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Chapter 1
Introduction: A Manuscript Approach to p967

“Who took that text out of context?”
~ Jacques Derrida

1.1. Introduction

In the late 1930s, a new Greek manuscript of Ezekiel was published in two different locations: among the Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri and at Princeton among the John H. Schiede Biblical Papyri. This manuscript is now known by Rahlf’s enumeration p967. p967 is dated to the late second or early third century C.E., making it the earliest copy of any Septuagint codex known at the time. The 1970s turned up two more portions of the Ezekiel manuscript, one at the University of Cologne, and the other in Madrid, Spain.

The significance of p967 for textual studies of Ezekiel was immediately apparent. p967, a Greek uncial, pre-dates Origen’s Hexapla and Codex Vaticanus (B) by nearly a century, revealing its importance for study of the Old Greek. In fact, aside from a still missing portion of the beginning of the manuscript (chs. 1-11:24), p967 is the earliest substantial witness to Ezekiel

---

1 Cited from a personal conversation with Jacques Derrida by Geoffrey Bennington, “Derrida,” (class lecture; CPLT 751 Derrida; Emory University, Spring, 2006).


3 The papyrus is now known to be a codex containing Ezekiel, Daniel with its additions of Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, and Esther.


in any language, including Hebrew. The finds among the Judean desert for Ezekiel were scanty and the Ezekiel scroll from Qumran cave 11 was petrified and could not be unrolled.  

Perhaps because of this notable lacuna of manuscript data, p967 presents several glaring textual difficulties, particularly with respect to the Masoretic Text (MT). The most notable features of p967 are its omission of ch. 36:23c-38 and its transposition of MT chs. 37 and 38-39, placing the vision of the valley of dried bones after the Gog-Magog battle. Several other unique minuses of significant length (i.e., over 10 letters) are also attested (e.g., Ezek 12:26-28 and 32:24-26).

Despite the significant divergences presented by the new witness, no comprehensive full-length study of p967 has yet appeared. Certainly the protracted publication of the manuscript in four separate critical editions posed challenges for any study of p967. Moreover, the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls diverted attention from Septuagintal books whose literary editions were not corroborated by the new Hebrew manuscripts. Septuagintal studies focused on books like Jeremiah, whose shorter LXX edition was corroborated by 4QJer. While studies of Jeremiah, Samuel, and Judges, for example, proliferated and spawned new theories about Hebrew textual traditions and multiple literary editions, the Greek text of Ezekiel went understudied. These conditions are _prima facie_ grounds for deeper study of p967.

---

6 See chart 1 below in §1.4.

7 Chapter and verse references cite the MT unless otherwise noted.

8 For example, despite Walter Zimmerli’s access to the Princeton and Chester Beatty manuscripts, he was unable to incorporate information regarding p967’s minus of 36:23c-38 because it could not be confirmed that the manuscript lacked it until the Madrid and Cologne publications in the 1970s after most of his work was completed. Walter Zimmerli, _Ezekiel_ (trans. Ronald E. Clements; 2 vols.; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 1:76-77 especially.

Initial examination of p967’s minuses focused on separate pericopes and usually evaluated these for scribal error. For instance, some scholars argued that p967’s omission of ch. 36:23c-38 was due to *homoiooteuton*, or to the loss of a leaf in either a Greek parent codex or the Hebrew *Vorlage*.  However, none of these proposals involved an argument that could explain *all* of p967’s unique features. Thus, p967 continued to present important, unresolved textual issues. In this early phase of scholarship on p967, some scholars like E. H. Kase did suggest that p967 preserved an early (Hebrew?) edition of Ezekiel; however, no work was done to support Kase’s impression.

While scholars had long noted p967’s minuses, a lack of sufficient study obscured the manuscript’s literary significance. Not until Johan Lust’s pioneering work in the early 1980s did p967 emerge as an important work of literature with its own distinctive features, as Kase had surmised. In 1981, with the publication of Lust’s article, “Ezekiel 36-40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript,” p967 first received attention as a literary work in its own right. In that article, Lust demonstrated that two notable MT variants were exegetically connected: the addition of ch. 36:23c-38 and the transposition of chs. 37 and 38-39. Lust showed that p967’s sequence of the Gog-Magog battle before the vision of the valley of bones and the minus of the promise oracle in 36:23c-38 displayed theological and literary coherence. Specifically, Lust demonstrated the

---

10 See chapters two and three for a more detailed discussion of this issue.


significance of p967 as a variant edition of Ezekiel’s eschatology. A subsequent literary study by Ashley Crane examined Ezekiel 36-39, concluding that p967 and MT presented variant editions of Ezekiel’s views of restoration.14 Earlier text-critical analysis had not perceived these literary connections.

Lust’s approach to p967’s text laid the ground work, such that p967 now qualifies for the designation ‘variant literary edition.’ A variant literary edition, a term coined by Eugene Ulrich, is a textual witness that contains variant passages, chapters, or book-level features that affect both meaning and literary character.15 In the case of p967, we still do not know: 1) how extensive the variant edition is, and 2) whether the status applies to the whole book, or just parts of it. This study addresses the precision still required in the designation ‘variant literary edition,’ with reference to p967.

Variant literary editions introduce new methodological issues into text-critical scholarship. Simultaneously, p967 is a unique textual witness to as well as a variant literary edition of Ezekiel. Lower critical inquiry cannot proceed without some account of p967’s literary character. In other words, both p967’s text and its literary edition are by necessity, interrelated issues. In the case of p967, many text-critical approaches ignored the highly relevant fact that p967 contains a variant literary edition of Ezekiel. Hence, this project must advance a means for integrating text-critical and literary methods.

14 Ashley Crane, Israel’s Restoration: A Textual-Comparative Exploration of Ezekiel 36-39 (VTSup 122; Boston: Brill, 2008).

15 According to Ulrich, a new imaginative model was required that “permits the diachronic complexity of the [biblical] text[s].” Ulrich, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible, 14. For instance, textual criticism had always assumed the category of the canonical text, which Ulrich argues needs to be a decision, not an assumption. Ibid., 51-98. For Ulrich, textual critics needed a sober reminder that all biblical books “passed through successive literary editions.” Ibid., x. While redaction criticism had always operated within this imaginative model, textual criticism had not. The explosion of new variant literary editions over which Ulrich poured in his magisterial work as editor of the DJD series are, according to him, the “key to the history of the biblical text.” Ibid., 106.
The story of scholarship on p967 provides an important lesson. An isolated field of inquiry can obscure important, even relevant information about a text. Variant literary editions necessitate a more complex and coordinated methodological approach. Eugene Ulrich points towards the type of methodological creativity required at the outset in the study of variant literary editions. He states

We should first pay serious attention to our new data, try creatively to allow various possible interpretations to emerge and be sufficiently explored, and only then come to a judgment between competing interpretations.\(^\text{16}\)

Maureen Bell makes a similar observation in her introduction to the book, Re-constructing the Book: Literary Texts in Transmission.\(^\text{17}\) Speaking about texts of great English works such as Shakespeare, Bell’s comments nevertheless speak clearly to the issue in biblical studies as well. She notes the way in which “literary critics, textual editors and bibliographers, and historians of publishing have hitherto tended to publish their research as if in separate fields of enquiry.”\(^\text{18}\) Her collection of essays focuses instead, on the coordinated use of multiple methods for understanding textual criticism in the context of literary history. This literary history involves not only text-critical issues but also literary, material, and sociological lenses of analysis.\(^\text{19}\)

The long-held expectation of the discovery or re-creation of an originary text, “superior” to all others, has been replaced by a (more democratic?) respect for each manuscript or printed witness in its own right. In the case of Shakespeare, for example, the “bad” quartos are being reinspected, reassessed and revalued in terms of printing history and performance practice.\(^\text{20}\)

\(^{16}\) Ulrich, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible, 102.


\(^{19}\) Ibid., 2.

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 3.
Bell’s comments fall into a much broader shift taking place in the textual study of classical works. This shift is especially relevant to how we understand manuscripts: as data used to establish an authoritative modern edition of a text and unique artifacts of an historically functioning work of literature. Within biblical studies, such methodological awareness is often made explicit, but rarely made central to a specific study. For example, Gene Tucker summarizes the complexity of the methodological issue well, saying,

Because all texts and versions of the Bible are historically conditioned documents, textual criticism must not only try to recover the best text but also attempt to reconstruct the history of the transmission of texts and versions. In this sense, textual criticism addresses another aspect of the question explored by literary, form and tradition criticism: what course did the history of the Bible take? It is not possible to distinguish sharply between the stages of that history which are treated respectively by the various methods.

Similarly, Ulrich urges that the object of study can no longer be the Urtext, in light of the fluidity of textual production in antiquity. Rather, Ulrich asks

---

21 See, for example, J. McGann who states that “textual criticism of modern literatures is reconceiving its discipline.” Jerome J. McGann, A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism (2d ed.; Charlottesville, Va: University Press of Virginia, 1992), 1. For a similar development in Medieval Studies, see the descriptive yet critical discussion of Howard R. Bloch, “New Philology and Old French,” in Spec 65 (1990): 38-58. Such a shift is only in nascent stages in biblical studies. For instance, Ulrich, writing explicitly about variant literary editions, emphasizes the fluidity of textual traditions and applies Sanders’ process of repetition and resignification to textual witnesses (Ulrich, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible, 8). The insights of Devorah Dimant offer fresh perspectives on the study of variant literary editions. Focusing on the abundant, yet unexplored evidence for scribal interpretive functions, Dimant notes that “a gradual shift of focus is taking place: side by side with the steady output of traditional philological-historical studies, a growing number of works are being devoted to literary and structural analysis. This new trend in research is producing a more sensitive approach to the interpretive function of Jewish literature of the Hellenistic-Roman period, and additional works are studying the various modes of biblical interpretation current in that literature.” See Devorah Dimant, “Literary Typologies and Biblical Interpretation in the Hellenistic-Roman Period,” in Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period (ed. Shemaryahu Talmon; JSPSup 10; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 73. Similarly, Kristen De Troyer calls into question the scholarly distinction between rewritten Scripture and Scripture. Working with George Nickelsburg’s discussion of the terms “rewritten,” “expanded,” and “supplements” in apocryphal literature, De Troyer notes that supplements resemble what textual critics call interpolations. She asks, “could some of these supplements not be seen simply as the further literary development of the biblical text itself?” While De Troyer does not apply this insight directly to the case of variant literary editions, her discussion pushes some of the boundaries that variant literary editions, by nature, defy. Kristen De Troyer, Rewriting the Sacred Text: What the Old Greek Texts Tell us about the Literary Growth of the Bible (TCS 4; Atlanta: SBL, 2003), 4. See also George W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Bible Rewritten and Expanded,” in Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period (ed., Michael Stone;CRINT, 2; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984).

Should not the object of … text-critical study be, not the single collection of MT texts [and versions] of the individual books, but the organic, developing, pluriform Hebrew text – different for each book – such as the evidence indicates.\textsuperscript{23}

Writing about classical texts, J. McGann offers a general ideal taken as central to this study, stating that

\begin{quote}
The entire socio-history of [a] work – from its originary moments of production through all its subsequent reproductive adventures – is postulated as the ultimate goal of critical self-consciousness.\textsuperscript{24}
\end{quote}

The present study originates in the claim that increased critical awareness is a pre-requisite to deeper study of variant literary editions. In examining a variant literary edition, the “entire socio-history” of any particular manuscript becomes necessary information that affects the utility of that manuscript’s data to any specific field of inquiry. For example, as the history of scholarship on p967 demonstrated and as more detailed analysis below will show, textual analysis, operating in isolation from literary study, obscures the full significance of p967’s data. What this proves is that when working with variant literary editions, a field of inquiry cannot operate in isolation, without first recognizing that the data it seeks to interpret is, as Maureen Bell urges, lodged within the “unstable form” of a book.\textsuperscript{25} Hence, the present study takes seriously that a text is always also a manuscript, a unique historical manuscript of a functioning literary work.

My manuscript approach to p967 takes as central the awareness that p967 is a text in at least three different ways. First, p967’s text is a mechanically transmitted witness to an earlier ‘originary’ text, (i.e., the Urtext or the Old Greek of Ezekiel.) Second, p967’s text is a variant literary edition from the MT with unique literary features. This ‘text’ can shed important new

\textsuperscript{23} Ulrich, \textit{The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible}, 15.


\textsuperscript{25} Bell, “Introduction,” 3.
light on Ezekiel’s editorial history. Third, the p967 codex presents a text of Ezekiel that was produced under specific conditions and that functioned in specific ways for historical readers. This manuscript approach encompasses all three definitions of text and implicates several various, potentially related areas of research, which include textual criticism, literary criticism, and codicological criticism.26

For reading ease, I shall retain the term ‘text’ in its traditional text-critical associations. However, from the outset, it is crucial to establish that a text’s nature is complex and multiple. While all of the three ‘texts’ mentioned above are self-consciously treated in the current study, the first two, that of textual and literary criticism, receive greater attention. There is one main reason for this: the weight of scholarly analysis on p967 brings us to the brink of the text-critical question: what is the relationship between p967’s text and its literary edition?

Having framed the project in terms of a manuscript approach, and in light of this decision to give more focus to p967’s text and its literary edition, further introductory remarks are now relevant. In what follows, I provide a general discussion of methods and variant literary editions and then present more specific work on p967. The discussion reveals the need for a complex and coordinated methodological approach to p967. Hence the present study clarifies and executes an innovative approach to variant literary editions.

1.2. Variant Literary Editions and the Problem of Method

1.2.1. Integrating Literary and Text-Critical Methods

Because the phenomenon of variant literary editions is not new to biblical studies, especially since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, several discussions of procedure and

---

26 For bibliography on the last, see chapter 6 below.
method precede this study. The need to integrate literary and text-critical modes of analysis has been widely recognized. As Emanuel Tov states in his chapter, “Contribution of the LXX to the Literary Criticism of the Bible:”

From the outset it would appear that these issues [i.e. literary ones,] are so far removed from the topics usually treated by textual critics that the relevance of textual data to literary criticism would seem to be remote. This chapter, however, demonstrates that this is not the case. As a rule, too little attention is paid to these aspects in the analysis of textual data.

As Tov indicates, literary methods, while necessary in the analysis of variant literary editions, are held in suspicion by textual critics. At issue is the analytical usefulness of literary categories in the text-critical enterprise. This issue was the subject of debate in the well-known joint project on the David and Goliath variant edition. In that study, four scholars were invited to address the issue of the variant Hebrew and Greek texts by combining literary and text-critical analysis. One question that emerged as central is how to determine an intentional literary variant. Tov and Lust critique the literary procedures and methods of Gooding and Barthélemy for being too subjective. Lust argues that “artful” literary criteria are unhelpful in determining


28 Lust has argued that “text-critical and literary methods should complement each other.” Johan Lust, “Methodological Remarks,” in The Story of David and Goliath, 126.


30 Barthélemy et. al., The Story of David and Goliath.

31 Tov and Lust also critique Gooding and Barthélemy for their procedural sequence.
intentional literary variants. For example, David Gooding’s literary analysis focused on rhetorical artistry and often argued for text-critical intentionality and priority based on notions of literary taste, completeness, and beauty.

Instead, both Tov and Lust defend a sequential procedure in which textual criticism precedes literary criticism. Tov’s “point of departure is the textual level and only the textual level,” leaving aside literary questions until late in the analysis. Because the evidence has “been transmitted to us in textual sources,” Tov argues that textual, and not literary analysis suits the data. Similarly Lust, who devotes more attention than Tov to the issue of sequencing, argues that textual criticism provides the best starting point for study of textual phenomena. In his own words:

Discussions may arise concerning sequence in which the respective critical methods should be applied. It is probably preferable to start with textual criticism. Indeed, when one tries to define the relation between different forms of a text…one deals with the history of the text. Such a historical study is not the first aim of rhetorical criticism or of structuralism. These methods may find rhetorical and structural qualities in the text at any stage of its development or of its transmission.

Both scholars emphasize the importance of securing a critical text before conducting literary analysis. However, two major problems immediately present themselves concerning the idea of a critical text. First, textual analysis is not perfectly objective and scientific. Tov himself

---

32 Lust, “Methodological Remarks,” in David and Goliath, 125.

33 A short list of some of Gooding’s literary comments that were used to produce his text-critical evaluation include: “precision of this beautifully structured sequence” (66), “the idea” explained (66), “ways of classical heroes” (67), sections that are “irredeemably inept” (69), “thought-flow of the narrative” (69), “main message of the story” (70), “pedantic and ruinous attempt to get rid of an apparent difficulty” (70), “common theme” (71), “completeness” (74), “logical progression” (74), “consistency” (75), “classical restraint” (75), “good taste” (75), “discrepancy” (79), “time-table difficulty” (81), and “narrative technique” (81).

34 Tov, “Response,” in David and Goliath, 94.

35 Tov, “Conclusion,” in David and Goliath, 131-132.

36 Lust, “Methodological Remarks,” in David and Goliath. 121.

37 Ibid.
questions the rule-based nature of textual criteria and admits that common sense ultimately
determines one’s evaluation. Second, as chapter 2 will demonstrate, complex textual debates
such as the theories about the Greek translators, inner-Greek revision, and Hebrew correction
militate against the facile establishment of a critical text.

A crucial theoretical issue lies behind these questions about method and the sequence of
text-critical and literary methods. It seems overstated if not altogether incorrect to hold that
because the variant literary data is transmitted in textual sources, textual criticism must have
sequential precedence. Indeed, the literary qualities of textual sources stand alongside their
textual nature as equally characteristic of the sources. As discussed above, a manuscript is a text
in several ways. This complexity and multiplicity does not provide a facile starting point for
methodological sequence. Nevertheless, methodological sequencing is possible, although it
depends on two important factors: 1) the scholar’s orienting questions; and 2) attention to what
we mean by ‘literary criticism.’ The latter warrants some attention, however briefly.

1.2.2. Defining Literary Criticism

Biblical studies offer two ways of understanding literary criticism. Ascendant with the
historical critical approach to biblical literature, literary criticism came to mean an interest in the

---


40 For example, in the David and Goliath study, Tov’s question determines his positions on methodological
sequencing. He proposes that “at the initial stage of our discussion there is, in my view, only one question: does the
deviating Greek text reflect a deviating Hebrew text or not?” Tov, “Response,” in *David and Goliath*, 93. Tov’s
question reveals his singular interest in the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX without concern for the possibility of
subsequent editorial development. Such development could take two forms: inner-Greek editorial development, or
inner-Greek correction towards a developed Hebrew text.
various stages in the development of biblical books.41 The second meaning of literary criticism comes from literary criticisms that flourish in modern humanities more broadly and has to do with the structure and style of literature, as well as with cultural notions about writing and strategies of reading. Many strands of this type of literary criticism have made deep and successful inroads into biblical studies, such as genre and narrative criticism, to name a few.42 As indicated above, Lust and Tov critiqued Gooding’s literary criticism as being exclusively interested in higher critical features of the variant literary edition, without paying sufficient attention to lower critical issues.43 What is required is a literary analysis that is rooted in text-critical questions and textual approaches.

The evidence furnished by variant literary editions resembles strata not unlike what redaction critics identify in Literaturkritik.44 In Literaturkritik, the scholar isolates strata of material that exhibit shared formal features, ideas, or themes that seem secondary to the text. The underlying assumption is that author-scribes introduced such strata. In other words, redaction critics use principles of ‘literary coherence’ to identify layers of editorial activity.

41 See J. Coert Rylaarsdam’s comments on the distinct types of literary criticisms within biblical studies which he lays out in the foreword of N. Habel’s volume on Literary Criticism. J. Coert Rylaarsdam, “Editor’s Foreward” in Norman Habel, Literary Criticism of the Old Testament, (GBSOTS; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), iii-ix.


43 See footnote above.

44 This study’s approach to literary analysis shows affiliation with the types of questions asked in redaction criticism. For the theoretical basis of this view, see S. Talmon who points out that the process of composition blended with the process of transmission. Shemaryahu Talmon, “The Textual Study of the Bible – A New Outlook” in Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text (eds. F. M. Cross and S. Talm; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975, 333. Similar comments can be found in Gene Tucker, “Editor’s Forward,” iii-iv; See also James Watts, “Text and Redaction in Jeremiah’s Oracles against the Nations,” CBQ 54 (1991): 437, and Kristen DeTroyer, Rewriting the Sacred Text,1.
Given that variant literary editions provide a hard set of data for such editorial activity, the types of literary strategies employed by redaction critics can be used to signal intentionality. This approach to textual and literary criticism is adopted in this study and will be referred to as the ‘coherence’ approach. It now remains to situate this approach within previous scholarship on p967’s literary edition.

1.3 Previous Scholarship on p967 as a Variant Literary Edition

1.3.1. Johan Lust and Ashley Crane

To date, scholarship on p967 has revealed much about its distinctive literary edition of Ezekiel. However, the types of literary analysis have shifted throughout the history of analysis. The earliest literary study of p967 adopted a tradition-historical approach to the literary analysis of p967’s unique text.

Lust recognized the eschatological significance of p967, especially the material in chs. 37-39. In his earliest study, cited above, Lust hypothesized that Pharisaic, anti-apocalyptic theology motivated the transposition in Ezekiel’s eschatological chapters. According to Lust, p967’s order of chs. 38→39→37 was the more original. The MT displays a later arrangement of these chapters, rejecting the idea that a resurrection followed the eschatological battle. The Pharisaic editor transposed the vision of the valley of dried bones so that it would come before the Gog-Magog battle. Thereby the MT edition disallowed a notion of resurrection at the end times.

Lust was challenged on his Pharisaic proposal, most notably by Daniel Block.45 Subsequently, Lust abandoned a full-blown argument for sectarian authorship. Instead, he

---

returned to the textual data and in two subsequent essays, demonstrated literary coherence among a larger number of p967’s variants. Examining the MT pluses in 12:26-28, 32:24-26, and the textual issue in chapter 7, Lust concluded that p967 presents the more apocalyptic edition of Ezekiel than MT. Further, he argued that an MT scribe added material in order to historicize p967’s more mythologizing tendencies. An MT innovation in 32:24-26 puts Meshech and Tubal in the pit alongside Israel’s other historical enemies. The MT also presents its theology of the historical fulfillment of prophecy in 12:26-28. According to this MT plus, Ezekiel’s oracles do not linger, but are immediately fulfilled. Lust goes on to suggest that these two variants correlate with the MT’s plot-sequence in chs. 37-39.

According to Lust’s proposals, MT chs. 37-39 represent a later scribal interest to historicize and fix the military events depicted therein. The MT treats Meshech and Tubal as historical leaders. Further, the MT edition interprets Ezekiel’s restoration oracles as immediately fulfilled in Israel’s post-exilic restoration and subsequent military invasion from the North. These historicizing interpretations work against the earlier edition (p967), which projected Ezekiel’s oracles forward to refer not to past or contemporary history but to the end times.

Ashley Crane’s dissertation, completed in 2006, adopted and developed Lust’s results. He focused on Ezekiel 36-39 in the MT and the Greek uncialss using what he called a “text-comparative method.” This method explores the interpretive significance of all meaningful textual variants as trajectories of interpretation. Crane was especially interested in Ezekiel’s
theology of restoration in these chapters, picking up on Lust’s eschatological/sectarian conclusions.\textsuperscript{48}

Later published in book form, Crane’s results advanced scholarly understandings of p967 and the MT as two different literary editions. Crane’s characterization of p967 especially highlighted the second half of ch. 37 and its immediate transition to chs. 40-48. In this section, according to Crane, p967 portrays the national unification under a Davidic messiah whose job is to shepherd the people peacefully, making sure they are torah-observant (v 24b), as they live under their covenant of peace (v 26). In p967’s order, his [the Davidic leader’s] greatest purpose is shepherding the people for the building of the sanctuary (v 26b), so God can dwell with his people (v 27).\textsuperscript{49}

Since p967’s order does not interrupt the covenant of peace in 37:26 with the military scene in chs. 38-39, the transition to the temple vision is seamlessly pacifist.

According to Crane, the later MT edition is the result of shifting Second Temple political realities. The MT edition re-crafted the peaceful vision of Ezekiel to “rally the troops” in a “call to arms.”\textsuperscript{50} In MT, ch. 37’s placement underscores the vision’s symbolic significance as Israel’s past restoration, according to Crane. Chapters 38-39 follow as a text for military hope and confidence in the contemporary present; the call to arms is implied.

Aside from the changed chapter order, the best textual support for Crane’s reading comes in 37:10. The MT, to describe the revivified bones, uses a military image: an ‘exceedingly great army’ (חַלֵּי בָּרוֹד מְאָֽרָם). In MT’s order of chapters, Israel’s restored army faces the military invasion of the following chapters. In contrast, p967 reads instead: ‘a very numerous congregation’ (συναγωγὴ πολλὴ σφόδρα). When read in the context of the changed chapter

\textsuperscript{48} Crane, \textit{Israel’s Restoration}, 24.

\textsuperscript{49} Crane, \textit{Israel’s Restoration}, 251.

\textsuperscript{50} Crane, \textit{Israel’s Restoration}, 253-54.
order, the Greek reading complements the peaceful temple-oriented function for ch. 37 in p967, proposed by Crane. While the variant in 37:10 can certainly take on the significances Crane proposes in light of the changed chapter order, the variant itself is not strong evidence for different views of restoration. p967’s reading συναγωγή occurs in all Greek witnesses and therefore cannot necessarily relate to p967’s alternate order of chapters. Additionally, Crane’s translation ‘army’ is not restrictive, חיל need not refer exclusively to a military group. Upon closer inspection, Crane’s reading of the variant visions of restoration in p967 and MT is not well-supported by a wider set of variants. Nevertheless, Crane’s attention to Ezekiel’s vision of restoration does offer intriguing literary readings of the two editions.

The work of Lust and Crane provided an important foundation for further understandings of p967 as a literary edition different from the MT. Especially important are Lust’s conclusions about the different eschatological horizons and the use of apocalyptic versus historicizing elements. Crane’s literary analysis, in the main, highlights important differences regarding Israel’s restoration along with a stimulating discussion of Davidic messianism. Most relevant to the present study, however, is Lust and Crane’s use of literary and text-critical forms of analysis.

Four types of analysis are clear in Lust and Crane’s work: 1) tradition-historical analysis, 2) historical criticism, 3) a ‘text-comparative’ approach, and 4) a coherence approach. Both Lust and Crane attend to literary issues in conjunction with text-critical questions to varying degrees of success. Their approaches require evaluation to determine how well they make sense of p967’s unique textual features.

---

51 For instance, חיל usually refers to a military army, however, it can also refer to a large group of people (1 Kgs 10:2; 2 Chr 9:1) or to leaders (Exod 18:21, 25), worthy men (1 Kgs 1:42) or worthy women (Ruth 3:11).

52 “Text-comparative” is Crane’s term.
1.3.2. Lust’s Tradition History Approach

Lust insightfully recognized the significance of p967’s edition of Ezekiel 36–40 to beliefs about resurrection and eschatology. This observation remains relevant to a history of theology. However, the utility of this approach to text-critical questions was swiftly refuted by Block. Specifically, Block challenged Lust’s claim that a sectarian theological view on eschatology was the editorial motivation which produced the MT. Block pointed out how difficult such sectarian and theological arguments are to substantiate,

Indeed, one could argue with equal if not greater force that the growth of apocalypticism in the late intertestamental period stimulated the rearrangement of oracles in the text-form, so that the resurrection of the dead is seen as the final eschatological event prior to the reestablishment of a spiritual Israel, rather than simply a metaphor for the restoration of the nation from exile.

In short, as Block suggests, the history of ideas about resurrection and eschatology provides an unstable basis upon which to make claims about textual priority. Lust fully accepted the critique, modifying his position and stating that MT’s “‘plusses’ are somehow connected with the editor’s opinions concerning eschatology and apocalypticism.”

1.3.3. Crane’s Historical-Critical Approach

Crane’s study is framed by Lust’s tradition-historical approach. Focusing on ‘restoration’ instead of eschatology, Crane focuses on the same block of text: Ezekiel 36–39. However, Crane’s analysis, presented above, is inadequate in two respects. First, Ezekiel’s material about

---

53 Lust’s original proposal understood the MT transposition as a Pharisaic attempt to disallow resurrection at the end times, thus placing ch. 37 (the vision of dried bones) before chs. 38-39 (the Gog-Magog battle). Lust, “Ezekiel 36–40,” 531. Block’s retort is the sixth argument he levies against Lust, and in my estimation, his only successful one. Block, The Book of Ezekiel.

54 Block, The Book of Ezekiel, 341.

restoration extends beyond the scope of Crane’s study. Several promise oracles throughout Ezekiel bear heavily on Ezekiel’s theology of restoration which is in fact the stated goal of Crane’s literary analysis. Chapter 34 is a promise oracle to Israel using the metaphor of a shepherd gathering his mishandled sheep. Ezek 30:39-44 deals with God gathering Israel to his holy mountain. Ezek 17:22-24 advances the vine metaphor and depicts its replanting on the mountain height of Israel. Finally, Ezek 11:14-25 uses much of the same purity language as 36:23c-38 to describe how God will restore Israel. These four passages bear on Ezekiel’s theology of restoration, and yet Crane does not consider them in his study. Hence, Crane’s study does not encompass the relevant scope of this theme in Ezekiel.56

Second, Crane’s conclusions about p967 and MT’s different views of restoration draw heavily on the world outside the text. He relies on Second Temple and Maccabean political realities to develop his characterization of the MT as the later edition. While this produces a stimulating reading, Crane’s real error is in formulating his decisions about textual priority on the basis of historical-critical arguments that are underdeveloped and therefore over-generalized. This is especially the case in his treatment of 36:23c-38.

Crane does not deal with the theological content nor literary impact of the MT plus 36:23c-38.57 In lieu of an exegetical analysis of the MT plus, Crane assumes these verses

\footnote{56 For example, p967 presents an extensive minus in a passage about restoration in 33:25 where the MT, as the longer text, reads על הדם תאכלו וינכם תשאו אל גלוליכם ודם תשפכו והארץ תירשו (you eat with blood, your eyes gaze upon your idols, and you pour out blood. Will you then possess the land?) Crane does not deal with this variant.}

\footnote{57 When Crane applies his text-comparative approach (discussed below) to the variants in 36:22-38, he understandably excludes p967 since it lacks vv. 23c-38. However, as a result, his analysis of 36:22-38 focuses only on the rare textual differences among the MT, Vaticanus, and Alexandrinus. In his own words, as our goal is to observe variants as possible theological interpretations, we will not discuss verses where agreement is found…Our discussion of vv. 22-38 may therefore appear disjoined owing to the omission of the majority of the verses. Crane, Israel’s Restoration, 74-75.
participate in the MT’s ‘call to purity’ (along with ch. 37). His discussion of the reason for 36:23c-38’s presence in MT is brief, saying only

as the chapter reorder [in the MT] appears to be a call to arms, this inserted pericope appears to be a call to purity. It introduces and supports the “new” moral and/or spiritual resurrection metaphor for the dry bones, and the unity of the united nation under a military Davidic leader.58

Aside from this remark, Crane is uncharacteristically inattentive to this unit. He turns to Lust in order to support his conclusions.59 In Crane’s words,

the main significance for us is that Lust’s changing eschatological proposal provides a plausible theological reason for the chapter re-order, resulting in the creation and insertion of 36:23c-38 in later MSS.60

Crane thus abandons his text-comparative method, discussed below, when he encounters the largest, most obvious variant in his chosen unit. Instead Crane’s arguments about the MT plus in ch. 36 rely on highly speculative historical-critical analyses. In fact, Crane resurrects Lust’s Pharisaic proposal, attributing the MT edition to “a sector of the Jewish community that may have felt so strongly about their theology to have interacted with the text, changing the text to reflect their sifting [sic] theology.”61 Ultimately, Crane places MT’s editorial activity in Hasmonean times as a call to arms. Crane’s case for the priority of p967’s text is far from proven; indeed his conclusion may well prove to be incorrect. Indeed, Block’s refutation of

58 Crane, Israel’s Restoration, 255. Italics mine.
59 Here Crane uncritically adopts Lust’s 2003 work which used the tradition historical approach to Ezek 36:23c-38. However, Lust’s goal in that study was to show why 36:23c-38 was an appropriate introduction to ch. 37. He never claimed to be attending to the entire plus as a unit of composition. Crane fails to recognize the limited and circumstantial nature of Lust’s comments.
60 Crane, Israel’s Restoration, 235.
61 Ibid.
Lust’s work applies equally well to Crane’s. In short, Crane’s historical-critical approach cannot support his text-critical conclusions about priority.\textsuperscript{62}

1.3.4. Crane’s Text-Comparative Approach

The body of Crane’s analysis consists of what he calls a text-comparative approach. This approach affirms the integrity of each source/manuscript witness as a final text of Ezekiel. Consistent with this affirmation, Crane examines meaningful textual variants as “trajectories of interpretation.” By this, Crane presupposes that textual variants are the result of intentional scribal interpretation, and that a comparison within a textual tradition will show various ‘trajectories’ of interpretation.

Further, in keeping with the affirmation of a manuscript as a final text, Crane even includes para-textual information for each witness, such as paragraphing. Overall, his text-comparative approach represents a legitimate challenge to textual criticism’s romance with the \textit{Urtext} and obsession with textual differences as solely derived from scribal error or contamination. Instead of going behind the witnesses to find an ideal text, Crane’s approach affirms the form of the text in which each particular manuscript presents it.

Crane’s text-comparative approach shares a major objective with the present study, namely to reframe textual criticism in the service of study of variant literary editions. As I will discuss below, my codicological analysis in chapter 6 will deepen Crane’s approach to the particularity of each manuscript, more fully affirming the idea that each manuscript is its own edition of Ezekiel.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{62} Indeed, Crane eschews text-critical methods at the outset of his study. Crane, \textit{Israel’s Restoration}, 4.

\textsuperscript{63} See more on the codicological analysis of p967 in chapter 6.
1.3.5. Lust’s Coherence Approach

Lust’s second phase of literary analysis adopted a ‘coherence’ approach to the literary analysis of p967’s variants. He examined a wider scope of variants between p967 and MT than previously or subsequently considered. Showing coherence across a larger data set more strongly supports theories of intentional editorial activity. For example, Lust was able to show that all of MT’s pluses he examined historicized Ezekiel’s oracles. In every case, p967’s edition presented the more mythologizing edition.

Lust’s coherence approach suggests that at some unknown stage, redactors altered Ezekiel’s textual tradition according to particular interests. As indicated above, this approach comes into close alignment with Literaturkritik and discerns literary layers from a circumscribed data set of variants. In this sense, Lust’s coherence approach adeptly combines literary analysis and text-critical approaches in the study of p967’s variant literary edition.

Having examined the four types of literary analysis already deployed on p967’s text, it remains to return to the text-critical discussion.

1.4. Returning to Textual Criticism of p967

Both Lust and Crane deal with textual issues in their literary analyses, although in often incomplete or even incorrect ways. Specifically, they addressed two important text-critical questions: 1) Are the meaningful variants that distinguish p967 and MT as variant literary editions intentional? and 2) assuming editorial activity, which edition of Ezekiel, p967 or MT, represents the earlier edition?
First, both scholars recognized the need to show that p967’s variants are not a result of transmission error. Lust’s work has gone a long way to defend the text of p967. He adduced factors such as the literary coherence among MT’s pluses, late linguistic features, the weakness of text-critical arguments for mechanical error, and the independent witness of Latin manuscript Wirceburgensis (LaW), which supports p967’s edition of Ezekiel 36-39 (the omission and re-order of chapters). Additionally, Crane adduced indirect evidence for p967’s edition of chs. 36-39 in Daniel, Revelation, Targum Neofiti, and Pseudo-Jonathan to Numbers 11:26. Crane shows that these ‘witnesses,’ perhaps his most important contribution to study of p967, knew p967’s order of chapters 36-39. Hence, he argues that a robust reception history would challenge claims that p967’s order of chapters is merely a scribal mistake, if erroneous at all. Crane’s work finally concludes about p967’s edition,

p967 is not an innovative or maverick text, but representative of an existing textual tradition.

Thus, he affirms what Lust had also argued, that several of MT’s pluses represent a coherent and distinct literary edition from p967. Nevertheless, debates persist, despite the strong evidence mounted by Lust and Crane.

---


66 Crane, Israel’s Restoration, 208.
Second, a textual argument mounted by both Lust and Crane is that the MT is the later edition, expanded from a Hebrew text best represented by p967’s Vorlage. For instance, Lust showed that the pluses in MT and in several other LXX manuscripts included late linguistic features.\(^{67}\) This constitutes important evidence in any evaluation about priority. However, it is premature to declare that the entire text of p967 traces back to a variant Hebrew Vorlage.

Indeed, several critical editions of the Ezekiel LXX remain ambivalent about p967’s text. Four examples will demonstrate this ambivalence. First, the Hebrew University Bible Project (HUBP), a self-declaring ‘conservative’ approach to the witnesses, does not assign much value to p967 readings.\(^{68}\) The editors of HUBP construct a diplomatic text, using the Aleppo Codex as the base text, but they developed a strict set of criteria for the variants they record in the apparatus, the most important of which is rejection of retroverted readings. Since most of p967’s unique variant readings are unsupported by Hebrew texts, the readings do not appear in the apparatus.

Second, Ziegler had access to the John H. Scheide (Princeton) and Chester Beatty (Dublin) portions of the p967 manuscript when he published his Göttingen edition of LXX

---

\(^{67}\) Lust, “Ezekiel 36-40,” 521-5.

\(^{68}\) Apparatus I in HUBP, devoted to the versions, often does not record p967’s variants, as in 12:26-28 and 32:24-26. By way of explanation, the editors do not view the Urtext as their supreme goal (xi §3,) but are rather interested in the proto-MT text tradition (xiii §11). The system of apparatuses which organize the editors’ opinions about the integrity of a reading, center on the Hebrew text. For them, “study of the versions has shown that retroverted readings cannot have a claim to certainty, unless attested in a Hebrew source” (xii §6). Of course, the editors acknowledge that the literal translation technique observed for Greek Ezekiel implies that several unique readings may reflect a Hebrew Vorlage. As one would expect, they state that the “retroverted readings from the ancient version in Apparatus I present the most difficult problems of method” (xvii §29). Apparatus I supplies the readings which in the editors’ view, reflects the period of textual pluriformity characteristic of the second and third century BCE, while the readings that appear in Apparatuses II – IV are characterized as reflecting a later stage (xiii §9). For LXX readings, the editors follow Ziegler’s 1977 edition for quotations, and refer to his text as the Old Greek (LXX). Because p967 was new to Ziegler’s 1977 edition and discussion appeared only in the Supplement (Nachtrag), the HUBP editors simply note when a reading derives specifically from p967, avoiding any judgment about whether it reflects the OG. (Chapter 36:23-38 appears as such a note in Apparatus I.) In the end, the editors demure, “the question of the importance of 967 as a witness to the Old Greek and its possible reflection of a variant Hebrew tradition cannot be treated here” (xxii §49 note 43).
Ezekiel (1952). Later, in part stimulated by the publication of the Madrid and Köln portions of p967, Detlef Fraenkel supplied a 22-page Supplement (*Nachtrag*) in the second edition (1977).\(^{69}\)

Fraenkel outlines how the complete evidence from p967 was evaluated for the second edition, and echoes Ziegler’s overall positive assessment of p967’s usefulness for determining the OG. However, Codex Vaticanus (B) was still given pride of place as the base text for the 1977 edition. Fraenkel notes the considerable amount of work required by the new evidence as something of an apologia for its incomplete incorporation into the eclectic, critical text.\(^{70}\)

Third, in his *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Tov characterized the LXX of Ezekiel as a variant literary stratum, earlier than the MT. Although he cites Lust’s work on p967, and presumably considered the evidence of p967 for himself, Tov’s presentation lacks analysis of any p967 variants.\(^{71}\) According to Tov, the stratum of recensional rewriting “is not extensive; it is extant in chapter 7 only.”\(^{72}\) One is left to conclude that Tov does not currently attribute much value to p967 in determining this “shorter and earlier edition.”

Fourth, Walter Zimmerli had full recourse to the Chester Beatty and John H. Schiede portions of p967 for his Hermeneia commentary on Ezekiel, but that work appeared before the critical editions of Jahn and Fernández-Galiano were prepared. Although Zimmerli acquired transcriptions of the latter portions, and therefore knew with certainty that p967 presented an alternative order of chs. 36-39, he does not mention this in his discussion of Ezekiel’s textual


\(^{70}\) Fraenkel, “Nachtrag” in Ziegler, LXX, 333.

\(^{71}\) The space and the genre of the book precluded any lengthy analysis of specific variants.

\(^{72}\) Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 333-4. See also idem., “Recensional Differences Between the MT and the LXX of Ezekiel,” *ETL* 62 (1986): 89. Tov concludes that the literary layer reflected in the MT was added to “a shorter and earlier edition as represented by LXX.” He argues on the basis of parallel elements and synonymous words contained in the MT pluses. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 334.
history. In fact, Zimmerli places the discussion of p967 in his section on “The Later History of the Book and Its Text” thereby apparently denying any merit to p967 as an early witness.\textsuperscript{73}

The four cases mentioned above share a minimalistic approach to p967’s text. None attribute much value to p967 as a witness to a Hebrew parent text, in contrast to Lust and Crane’s assertions. Even Ziegler’s eclectic Greek text defers to B as the best witness to the Old Greek. Moreover, textual debates continue over individual p967 variants. From a text-critical perspective, more work is certainly required on p967, especially if it is to be taken seriously as reflecting an early edition of Ezekiel.

One of the primary issues involved in determining textual priority is genetic relations; indeed, p967’s text-type remains a somewhat open question. Additionally, inner-Greek revision must be considered. The relationship among p967, B, and the Old Greek is far from resolved. Lust’s argument for the priority of p967 over MT is at least based on translation and linguistic analysis. But, as I will discuss below, Lust overstates his case by implying that the status of textual priority extends to all of p967’s textual features.

Crane uncritically accepts that p967 is closest to the Old Greek. In so doing, he conflates p967 with the OG and assumes p967 reflects the Hebrew Vorlage of the OG. The result is that when Crane speaks about the priority of p967 over the MT, he has abandoned textual criticism’s well-established text groups and stemmata of textual relations.\textsuperscript{74} In point of fact, these and other issues, such as translation technique, render comprehensive positions on priority premature.\textsuperscript{75}


\textsuperscript{74} To be sure, Crane’s is not a traditional text-critical project. Nevertheless, his study does not adequately interact with textual criticism. For instance, he defines scribal errors as “variants without discernible interpretive intent.” Crane, \textit{Israel’s Restoration}, 2. This definition radically diverges from textual criticism’s well established principles for transmission error. See Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible}, 232-75. This sort of inadequate appropriation of text-critical principles is characteristic of a project whose method over-privileges final forms. Crane’s text-comparative method insists that texts were read in their final form as manuscripts and therefore must be
Indeed, scholars have taken issue with the conclusion that p967 is earlier than the MT. Daniel I. Block directed a seven-point challenge against the priority of p967. Block’s seven critiques defended the integrity of the MT as the ancient standardized form and thus the preferred basis for his exegetical work. According to Block, p967’s witness provides not a real but at best a hypothetical reconstruction of an early Hebrew text which can therefore not be used to supplant the actually extant Hebrew of MT. In the end, Block affirms that p967 “may still represent an old text form,” but he avoids taking a conclusive stance on priority.

Block’s implicit position on priority is made explicit in the recent article of Hector M. Patmore. Patmore argues that priority cannot be defended for either p967 or MT; all that can be said for certain is that we have in these two witnesses, parallel ancient editions of Ezekiel. Referring to the Hebrew evidence for the wide circulation of ‘proto-MT’ texts at Qumran and Masada, Patmore concludes

The available data are better explained by the conclusion that two different texts of Ezekiel [MT and p967] must have been in circulation concurrently for a prolonged period of time and that the historical precedence of either text cannot be established legitimately.

respected for their differences. While I embrace this presupposition whole-heartedly, it does not eliminate the need for textual criticism. He attempts to assign priority throughout, often on the basis of literary considerations alone. Crane eschews text-critical analysis and yet seeks to draw textual conclusions.

75 This will be discussed more fully in chapter 3.

76 Block, The Book of Ezekiel, 337-42. For a good discussion of Block’s seven points, see Crane who often favors Lust. Crane, Israel’s Restoration, 290-300.

77 Block, The Book of Ezekiel, 342.

78 Ibid.

79 Block’s ambivalence on the issue of priority can be seen in his comments about the originality of the MT plus at 36:23c-38. Block concedes that the passage in the LXX was brought into conformity with the received Hebrew text, and shows distinct literary style from its literary environment. Thus, Block allows that the passage could be a secondary addition, saying it “may point to the hand of a redactor,” albeit a thoroughly Ezekielian one. Block, The Book of Ezekiel, 343.

Patmore’s work is based on the arguable strength of the ‘proto-MT’ textual tradition. Indeed, he reminds us that we have a total of 340 words of Ezekiel in Hebrew preserved in the various fragments from the Judean desert but only from chapters 1, 10, 11, 23, 24, 35-38, and 41 many of which support MT readings over LXX or p967 ones (see chart 1).

Chart 1: Hebrew Manuscripts of Ezekiel from the Judean Desert

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>PRESERVED</th>
<th>SCRIPT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Q9(^{81})</td>
<td>Two fragments within 4:16-5:1</td>
<td>“assez classique”(^{82})</td>
<td>(not dated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Q1(^{83})</td>
<td>One complete word, a hapax in 16:31</td>
<td>Herodian</td>
<td>End of the first century BCE or the beginning of the first century CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q73 (4Q Ezek(^{a}))(^{84})</td>
<td>10:6-11:11; 23:14-15, 17-18, 44-47; 41:3-6</td>
<td>Late Hasmonean/early Herodian(^{85})</td>
<td>Middle of the first century BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q74 (4Q Ezek(^{b}))</td>
<td>Multiple fragments from 1:10-24</td>
<td>Herodian</td>
<td>Early first century CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q75 (4Q Ezek(^{c}))</td>
<td>24:2b-3</td>
<td>Hasmonean</td>
<td>First or middle of the first century CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11Q4(^{86})</td>
<td>Words from 4:3-6; 5:11-</td>
<td>Mid-</td>
<td>c. 10 BCE – 30 CE(^{88})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{81}\) 1Q9 consists of two small fragments of Ez 4:16-5:1 and is published in Dominique Barthélemy, “Ézéchiel (Pl. XII),” in Dominique Barthélemy and Józef Tadeusz Milik, *Qumran Cave I* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 68-9.

\(^{82}\) Ibid.

\(^{83}\) 3Q1 is extremely fragmentary and difficult to read. Only one full word, לָכָלָס can be discerned, which only appears in Ez 16:31. The manuscript is published in Maurice Baillet, “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* (DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 94.


\(^{85}\) Sanderson, “Ezekiel,” 209. This date is supported by Lawrence A. Sinclair, “A Qumran Biblical Fragment 4Q Ezek\(^{e}\) (Ezek 10, 17-11, 11),” *RevQ* 14 (1989): 100.

Patmore’s study is a very useful reminder that the LXX textual tradition has no extant Hebrew support. “What we can say positively is that what [Hebrew] data we do have do not reflect a prototype of the Greek recensions.”

However, Patmore’s study contains some errors and further illustrates the types of methodological pitfalls that await students of Greek texts and p967, specifically. For instance, the Hebrew texts of Ezekiel may not represent as strong a textual tradition for the MT as Patmore supposes. Many of the manuscript fragments that Patmore cites (4Q73-75) have been cautiously identified as excerpted or abbreviated biblical manuscripts. These types of manuscripts do not

| MasEzek | 17; 7:9-12; 10:11; and 13:17<sup>87</sup> | Herodian/possibly late-Herodian | Early Herodian hand | Second half of the first century BCE |

---

<sup>87</sup> Brownlee, “The Scroll of Ezekiel,” 16-17.

<sup>88</sup> Herbert assumes the dating scheme of F. M. Cross, and refutes Brownlee’s dating to c. 55-25 B.C.E. as too early.” Herbert, “11QEzekiel,” 21.


<sup>90</sup> Patmore, “The Shorter and Longer Texts,” 237.


represent full copies of Ezekiel, and thus provide a rather complicated ‘witness’ to the biblical text. Julie A. Duncan has noted the “expansionist tendencies” of many of the excerpted and abbreviated manuscripts. Judith Sanderson argues that 4QEkzb cannot be a full text of Ezekiel, but rather a manuscript with what seem to be “edited highlights” of the prophet’s visions. Additionally, Brent A. Strawn observes that excerpted manuscripts were probably more than just a copy of a biblical text – indeed, function may dictate the text’s form, if not type, in the case of these manuscripts (i.e., liturgical texts). Materialist philology “warrants caution when comparing the excerpted manuscripts’ textual data with other witnesses to the biblical text.” Finally, it may be significant that MasEzek, the strongest textual support for MT’s ‘eschatological edition,’ was uncovered in a synagogue at Masada. The ancient function of the manuscript no doubt plays an important role in how we understand its textual information.

In sum, while Patmore’s study should be viewed with caution, he is correct that it is still too early to establish textual priority definitively between p967 and MT’s texts. Lust and Crane have not yet conclusively proven their positions on textual priority, although Lust’s work has

(3QEkz) may be excerpted as well. For an opposing position, see Mladen Popović, “Prophet, Books and Texts: Ezekiel, Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Authoritativeness of Ezekiel Traditions in Early Judaism,” in M. Popović (ed.), Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism (JSJSup 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 227-251

93 For a good discussion of these texts, see Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated,” 28; and Brent A. Strawn, “Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran: Their Significance for the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible and the Socio-Religious History of the Qumran Community and its Literature,” in The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol. 2: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 112-113. His essay also includes impressive bibliographic references to the pioneering work of Patrick Skehan, Sidnie White Crawford, Julie Duncan, and Emanuel Tov with excerpted texts, as well as numerous other scholarly mentions of the phenomenon.


clearly made the stronger case. While textual priority is still undecided, Lust did lay important groundwork for further study of p967 as a variant literary edition of Ezekiel.

1.5. The Contents of the Present Study

The present study represents a manuscript approach to p967. Primarily, the study seeks to provide a deeper understanding of the literary history of Ezekiel through the lens of p967’s text. In addition, the preceding discussion has revealed a number of issues which this project will address. A central issue is the way in which textual criticism interacts with and complements various other critical approaches. For the time being, I accept Tov and Lust’s insistence that textual criticism takes sequential precedence, methodologically. Hence, this project begins and is everywhere rooted in text-critical questions. To that end, chapter 2 contains a comprehensive discussion of prior study of p967’s text. Textual criticism assumes priority in order to orient the study within the state of discussion on p967’s text. However, my thoughts on methodological sequence do diverge from the positions of Tov and Lust. Indeed, several unresolved and outstanding textual issues demonstrate the need for this literary study of p967. Thus, while Chapter 2 provides a text-critical orientation to the unique features of p967’s text, the ‘coherence approach’ overturns the methodological sequence and gives momentary priority to literary analysis. As per the coherence approach, only those literary features which can be shown to participate in Tendenzen sufficiently complement strictly text-critical evaluations.

Hence, in chapters 3, 4, and 5, I combine textual criticism with the ‘coherence’ approach to literary criticism. These chapters drive towards the question: what is the scope and nature of p967’s variant literary edition? A comprehensive study of p967’s variants is needed. In what way(s) does p967 represent a variant literary edition from other known witnesses, especially the
MT? Only a comprehensive study of p967’s ‘literary’ variants can shed new light on the meaningful divergence in Ezekiel’s text history. Hence, chapters 3, 4, and 5 examine only those variants that my ‘coherence approach’ deemed meaningful to the divergent editions of p967 and MT.

Chapter 3 describes and develops the coherence approach and introduces the data set for chapters 4 and 5: those variants which participate in the larger scope of p967’s variant literary edition. Chapter 4 is strictly text-critical. In it, I submit my data-set to text-critical analysis, and consider such issues as p967’s relation to the Old Greek and its Hebrew Vorlage. Then, chapter 5 turns to a literary analysis of the same set of variants. This chapter is largely exegetical, presenting the meaningful differences between p967 and MT as variant literary editions according to literary tendencies.

Chapter 6 provides a comprehensive codicological analysis of p967. The chapter begins with a descriptive analysis of p967’s paratextual features, such as format, text-arrangement, and marginal marks, including several Greek notations. The second half of the chapter interprets the significance of p967’s paratextual marks for its literary edition.

Finally, chapter 7 presents conclusions about p967 as a text, a variant literary edition, and an artifact of the book of Ezekiel. The evidence furnished by p967 for Ezekiel’s textual history places Ezekiel with Daniel, Jeremiah, and Esther, along with sections of Judges, Exodus, and 1 Samuel all of which preserve evidence for at least two editions. This study will thus help to rectify our heretofore limited understanding of the different books of Ezekiel. The study will also impact our understanding of Ezekiel’s composition history, as some conclusions about Ezekiel’s transmission will be possible.

---

97 Ziegler’s LXX Ezekiel is 6% shorter than the MT. Even without considering p967, this was enough for Emanuel Tov to call the LXX a variant literary edition of Ezekiel. Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, 333.