority. Rather it is a particular conceptual framework, shaped by the notions of Canon and Divine Inspiration, that transforms this ancient literature into 'Scripture'.

Yet even as Scripture, the polyvalency of these texts and the democratic legitimization of readings become problematic only when one demands that Scripture speak once and for all time. Only a timeless and unchanging

readership would allow a text to speak in a timeless and unchanging way. Yet if God is a God who acts in history, then we should expect His words to speak to us in time limited and ever changing ways.

αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας δέον ἐστὶν ἐπιστήμονας γίνεσθαι

(Ecclesiasticus, Prologue, 4)

ABBREVIATIONS

Primary Sources:

b.Megilla	Babylonian Talmud, tractate e.g. Megilla
Eccl.R.	Ecclesiastes Rabbah
Gen.R.	Genesis Rabbah
Mid.Tan.B	Midrash Tanhuma Buber
MRI	Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael
PR	Pesikta Rabbati
PRE	Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer
PRK	Pesikta de Rav Kahana
Tg.Ezek.	Targum to e.g. Ezekiel

Journals:

ASTI	Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute
ArOr	Archiv Orientální
BTB	Biblical Theology Bulletin
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CTM	Concordia Theological Monthly
CQR	Church Quarterly Review
ETL	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
Int.	Interpretation
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JSJ	Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
RdeQ	Revue de Qumran
SJOT	Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament
VT	Vetus Testamentum
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

English Language Bibles

ASV	American Standard Version
DV	Darby Version
KJV	King James Version

RSV	Revised Standard Version
WB	Webster's Bible
WEB	World English Bible
YLT	Young's Literal Translation

Reference Works

BHRG	Van der Merwe, C.H. J., J.A.Naudé & J.H. Kroeze, <i>A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar</i> (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999)
Gibson	Gibson, J.C.L., <i>Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar ~ Syntax</i> (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994)
Ginzberg	Ginzberg, Louis, <i>The legends of the Jews</i> , trans. H. Szold (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1946-55)
GK	Kautzsch, E., <i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> , trans. A.E.Cowley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 26th ed. 1898)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Editions and Translations

- Attridge, Harold, et al**, *Qumran Cave 4, VIII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 1, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 13* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).
- Baillet, Maurice**, *Ézéchiel (Pl. XVIII)* in Maurice Baillet, Józef Tadeusz Milik and Roland de Vaux, *Les "petites grottes" de Qumrân: Exploration de la Falaise, les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q, le Rouleau de Cuivre, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 3i* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).
- *Qumrân Grotte 4, III, (4Q482-4Q520), Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 7* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 137-68.
- Barthélemy, Dominique**, *Ézéchiel (Pl. XII)* in Dominique Barthélemy and Józef Tadeusz Milik, *Qumran Cave 1, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 1* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 68-9.
- Borret, Marcel** (ed.), *Origène: Contre Celse, Sources Chrétiennes 147* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1969).
- *Origène: Homélie sur Ézéchiel, Sources Chrétiennes 352* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1989).
- Braude, William G. and Israel J. Kapstein** (trans.), *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975).
- Braude, William G.** (trans.), *Pesikta Rabbati Yale Judaica Series 18* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1968).
- Buber, Shelomoh** (ed.), *Midrash Tanhuma* (Vilna: Druck and Verlag, 1885).
- Charlesworth, James H.** (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vol 2* (London: Doubleday, 1983-1985).
- Crouzel, Henri, and Manilo Simonetti** (trans. & eds.), *Origène: Traité des Principes, Sources Chrétiennes 252* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1978).
- Epstein, I.**, *The Babylonian Talmud* (London: Soncino, 1948).
- Evans, Ernest** (trans. & ed.) *Adversus Marcionem* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972).
- Field, Frederick**, (ed.) *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt: Veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1875) Vol. 2.

- Freedman, H., and M. Simon (trans. & eds.),** *Midrash Rabbah*, Vol.1-10 (London: Soncino, 1951).
- Friedlander, Gerald (trans.),** *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1916).
- Friedmann, M,** *Pesikta Rabbati* (Wein, 1880).
- Glorie, Francisci (ed.),** *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera. Pars 1, Opera Exegetica. 4, Commentariorum in Hiezechielem Libri XIV, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 75* (Turnholti: Brepols, 1964).
- Herbert, Edward D.,** 11QEzekiel (*Pls. II, LIV*) in Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar and Adam S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11. 2, 11Q2-18, 11Q20-31, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 23* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 15-28.
- Jahn, P. Leopold Günther,** *Der griechische Text des Buches Ezechiel: nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967, Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 15* (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1972).
- Johnson, Allan Chester, Henry Snyder Gehman, and Edmund Harris Kase, Jr. (eds.),** *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel*, Princeton University Studies in Papyrology 3 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1938).
- Johnson, M. D.,** 'Life of Adam and Eve: A New Translation and Introduction' in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vol 2* (London: Doubleday, 1985), 249-95.
- Kee, Howard Clark,** *The Cambridge Annotated Study Apocrypha* (Cambridge: University Press, 1994).
- Lauterbach, Jacob,** *Mekilta de Rabbi-Ishmael* (Philadelphia PA: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933), Vols 1-3.
- Levey, Samson H.,** *The Targum of Ezekiel, The Aramaic Bible 13* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987).
- Mandelbaum, Bernard,** *Pesikta de Rav Kahana: According to an Oxford Manuscript* (New York, NY: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962), Vols. 1-2.
- McCauley, Leo P., and Anthony A. Stephenson (trans.),** *The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem, The Fathers of the Church 61* (Washington DC: The Catholic University of America, 1969).
- Midrash Rabbah* (Warsaw: Levin-Epshtain, 1924 - 1927), Vols. 1-5.
- Migne, Jacques-Paul (ed.),** *Origenis, Opera Omnia, 3, Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca, 013* (Paris, 1862).

Neusner, Jacob, *Pesiqta deRab Kahana*, Vols. 1-2, Brown Judaic Studies 122 (Atlanta GA: Scholars, 1987).

-- *Mekhilta According to Rabbi Ishmael: An Analytical Translation*, Vol 1, Brown Judaic Studies 148 (Atlanta GA: Scholars, 1988).

Ribera-Florit, Josep, *Targum Jonatán de los Profetas Posteriores en Tradición Babilónica: Ezequiel*, Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 52 (Madrid : Instituto de Filología del CSIC, Departamento de Filología Bíblica y de Oriente Antiguo, 1997).

Roberts, Alexander & James Donaldson (eds.), *Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers Down to a.d. 325* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995).

Robinson, Stephen Edward, 'Testament of Adam' in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol 1 (London: Doubleday, 1983), 989-995.

Sanderson, Judith E., 'Ezekiel' in Eugene Ulrich, et al, *Qumran Cave 4. 10, The Prophets*, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 15 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 209-20.

Schaff, Philip and Henry Wace, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995).

Sperber, Alexander, *The Latter Prophets According to Targum Jonathan, The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*, Vol 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1962).

Talmon, Shemaryahu, '1043-2220 (MasEzek) Ezekiel 35:11-38:14' in J. Aviram, et al, *Masada: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999) Vol. 6., 59-75.

Talmud Bavli (Jerusalem: El ha-Mekorort, 1959-1963).

Townsend, J., *Midrash Tanhuma Translated into English with Introduction, Indices and Brief Notes* (Volumes 1-3, Hoboken: Ktav) 1989-2003.

Wevers, John William (ed.), *Genesis, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum*, Vol.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

-- *Exodus, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum*. Vol. 2, 1(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).

Ziegler, Joseph (ed.), *Ezekiel, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum*, Vol.16, 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977).

Zondel ben Joseph, Enoch (ed.), *Midrash Tanhuma* (Lublin: A. Feder, B. Zetser, 1893).

Critical Works Cited

- Aaron, David H.**, 'Shedding Light on God's Body in Rabbinic Midrashim: Reflections on the Theory of a Luminous Adam', *Harvard Theological Review* 90 (1997), 299-314.
- Ackroyd, Peter R.**, *Exile and Restoration* (London: Xpress Reprints, 1994 [1968]), 103-117.
- Albright, William F.**, 'New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible' in Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon (eds.), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975), 140-146.
- Alexander, Philip S.**, 'Targum, Targumim' in Freedman, David Noel (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol 6 (New York : Doubleday, 1992).
- *The Targum of Canticles, The Aramaic Bible 17A* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2002).
- 'Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scriptures' in Martin Jan Mulder (ed.), *Mikra* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 2004), 217-253.
- Allen, Leslie C.**, *Ezekiel 20-48*, Word Biblical Commentary 29 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1990).
- *Ezekiel 1-19*, Word Biblical Commentary 28 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1994).
- Arzi, Abraham**, 'Al Tikrei' in Fred Skolnik, et al (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (2nd ed., London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 2, 20.
- Auvray, P.** 'Le Problème Historique du Livre d'Ézéchiel', *Revue Biblique* 55 (1948), 503-19.
- Avery-Peck, Alan J.**, 'The Mishnah, Tosefta, and the Talmuds' in Jacob Neusner (ed.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 1, The Literary and Archaeological Sources* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 173-216.
- Barr, James**, 'Thou Art the Cherub: Ezekiel 28.14 and the Post-Ezekiel Understanding of Genesis 2-3' in E.Ulrich, et al (eds.), *Priests, Prophets and Scribes* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), 213-223.
- Batto, Bernard Frank**, *Slaying the Dragon : Mythmaking in the Biblical Tradition* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992).
- Bertholet, Alfred**, *Hesekiel*, Handbuch zum Alten Testament 13 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1936).
- Bevan, A. A.**, 'The King of Tyre in Ezekiel XXVIII', *Journal of Theological Studies* 4 (1903), 500-505.
- Biggs, Charles R.**, *The Book of Ezekiel*, Epworth Commentaries (London: Epworth, 1996).

Blenkinsopp, Joseph, *Ezekiel, Interpretation* (Louisville, KY: John Knox, 1990).

Block, Daniel I., *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1-24*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 1997).

-- *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25-48*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 1998).

Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice, 'Montagne Sainte, Jardin d'Éden et Sanctuaire (Hiérosolymite) dans un Oracle d'Ézéchiél contre le Prince de Tyr (Éz 28:11-19)' in H. Limet and J. Ries (eds.), *Le Mythe, son Langage et son Message: Actes du Colloque de Liège et Louvain-la-Neuve 1981*, Homo Religiosus 9 (Louvain-la-Neuve: Centre d'Histoire des Religions, 1983), 131-153.

Böhl, F., *Aufbau und literarische Formen des aggadischen Teils im Jalamdenu-Midrash* (Wiesbaden, 1977).

Bowker, John Westerdale, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).

Bregman, Marc, *The Tanhuma-Yelammedenu Literature: Studies in the Evolution of the Versions* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2003).

Brooke, G.J., review of *All the Glory of Adam*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), by Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, in *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 27 (no.5 2005) 167-68.

Brown, Peter, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (London: Faber & Faber, 1979 [1969]).

Brownlee, William H., 'The Scroll of Ezekiel from the Eleventh Qumran Cave' *Revue de Qumran* 4 (1963), 11-28.

-- *Ezekiel 1-19*, Word Biblical Commentary 28 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1986).

Caird, George Bradford, 'Ben Sira and the Dating of the Septuagint' in Livingstone, Elizabeth A., *Studia Evangelica v7; Papers Presented to the 5th International Congress on Biblical Studies held at Oxford, 1973*, Texte Und Untersuch Gesch Altchrist Lit 126 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1982).

Callender Jr., Dexter E., 'The Primal Human in Ezekiel and the Image of God' in M. Odell and J. Strong (eds.), *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*, Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 9 (Atlanta GA: SBL, 2000) 175-94.

-- *Adam in Myth and History: Ancient Israelite Perspectives on the Primal Human*, Harvard Semitic Studies (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000).

Carley, Keith W., *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, The Cambridge Bible Commentary on the New English Bible (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974).

- Cathcart, Kevin J., and Robert P. Gordon,** *The Targum to the Minor Prophets, The Aramaic Bible 14* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989).
- Chadwick, Henry,** *The Early Church, The Pelican History of the Church 1* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1976).
- Chilton, Bruce D.,** *The Glory of Israel, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 23* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982).
- Churgin, Pinkhos,** 'Targum Jonathan to the Prophets' in Smolar, Leivy, and Moses Aberbach, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (New York: Ktav: Baltimore Hebrew College, 1983), 229-380.
- Clements, Ronald E.,** *Ezekiel, Westminster Bible Companion* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1996).
- Clifford, Richard J.,** *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament, Harvard Semitic Monographs 4* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972).
- Collins, J.J.,** 'Testaments', in Michael E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period, Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Section 2, Volume 2* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 325-55.
- review of *All the Glory of Adam, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), by Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, in *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 34 (no.1 2003) 73-79.
- Cooke, George Albert,** *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel, The International Critical Commentary* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936).
- Cornill, Carl Heinrich,** *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (Leipzig: Hinrich, 1886).
- Corral, Martin Alonso,** *Ezekiel's Oracles Against Tyre: Historical Reality and Motivations, Biblica et Orientalia 46* (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 2002).
- Craigie, Peter C.,** *Ezekiel, The Daily Study Bible* (Edinburgh: The Saint Andrews Press, 1983).
- Cross, Frank Moore,** "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts" in Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon (eds.), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975), 306-20.
- Crouzel, Henri,** 'Origen' in Angelo Di Berardino, *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, trans. Adrian Walford (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1992), Vol. 2, 619-23.

Daniélou, Jean, and Henri Marrou, *The Christian Centuries, Vol. 1, The First Six Hundred Years*, trans. Vincent Cronin (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1964).

-- *A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea, Vol. 2, Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*, trans. John Austin Baker (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1980 [1973]).

de Lagarde, Paul, *Septuaginta Studien* (Göttingen : Dieterich, 1891-1892).

de Vaux, Roland, 'The Prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel' in his *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971), 242-51.

Dines, Jennifer, *The Septuagint* (London: T & T Clark, 2004).

Duguid, Iain M., *Ezekiel, The NIV Application Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999).

Dus, Jan, 'Melek Šör - Melqart? (zur Interpretation von Ez 28,11-19)', *Archiv Orientalní* 26 (1958) 179-85.

Eichrodt, Walther, *Ezekiel: a Commentary*, trans. Cosslett Quin (London: SCM, 1970).

Ellison, H. L., *Ezekiel: The Man and His Message* (London: Paternoster, 1959).

Fernández Marcos, Natalio, *The Septuagint in Context : Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*, trans. Wilfred G.E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

Fisch, S., *Ezekiel: Hebrew Text & English Translation* (London: Soncino, 1950).

Flesher, Paul V. M., 'The Targumim in the Context of Rabbinic Literature' in Jacob Neusner, *Introduction to Rabbinic literature* (New York NY: Doubleday, 1999) 611-29.

-- 'Targum as Scripture' in Paul V. M. Flesher (ed.), *Targum and Scripture: Studies in Aramaic Translations and Interpretation in Memory of Ernest G. Clarke* (Leiden: Brill, 2002) 61-75.

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T., *All the Glory of Adam, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

Fohrer, Georg, *Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 72* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1952).

-- with a contribution from Kurt Galling, *Ezekiel, Handbuch zum Alten Testament 13* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955).

Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method*, trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall (London: Continuum, 2004).

Gaster, Theodor Herzl, *Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament* (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1969).

- Ginzberg, Louis**, *The Legends of the Jews*, trans. H. Szold (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1946-55).
- Goff, Matthew**, review of *All the Glory of Adam*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), by Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122 (no.1 Spr 2003), 172-75.
- Goldberg, Abraham**, 'The Babylonian Talmud' in Shmuel Safrai (ed.), *The Literature of the Sages*, Part 1, *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, Section 2 (Philadelphia PA: Fortress, 1987), 323-45.
- Golitzin, Alexander**, 'Recovering the 'Glory of Adam'' in James R. Davila (ed), *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 46 (Leiden: Brill, 2003).
- Goshen Gottstein, Alon**, 'The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Judaism', *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994), 171-95.
- Greenberg, Moshe**, 'The Use of the Ancient Versions for Interpreting the Hebrew Text: A Sampling from Ezekiel ii 1 – iii 11' in International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament. 9th Congress (1977: Göttingen), *Congress Volume: Göttingen, 1977*, Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 29 (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 131-148.
- *Ezekiel 1-20*, The Anchor Bible 22 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983).
- *Studies in the Bible and Jewish Thought*, Jewish Publication Society Scholars of Distinction Series (Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1995).
- *Ezekiel 21-37*, The Anchor Bible 22A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1997).
- Gunkel, Hermann**, *Genesis*, trans. Mark E. Biddle (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997 [1901]).
- Hals, Ronald M.**, *Ezekiel*, The Forms of Old Testament Literature 19 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989).
- Habel, Norman C.**, 'Ezekiel 28 and the Fall of the First Man' *Concordia Theological Monthly* 38 (1967), 516-24.
- Harl, Marguerite, Gilles Dorival, and Olivier Munnich**, *La Bible grecque des Septante : du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf / Paris: Éditions du C.N.R.S, 1988).
- Hauser, Alan J. and Duane F. Watson (eds.)**, *A History of Biblical Interpretation*, Vol 1, *The Ancient Period* (Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2003).
- Hayward, C. T. R.**, *The Targum of Jeremiah*, The Aramaic Bible 12 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987).

-- Interpretations of the name Israel in ancient Judaism and some early Christian writings: from victorious athlete to heavenly champion (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Heinemann, Joseph, 'Leviticus Rabbah' in Fred Skolnik, *et al* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (2nd ed., London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 12, 740-2.

Hertrich, Volkmar, *Ezechielprobleme*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 61 (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1933).

Herr, Moshe David, 'Ecclesiastes Rabbah' in Fred Skolnik, *et al* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (2nd ed., London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 6, 90-91.

-- 'Exodus Rabbah' in Fred Skolnik, *et al* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (2nd ed., London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 6, 624.

-- and Stephen G. Wald, 'Genesis Rabbah' in Fred Skolnik, *et al* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (2nd ed., London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 7, 448-449.

-- 'Lamentations Rabbah' in Fred Skolnik, *et al* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (2nd ed., London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 12, 451-2.

-- 'Numbers Rabbah' in Fred Skolnik, *et al* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (2nd ed., London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 15, 337-8.

-- 'Pirkei de Rabbi Eliezer', *et al* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (2nd ed., London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 16, 182-3.

Himmelfarb, Martha, 'The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of ben Sira' in Jamie Scott & Paul Simpson-Housley (eds.), *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York, NY: Greenwood, 1991) 63-78.

Hirshman, Marc, 'Aggadic Midrash' in Shmuel Safrai, *et al* (eds.), *The Literature of the Sages*, Part 2, *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, Section 2, Volume 3 (Philadelphia PA: Fortress, 2006), 107-230.

Iser, Wolfgang, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (London: Routledge, 1978).

Jahn, Gustav, *Das Buch Ezeziel auf Grund der Septuaginta hergestellt* (Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1905).

Jauss, Hans Robert, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception, Theory and History of Literature 2*, trans. Timothy Bahti (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, 1982).

Jellicoe, Sidney, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).

Jeppesen, Knud, 'You Are a Cherub, But No God!', *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 5 (1991), 83-94.

Job, John, *Watchman in Babylon: A Study Guide to Ezekiel* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1983).

Kahle, Paul, *The Cairo Geniza* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1959).

Kasher, Rimon, 'The Interpretation of Scripture in Rabbinic Literature' in Martin Jan Mulder (ed.), *Mikra* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 2004), 547-594.

Katz, Peter, 'Zur Textgestaltung der Ezechiel-Septuagint' *Biblica* 35 no.1 (1954), 29-39.

Kelly, J.N.D., *Jerome* (London: Duckworth, 1975).

– *Golden mouth : the story of John Chrysostom : ascetic, preacher, bishop* (London: Duckworth, 1995).

Kessler, Martin, review of *Ezekiel's Prophecy on Tyre (Ez. 26, 1-28, 19): A New Approach*, *Biblica et Orientalia* 20 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968), by H. J. van Dijk, in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 29 (No. 3, Jul. 1970), 213-16.

Komlosh, Yehuda, 'The Expository Traits of the Targum to Ezekiel' in Abraham I. Katsh and Leon Nemoy (eds.) *Essays on the occasion of the seventieth anniversary of the Dropsie University, 1909-1979* (Philadelphia, PA: Dropsie University, 1979), 289-96.

Lancel, Serge, *St Augustine*, trans. Antonia Nevill (London: SCM, 2002).

Le Deaut, Roger, 'Usage Implicite de l' 'Al Tigré dans le Targum de Job de Qumrân' in Domingo Muñoz Leon, *Salvacion en la Palabra* (Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1986), 419-31.

Lerner, Myron B., 'The Works of Aggadic Midrashim and the Esther Midrashim' in Shmuel Safrai, et al (eds.), *The Literature of the Sages, Part 2, Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Section 2* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 2006), 133-229.

Levenson, Jon Douglas, *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 10 (Cambridge, MA: Scholars Press, 1976).

– *Sinai and Zion* (San Francisco CA: HarperCollins, 1985).

Levison, John R., *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*, *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 1* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1988).

Levey, Samson H., 'The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets' *Vetus Testamentum* 21 (no.2 Apr. 1971), 186-96.

Lust, Johan, 'Ezekiel 36-40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43 no. 4 Oct. (1981).

-- 'The use of textual witnesses for the establishment of the text: the shorter and longer texts of Ezekiel' in his *Ezekiel and his Book*, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 74 (Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 7-20.

-- 'Ezekiel Manuscripts in Qumran: Preliminary Edition of 4Q Ez^a and b' in his *Ezekiel and his Book*, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 74 (Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 90-100.

-- 'the Septuagint of Ezekiel according to Papyrus 967 and the Pentateuch' *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 72 (No. 1 Ap. 1996), 131-137.

-- 'The Vocabulary of LXX Ezekiel and its dependence upon the Pentateuch' in M. Vervenne & J. Lust (eds.), *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature*, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 133 (Peeters Publishers, 1997).

-- 'Textual Criticism of the Old Testament and of the New Testament: Stepbrothers?' in A. Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Criticism and Exegesis. Major Omissions in P967 Ezekiel*, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 161 (Leuven, University Press & Peeters, 2002), 15-31.

-- 'Major Divergences between LXX and MT in Ezekiel' in Adrian Schenker (ed.), *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: the Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered*, *Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 52 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003).

Mackay, Cameron, 'The King of Tyre', *Church Quarterly Review* 117 (1933-34), 239-58.

Marquis, G., 'Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Techniques: as Exemplified in the LXX of Ezekiel' in *International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem, 1986*, ed. Claude E. Cox (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 405-424.

Matthews, Gareth B., *Augustine*, *Blackwell Great Minds* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005).

May, Herbert G., 'The Book of Ezekiel' in G.A. Buttrick, *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York, NY: Abingdon, 1956), 39-338.

-- 'The King in the Garden of Eden: A Study of Ezekiel 28:12-19.', in B.W. Anderson & W. Harrelson (eds.) *Israel's Prophetic Heritage* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1962) 166-76.

Mayer, Wendy, and Pauline Allen, *John Chrysostom, The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 2000).

- McGregor, Leslie John**, *The Greek Text of Ezekiel: An Examination of Its Homogeneity, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 18* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1985).
- McGuckin, John A.**, *The SCM Press A-Z of Patristic Theology* (London: SCM, 2005).
- McKenzie, John L.**, 'Mythological Allusions in Ezek 28 12-18' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 75 (1956), 322-327.
- McNamara, Martin**, *Targum and Testament* (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1972).
- Mein, Andrew**, *Ezekiel and the Ethics of Exile* (Oxford: OUP, 2001).
- Melling, David J.**, 'Cyril of Jerusalem' in Ken Parry *et al.* (eds.), *The Blackwell Dictionary of Eastern Christianity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 151.
- Mettinger, Tryggve N. D.**, *King and Messiah : the Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*, Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 8 (Lund : CWK Gleerup, 1976).
- Miller, James E.**, 'The Mælæk of Tyre (Ezekiel 28,11-19)', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 105 (1993), 497-501.
- Moreschini, Claudio**, and Enrico Norelli, *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature: A Literary History, Vol 1, From Paul to the Age of Constantine*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005)
- *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature: A Literary History, Vol 2, From the Council of Nicea to the Beginning of the Medieval Period*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005)
- Morgenstern, Julian**, 'The King-God among the Western Semites and the Meaning of Epiphanes', *Vetus Testamentum* 10 (1960), 152-55.
- Mulder, Martin Jan**, (ed.) *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004 [1988]).
- 'The Transmission of the Biblical Text' in Martin Jan Mulder (ed.) *Mikra* (Peabody, MA. : Hendrickson Publishers, 2004).
- Nautin, Pierre**, 'Hippolytus' in Angelo Di Berardino, *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, trans. Adrian Walford (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1992), Vol. 1, 383-5.
- Neusner, Jacob**, *In Search of Talmudic Biography: The Problem of the Attributed Saying*, Brown Judaic Studies 70 (Chico CA: Scholars, 1984).
- *Introduction to Rabbinic Literature* (New York NY: Doubleday, 1993).
- *What is Midrash?* (Philadelphia PA: Fortress, 1987).

-- *Mekhilta According to Rabbi Ishmael: An Introduction to Judaism's First Scriptural Encyclopedia*, Brown Judaic Studies 152 (Atlanta GA: Scholars, 1988).

Newsom, Carol A., 'A Maker of Metaphors – Ezekiel's Oracles Against Tyre' *Interpretation* 38 no.2 (April 1984).

Patmore, Hector Michael, 'The shorter and longer texts of Ezekiel', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 32 (No. 2, Dec. 2007), 231-42.

-- 'Did the Masoretes Get It Wrong? The Vocalization and Accentuation of Ezekiel xxviii 12-19', *Vetus Testamentum*, 58 (No. 2, 2008), 245-57.

Pearson, Birger A., 'Egypt' in Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young, *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, Vol. 1, *Origins to Constantine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 331-50.

Perrot, Charles, 'The Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue' in Martin Jan Mulder (ed.), *Mikra* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 2004), 137-60.

Pohlman, Karl-Friedrich, *Das Buch des Propheten Hesekiel (Ezechiel) Kapitel 1-19*, *Das Alte Testament Deutsch* 22/1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996).

-- with a contribution from Thilo Alexander Rudnig, *Das Buch des Propheten Hesekiel (Ezechiel) Kapitel 20-48*, *Das Alte Testament Deutsch* 22/2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001).

Pope, Marvin H., *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955).

Porton, Gary G., 'Rabbinic Midrash' in Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson (eds.), *A History of Biblical Interpretation*, Vol 1, *The Ancient Period* (Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2003).

-- 'Rabbinic Midrash' in Jacob Neusner (ed.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity*, Part 1, *The Literary and Archaeological Sources* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 217-36.

Puech, Émile, '4QEz^a: Note Additionnelle', *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1989), 107-8.

Rebenich, Stefan, *Jerome*, *The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 2002).

Ribera-Florit, Josep, 'The Use of the Derash Method in the Targum of Ezekiel' in Craig A. Evans (ed.), *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 406-22.

-- 'Some Doctrinal Aspects of the Targum of Ezekiel' in Paul V.M. Flesher (ed), *Targum and Scripture: Studies in Aramaic Translations and Interpretation in Memory of Ernest G. Clarke* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 149-156.

Ribera, Josep, 'The Image of Israel according to the Targum of Ezekiel' in Kevin J. Cathcart and Michael Maher (eds.), *Targumic and Cognate Studies*:

Essays in Honour of Martin McNamara (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996) 111-21.

Ritter, Adolf Martin, 'Church and State up to c.300 CE' in Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young, *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, Vol. 1, *Origins to Constantine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 524-37.

Robinson, Henry Wheeler, *Two Hebrew Prophets: Studies in Hosea and Ezekiel* (London: Lutterworth, 1948).

Robinson, Stephen Edward, *The Testament of Adam: An Examination of the Syriac and Greek Traditions*, SBL Dissertation Series 52 (Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982).

Safrai, Zeev, 'The Targums as Part of Rabbinic Literature' in Shmuel Safrai, *et al* (eds.), *The Literature of the Sages*, *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, Part 2, Section 2 (Philadelphia PA: Fortress, 2006), 243-78.

Samely, Alexander, *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuchal Targums*, *Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 27* (Tübingen: JCB Mohr, 1992).

Schiffman, Lawrence H., *From Text to Tradition: a History of Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1991).

Simonetti, Manlio, 'Cyril of Jerusalem' in Angelo Di Berardino, *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, trans. Adrian Walford (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1992), Vol.1, 215.

Sinclair, Lawrence A., 'A Qumran Biblical Fragment 4QEZEK^a (EZEK. 10, 17 - 11, 11)', *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1989), 99-105.

Siniscalco, Paolo, 'Tertullian' in Angelo Di Berardino, *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, trans. Adrian Walford (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1992), Vol. 2, 818-20.

Smolar, Leivy, and Moses Aberbach, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (New York: Ktav: Baltimore Hebrew College, 1983).

Sperber, Daniel, 'Pesikta Rabbati', in Fred Skolnik, *et al* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (2nd ed., London: Thomson Gale, 2007), Vol 16, 12-13.

Stalker, D. M. G., *Ezekiel*, *Torch Bible Commentaries* (London: SCM, 1968).

Strack, Hermann L., and G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, trans. M. Bockmuehl (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991).

Swete, Henry Barclay, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek : with an Appendix Containing the Letter of Aristeas*, ed. H. St. J. Thackerasy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914).

Tal, Abraham, *The Language of the Targum of the Former Prophets and its Position within the Aramaic Dialects* (Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, 1975).

- Taylor**, John Bernard, *Ezekiel*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (London: The Tyndale Press, 1969).
- Thackeray**, Henry St. John, 'The Greek Translators of the Prophetic Books' *Journal of Theological Studies* 4 (1903), 578-85.
- 'The Greek Translators of Ezekiel' *Journal of Theological Studies* 4 (1903), 398-411.
- 'The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings' *Journal of Theological Studies* 8 (1907), 262-78.
- *The Septuagint and Jewish worship: a Study in Origins* (London: H. Milford, 1921).
- Tov**, Emanuel, 'The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of Other Books' in Pierre Casetti, Othmar Keel, and Adrian Schenker (eds.) *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: Études Bibliques Offertes à l'Occasion de son 60e Anniversaire*, *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 38 (Fribourg, Suisse: Éditions universitaires, 1981).
- *The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem: Simor, 1981).
- 'Recensional Differences between the MT and LXX of Ezekiel' *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 62 (No. 1 Ap. 1986), 89-101.
- 'The Septuagint' in Martin Jan Mulder (ed.) *Mikra* (Peabody, MA. : Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 161-87.
- Trigg**, Joseph W., *Origen, The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 1998).
- Turner**, Nigel, 'Greek Translators of Ezekiel', *Journal of Theological Studies* 7 (No. 1 Ap. 1956), 12-24.
- van Dijk**, H.J., *Ezekiel's Prophecy on Tyre (Ez. 26,1 – 28,19): A New Approach*, *Biblica et Orientalia* 20 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968).
- Van Seters**, John, 'The Creation of Man and the Creation of the King', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 101 (1989), 333-42.
- *Prologue to History: the Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Louisville KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1992).
- Wenham**, Gordon J., 'Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story' in *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies* 9 (1986), 19-25.
- Wevers**, John William, *Ezekiel*, New Century Bible Commentary (London : Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1969).
- *Notes on the Greek text of Genesis* (Atlanta : Scholars Press, 1993).

Widengren, Geo, *The King and the Tree of Life in Ancient Near Eastern Religion, King and Saviour* 4 (Uppsala: A.B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1951).

-- *Sakrales Königtum im Alten Testamentum und im Judentum* (Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1955).

-- 'Early Hebrew Myths and Their Interpretation' in S. H. Hooke (ed.), *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), 149-203.

Williams, Anthony J., 'The Mythological Background of Ezekiel 28:12-19?', *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 6 (1976), 49-61.

Wilson, Robert R., 'The Death of the King of Tyre: The Editorial History of Ezekiel 28' in John H. Marks and Robert M. Good (eds.), *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope* (Guilford, CT: Four Quarters, 1987).

Wright, Christopher J.H., *The Message of Ezekiel, The Bible Speaks Today* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 2002).

Yadin, Yigael *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1966).

Yaron, Kalman, 'The Dirge over the King of Tyre' *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* (1964), 28-57.

Young, Frances M., 'Towards a Christian *paideia*' in Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young, *The Cambridge History of Christianity, Vol. 1, Origins to Constantine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 485-500.

Ziegler, Joseph, 'Zur Textgestaltung der Ezechiel-Septuagint' *Biblica* 34 (No.4 1953), 435-455 reprinted in Joseph Ziegler, *Sylloge: gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta, Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens* 10 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 394-415.

Zimmerli, Walther, *Ezekiel 1 : A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24*, Hermeneia, trans. Ronald E. Clement (Philadelphia : Fortress, 1979).

-- *Ezekiel 2 : A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 25-48*, Hermeneia, trans. James D. Martin (Philadelphia : Fortress, 1983).

Reference Works Cited

Gibson, J.C.L., *Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar ~ Syntax* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994).

Kautsch, E., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, trans. A.E.Cowley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 26th ed. 1898).

Van der Merwe, C.H. J., J.A.Naudé & J.H. Kroeze, *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999).

Conybeare, Frederick Cornwallis and St. George W. J. Stock, *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1980).

