1. INTRODUCTION

When Ziegler\textsuperscript{1} prepared the critical text of Ezekiel for the Göttingen edition of the Septuagint (first published in 1952), he gave pride of place to the B text, with Codex Vaticanus (B) and Papyrus 967 as the most important witnesses. However, when he compiled his text, he had only a part of this papyrus at his disposal. The publication of the parts of the papyrus in Cologne\textsuperscript{2} and Madrid\textsuperscript{3} has made it possible to revisit the original Greek. In some instances, Ziegler did not accept the reading of B as his original Greek. The question is whether readings of Papyrus 967 may change this choice in some instances. In many instances the papyrus supports the choice of the reading of B as the original Greek. However, in some instances where Ziegler did not accept the reading of B, this papyrus supports B, whereas in others it disagrees with B and supports the reading of Ziegler. This paper will examine the readings of Ziegler in Ezekiel 18 in the light of the readings of Papyrus 967. Many examples of Papyrus 967 agreeing with B and the critical text occur, but examples where Papyrus 967 agrees with a reading not accepted by Ziegler (18:4, 9), or where Papyrus 967 agrees with the critical text against B (18:10), are important. These readings will be evaluated, with suggestions for revising the original Greek of Ezekiel 18.

2. PAPYRUS 967 IN RECENT DISCUSSIONS

As regards the value of Papyrus 967, two main views can be distinguished. Some scholars regard the papyrus as very important for the history of the
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\textsuperscript{2} L. G. Jahn, \textit{Der griechische Text des Buches Ezechiel nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967} (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 15; Bonn: Habelt, 1972.)

text of Ezekiel in the Hebrew transmission of the book, with the papyrus representing an older version of the Hebrew. On the other hand, there are scholars who restrict the importance of this papyrus to the transmission of the Greek Ezekiel. It is impossible to discuss these questions in detail in this paper. Important surveys of the problems and proposed conclusions can be found in the works of Schwagmeier, Flanagan, Olley and O’Hare.

Schwagmeier, Flanagan and Olley support the idea that Papyrus 967 is very important for the history of the Hebrew Ezekiel as well, while Flanagan argues in favour of its importance being restricted to the Greek transmission of the book. In both these views, the fact that Ezekiel 36:23–30 is omitted by the papyrus and the rearrangement of chapters 36–39 play an important role. In the first view the insertion of 36:23–38 is regarded as a late feature in the Hebrew tradition, while the rearrangement of 36–39 must be regarded as original. In the second view, these two factors are ascribed to the transmission of Ezekiel in Greek. These issues will probably not find a consensus very easily. The aim of this paper is, however, not related to that problem, but rather to the importance of Papyrus 967 for determining the original Greek. The manuscript frequently has readings agreeing with the text as reconstructed by Ziegler, frequently agreeing with B. There are many instances, however, where the papyrus does not agree with the text of Ziegler, agreeing or disagreeing with B. It will be impossible to give attention to all the variants in Ezekiel 18, but a representative sample will be discussed to throw light on the use of Papyrus 967 in determining the reading of the original Greek in Ezekiel 18.

As Papyrus 967 is an important pre-hexaplaric witness to the Greek text of Ezekiel, attention will first be given to passages that are important for the hexaplaric tradition of Ezekiel, then to passages important for the relationship between B and Papyrus 967, and finally to some other interesting variants in Papyrus 967.
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