

קול AS HYPOSTASIS IN THE HEBREW BIBLE

AZZAN YADIN

azzan@rci.rutgers.edu

Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08901

In later Second Temple and post-70 literature it is not unusual for divine revelation to be communicated by a heavenly voice. As Peter Kuhn demonstrates in *Offenbarungsstimmen im Antiken Judentum*, the revelatory voice is found throughout Second Temple literature, and he cites dozens of examples from late biblical sources, apocalyptic literature, *Jubilees*, targums, Hellenistic Jewish authors, and the rabbinic *bat qol*.² The present study argues that the concept of a mediating, hypostatic voice (קול) exists in earlier strata of the Hebrew Bible as well.²

The term “hypostatic” is problematic. S. Dean McBride defines “hypostasis” as “a quality, epithet, attribute, manifestation or the like of a deity which through a process of personification and differentiation has become a distinct (if not fully independent) divine being in its own right,”³ a definition adopted in

A number of scholars generously read earlier drafts of this study and provided me with very helpful comments. My thanks to David Aune, Chris Franke, Bernard Levinson, Doug Olson, Benjamin Sommer, Mark Throntveit, and Molly Zahn. Thanks also to Michael Wise, C. Mark McCormick, Hindy Najman, and Emily Godek.

¹ Peter Kuhn, *Offenbarungsstimmen im Antiken Judentum: Untersuchungen zur Bat Qol und verwandten Phänomenen* (TSAJ 20; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1989). To these should be added examples from the NT (e.g., Mark 1:11 and parallels), and see also the interesting discussion of Ber. Sira 17:13 by Anthony Hanson, “LXX Treatment of the Theme of Seeing God,” in *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (ed. George Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 564–65.

² Kuhn’s book, which I came across in the final stages of this study, offers a brief interpretation of Ezek 1:28 that contains elements similar to my own (including a link with Num 7:89); see *Offenbarungsstimmen*, 9–14.

³ S. Dean McBride, “The Deuteronomic Name Theology” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1969), 5, quoted in John T. Strong, “God’s *Kabôd*: The Presence of Yahweh in the Book of Ezekiel,” in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives* (ed. Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong; SBLSymS 9; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 72.

the present study. In addition, the terms "intermediary" and "mediating" are used interchangeably with "hypostatic," since they express the independence of the entity in question from God. There are different shades of meaning to these terms, but the biblical sources do not allow for more precise semantic differentiation, an ambiguity endemic to analysis of biblical hypostases (most notably Wisdom).⁴ Rather than assay a complete and adequate definition, it is hoped the biblical passages in question and the subsequent analysis convey the hypostatic nature of קול.

My argument is limited in scope. The word קול does not regularly refer to a mediating entity; in fact these instances are rare. There are, however, a number of passages in Ezekiel, Numbers, and the account of the Sinai theophany that suggest the presence of a hypostatic voice. The MT of these passages is often corrupt in ways that obscure the hypostatic nature or even the very existence of the voice—arguably the result of a theologically motivated late editor—so certainty is not possible. The argument consists of two parts: first, analysis of the three verses that contain the *hitpa'el* form of דבר, followed by a discussion of the Sinai/Horeb theophany. We begin with Num 7:89.

I. The *Hitpa'el* מדבר and the Fragmentary Nature of Numbers 7:89

Numbers 7:89 involves a number of difficulties:

וּבָא מֹשֶׁה אֶל אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד לְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ וַיִּשְׁמַע אֶת הַקּוֹל מִדִּבְרֵי אֱלֹהִים מֵעַל הַכַּפֹּרֶת
אֲשֶׁר עַל אֲרֹן הָעֵדוּת מִבֵּין שְׁנֵי הַכְּרֻבִּים וַיְדַבֵּר אֱלֹהִים

And when Moses went into the Tent of Meeting to speak with Him, he heard the voice speaking to him from above the cover of the ark that was upon the ark of the testimony, from between the two cherubim, saying to him. . . .⁵

One problem is the vocalization מדבר, a *hitpa'el* participle instead of the more common *pi'el* vocalization. The curious vocalization has elicited different explanations from both ancient and modern commentators. Abraham Ibn Ezra argues in his commentary on this verse that מדבר is not a *hitpa'el* participle but an infinitive construct with a prefixed prepositional ה (= בן). This suggestion,

⁴ On Wisdom, see Bernhard Lang, *Wisdom and the Book of Proverbs: An Israelite Goddess Redefined* (New York: Pilgrim, 1986); Lang rejects the notion of Wisdom as hypostasis (pp. 137–46), though the title of the book suggests that Wisdom was once much more than that. Claudia V. Camp also rejects the view that Wisdom is a hypostasis (*Wisdom and the Feminine in the Book of Proverbs* [Sheffield: Almond, 1985], 34–37), but later in the study embraces the notion that "Wisdom, who was begotten before creation and was present with God during creation, is also the primary link between God and humankind" (p. 272). Much depends, it seems, on how one understands the term "hypostasis."

⁵ Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

however, fits poorly with the sense of the verse in Numbers. The מ of מדבר in Num 7:89 cannot be prepositional, since Moses is hearing speech—the speaker is מדבר with Moses—not addressing the act of speech as Ibn Ezra's reading requires. Rashi argues that the *hitpa'el* is a reverential form that suggests that God was both the speaker and the audience of the speech. Martin Noth, consciously or not, follows Rashi in arguing that the *hitpa'el* participle indicates that the voice "speaks with itself," adding parenthetically, "this is certainly the meaning of the text in the traditional vocalization."⁶ The problem with Noth's (and Rashi's) reading is that it does not explain why this verse employs the reverential *hitpa'el* to represent God's speech, while innumerable verses use the (irreverent?) *pi'el*, including וידבר אלו at the end of the verse. Baruch Levine argues that the *hitpa'el* participle has an iterative force and should be rendered "He continuously spoke."⁷ This reading, while possible, lacks contextual support, since the broader context provides no indication that the speech described in Num 7:89 was any more or less continuous than other divine speeches. Indeed, the attempt to ascertain the meaning of the *hitpa'el* from the broader context of the passage leads to a second difficulty confronting the interpreter of Num 7:89, namely, that the verse is essentially without context.

Numbers 7:89 is the concluding verse of ch. 7, which describes the gifts the tribal chieftains bring as part of the dedication of the tabernacle. The physical setting of the narrative—the tabernacle—is carried over into v. 89, but the theme of God's revelation to Moses constitutes a thematic break with what precedes it. The final words of v. 89—וידבר אלו ("saying to him")—require that what follows be the content of the divine communication. Instead one finds a second introductory formula (Num 8:1) preceding God's instructions regarding the construction of the lampstand. The result—"And when Moses went into the tent of meeting to speak with Him, he heard the voice speaking to him . . . saying to him. And the Lord spoke to Moses saying: Speak to Aaron and tell him . . ."—is an impossible juxtaposition of one introductory statement leading to another.

Numbers 7:89 is isolated both from what precedes and from what follows it and is rightly characterized by A. H. McNeile as "an isolated and mutilated fragment." Without context it is impossible to determine which if any of the grammatical explanations offered for the MT vocalization of מדבר is appropriate. McNeile himself tries to explain the fragmentary nature of Num 7:89 as "a single incident introducing some words of Jehovah which have been lost."⁸ But

⁶ Martin Noth, *Numbers: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), 65.

⁷ Baruch Levine, *Numbers 1–20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 4; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 258. On the iterative meaning, see E. A. Speiser, "The Dura-tive Hithpa'el: A *tan* Form," *JAOS* 75 (1955): 118–21.

⁸ A. H. McNeile, *The Book of Numbers* (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), 43.

the idea that Num 7:89 was originally followed by a divine statement since lost has no explanatory force unless it explains why an introductory formula is preserved without the speech it introduces. These difficulties led Jacob Milgrom candidly to admit that “[w]hy the Masoretes pointed [מִדְּבַר] as a Hitpaël participle is not clear.”⁹

A source that has been overlooked in the analysis of Num 7:89 is the *Sifre Numbers*, the legal midrash redacted in the third century but containing traditions attributed to sages of the second.¹⁰ I have devoted a separate study to the *Sifre Numbers*’ interpretation of Num 7:89 and will not rehearse the argument here, except to say that the *Sifre Numbers*’ gloss of Num 7:89 draws the reader’s attention to the fact that God is not mentioned in the verse.¹¹ At first sight this comment appears meaningless, since God—though not mentioned by name—is obviously the one speaking to Moses, and there is a venerable tradition of translators and commentators “introducing” God into the verse. One of two methods is typically employed. Either one substitutes “God’s voice” for MT “the voice,” as when LXX has Moses hearing “τὴν φωνὴν Κυρίου λαλοῦντες,” and Noth refers to “the voice (*sc.* of God)”; or one makes God the explicit object of the Hebrew אֱלֹהִים. The NRSV has, “And when Moses went into the tent of meeting to speak with the Lord”; Philip J. Budd parenthetically glosses, “And when Moses entered the Tent of Meeting to speak with him (*Yahweh*) . . .”; and *La Sainte Bible* translates: “Quand Moïse pénétrait dans la Tente de Réunion pour s’adresser à Lui”—capitalizing the pronoun to indicate that it refers to God.¹² Numbers 7:89 does not support either approach. First, the verse states that Moses heard *the* voice, not “God” or “God’s voice.” Second, the isolated and discontinuous nature of the verse undermines any attempt to determine the referent of אֱלֹהִים. God is not mentioned in the description of the chieftains’ gifts; one must return to Num 7:11—almost eighty verses earlier—to find mention of God. The assumption that אֱלֹהִים refers to God, though *prima facie* reasonable, is motivated by theology, not grammar.

The *Sifre Numbers* picks up on the absence of explicit mention of God and

⁹ Jacob Milgrom, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Numbers* (Philadelphia/Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society, 1990), 305 n. 22.

¹⁰ On the *Sifre Numbers*, see H. L. Strack and Günter Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (trans. and ed. Markus Bockmuehl; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 266–68. The passage in question is *Sifre Numbers* §58, pp. 55–66 in the Horovitz edition.

¹¹ See Azzan Yadin, “Shnei Ketuvim and Rabbinic Intermediation,” *JSJ* 33 (2002): 386–410. The biblical analysis does not depend on the rabbinic interpretation in any way. I present the rabbinic material as a way to emphasize how much rabbinic interpretation has to offer biblical scholarship, and to protest the gulf that often separates rabbinics from biblical scholarship.

¹² Noth, *Numbers*, 65; Philip J. Budd, *Numbers* (WBC 5; Waco: Word, 1984), 85; *La Sainte Bible*, translated under the direction of l’École biblique de Jérusalem (Paris: Cerf, 1961), 146.

suggests that it is “the voice” that speaks in the tent of meeting, not God. “Scripture relates that Moses would enter into the Tent of Meeting and stand there, and the voice descended from highest heavens to between the Cherubs and he heard the voice speaking to him from within” (*Sifre Numbers* §51 [Horovitz ed., 55]). According to the *Sifre Numbers*, the voice regularly resides in the highest heavens but descends from its heavenly abode to speak with Moses within the tent.¹³ In other words, the *Sifre Numbers* interprets Num 7:89 as a theological statement to the effect that a hypostatic voice lowers itself from the heavens to communicate with Moses while God remains divorced from human affairs. Bracketing the theological ramifications of this interpretation for the understanding of rabbinic Judaism, we see that the intermediary voice reading clarifies, at least partially, the two major difficulties outlined above.

1. The lack of context of Num 7:89: God’s location at the time of revelation is a contested issue within the Bible. If Num 7:89 does introduce a mediating voice, the discontinuity of the verse may be an attempt to introduce a polemical theological position in an inconspicuous manner. On this reading, the lack of clear antecedent for the pronoun אֱלֹהִים is not an accidental ambiguity but a smokescreen that allows the reader to assume that the referent is God. In this way the new position is introduced but its novelty is camouflaged, a dynamic well known in biblical literature from Deuteronomy.¹⁴ I refer to Noth’s observation that Num 7:89 is “phrased, perhaps intentionally, in a very mysterious way” and that the “strange wording . . . suggests [the verse] is intended as an independent statement and not simply as the introduction to a divine address.”¹⁵ The mediating-voice interpretation of the verse provides such an

¹³ With this interpretation, the *Sifre Numbers* takes a clear stand on an issue that has occupied modern critics, siding, as it were, with Gerhard von Rad (“The Tent and the Ark,” in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* [Edinburgh/London: Oliver & Boyd, 1965], 105–6) in holding that the meeting does not entail a permanent residence of the divine in the tent. See also Manfred Görg’s assertion that “שָׁכַן” meint hier wie auch sonst bei P ein kurzzeitiges Verweilen (Görg, *Das Zelt der Begegnung* [BBB 27; Bonn: Peter Hanslein, 1967], 60). Israel Knohl rejects this position, arguing that the priestly Torah accepts God’s permanent presence in the tent of meeting (though the Holiness School does not); see Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 131. For a survey of the different opinions regarding this issue, see Trygve N. D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and כְּבוֹד Theologies* (Lund: Gleerup, 1982), 84; and, more recently, Benjamin D. Sommer, “Conflicting Constructions of Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle,” *BibInt* 9 (2001): 41–63 and the literature cited in n. 18.

¹⁴ See Bernard Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), esp. 144–57; and also Benjamin D. Sommer, *A Prophet Read Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988), 154–56.

¹⁵ Noth, *Numbers*, 65.

"independent statement" and explains why the verse is phrased "in a very mysterious way."

2. The MT vocalization of מְדַבֵּר: The *Sifre Numbers* does not cite any specific textual difficulty as generating its exegesis, but there can be little doubt that the unusual vocalization caught the eye of the rabbinic exegete. The mediating voice speaking to Moses from the tent of meeting offers a possible explanation by allowing the *hitpa'el* to be understood as a reflexive form. The argument is not central enough to warrant an extended discussion of the various meanings of the *hitpa'el*, but consider, by way of illustration, קָדַשׁ, a root that—like דָּבַר—is regularly found in the *piel*. Just as מִתְקַדֵּשׁ means "to sanctify oneself, to cause oneself to be holy,"¹⁶ מְדַבֵּר could suggest "causing oneself to speak" or "speaking by one's own agency." This is not the only or even the most obvious meaning of the *hitpa'el*, but if Num 7:89 refers to a mediating voice, the curious form might emphasize the agency of the voice and thus its independence from God. This interpretation of the *hitpa'el* would be strengthened if the same form were found in other passages referring to a mediating voice.

This is as far as Num 7:89 will take us. The interpretation offered by the *Sifre Numbers* is suggestive, but the brevity and fragmentary nature of Num 7:89 render any interpretation speculative. The rabbinic reading does, however, point the way for further inquiry. If there is a relationship between the *hitpa'el* vocalization of מְדַבֵּר and a theology of mediation, the connection might present itself more clearly in other contexts. There are only two other instances of מְדַבֵּר, both in Ezekiel.

II. The *Hitpa'el* מְדַבֵּר in Ezekiel

Ezekiel 43:6

Ezekiel 43:6 is part of the temple restoration program. Ezekiel has been transported to the Land of Israel, where he sees a heavenly entity, a man "whose appearance was like bronze" (Ezek 40:3). The man guides Ezekiel through the restored temple, measuring its dimensions and moving from gate to gate. When they reach the eastern gate, Ezekiel has the following vision (Ezek 43:1–6):

1 וַיֹּלֶכְנִי אֶל הַשַּׁעַר שֶׁעַר אֲשֶׁר פָּנָה דֶּרֶךְ הַקֳּדִים 2 וְהִנֵּה כְבוֹד אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בָּא מִדֶּרֶךְ הַקֳּדִים וְקוֹל כְּקוֹל מַיִם רַבִּים וְהָאֵדָן הָאִירָה מִכְבָּדוֹ 3 וּכְמִרְאָה הִמָּרְאָה אֲשֶׁר רָאִיתִי כְּמִרְאָה אֲשֶׁר רָאִיתִי בְּבֹאִי לִשְׁחַת אֶת הָעִיר וּמִרְאָתָה כְּמִרְאָה אֲשֶׁר

¹⁶ Joüon 1:159; GKC §54 (3).

רָאִיתִי אֶל נֹהֵר כְּבֹר וְאֶפֶס אֶל פָּנָי 4 וּכְבוֹד יְהוָה בָּא אֶל הַבַּיִת דֶּרֶךְ שַׁעַר אֲשֶׁר פָּנָיו דֶּרֶךְ הַקֳּדִים 5 וְהִשְׁאֵנִי רוּחַ וְתִבְיָאֵנִי אֶל הַחֹצֵר הַפְּנִימִי וְהִנֵּה מֵלֵא כְבוֹד יְהוָה הַבַּיִת 6 וְאִשְׁמַע מִדְּבַר אֱלִי מִהַבַּיִת וְאִישׁ הָיָה עִמָּד אֲצִלִּי.

1. Afterward he [= the man] brought me to the gate, the gate facing east. 2. And behold, the glory of the God of Israel came from the east and the sound of his voice was like the sound of many waters and the earth shone with His brilliance. 3. And the vision I saw was like the vision which I had seen when he came to destroy the city, and like the vision which I had seen by the river Chebar¹⁷ and I fell on my face. 4. As the glory of the Lord entered the temple by the gate facing east, 5. the spirit lifted me up and brought me into the inner court; and behold the glory of the Lord filled the temple. 6. And I heard speaking [*middabbēr*] to me out of the temple, though [the] man had been¹⁸ standing beside me.

The first issue to be addressed is the identity of the speaker, a difficult question since מְדַבֵּר אֱלִי ("And I heard speaking to me out of the temple") has no apparent subject. The *hitpa'el* participle can be nominal, in which case *middabbēr* would refer to the speaker addressing Ezekiel, and this is how most translations render it.¹⁹ This translation is awkward, however, since the participle appears in the phrase מְדַבֵּר אֱלִי, which implies that the prophet hears speech (not a speaker) issuing from the temple. Though "one who speaks to me from the temple" is not ungrammatical, it is awkward, since the participle functions both nominally and verbally. If the participle is nominal the verse ought to provide an independent verb (e.g., "I heard a speaker *call* to me from the temple"); if verbal, there should be an independent subject (e.g., "I heard *a man* speak to me from the temple").

The latter possibility is attested in the LXX of v. 6, which explicitly identifies the speaker as a voice: καὶ ἔστην καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου λαλοῦντος πρὸς με ("and I arose and behold a voice from within the temple of one speaking to me"). According to the LXX, Ezekiel heard the voice of one speaking (φωνὴ λαλοῦντος) from the temple. In this manner, the LXX provides the speaking subject not found in v. 6 of the MT. Usually the smoothness of the LXX would be explained as an exegetical plus that serves to resolve the difficult

¹⁷ Both these visions—one on the River Chebar and one prophesying the destruction of Jerusalem—are discussed below.

¹⁸ The pluperfect אֲצִלִּי emphasizes that the human figure was standing beside Ezekiel all along and was not the speaker. On this form, see Ziony Levit, *The Anterior Construction in Classical Hebrew* (SBLMS 50; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998).

¹⁹ KJV: "And I heard *him* speaking to me"; NRSV: "I heard *someone* speaking to me"; Vulgate: "Et audiui loquentem ad me de domo"; Luther: "Und ich hörte einen mit mir reden"; *La Sainte Bible*: "Et j'entendis quelqu'un me parler depuis le Temple."

text of the MT.²⁰ With regard to Ezekiel, however, Emanuel Tov's important findings concerning the relationship of the MT and the LXX of Ezekiel suggest that the *lectio difficilior* of the MT should not be accorded priority.²¹ The starting point for Tov's discussion is that the LXX is significantly shorter than the MT (by 4 to 5 percent), which leads to the question "whether the quantitative differences between the MT and LXX of Ez. were created by the translator or were already extant in his Hebrew *Vorlage*." Using evidence from word order, consistency in the choice of lexical equivalents, the choice of particular equivalents, and overall fidelity, Tov concludes that the translation technique of the LXX is, with regard to Ezekiel, "relatively literal and consistent." As a result, the minuses in the LXX are best understood not as free or imprecise translation but as reflecting a Hebrew *Vorlage* that was shorter than MT. Indeed, Tov argues that in most instances "the LXX reflects a more original text from a contextual point of view, and the long text of the MT a secondary one. . . . The amplifications of MT represent an added layer of contextual exegesis, clarification and slight editing."²²

Applying Tov's findings to Ezek 43:6 suggests that the LXX φωνή λαλοῦντος is based on an early witness and is not a late exegetical plus. If so, the indefinite genitive of the LXX ("voice of a speaker") reflects an indefinite construct form most naturally rendered in Hebrew as *קול מדבר*, a phrase I will discuss at length below. In this way, the LXX provides a subject, *קול*, that is absent from the MT.²³ The LXX of Ezekiel does not use φωνή as a clarifying, exegetic term. In fact, all other LXX occurrences of φωνή reflect the MT *קול*,²⁴ which strengthens the possibility that φωνή in 43:6 corresponds to an earlier *קול* that was dropped from the MT. The absence of *קול* from the MT of v. 6, however, is problematic inasmuch as this change obfuscates the meaning of the verse relative to the LXX (and its presumed *Vorlage*). An intentional move from an earlier clear text (LXX) to a later obscure text (MT) is philologically counter-

²⁰ On the distinction between exegetical and linguistic translation, see Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem: Simor, 1997), 50–66.

²¹ Emanuel Tov, "Recensional Differences Between the MT and LXX of Ezekiel," *ETL* 52 (1986): 89–101.

²² Ibid., 91, 92, and the literature cited in n. 11. Tov's conclusion is that "the MT and LXX texts of Ez. reflect two different redactional stages of the book" (p. 101); so even though he focuses on the LXX minuses, the priority of the LXX to the MT holds for other textual differences, unless proven otherwise.

²³ Or, if one understands *מדבר* as a nominal form, the LXX's addition of *קול* "frees up" *מדבר*, providing the MT with a proper verbal predicate.

²⁴ The verses in question are Ezek 1:24 (5x), 25; 2:1 (= MT 1:28); 3:12, 13; 9:1; 10:5; 11:13; 19:7, 9; 21:22 (= MT 21:27); 23:42; 26:10, 13, 15; 27:28, 30; 31:16; 33:4, 5, 32; 37:7; 43:2. In 35:12 the LXX ἤκουσα τῆς φωνῆς τῶν βλασφημιῶν σου ("I have heard the sound of your blasphemies") corresponds to the MT שָׁמַעְתִּי אֶת כָּל בְּלִצְהֶךָ ("I have heard all your blasphemies"), a deviation based on the homophonic relationship of *קל* and *כל*.

intuitive and ought not to be accepted, unless it is possible to provide a motive for such a move. I will argue below that the MT has such a motive, but first we turn to the remaining instance of *מדבר*, Ezek 2:2.

Ezekiel 2:2

Ezekiel has just seen the vision of the divine chariot and now witnesses "the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the LORD" (Ezek 1:28). He prostrates himself, and there follows an extended auditory revelation (Ezek 1:28bβ–3:15), which is introduced by the following:

1:28 כִּמְרָאָה הִקְשַׁת אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה בְּיוֹם הַגֶּשֶׁם כִּן מְרָאָה הִנֵּה סָבִיב הוּא מְרָאָה
דְּמוּת כְּבוֹד יְהוָה וּמְרָאָה וּפָל עַל פְּנֵי וְאִשְׁמַע קוֹל מְדַבֵּר. 2:1 וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי בֵּן
אָדָם עֹמֵד עַל רִגְלֶיךָ וְאָדַבְרָת אִתְּךָ. 2:2 וְתָבֵא בִי רוּחַ כְּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר אֵלַי וְהִעֲמַנִּי
עַל רִגְלֵי וְאִשְׁמַע אֶת מְדַבֵּר אֵלַי.

1:28 Like the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud on the day of rain, so was the appearance of the surrounding radiance. That was the appearance of the figure of the Glory of Yahweh; when I saw it, I fell on my face. Then I heard a voice speaking.²⁵ 2:1 And it said to me: "Man, get on your feet and I shall speak to you." 2:2 Spirit entered me as it spoke to me and got me on my feet,²⁶ and I heard speaking with me.

The word *מדבר* in 1:28 is vocalized as a *pi'el* participle and so is not directly related to the present inquiry—though the "voice speaking" does not belong to the object of the vision, God's Glory. Were God's Glory the speaker, the verse might have read:

*וּמְרָאָה וּפָל עַל פְּנֵי וְאִשְׁמַע אֶת כְּבוֹד יְהוָה מְדַבֵּר

*when I saw it I fell on my face. Then I heard the Glory of God speaking

Or:

*וּמְרָאָה וּפָל עַל פְּנֵי וְאִשְׁמַע אֶת קוֹל כְּבוֹד יְהוָה מְדַבֵּר

*when I saw it I fell on my face. Then I heard the voice of the Glory of God speaking.

Instead, the speech heard by the prophet breaks with the visual revelation that precedes it. The visual revelation is of the Glory of God, but the auditory aspect is attributed not to the *כבוד* but rather to a "voice speaking." How is the clause to be understood? The LXX reads καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν λαλοῦντος, "and I heard a voice of a speaker," a translation that takes *מדבר* as nominal, forming a con-

²⁵ I argue for this translation below.

²⁶ The action of the spirit parallels its appearance in 43:5, where it also lifts the prophet just prior to his hearing an unidentified (in MT) speaker *מדבר* with him.

struct chain with קל. This reading, while grammatically possible, raises a number of difficulties. The indeterminate "a voice of a speaker" is awkward, since what follows is an extended oration in which Ezekiel's prophetic mission is delineated. This is clearly one of the key passages of the book, and it is curious that it would be attributed to "a voice" of "a speaker."²⁷

Modern commentators have suggested that the vague "a speaker" is theologically motivated, an attempt to preserve the mystery of God.²⁸ But Ezekiel has arguably just provided the single most graphic description of "visions of God" (Ezek 1:1) in the entire Hebrew Bible. Granted, the vision is described as the "appearance of the likeness of the glory of Yahweh" (1:28), a triple mediation that serves to dispel the notion that Ezekiel is describing Yahweh *simpliciter*.²⁹ Still, the visual explicitness of his revelation is theologically problematic, given the aniconic and antvisual voices within the Hebrew Bible, while the ascription of speech to Yahweh is a biblical commonplace—how much more when the hearer is designated a prophet. It is curious, then, that Ezekiel would charge headlong into the theologically loaded issue of God's visual appearance, but be forced into an oblique and (reading קל מדבר as a construct chain) grammatically awkward presentation by the theological commonplace of God addressing a prophet. Indeed, on Walther Zimmerli's and Moshe Greenberg's theological reading, Ezekiel's obfuscation of the source of the speech is counterintuitive. If the כבוד is a figure shown to the prophet in order to allow God to remain "hidden in the manifestation of His glory" (to use Zimmerli's delectably paradoxical formulation), thus shielding God from anthropomorphism—should the Glory not shield God from anthropomorphic speech as well?

These difficulties—theological and syntactic alike—can be avoided by adopting the alternative translation of קל מדבר that Greenberg cites in his

²⁷ A number of translators have sought to mitigate the difficulty by presenting either the speaker or the voice as definite. KJV "I heard *him* that spake unto me" is an example of the former, while Walther Zimmerli's "And I heard the voice of someone speaking" (*Ezekiel: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel* [2 vols.; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979, 1983], 1:89), of the latter. The Hebrew קל מדבר, however, is ineluctably indefinite.

²⁸ Zimmerli writes "[t]hat Yahweh's name is not mentioned in this, although 'the voice of someone speaking' is referred to cautiously, helps to preserve the mystery of the deity, hidden in the manifestation of his glory" (*Ezekiel*, 1:131). Moshe Greenberg similarly argues that "the expression avoids ascribing the speech directly to the human figure visible on the throne in the apparition, as though reserving the source of the speech for the unseen God" (*Ezekiel 1–20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 22; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983], 61).

²⁹ This interpretation is already found in the *Mekilta of Rabbi Ishmael*, where Rabbi Eliezer argues that the prophets were not granted sight of God but only of images, citing Ezek 1:1 ("The heavens opened and I saw visions of God") (*Mekilta of Rabbi Ishmael*, Shirata 3 [Lauterbach ed., 2:24]).

notes: "And I heard a voice speaking"³⁰ Here the participle is verbal, and קל is the speaking subject rather than part of a construct chain. This rendering is smoother and more congruent with the meaning of similar biblical phrases.³¹ It also corresponds to the proposed *Vorlage* of the LXX of Ezek 43:6, in which the prophet hears קל מדבר, arguably a speaking voice translated as "the voice of one speaking."

If the קל מדבר of 1:28 is a speaking voice, it is possible that the same קל is the speaker in 2:2, ואשמע את מדבר אלי. The difficulties inherent in this phrase are evident. It contains את followed by an indefinite participle and, of course, the *hitpa'el* vocalization of the participle. Most translations gloss the difficulty by rendering the verse as though מדבר were definite, the results being similar to those discussed for 43:6. Thus, KJV ("I heard *him* that spake unto me"), Luther ("und hörete dem zu, der mit mir redete"), *La Sainte Bible* ("et j'entendis *quelqu'un* qui me parlait") are clearly trying to make sense of the difficult MT. The LXX provides a more coherent reading, καὶ ἤκουον αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος πρὸς μέ, which suggests אשמע אתו מדבר אלי ("and I heard it [or: him] speaking to me"), where the MT את is understood as a graphic corruption of אתו מדבר,³² which would refer back to the speaking voice of 1:28: "And I heard a voice speaking, and it said to me . . . and I heard it speaking with me." This reading fits nicely with the indefinite קל in 1:28 and the definite reference to the קל subsequently. On this interpretation, the *Vorlage* of the LXX 1:28bβ–2:2 (which is prior to the MT) is:

... ואשמע קול מדבר. ויאמר אלי בן אדם עמד על רגליך ואדבר אתך.
והבא בי רוח כאשר דבר אלי ותעמדני על רגלי ואשמע אותו מדבר אלי

Then I heard a voice speaking. And it said to me: "Man, get on your feet and I shall speak to you." Spirit entered me as it spoke to me and got me on my feet, and I heard it speaking with me.

If the LXX of Ezek 2:2 is accepted, then it counts as another example of an active, mediating voice that takes the *hitpa'el* participle מדבר.

The argument thus far suggests that the three instances of the *hitpa'el* participle of *db* exhibit a number of similarities. Each of them arguably has קל as its subject. This is explicit in Num 7:89 and in (the pre-MT) LXX of Ezek 43:6, and it is a possible, though not certain, reading of the LXX of Ezek 2:2. Further,

³⁰ Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 61, note *ad loc.*

³¹ See, e.g., Isa 40:3, קל קרא במדבר (rightly translated by NJPSV: "A voice rings out: 'Clear in the wilderness . . .') and Isa 40:6, קל אמר קרא (NJPSV: "A voice rings out: 'Proclaim . . .'), where the more natural rendering of the Hebrew has the voice as the subject and the participle its verbal predicate.

³² So Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 1:89. The LXX is the basis for the NRSV: "and I heard him speaking to me."

in each case קול appears in the context of divine revelation but is not explicitly characterized as God's (i.e., as קול אלהים or קול יהוה).³³ One may conclude tentatively that the *Sifre Numbers*' linking of the *hitpa'el* vocalization of מדבר to a mediating voice in Num 7:89 is at the very least highly suggestive for the remaining occurrences of the form, in which the MT alters a smooth text (the LXX *Vorlage*) in a way that reduces the presence of the קול.

Ezekiel 1:24–26

A weakness of this argument is its reliance on the *hitpa'el* vocalization, arguably a late Masoretic addition. In discussing Ezek 2:2, Greenberg makes this point explicitly, presenting the unusual vocalization as a late, theological addition, almost a Masoretic midrash: "The rare MT vocalization seems to be artificial—an exploitation of a textual opening for introducing a later reverential linguistic conceit."³⁴ Greenberg is right to warn against confusing later Masoretic pointing and the consonantal text, but the evidence for a hypostatic קול is not wholly dependent on the vocalization. First and foremost, the explicit mention of a voice in the LXX of Ezek 1:28—keeping in mind Tov's argument that the LXX of Ezekiel is an earlier textual witness than the MT—is independent of the vocalization. An additional nonvocalization witness is found in Ezek 1:24–26, where the MT text is evidently corrupt:

24 ואשמע את קול כנפיהם כקול מים רבים כקול-שדי בלכתם קול המלה כקול מחנה בעמדם הרפניה כנפיהם 25 ויהי קול מעל לרקיע אשר על-ראשם בעמדם תרפניה כנפיהם 26 וממעל לרקיע אשר על-ראשם כמראה אבן-ספיר דמות כסא ועל דמות הכסא דמות כמראה אדם עליו מלמעלה

24. And when they went, I heard the sound (*qôl*) of their wings like the sound (*qôl*) of many waters, like the thunder (*qôl*) of the Almighty, a sound (*qôl*) of tumult like the sound (*qôl*) of a host; when they stood still, they let down their wings. 25. And there came a voice (*qôl*) from above the firmament over their heads; when they stood still, they let down their wings. 26. And above the firmament over their heads, in appearance like sapphire, there was the likeness of a throne; and seated above the likeness of a throne was a likeness as it were of a human form.

As scholars have noted, v. 25a, מעל לרקיע אשר על ראשם ("and above the firmament over their heads"), is repeated in v. 26a, while v. 25b, בעמדם הרפניה,

³³ The MT of Ezek 43:2 has קול referring to Yahweh, but the LXX does not. Since the priority of the LXX over the MT does not hold generally for Numbers, the LXX καὶ ἤκουσεν τὴν φωνὴν κυρίου λαλοῦντος πρὸς αὐτόν ("and he heard the voice of the Lord speaking to him") for the MT וישמע את הקול מדבר אליו ("and he heard the voice speaking to him") in Num 7:89 is an exegetic plus that clarifies the difficult text of the MT.

³⁴ Greenberg, *Ezekiel* 1–20, 62.

כנפיהם ("when they stood still they let down their wings"), repeats verbatim v. 24b. The result is an extremely awkward passage. These difficulties are absent from the earlier recension reflected in the LXX, which reads:

24 καὶ ἤκουον τὴν φωνὴν τῶν πτερύγων αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτὰ ὡς φωνὴν ὕδατος πολλοῦ· καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐστάναι αὐτὰ κατέπαυον αἱ πτέρυγες αὐτῶν 25 καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ὑπεράνωθεν τοῦ στερεώματος τοῦ ὄντος ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν. 26 ὡς ὄρασις λίθου σαπφείρου ὁμοίωμα θρόνου ἐπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὁμοιώματος τοῦ θρόνου ὁμοίωμα ὡς εἶδος ἀνθρώπου ἄνωθεν.

This LXX passage reflects the *Vorlage*:

24 ואשמע את קול כנפיהם בלכתם כקול מים רבים ובעמדם הרפניה כנפיהם 25 והנה קול מעל לרקיע אשר על ראשם 26 כמראה אבן-ספיר דמות כסא ועל דמות הכסא דמות כמראה אדם [עליו] מלמעלה

24. And when they went, I heard the sound (*qôl*) of their wings like the sound of many waters but when they stood still, they let down their wings. 25. And behold a voice (*qôl*) from above the firmament over their heads 26. in appearance like sapphire . . .

The difference between the two versions is significant.³⁶ The LXX does not contain the repetitions of the MT and as a result is a much clearer text. Why, then, does the later MT version contain corruptions not present in an earlier witness? Again, I believe the motivation is theological. Φωνή in v. 24 means "sound" (of wings). But *after* the wings have fallen silent Ezekiel beholds a φωνή (v. 25). There is no speech reported, so the prophet does not perceive the φωνή by auditory means, and since the φωνή is spatially situated above the heads of the angels, LXX v. 25 may be referring to a visible voice. The heavy-handed corruption of the MT aims, I propose, to obscure this interpretation.

The MT undermines the hypostatic voice reading in two ways: First, it substitutes קול יהוה ("and there was a voice") for והנה קול ("and behold a voice"), diminishing the possibility that the voice be understood as a visible entity. והנה often has the force of a demonstrative or deictic statement, especially when followed by a noun; ויהי does not.³⁷ Second, the MT surrounds קול in v. 25 with instances of קול that cannot mean "voice." The MT repeats 1:24b ("when they stood still they let down their wings") immediately after the appearance of the

³⁵ ונה regularly corresponds to LXX καὶ ἰδοὺ.

³⁶ Leslie Allen offers a helpful discussion of the complex relationship between the MT and the LXX here (*Ezekiel* 1–19 [WBC 28; Dallas: Word, 1994], 9 n. 24c), though I do not share his conclusions.

³⁷ GKC §147c; see also Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* (Sheffield Almond, 1983), 62–63.

קול in v. 25a, "sandwiching" it between two references to the sound of the angels' wings and framing the קול as an audible *sound* rather than a voice spatially situated above the angels' heads as in the LXX. The repetition of v. 24b in v. 25b creates the expectation that v. 25a (the קול) will be analogous to v. 24a (קול meaning "sound [of wings]"). The other MT pluses serve the same function: v. 24 contains a series of references to קול, all of which mean "sound" or "thunder," but surely not "voice." Here too the MT obscures the קול-voice of v. 25 (LXX and *Vorlage*) with a barrage of קולות-sounds. This, in any case, is the solution adopted by those MT scribes who have not dropped v. 25 altogether.³⁸ Or this interpretation, Ezek 1:24–26 contains MT corruptions that are aimed at blurring the hypostatic φωνή of the LXX, unrelated to the Masoretic vocalization.

Ezekiel 9:1

One final passage should be considered, since Ezekiel himself suggested its relevance. Ezekiel 43:3 likens the vision at the temple to two earlier visions: the opening vision of the book, which has been discussed at length, and the prophecy on the destruction of Jerusalem in Ezek 9. If the argument thus far is correct and both Ezek 43:6 and 2:2 know of an independent, mediating voice, one might expect to find such a voice in Ezek 9 as well. The literary setting of this vision is much like that of Ezek 43. Ezekiel is led by a fiery figure to Jerusalem, to the "door of the court" (8:7), where he sees the idols and impurities within the temple. He is then led to the inner court of the temple (8:16), where the fiery man promises retribution against the house of Judah, and then begins a new auditory revelation (9:1):

8:18 וגם אני אעשה בחמה לא תחוס עיני ולא אחמל וקראו באוני קול גדול ולא אשמע אותם 9:1 ויקרא באוני קול: דול לאמר קרבו פקדות העיר ואיש כלי משחתו בידו.

8:18 Therefore I will deal in wrath; my eye will not spare, nor will I have pity; and though they cry in my ears with a loud voice, I will not hear them.
9:1 Then he cried in my ears with a loud voice, saying "Draw near, you executioners of the city, each with his destroying weapon in his hand."

The key phrase here is קול גדול in 8:18 and its near repetition, ויקרא באוני קול גדול, in 9:1. The RSV (above) understands both occurrences of קול גדול as adverbial, roughly equivalent to בקול גדול, and translates accord-

ingly, which is standard.³⁹ The meaning of ויקרא באוני קול גדול (understood adverbially) in MT 9:1 is perplexing, however. The preceding verse, 8:18, describes the plight of idolaters that now must face the terrible wrath of God, who shows no mercy even though they cry out "with a loud voice." Here the loud voice fits well with the narrative context. But in 9:1 the speaker—the fiery figure that has been speaking since the beginning of ch. 8—resumes his communication with the prophet, but rather than speak he is shouting in Ezekiel's ear for no apparent reason a speech not even addressed to Ezekiel.

Turning to the LXX, one finds that 9:1 reads: φωνή μεγάλη ("with a great voice"), an adverbial understanding of קול גדול that corresponds to the MT. The LXX of 8:18, however, is quite different: καὶ ἐγὼ ποιήσω αὐτοῖς μετὰ θυμοῦ οὐ φείσεται ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς μου οὐδὲ μὴ ἐλεήσω ("Therefore I will deal in wrath; my eye will not spare, nor will I have pity"). The MT of 8:18b (וקראו באוני קול גדול ולא אשמע אותם) ["and though they cry in my ears with a loud voice, I will not hear them"] is absent. Again keeping in mind the priority of the LXX, why would the MT add this clause? I believe it follows the pattern observed in Ezek 2:2 and 43:6, in which the change seeks to blur the theological notion of a hypostatic voice. Consider what the MT would be without the plus in 8:18:

8:18 וגם אני אעשה בחמה לא תחוס עיני ולא אחמל 9:1 ויקרא באוני קול גדול
לאמר קרבו פקדות העיר ואיש כלי משחתו בידו

8:18 Therefore I will deal in wrath; my eye will not spare, nor will I have pity.
9:1 And a great קול cried out in my ears, saying, "Draw near, you executioners of the city, each with his destroying weapon in his hand."

Here "and a great קול cried out in my ears" strongly favors understanding קול as an active voice that cries out to the prophet. The LXX posits a speaking voice, but the MT plus in 8:18, with its unambiguously adverbial understanding of קול גדול ("they cry . . . with a loud voice"), inclines the reader toward an identical—that is, adverbial—understanding of קול גדול in 9:1. In other words, the MT plus in 8:18 juxtaposes an adverbial קול גדול to 9:1 to blur the hypostatic voice crying out in the prophet's ear.

Finally it should be noted that a mediating voice is theologically consistent with the broader theology of Ezekiel, which includes several apparent hypostases. The clearest example is the hand that appears before Ezekiel in 2:9:

³⁹ KJV: "He cried also in mine ears with a loud voice"; NRSV: "Then he cried in my ears with a loud voice"; Vulgate: "et clamavit in auribus meis voce magna dicens . . ."; Luther: "Und er rief mit lauter Stimme vor meinen Ohren"; *La Sainte Bible*: "C'est alors que d'une voix forte il cria à mes oreilles." On this form, see GKC §117 s, t, citing 1 Kgs 8:55; 2 Sam 15:23; and another example from Ezekiel—11:13.

³⁸ Nine MSS omit the verse; see *BHS*, *ad loc.*

ואראה והנה יד שלוחה אלי והנה בו מגילת ספר

And when I looked, behold, a hand was stretched out to me, and lo, a written scroll was in it.

The context leaves no doubt that this is a divine hand, as Zimmerli, Daniel Block, and others well recognize.⁴⁰ But since God is not mentioned in the verse and the hand and its actions are not attributed to God, the hand appears as an independent, mediating agent.⁴¹ A less obvious but more common hypostasis may be the *כבוד* itself, as John T. Strong argues in a recent article. Drawing from descriptions of the nature and role of the *כבוד* in Isaiah and the Psalms, but most often Ezekiel, Strong argues that the *כבוד* functions as the terrestrial representative of the God who resides in heaven: "It is my contention that the *כבוד* was understood by Ezekiel to be the hypostasis of the enthroned divine king, Yahweh."⁴² The scroll-bearing hand and the possibility that the *כבוד*, the main theological figure of the book of Ezekiel, is a hypostasis characterize Ezekiel's theology as potentially hospitable to a hypostatic voice.⁴³

The analysis of the *hitpa'el* מִדְּבַר—precipitated by the *Sifre Numbers* interpretation of Num 7:89—has been taken as far as it can go; there are no more instances of this form in the Hebrew Bible. There remains, however, the broader theological motivation for the hypostatic voice. Like other mediators, the voice appears in order to maintain God's transcendence, making contact with the material world so that God does not have to. It is not surprising, then, that the mediating voice appears in the context of the tabernacle (Num 7:89) and the temple (Ezek 43:6; 9:1), both sites of regular contact between the divine and the mundane that raise the question of divine transcendence. Given the theological impetus behind the mediating voice, might we not expect to find a mediating voice—or at least traces of one—in the other major site of revelation, at Sinai?

⁴⁰ Zimmerli: "The original text of Ezekiel undoubtedly refers in 2:9 to the hand of Yahweh" (*Ezekiel*, 1:135); Block: "In light of the command in v. 8, the hand obviously belongs to Yahweh" (Daniel Isaac Block, *The Book of Ezekiel* [2 vols.; NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997, 1998], 1:123).

⁴¹ Like Ezekiel, Daniel contains both a mediating voice ("While the word was in the king's mouth, there descended a voice from heaven saying . . ." [Dan 4:28]), and a mediating hand ("Then was the part of the hand sent from him; and this writing was written . . ." [Dan 5:24]).

⁴² See Strong, "God's *Kabôd*," 69–95, here 73.

⁴³ Ezekiel's mediators may well be generated by the same theological convictions that cause him to avoid visual anthropomorphism in ch. 1, where Ezekiel describes God's entourage at great length but not the form of God itself. The LXX of Ezekiel discusses the voice openly, but the MT blurs these references. This discrepancy may be because the LXX translators were more accustomed to the idea of an intermediary voice owing to its prevalence in Greek religious literature (see Otto Betz, "φωνή," *TDNT* 9:278–80).

III. The Voice at Sinai/Horeb

The Sinai narrative, Exod 19–24, is a very complex composite work, whose history has been the subject of a great deal of scholarship.⁴⁴ These matters will be considered in the course of argument, but are not the focus of inquiry. The task at hand is to examine the traces of a mediating-voice tradition within the Sinai pericopes. The first verse to be analyzed is Exod 19:19:

18 והר סיני עשן כולו מפני אשר ירד עליו יהוה באש ויעל עשנו כעשן הכבשן
ויחרר כל ההר מאד 19 ויהי קול השופר הולך וחזק מאד משה ידבר והאלהים
יענני בקול 20 וירד יהוה על הר סיני אל ראש ההר יקרא יהוה למשה אל ראש
ההר ויעל משה.

18. The whole of Mount Sinai was smoking since Yahweh had descended upon it in fire, and its smoke was billowing like the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mountain shook mightily. 19. And the sound of the ram's horn was growing much stronger. Moses spoke and God answered with a voice. 20. Thus Yahweh came down upon Mt. Sinai, to the top of the mountain, and Yahweh summoned Moses to the top of the mountain and Moses ascended. (Exod 19:18–20)

As biblical scholars have long recognized, the sequence of events narrated in these verses is chronologically impossible. Verse 18 states that Yahweh had already descended onto Mt. Sinai and (v. 19) communicated with God, but in v. 20 Yahweh descends onto Mt. Sinai and calls Moses to ascend the mountain. As a result, there is broad scholarly consensus that vv. 19 and 20 were not originally connected but that v. 20 and the section that follows are an insertion.⁴⁵ There is some controversy over what verse originally followed 19:19, which is a composite of two asyndetic clauses: v. 19a ("And the sound of the ram's horn was growing much stronger") and v. 19b ("Moses spoke and God answered [בקול]"). This has led scholars to conclude that v. 19b—the key hemistich for the present analysis—"is not continuous with what precedes or follows it."⁴⁶ There

⁴⁴ The secondary literature on the composition of the Sinai pericopes is vast and cannot be discussed here. For a survey of relevant literature, see the first chapter ("Redaction and Theology in the Sinai Complex") of Thomas B. Dozeman, *God on the Mountain: A Study of Redaction, Theology, and Canon in Exodus 19–24* (SBLMS 37; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 1–17. A work that is not cited by Dozeman but has played a major role in my understanding of these chapters is Arie Toeg, *Lawgiving at Sinai* [in Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1977).

⁴⁵ See, e.g., Toeg, *Lawgiving at Sinai*, 21; Walter Beyerlin, *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinai Traditions* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966), 8: "it is clear that the whole section xix. 20–24 is a later gloss."

⁴⁶ John I. Durham, *Exodus* (WBC 3; Waco: Word, 1987), 267.

are two schools of thought regarding the translation of v. 19b: one renders קול as "voice," the other as "thunder,"⁴⁷ and I would argue that the former is to be preferred. "Voice" is a standard meaning of קול and fits the context of the Sinaitic dialogue between Moses and God. As Thomas Dozeman notes: "Although the singular *qôl* . . . often refers specifically to the voice of God. . . . [T]he plural קולות almost always occurs in the context of a storm . . . and does not refer to a more specific divine verbal communication."⁴⁸

Dozeman's observation is strengthened by Haiim Rosén's argument that the "gender incongruity" exhibited by the singular and plural forms of קול (singular: zero grade suffix [= "masculine"]; plural: *-ôl* suffix [= "feminine"]) is a marker of countability and noncountability. According to Rosén, nouns that exhibit this irregularity are discrete and countable in the plural but noncountable in the singular.⁴⁹ Rosén's explanation of the morphological pattern cannot be accorded the status of a general law, since there are a number of questionable cases⁵⁰ as well as outright counterexamples.⁵¹ Rosén's hypothesis does, however, hold for a large number of the nouns exhibiting the morphological "incongruity." Consider the following paired examples:⁵²

- ארצות, ארץ Singular: "earth" or "land" or "soil" in a general sense; plural: discrete political or geographic entities
- נפשות, נפש Singular: "life force" or "spirit" (except in determined legal phraseology); plural: "people, individuals"
- רוחות, רוח Singular: "spirit" or "wind"; plural: "direction"
- שמות, שם Singular: "fame, reputation"; plural: "names"

⁴⁷ See the rich discussion of Benjamin Sommer, "Revelation at Sinai in the Hebrew Bible and in Jewish Theology," *JR* 79 (1999): 422–51.

⁴⁸ Dozeman, *God on the Mountain*, 27.

⁴⁹ Haiim Rosén, "On Some Nominal Morphological Categories in Biblical Hebrew," in *On the Dignity of Man: Oriental and Classical Studies in Honour of Frithjof Rundgren*, special issue, *Orientalia Suecana* 33–35 (1986): 355–65; reprinted in Haiim Rosén, *East and West: Selected Writings in Linguistics* (Munich: W. Fink, 1994), 2:418–28. References in what follows are to *East and West*.

⁵⁰ For example: בוס, כוסות, ארץ, ארצות, חרב, חרבות, מקום, מקומות. None of these clearly fits the pattern.

⁵¹ For example: הלום, הלומות, דור, דורות. My thanks to Dr. Yaakov Levi for his helpful comments.

⁵² These characteristics only present themselves when the nouns are not determined either by *heh* or as part of a construct chain.

- נרות, נר Singular: "light"; plural: "lamps"
- שערות, שיער Singular: "hair, a mass of hair"; plural: "individual hairs, strands of hair"
- עורות, עור Singular: "skin" or "leather"; plural: "hides"
- לשונות, לשון Singular: "speech, discourse" (except when referring to a tongue-shaped bay or to "tongues" of fire); plural: "(discrete) languages"

Does the incongruent pair קול, קולות belong to this group? The singular קול generally means "voice," or "sound"; these meanings are not discrete or countable. קול means "thunder" *only* in a grammatically determined state, namely, when it is identified as the voice of God. This is usually achieved with the construct יהוה קול, which appears in meteorological contexts (e.g., Ps 29), but also by a pronominal suffix that marks the קול as belonging to God. So while God's קול can manifest itself as (or is) thunder, the meaning of (undetermined) קול is not "thunder."⁵³ The plural קולות almost never means "sounds" or "voices," but appears in explicitly meteorological contexts meaning "peals of thunder." In Exodus, קולות is paired with ברד ("hail") five times (9:23, 28, 29, 33, 34), once with ברקים ("flashes of lightning") in the Sinai epiphany (Exod 19:16), and once in a questionable meaning to be discussed below (Exod 20:18). Elsewhere it is paired with מטר ("rain") (1 Sam 12:17, 18; Job 23:26), and only once appears in the meaning of "sounds"—in the construct state (Ps 93:4).⁵⁴ It seems, then, that the pair קול, קולות generally fits the pattern identified by Rosén: the *-ôl* ending refers to a discrete, countable plural ("peals of thunder"), while the zero-grade ending has a more abstract sense ("voice, sound"). If so, והאלהים יענו בקול does not mean "God answered [Moses] in a thunder" but "God answered him by a voice."

But now a different problem presents itself, namely, why is the vocal nature of God's speech stated? Were speech conveyed by something other than a voice, the situation would be unusual and the nonvocal medium made explicit. But there is no need to state that speech is conveyed by voice. There

⁵³ Jeremiah 10:13 may use קול in this sense, but the MT is clearly corrupt.

⁵⁴ In Ps 93:4 in the phrase מקלות מים רבים ("than the sounds of great waters"). The entire psalm describes a sea storm, and the phrase is probably the result of syllabic considerations; see Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms II: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 17; New York: Doubleday, 1968), 341–42. The phrase קול-יהוה in Ps 29 refers to thunder, but that only means that the voice of God is identified with thunder, not that קול as such means "thunder." See the similar analysis by Dozeman, *God on the Mountain*, 27 n. 19.

are countless occurrences of speech verbs (ויקרא, וידבר, ויען, ויגד, ויאמר) where the vocal medium is assumed but never stated; these verbs occur hundreds of times in the Hebrew Bible without the addition of בקול. Why does Exod 19:19b state that והאלהים יענו בקול?

In order to answer this question it is necessary to examine this statement in conjunction with the verse that textual scholarship suggests (though not with complete unanimity) was its original sequel, namely, 20:18a:⁵⁵

וכל העם רואים את הקלות ואת הלפידים ואת קול השפר ואת החר עשן

And all the people saw the *qolôt* and the flashes of lightning (לפידים) and the sound of the trumpet (*qôl haššôpâr*) and the mountain smoking. . . .

Two issues must be examined in relation to this verse. First, it is unclear what it means that the people saw the peals of thunder (קלות). Some of the translators have sought to soften this incongruity by translating רואים as “perceived” (RSV) or “witnessed” (NRSV), verbs of perception that are not sight-specific; and commentators have suggested that the verse is meant to convey “something stronger and more inclusive than ‘hearing,’ e.g., synaesthetic ‘seeing,’ or ‘witnessed and experienced.’”⁵⁶ But it is odd that such a momentous and singular experience would have as its objects the blast of a trumpet and the לפידים, which may be mere torches (see discussion below).

The second difficulty is the pairing of קלות and לפידים. There is broad consensus among modern translators that these terms are to be rendered “thunder” and “lightning,” respectively. If קלות is the correct reading, then “thunder” is appropriate, since the plural form regularly occurs in meteorological contexts, as noted above. The same cannot be said for לפידים, whose root meaning is “torches”; it does not mean “lightning,” and never appears in meteorological contexts. When employed metaphorically, it is tied to imagery of burning (e.g., Isa 62:1), while a number of verses juxtapose לפידים and lightning as distinct elements.⁵⁷ It is curious, then, that Exod 20:18a should use לפידים to signify flashes of lightning, particularly when ברקים, the regular term, appears along-

side קלות in Exod 19:16. Furthermore, there is a broad consensus among the ancient translators that לפידים means not “flashes of lightning” but “torches.”⁵⁸ Both biblical semantics and the testimony of the ancient translators suggest, then, that לפידים are not flashes of lightning but torches, in which case the context is not meteorological and it is unclear why קלות—“peals of thunder”—would be paired with לפידים. Indeed, without the meteorological context, קלות becomes a very problematic reading.

But there is an alternative. The LXX of 20:18a has καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἑώρα τὴν φωνήν (“and the whole people saw the [singular] קל and the torches etc.”). The LXX does not resolve the problematic representation of auditory phenomena that are perceived visually, so the singular קל (where MT has קלות) is not a harmonizing gloss. Quite the contrary, the singular קל is difficult since the phrase קל השפר appears later in the verse and the repetition is awkward.⁵⁹ The oddness of the singular form argues for its originality. The LXX reading also has a distinct advantage over the MT as the nonmeteorological singular קל does not foist upon the לפידים the otherwise unattested meaning “lightning.” The LXX is also the theological *lectio difficilior*—suggesting that the Israelites saw “the קל”—while the MT is on much safer ground, describing peals of thunder during the epiphany at Sinai, a fact already established in 19:16. Taken together, these arguments provide significant evidence for preferring the LXX קל to the MT קלות.

Thus far I have introduced two arguments concerning the Sinai epiphany: first, that קל in Exod 19:19b means “voice” and not “thunder,” and, second, that the LXX reading of Exod 20:18a (φωνή, קל) is preferable to the MT (קלות). These are not bold arguments. The former is comfortably within scholarly consensus. And while I know of no precedent for the superiority of קל to קלות, it is generally acceptable to prefer the LXX to the MT when the former is either the theological *lectio difficilior* or accords with biblical semantics, both of which hold in the present case. Building on these arguments, the reconstruction of the original juxtaposition of Exod 19:19b and Exod 20:18a yields:

משה דבר והאלהים יענו בקול וכל העם רואים את הקל

*Moses spoke and God answered him by a voice, and the entire people saw the voice.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ A number of scholars argue that Exod 19:19b was originally followed by Exod 20:1, the Decalogue. For a survey of the scholarship supporting Exod 20:1 as the sequel see Toeg, *Lawgiving at Sinai*, 20–21 (though he rejects this view); and Durham, *Exodus*, 269. The more widely accepted view identifies Exod 20:18 as the original sequel to 19:19b. Toeg argues for this position persuasively (*Lawgiving at Sinai*, 22, 37–38), and see the literature he cites there. Among more recent discussions, see A. Phillips, “A Fresh Look at the Sinai Pericope,” VT 34 (1984): 290; and Frank Polak, “Theophany and Mediator: The Unfolding of a Theme in the Book of Exodus,” in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction, Reception, Interpretation* (ed. Marc Vervene; BETL 126; Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1996), 136–37 and esp. n. 69.

⁵⁶ Polak, “Theophany and Mediator,” 137.

⁵⁷ Daniel 10:6 is one example, or Nah 2:5, where the chariots appear as לפידים but run like bolts of lightning (ברקים).

⁵⁸ The LXX has τὰς λαμπάδας; Onkelos has בעריות (= torches); and the Vulgate has *lampades*.

⁵⁹ The singular form is “particularly odd since this means that the phrase now occurs coordinately in the same form, once for the [qôl] and once for the sound [qôl] (of the trumpet)” (John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* [SBLSCS 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990], 315).

⁶⁰ The MT of the remainder of Exod 20:18 may reflect the conflation—perhaps as an intentional blurring—of this visible voice with other elements of the theophany, the peals of thunder and

This reconstruction, if correct, establishes the presence of a voice at Sinai. The voice was an intermediary between God and Moses and was visible to the children of Israel.⁶¹ And while on its own a reconstructed verse may not prove decisive, a similar view is articulated in Deuteronomy's description of the mountain epiphany (Deut 4:1–40), a passage in which one hypostasis—the “great fire” of Deut 4:36—has already been recognized by scholars.⁶² A second may be the subject of 4:11–12:

11 והקרבן ותעמדם תחת ההר וההר כער באש עד לב השמים חשך ענן וערפל
12 וידבר יהוה אליכם מתוך האש קול דברים אחם שמעים ותמונה אינכם ראים
וולתי קול

11. And you came near and stood at the foot of the mountain, while the mountain burned with fire to the heart of heaven, wrapped in darkness, cloud, and gloom 12. Then YHWH spoke to you out of the midst of the fire; you heard the sound of words, but you saw no form except a qôl.

The underlined phrase has been the subject of extensive discussion and, in what is by now a familiar pattern, most translators discount the possibility of a visible voice. This may be a mistake. Verse 12b is divided thematically: v. 12b α refers to the auditory experience of the theophany (“you heard the sound of words”), while v. 12b β deals with the visual, asserting that they perceived no form “except a qôl.” If we remove the last two words of the verse (וולתי קול) the

the blasts of the horn. At present, this suggestion remains speculative; I know of no compelling explanation for the MT of Exod 20:18b.

⁶¹ The existence of a visible, mediating voice may lie at the heart of a tannaitic dispute recorded in the legal midrash to Exodus, the *Mekila of Rabbi Ishmael*. Glossing Exod 20:18a (“And the entire nation saw the voices [LXX: voice]”): “They saw the visible and heard the audible—these are the words of Rabbi Ishmael. Rabbi Aqiba says, They saw the audible and heard the visible” (*Mekila of Rabbi Ishmael*, Horovitz-Rabin ed., 235, corrected according to the comments of Meir Friedmann [Ish-Shalom], *Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael with Meir Aqin Commentary* [Jerusalem: n.p., n.d. [Vienna, 1870]], 71a).

⁶² On the Deuteronomistic framework of Deuteronomy, see Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 5; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 13–15, as well as the literature cited in Ian Wilson, *Out of the Midst of the Fire: Divine Presence in Deuteronomy* (SBLDS 151; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 46 n. 3. As for the “great fire,” as scholars have recognized, the function of this fire is to mediate between God and Israel, distancing God from the site of revelation. Thus R. E. Clements writes that Deut 4:36 contains “no suggestion . . . of a descent of Yahweh in any fashion, but only of the appearance of fire and of a voice out of the fire” (*God and Temple* [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965], 90); and Jeffrey Tigay notes that Deut 4:36 “states that there was indeed something on the earth when God spoke but it was not God” (Jeffrey Tigay, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Deuteronomy* [Philadelphia/Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society, 1996], 56). On the revisionary force of Deut 4:36 (relative to, e.g., Deut 5:4), see Stephen A. Geller, *Sacred Enigmas: Literary Religion in the Hebrew Bible* (London/New York: Routledge, 1996), 30–61.

resulting phrase, “you heard the sound of words, but you saw no form,” portrays the auditory and visual aspects as an absolute contrast: the former existed, the latter did not. This contrast is not strengthened by וולתי קול; it is weakened. The Israelites perceived no form *except* a qôl, a visible voice. Here, too, the LXX supports this reading. Where the MT of Deut 4:11 states that the mountain “burned with fire to the heart of heaven, wrapped in darkness, cloud, and gloom,” the LXX adds to this list a “great voice” (ἐκαίετο πυρὶ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ σκότος γνόφος θύελλα φωνὴ μεγάλη)—a voice that descended to the mountain and then was seen by the Israelites.⁶³ Deuteronomy 4:12 echoes the view found in the reconstructed Exod 19:19b + 20:18a: the Israelites stood at the foot of the mountain and saw a hypostatic voice.⁶⁴

IV. Conclusion

The present study consists of a series of close readings that argue for the presence of a hypostatic voice in certain parts of the Hebrew Bible. The biblical passages do not easily map onto accepted source-critical models. Though the isolated and fragmentary nature of Num 7:89 obscures its provenance, the cultic context of the verse and its terminology strongly suggest that it is Priestly. Moses enters into the tabernacle, the central priestly institution of the desert years, and hears the voice from ארן העדות, a term that appears exclusively in Priestly sources,⁶⁵ in which case the mediating voice is a radical expression of P's anti-anthropomorphic views, a topic that has been much discussed in recent scholarship.⁶⁶ Exodus 19:19b + 20:18a may be the product of a Deuterono-

⁶³ The variant has not received much attention, most likely because the possibility that it expresses a meaningful theological position was discounted. Wevers writes that “[a] popular Bgloss has added φωνὴ μεγάλη at the end, but this was taken over from 5:22, where the three nouns also obtain” (John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* [SBLSCS 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995], 73).

⁶⁴ The theological connection between the theophany accounts in Exodus and Deuteronomy can be explained in source-critical terms if one assumes that Exod 19–24 underwent Deuteronomistic redaction, a position pioneered by Lothar Perlitt and recently defended by Thomas B. Dozeman (*God on the Mountain*; see 37 n. 1 and 38 n. 7 for a survey of sources on the Deuteronomistic redaction of the Sinai narrative). However, the reading offered here does not depend on this explanation. If the Exodus account of the theophany is ascribed to an earlier source, Deut 4:12 may be understood as an interpretation of Exod 19:19b + 20:18a, perhaps based on the same Hebrew text of Exodus that is reflected in the LXX. This explanation accords with the view that “[t]he oldest Jewish commentary on the Book of Exodus appears in another biblical text: the Book of Deuteronomy” (Sommer, “Revelation at Sinai,” 432 [though I consider the characterization of Deuteronomy as a Jewish commentary anachronistic]).

⁶⁵ On the Priestly terminology, see C. L. Seow, “The Designation of the Ark in Priestly Theology,” *HAR* 8 (1984): 185–98.

⁶⁶ See Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Comm-*

mistic redaction, but it may also belong to an earlier stratum that is exegetically reworked in Deut 4:12; the provenance of Deut 4 is itself a matter of debate.⁶⁷ As for Ezekiel, it is generally accepted that his theology is Priestly, though Risa Levitt-Kohn has argued that Ezekiel combines Deuteronom(ist)ic and Priestly traditions.⁶⁸ The picture is unclear, and it is difficult to attribute the hypostatic voice to a single source.

Some general conclusions are nonetheless possible. Chronologically, most of the sources discussed appear in relatively late biblical strata. Numbers 7:89 resists definite dating but scholarly consensus rules that it is not part of the earlier strata of P. Ezekiel and the Deuteronomistic sections within Deuteronomy are clearly late, and Exod 19:19b + 20:18a may be late, though this is less certain. The general lateness of the hypostatic voice is strengthened by the proliferation of such voices in Second Temple literature, including Dan 4:28.⁶⁹ In terms of the manuscript traditions, it is clear that the LXX is far more comfortable with the notion of a hypostatic voice than the MT, and it is possible that this holds true for other theologoumena. Finally, it is worth noting the important role of the Masoretic vocalization of מְדַבֵּר in Ezek 2:2 and 43:5. Both verses were examined solely on the grounds that (like Num 7:89) they contain a *hitpa'el* vocalization of מְדַבֵּר, and in both cases the superior manuscript tradition of the LXX indicated the presence of a hypostatic voice. Although the Masoretic pointing is later, in these cases it improves the consonantal text by preserving phenomena blurred or excised from the MT but present in the pre-MT *Vorlage* of the LXX.

tary (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 58–61; Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 128–36. It should be noted that the absence of a mediating voice in the P account of Sinai cannot be counted for or against the existence of a hypostatic voice in P, since Baruch Schwartz has shown that “P’s idea of the [Sinai] theophany is totally dissimilar to the theophany of E and D. . . . In P no words are spoken, no Decalogue or other such sample of divine law is proclaimed” (“The Priestly Account of the Theophany and Lawgiving at Sinai,” in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran* (ed. Michael V. Fox et al.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 125).

⁶⁷ Eckart Otto, for example, argues that Deut 4 uses—and thus is subsequent to—Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomistic History, prophets, and the Priestly Torah (“Deuteronomium 4: Die Pentateuchredaktion im Deuteronomiumsrahmen,” in *Das Deuteronomium und seine Querbeziehungen* (ed. Timo Veijola; Schriften der Finnischen Exegetischen Gesellschaft 62; Helsinki: Finnische Exegetische Gesellschaft; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 219).

⁶⁸ Risa Levitt-Kohn, “Ezekiel, the Exile, and the Torah,” *SBL 1999 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 501–26.

⁶⁹ See the discussion in Kuhn, *Offenbarungssimmen*.

APPENDIX

THE REVELATORY VOICE IN THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN

The Book of Revelation opens with a vision (Rev 1:10–12):

10 I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and I heard behind me a great voice like a trumpet 11 saying "Write what you see in a book and send it to the Seven churches . . . 12 And I turned to see the voice that was speaking with me, and on turning I saw seven golden lampstands 13 and in the middle of the lampstands one like a son of man . . . 15 and his voice sounded like the roar of rushing water . . . 16 . . . and a sharp, two-edged sword issued from his mouth. . . ."

In an article published in 1986, James Charlesworth argues that the vision described by John is one of a visible, hypostatic voice.⁷⁰ Rejecting the tendency to translate v. 12 as “I turned to see *the one* speaking to me,” Charlesworth argues that John is reporting an encounter with a visible hypostasis: “If ‘the voice’ was conceived in early Jewish thought and perhaps in early Christian circles as a heavenly being, then one can legitimately talk about seeing her, or him.”⁷¹

Interestingly, the passage in question contains a remarkable number of allusions to the biblical texts that have been examined in the present study.

1. The presence of the spirit is familiar from Ezek 2:1–2 and 43:1–6.
2. The sound of the trumpet recalls the trumpets in Exod 20:18 (“And all the people saw the voice [LXX] . . . and the sound of the trumpet”).
3. The great voice behind the speaker recalls Ezek 3:12, a passage that is very similar to the ones discussed above (“Then the Spirit lifted me up, and as the glory of the LORD arose from its place I heard behind me the sound [*qôl*] of a great noise”).⁷²
4. The vision of “one like the son of man” has been characterized as “a combination of Ezek 1:26, 9:2, 11 . . . and Dan 7:13,”⁷³ passages that contain (on my reading) explicit references to the mediating divine voice.
5. The seven lampstands allude to the seven lamps whose erection is commanded during (or immediately following) Moses’ encounter with the

⁷⁰ James H. Charlesworth, “The Jewish Roots of Christology: The Discovery of the Hypostatic Voice,” *SJT* 39 (1986): 19–41.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁷² A comparison noted by a number of commentators; see, e.g., J. Massyngberde Ford, *Revelation: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (AB 38; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975), 382.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 385.

voice in the tabernacle in Num 7:89–8:1: “And when Moses went into the Tent of Meeting to speak with Him, he heard the voice speaking to him. . . . And the LORD spoke to Moses saying, ‘Say to Aaron, When you set up the lamps, the seven lamps shall give light in front of the lampstand.’”

6. The description of the voice as rushing waters recalls Ezek 1:24 (and 43:2), discussed at length above.⁷⁴

Charlesworth concludes that “[t]he evidence is impressive, and I am persuaded that before A.D. 100 Jews . . . believed in the existence of a celestial being they called ‘the voice.’”⁷⁵

In light of the above discussion, I suggest that John of Patmos consciously alludes to key passages in Ezekiel and Daniel and to Num 7:89–8:1 in order to present himself as part of a group of prophets or visionaries that have received revelation from the “voice.” Charlesworth’s argument can be taken a step further. Not only were there Jews who believed in a celestial being called “the voice”—John of Patmos and the rabbinic author of the *Sifre Numbers*, to name two—they believed that the existence of this hypostatic voice was attested in the Hebrew Bible itself. This essay suggests that these later readers were correct. There are biblical passages that know of a hypostatic voice, and these may well be the source of the Second Temple revelatory voice and perhaps also of its contemporaries, the “vocal” hypostases Logos and Memra.

⁷⁴ The double-edged sword (ῥομφαία) issuing from the mouth of the heavenly figure may be connected to the difficult crux in the LXX of Ezek 43:2, which translates מים רבים כקול (and his *qōl* was like the *qōl* of many waters”) as καὶ φωνὴ τῆς παρεμβολῆς ὡς φωνὴ διπλασιαζόντων πολλῶν (“the sound of the camp was like the sound of many *dual sharpeners of swords*”), as though the קול issuing from the figure’s mouth were swordlike. The image of the sword in the mouth may also be (midrashically?) related to the Hebrew חרב פיפיות (Ps 149:6) and its alternate form חרב פיית (Prov 5:4). All this is clearly speculative; both the image of the sword in the figure’s mouth and the LXX of Ezek 43:2 require fuller discussion.

⁷⁵ Charlesworth, “Jewish Roots,” 37.