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In his monograph on 1 Kings 2–14 in the Masoretic Text (MT) and the Septuagint (LXX) A. Schenker notes that the divergences between the MT and the LXX have usually been treated as individual modifications, without interconnection.¹ He challenges his colleagues in this regard, inviting them to change their approach. In his view the following questions deserve an answer: do the differences between the two forms of the text, represented respectively by the MT and LXX, display a literary coherence resulting in two different texts, each with its own narrative logic and its own literary characteristics? Are the MT and LXX in these instances based on a common source or are they dependent on one another? If they prove to be dependent on one another, is it possible to say which is dependent on which? Why were changes introduced and against which historical background did they take place? These questions are related to E. Ulrich’s relentless research concerning the textual pluriformity of the developing biblical books.² The present paper tries to formulate some answers, in as far as Ezek 34:31 and 36:37-38 and their context are concerned.

In the MT of Ezekiel, the epilogue of chapter 34 reads: “And you my flock, the flock (גָּזִים) of my pasture, you are human (בָּשָׂר), I am your God, says the Lord” (34:31). In the epilogue of chapter 36 one finds similar observations: “I will multiply them as a human (בָּשָׂר) flock (גָּזִים) … so will the ruined cities be filled with a human (בָּשָׂר) flock (גָּזִים)” (36:37-38).

In the Old Greek version of chapter 36, best represented by p967,³

---

¹ A. Schenker, Septante et texte massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14 (CRB 48; Paris: Gabalda, 2000) 1–2.
² E. Ulrich, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1999). In this collection of essays several papers deal with the topic to which we refer.
³ p967 is supported by the Vetus latina “Codex Wirceburgensis.” The term “Old Greek” refers to the earliest preserved form of the Septuagint. Sometimes this Old Greek differs from Ziegler’s critical edition of the Septuagint. At the time of his edition, Ziegler did not yet have access to several of the sections of p967 now available to us. These sections have been published by F. G. Kenyon, The
there is no mention of a human flock: indeed, the chap. ends in v. 23ba. As a matter of fact, every MS of LXX 34:31 lacks the phrase "you are human."

Most commentators discuss the special character of the Hebrew text, without paying much attention to the shorter form of these passages in the Old Greek and to the intervening context. M. Greenberg observes that verse 31 of chapter 34 is phrased inelegantly and needlessly identifies the flock, which occupied centre stage in vv. 1-23, with the humans who have taken over the scene since v. 24. In his view, the term "human" (דָּון) appears to be a gloss inspired by 36:37-38. Other commentators adopt a similar view. D. I. Block adds a reference to J. Wevers who opines that the word דָּון may be a dittograph of the following דָּון. Other authors, such as K.-F. Pohlmann, D. Barthélemy and F. Hossfeld, suggest that 36:37-38 is inspired by 34:31 (and 36:11) and not vice versa. In Pohlmann's view, both 34:31 and 36:37-38 are Nachträge. In a long footnote, he argues in favour of the short text preserved in p967 in as far as the end of chap. 36 is concerned. In his comment on 36:37-38, Greenberg compares דָּון נָּעַר ("human flock") with דָּון נָּאַר ("a wild ass of a human") in Gen 16:12. This remark merely serves to draw attention to the exceptional character of the phrase. דָּון נָּעַר does not occur elsewhere in the Bible.

---


5 Among them one finds D. I. Block, Ezekiel, 2.295; L. Allen, Ezekiel, 2.158; B. Willmes, Hirten-allegorie, 57; J. Wevers, Ezekiel, 185; Zimmerli, Ezechiel, 2.832. For fuller details, see the BIBLIOGRAPHY at the end of this article.

6 Block, Ezekiel, 2.295.

7 See Pohlmann, Hesekiel, 2.490; Hossfeld, Untersuchungen, 340; according to Hossfeld, Ezek 34:31 also betrays the late hand of an editor familiar with the Deuteronomistic circles at work in Jeremiah: ibidem, 277-78, 283-84. For the influence of 34:31 on 36:37-38, see also Barthélemy, Critique textuelle, 286.

8 Pohlmann, Hesekiel, 2.490-91.

9 Greenberg, Ezekiel 21-37, 733.