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In his dissertation volumes\(^1\) our honoured colleague Julio Trebolle defended a thesis with two important facets for the textual criticism of the Books of Samuel and Kings: first, the Old Greek (OG),\(^2\) and the Old Latin (OL), are based on a Hebrew text that is different from, and earlier than the Masoretic Text (M); second: the reworked text as found in M is related to the deuteronomistic circles. OG translates an earlier text, in which some of the Deuteronomistic elements extant in M are not yet taken up. This does not suggest that OG was composed before or in the times of the activity of the deuteronomistic circles. It simply says that it translates an early Hebrew text that did not yet contain a full version of the deuteronomistic redaction.

The present contribution seeks to apply the first part of the thesis to the OG and M versions of the lament or *qina* over the King of Tyre in Ezek 28:11-19. The title of this king—גֶּדֶנ in M, and ἄρχων in OG—touches upon a topic to which Julio devoted a short but interesting and dense text critical essay.\(^3\)

---


\(^{2}\) Trebolle adequately demonstrated that OG in the Books of Samuel and Kings is best represented by the so-called Lucianic text. In the following notes on Ezekiel, we distinguish between OG, and G or the critical edition of the Septuagint as published in Göttingen.

Problems in Ezek 28:11-19

Chapter 28 is one of the most difficult passages in the book. The problems include: the relationship between its two major sections (1-10 and 11-19), the differences between the Masoretic text and the Septuagint, numerous textual obscurities, *hapax legomena*, and the links with other biblical traditions, such as the paradise stories in Gen 2-3 and with the priestly materials in Exod 28 and 39.4

Most often, these questions are answered on the level of literary criticism of the text preserved in M. Two matadors of textual criticism and biblical scholarship rightly note that G should receive an important role in the discussion. Their careful observations and deductions lead to contrasting results. According to P.-M. Bogaert5 most of the problems in the text can be solved when one accepts the priority of OG and its Hebrew parent text. According to J. Barr,6 who does not distinguish G and OG, G offers a facilitating translation of M. In his view, many commentaries run into difficulties because they recur to G when they do not understand M, and do not see that the translator of G failed to understand M. How do these two scholars proceed?7

---


7 More recently several authors joined the debate. The following list is not exhaustive: R.R. Wilson, “The Death of the King of Tyre: The Editorial History of Ezekiel 28,” in J.H. Marks & R.M. Good (eds.), *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East. FS M.H. Pope* (Guilford, Connecticut: Four Quarters Publishing Company,