THE USE OF INTERROGATIVES IN THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL AND THEIR TRANSLATION IN THE ANCIENT VERSIONS[1]

Harry van Rooy

Faculty of Theology

North-West University: Potchefstroom Campus

Potchefstroom 2520

E-mail: Herrie.VanRooy@nwu.ac.za

ABSTRACT

The Hebrew book of Ezekiel contains more than 70 questions, many of them rhetorical. The questions are introduced by interrogative particles, such as הֲ and הֲלֹא, and interrogative pronouns. There are also questions without such particles. This paper investigates the construction and use of questions in the Hebrew Ezekiel and the translation of these questions into the Septuagint, Peshitta, Targum and Vulgate. The first section of the paper deals with the construction of questions in the Hebrew Old Testament as well as in the versions. The main part of the paper discusses a few of the different kinds of questions in the Hebrew Ezekiel, and their rendering into the versions. From the examples discussed, it is clear that the Targum normally follows the Hebrew closely. The LXX and Vulgate do not have fixed patterns, but use interrogative particles in the majority of examples. The Peshitta is close to the Hebrew in factual questions, but shows a variety of translations for yes-no questions, in most instances without any interrogative particles.

INTRODUCTION

More than 70 questions appear in the Hebrew book of Ezekiel, mostly introduced by interrogative particles, such as הֲ and הֲלֹא. This paper investigates the construction and use of questions in Ezekiel and the translation of these questions into the Septuagint, Peshitta, Targum and Vulgate. In the first section of the paper, some remarks are made about the way in which questions are structured in the Hebrew Old Testament, as well as in the four versions in question. The main part of the paper contains a discussion of

---

the variant kinds of questions found in the Hebrew Ezekiel, and their rendering into the four versions. Not all questions are discussed, but only a few examples selected from the different kinds of questions and particles found in the book.

QUESTIONS IN BIBLICAL HEBREW, GREEK, LATIN, SYRIAC AND ARAMAIC

In Biblical Hebrew, two kinds of questions can be distinguished, namely factual questions and questions requiring a "yes" or "no" answer (Van der Merwe, Naude & Kroeze 2004:321). The latter may also be called polar questions (Gibson 1997:183; Waltke & O'Connor 1990:315). Although questions can be structured without particles, particles usually form part of the questions. For yes-no questions the particles הֲ and הֲלֹא are normally used (Van der Merwe, Naude & Kroeze, 2004:321-322). They can also be used for rhetorical questions, especially הֲלֹא. A double question is usually introduced by הֲ ... (וְ) אִם. These particles can also be used for indirect questions. Gesenius, Kautzsch and Cowley (1966:473) call these questions "simple" questions. They say a special use of הֲ is found when the speaker is unsure of the answer (Gesenius, Kautzsch & Cowley 1966:474). The particle can, however, also be used in questions that expect a negative answer. הֲלֹא is frequently used when a positive answer is expected (Gibson 1997:184).

A factual question can also be introduced by one of a several particles (for a detailed discussion of all the particles, cf. van der Merwe, Naude & Kroeze 2004:322-328; Waltke & O'Connor 1990:318-329). מִי ("who?") is used for personal questions and can also be used in rhetorical questions or for a wish. מָה ("what?") is used for questions about things or the state of affairs. This particle can be joined to a number of prepositions for questions introduced by interrogatives such as "why?", "how?" and "how long?" Other interrogatives such as אֵי ("which/what place?"), אַיֵּה and אֵיפֹה ("in which/what place?"), אֵיךְ and אֵיכָה ("how?"), אָן and אָנָה ("to which/what place?") are also used in Biblical Hebrew. Most of these particles are found in Ezekiel. In indirect questions, the interrogative is used without any change in sentence structure (Gibson

1997:8). Rhetorical questions are not questions asking for information, but the implied answer to the question is the information the speaker wants to convey (cf. Moshavi 2011:254-256).

Nunn (1922) has a brief discussion of the use of interrogatives in ecclesiastical Latin, comparing it to classical usage, which is different in some instances. Direct questions that may be answered positively or negatively are formed by adding *ne* to an emphatic word at the beginning of a sentence. In the Vulgate, however, there are questions without particles; the fact that they are questions is indicated by the context (Nunn 1922:97; Collins 1985:50). A question expecting a positive answer is introduced by *nonne* (cf. Collins 1985:223) and also by *an* in the Vulgate (Nunn 1922:97). If a negative answer is expected, *num* is the usual particle in Classical Latin, whereas *numquid* is used in the Vulgate (although *num* is also found in the Vulgate of the Old Testament) (Nunn 1922:97; Collins 1985:223-224). *Si* may also be used for direct and indirect questions (Nunn 1922:97; Collins 1985:224). In indirect questions, the subjunctive is frequently used. Interrogative pronouns may be used, as well as compounds, including an interrogative pronoun such as *quomodo* (Nunn 1922:97). Alternative questions are structured in such a way that the first and the second of the coordinated clauses are introduced by *utrum* and *an* respectively; or, only the second clause is introduced by *an* (Nunn 1922:98). *Quis* and *quid* are used as interrogative pronouns (Collins 1985:225). The interrogative adjectives *qui*, *quae* and *quod* are also used to phrase questions (Collins 1985:83-84).

As far as Aramaic is concerned, Dalman (1981) has an extensive discussion, spread throughout his work (cf. e.g., 1981:119-121, 208, 212, 218-220), of different particles used, but he does not treat the construction of questions as such. It is, however, interesting to note that the Hebrew interrogative particle הֲ (and הֲלֹא) does not normally occur in Aramaic. An exception is Biblical and Jewish Aramaic (only in the Targum; cf. Koehler & Baumgartner 1994:236; 2000:1857).

Muraoka (1997:21, 63) briefly discusses the interrogative particles in Syriac, but does not discuss the construction of questions. Brockelmann (1979:50) lists the interrogative pronouns used in Syriac, such as ܡܢ ("who?") and ܡܢܐ ("what?"). He

says indirect questions can follow a verb directly, but they can also be linked by ⸎⸗ (Brockelmann 1929:121-122). Indirect questions of which the answers are unsure (*Indirekte Zweifelsfragen*) can be introduced by ⸗⸎ or ⸗⸎⸗ (Brockelmann 1979:122). Nöldeke (1904:181-183) has a more complete discussion of the interrogative pronouns in Syriac. He says (1904:267) there are no formal markers for direct questions having the meaning "whether?". This statement refers to the yes-no questions mentioned above. The interrogative particles usually stand at the beginning of a sentence, but may be moved further, although not to the position after the verb (Nöldeke 1904:267-268). He has an extensive discussion of indirect questions in Syriac (1904:303-307). For "if" or "whether" in indirect questions, the particle ⸗⸎ is used when the question is related to the entire predicate. For the other particles, no clear distinction appears in the construction of indirect questions, even when ⸗ is prefixed to the particle.

Funk (1973) has a systematic discussion of questions in Hellenistic Greek. Questions are usually, but not always, introduced by interrogative particles. These particles may be interrogative pronouns or interrogative adverbs (Funk 1973:392). The word order of interrogative sentences is not fixed and such sentences follow the same basic word order as declarative sentences (Funk 1973:393). It is interesting to note the use of εἰ in direct and indirect questions. In Classical Greek, it is used in indirect questions, but it has become the normal interrogative particle, also for direct questions in Biblical Greek (Conybeare & Stock 1988:90-91). Caragounis (2004:208-216) discusses this development in detail. He thinks that in the manuscript tradition of the New Testament, εἰ was confused with ἤ (Caragounis, 2004:216). He notes that ἦ μήν occurs eleven times in Rahlf's edition of the Septuagint, and εἰ μήν nine times (Caragounis 2004:214; also notes 263 and 264). Of these nine appearances of εἰ μήν, five are found in Ezekiel (33:27; 34:8; 35:6; 36:5; and 38:19). Muraoka (2009:190) regards the use of εἰ as interrogative particle for direct and indirect questions as a usage that does not predate the Septuagint.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT INTERROGATIVE PARTICLES IN THE HEBREW BIBLE

Questions are also structured without any interrogative particles, using only intonation, as is done in many languages. In Ezekiel, a possible example is found in 20:31:

וּבִשְׂאֵ֣ת מַתְּנֹֽתֵיכֶ֡ם בְּהַעֲבִ֣יר בְּנֵיכֶם֩ בָּאֵ֨שׁ אַתֶּ֜ם נִטְמְאִ֤ים לְכָל־גִּלּֽוּלֵיכֶם֙ עַד־הַיּ֔וֹם וַאֲנִ֛י אִדָּרֵ֥שׁ לָכֶ֖ם בֵּ֣ית יִשְׂרָאֵ֑ל חַי־אָ֗נִי נְאֻם֙ אֲדֹנָ֣י יְהֹוִ֔ה אִם־אִדָּרֵ֖שׁ לָכֶֽם

> NIV: "'When you offer your gifts – the sacrifice of your children in the fire – you continue to defile yourselves with all your idols to this day. **Am I to let you inquire of me, you Israelites?** As surely as I live,' declares the Sovereign LORD, 'I will not let you inquire of me.'"

The statement before the boldface sentence and the oath following it are proof that the enclosed sentence cannot be taken as a statement that the Lord will be available to his people (cf. Zimmerli 1979:402; Block 1997:645, especially note 163; and Cooke 1970:225). An indication of an interrogative sentence may be the fronting of the personal pronoun in this instance. Below is found a discussion of a similar example from 20:3, where the Hebrew uses the particle הֲ, thus increasing the probability that the relevant sentence is indeed meant to be a question.

The LXX translates the sentence without any particle: καὶ ἐγὼ ἀποκριθῶ ὑμῖν, οἶκος τοῦ Ισραηλ. The *New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Hubler 2007:961) translates it as the following question: "And am I to answer you, O house of Israel?" This is probably done on account of the context.

In Latin, questions such as these may be structured without an interrogative particle, or with *-ne* or *num*. In this instance, the Vulgate does not have an interrogative particle, but it translates the oath correctly by using a negative particle:

> et in oblatione donorum vestrorum cum transducitis filios vestros per ignem vos polluimini in omnibus idolis vestris usque hodie et ego respondebo vobis domus Israhel vivo ego dicit Dominus Deus quia non respondebo vobis

However, the translation, "et ego respondebo vobis domus Israhel" ("and shall I

answer you, house of Israel"), indicates that the translator understood the phrase as a question and translated it into Latin to convey the meaning of the Hebrew rhetorical question, thus agreeing with the translation of the Septuagint.

The Targum also has a translation without a particle and follows the Hebrew almost verbatim:

וַאֲנָא אִשְׁתְּאֵיל לְכוֹן בְּמֵימְרִי בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל קַיָּים אֲנָא אֲמַר יוי אֱלֹהִים אִם אִשְׁתְּאֵיל לְכוֹן בְּמֵימְרִי

The Peshitta translation is fairly free, but the sense is clear so that it can be assumed that the translators also understood the text as a question:

ܐܝܟ ܐܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܡܪܐ ܡܪܘܬܐ ܠܐ ܐܬܠ ܠܟܘܢ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܕܐܫܬܐܠܘܢ ܡܢܝ ܒܝܬ ܝܣܪܝܠ ܚܝ ܐܢܐ

It may be translated as a question: "'And do you want to consult with me, house of Israel? As I live,' says the Lord of Lords, 'I will not give you a word.'"

In this instance, all the versions follow the Hebrew in not using an interrogative particle, although it is clear that the translators understood the Hebrew correctly.

FACTUAL QUESTIONS (WH- QUESTIONS)

There are not many questions with interrogative particles such as אֵי ("which place?"), אַיֵּה and אֵיפֹה ("in which place?"), אֵיךְ and אֵיכָה ("how?"), אָן and אָנָה ("to which place?") in Ezekiel. אַיֵּה is found in Ezekiel 13:12:

וְהִנֵּה נָפַל הַקִּיר הֲלוֹא יֵאָמֵר אֲלֵיכֶם אַיֵּה הַטִּיחַ אֲשֶׁר טַחְתֶּם

NIV: "When the wall collapses, will people not ask you, 'Where is the whitewash you covered it with?'"

The "where" question follows a rhetorical question. This pattern occurs frequently in the book, usually in direct speech. In instances like this, a corresponding interrogative particle is usually found in the versions:

LXX: Ποῦ ἐστιν ἡ ἀλοιφὴ ὑμῶν ἣν ἠλείψατε.

Vulgate: ubi est litura quam levistis

Peshitta: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܗܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܫܡܥܬܘܢ

Targum: אֵן שְׁיִעָא דְשַׁעתון

All four versions follow the word order and meaning of the Hebrew closely, even with respect to the use of related nouns and verbs at the end of the sentence.

An example of a question with אֵיךְ occurs in 33:10:

וְאַתָּה בֶן־אָדָם אֱמֹר אֶל־בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל כֵּן אֲמַרְתֶּם לֵאמֹר כִּי־פְשָׁעֵינוּ וְחַטֹּאתֵינוּ עָלֵינוּ וּבָם אֲנַחְנוּ נְמַקִּים וְאֵיךְ נִחְיֶה

NIV: "Son of man, say to the Israelites, 'This is what you are saying: "Our offenses and sins weigh us down, and we are wasting away because of them. How then can we live?"'"

This question can be seen as stating the despair of the people (Zimmerli 1983:187). In this instance, the versions again use a corresponding interrogative particle:

LXX: καὶ πῶς ζησόμεθα

Vulgate: quomodo ergo vivere poterimus

Peshitta: ܐܝܟܢܐ ܢܐܚܐ ܣܟ

Targum: ואיכדין נתקים

It is interesting to note that the Peshitta stands alone in translating the verb as a participle.

In 18:31, a question with לָמֶה occurs:

הַשְׁלִיכוּ מֵעֲלֵיכֶם אֶת־כָּל־פִּשְׁעֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר פְּשַׁעְתֶּם בָּם וַעֲשׂוּ לָכֶם לֵב חָדָשׁ וְרוּחַ חֲדָשָׁה וְלָמֶּה תָמֻתוּ בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל

NIV: "Rid yourselves of all the offenses you have committed, and get a new heart and a new spirit. Why will you die, people of Israel?"

This question is rhetorical and it is a clear warning to the people to choose life (cf. Zimmerli 1979:386). The LXX, Targum and Vulgate again use particles here:

LXX: καὶ ἵνα τί ἀποθνήσκετε, οἶκος Ισραηλ

ἵνα τί is used to translate the Hebrew particle לָמֶה. (Cf. Muraoka, 2009:341 for uses of this combination to indicate discontent, displeasure or incredulity.)

Vulgate: et quare moriemini domus Israhel

Targum: וּלְמָא תְמוּתוּן בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל

The Peshitta has a free rendering of the question, without an interrogative particle:

ܘܠܐ ܬܡܘܬܘܢ ܕܒܝܬ ܐܝܣܪܝܠ.

This rendering can be regarded as a final or result clause: "… so that you do not die, house of Israel". It follows the rhetorical function of the Hebrew question. Among these examples, the Peshitta translation of the question in Ezekiel 18:31 is the only translation that does not use a corresponding interrogative particle.

FACTUAL QUESTIONS (מִי – "WHO?" AND מֶה – "WHAT?")

Questions about persons ("who?") occur only three times in Ezekiel, using the particle מִי. A typical example is found in 31:2:

בֶּן־אָדָם אֱמֹר אֶל־פַּרְעֹה מֶלֶךְ־מִצְרַיִם וְאֶל־הֲמוֹנוֹ אֶל־מִי דָּמִיתָ בְגָדְלֶךָ

NIV: "Son of man, say to Pharaoh, king of Egypt, and to his hordes: 'Who can be compared with you in majesty?'"

The versions typically use the corresponding particle. This holds true for מִי, as in the example above, and for מֶה in the next example.

LXX: Τίνι ὡμοίωσας σεαυτὸν ἐν τῷ ὕψει σου

Vulgate: cui similis factus es in magnitudine tua

Peshitta: ܠܡܢ ܕܡܝܬ ܒܪܘܡܟ

Targum: לְמַן דְּמֵיתָא בְּתֻקְפָּךְ

The same pattern is followed for questions that use the particle מֶה ("what?"). A typical example occurs in 12:22:

בֶּן־אָדָם מֶה־הַמָּשָׁל הַזֶּה לָכֶם עַל־אַדְמַת יִשְׂרָאֵל

NIV: "Son of man, what is this proverb you have in the land of Israel...?"

LXX: Υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου, τίς ὑμῖν ἡ παραβολὴ αὕτη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦ Ισραηλ

Vulgate: fili hominis quod est proverbium istud vobis in terra Israhel

Peshitta: ܒܪܢܫܐ ܡܢܐ ܗܘ ܡܬܠܐ ܗܢܐ ܕܡܬܡܬܠܝܢ ܠܟܘܢ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܕܐܝܣܪܝܠ

Targum: בַּר אָדָם מָא מַתְלָא הָדֵין לְכוֹן עַל אַרְעָא דְיִשְׂרָאֵל

The versions do not experience any problems with these kinds of questions, as they use the corresponding particles and apply them according to the normal style of their respective languages. Examples are the declensions of the interrogative pronouns in Greek and Latin.

YES-NO QUESTIONS

A greater variety occurs in those questions where a "yes" or "no" answer is expected. All the versions do not have particles corresponding to the Hebrew הֲ or הֲלֹא; thus, they have to find different ways to render these kinds of questions into their respective languages. A typical example of a question with הֲ occurs in 20:3:

בֶּן־אָדָם דַּבֵּר אֶת־זִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם כֹּה אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִֹה הֲלִדְרֹשׁ אֹתִי אַתֶּם בָּאִים
חַי־אָנִי אִם־אִדָּרֵשׁ לָכֶם נְאֻם אֲדֹנָי יְהוֶה

> NIV: "Son of man, speak to the elders of Israel and say to them, 'This is what
> the Sovereign LORD says: "Have you come to inquire of me? As surely as I live,
> I will not let you inquire of me," declares the Sovereign LORD.'"

This example is typical of rhetorical questions in Ezekiel. In this case, a positive answer is expected. Questions like this one frequently occur to introduce a message from the Lord to the people (or the elders in this case). Three of the versions use interrogative particles:

> LXX: Εἰ ἐπερωτῆσαί με ὑμεῖς ἔρχεσθε

Here the LXX uses the particle εἰ with the indicative to express the question. This is not a construction found in Classical Greek, as has been shown above. It is also found in the New Testament and may probably be regarded as a Hebraism (Blass, De Brunner & Funk, 1974:226).

> Vulgate: num ad interrogandum me vos venistis

The particle *num* in Latin usually indicates that a negative answer is expected. In this case, the Hebrew expects a positive answer and the Latin does not. In Latin, *-ne* is

neutral as far as the answer expected is concerned, while *nonne* indicates that a positive answer is expected, as indicated above.

Targum: הלמתבע אולפן מן קדמי אתן אתן

The Targum uses the same particle as the Hebrew. The particle is not used in non-Biblical Aramaic, so that its usage here can be regarded as a Hebraism.

Peshitta: ܠܕܡܠܐܠܗܝ ܐܠܢ ܐܢܬܘ

The Peshitta does not use a particle, but the context makes a question probable.

There are instances where a question with הֲ is followed by an indirect question in the Hebrew Ezekiel, as in 8:6:

וַיֹּ֣אמֶר אֵלַ֗י בֶּן־אָדָם֙ הֲרֹאֶ֣ה אַתָּ֔ה מָ֣ה הֵ֖ם עֹשִׂ֑ים תּוֹעֵב֨וֹת גְּדֹל֜וֹת אֲשֶׁ֥ר בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵ֣ל ׀ עֹשִׂ֣ים
פֹּ֗ה לְרָֽחֳקָה֙ מֵעַ֣ל מִקְדָּשִׁ֔י וְעוֹד֙ תָּשׁ֣וּב תִּרְאֶ֔ה תּוֹעֵב֖וֹת גְּדֹלֽוֹת

> NIV: And he said to me, "Son of man, do you see what they are doing—the utterly detestable things the Israelites are doing here, things that will drive me far from my sanctuary? But you will see things that are even more detestable."

The main question expects the positive answer that the prophet is indeed seeing what the people are doing.

The Targum follows the Hebrew closely, using the same interrogative particle for the main question as the Hebrew:

ואמר לי בר אדם החזי את מא דאינון עבדין

The LXX does not use a particle for the main question and uses τί for the indirect question: καὶ εἶπε πρὸς με Υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου, ἑόρακας τί οὗτοι ποιοῦσιν.

The same kind of construction is used by the Peshitta (ܗܟܢ ܥܒܕܝܢ ܠܝ ܘܐܡܪ (ܚܕܝܢ).

The Vulgate uses the particle *-ne* for the main question and *quid* for the indirect question. The particle *-ne* usually leaves the answer to the question open: "et dixit ad me fili hominis putasne vides tu quid isti faciant abominationes magnas quas domus Israhel facit hic".

What is interesting in this translation is the use of *putas* with *vides*, making the question almost hypothetical: "Do you suppose you see...?"

In 8:17, a second direct question follows the first one, both introduced by הֲ:

וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי֙ הֲרָאִ֣יתָ בֶן־אָדָם֒ הֲנָקֵל֙ לְבֵ֣ית יְהוּדָ֔ה מֵעֲשֹׂ֖ות אֶת־הַתֹּועֵבֹ֑ות אֲשֶׁ֥ר עָשֹׂו־פֹ֖ה

NIV: He said to me, "Have you seen this, son of man? Is it a trivial matter for the people of Judah to do the detestable things they are doing here?"

This example is discussed by Moshavi (2011:255) as one of the questions where a positive rhetorical question expects a positive answer, different from the usual pattern.

The Targum follows the Hebrew in the double use of the interrogative particle:

ואמר לי החזיתא בר אדם הזעיר לבית יהודה מלמעבד ית כל תועבתא

LXX: καὶ εἶπε πρός με Ἑόρακας, υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου; μὴ μικρὰ τῷ οἴκῳ Ιουδα τοῦ ποιεῖν τὰς ἀνομίας, ἃς πεποιήκασιν ὧδε

The first question is without a particle, while the second one begins with μὴ. This construction is used, as in Classical Greek, to indicate a negative answer is expected (Blass, Debrunner & Funk 1974:220).

The Vulgate has a free rendering of the Hebrew, making the first question a statement, and the second an indirect question: "et dixit ad me certe vidisti fili hominis numquid leve est hoc domui Iuda" ("And He said to me: 'You certainly saw, son of man, how insignificant this is for the house of Judah ...'").

Interestingly, the Peshitta does the same as the Vulgate, just without a qualifier like *certe*: ܘܐܡܪ ܠܝ ܚܙܐ ܐܢܬ ܒܪܢܫܐ ܘܠܡܐ ܙܥܘܪܐ ܗܝ, ܠܒܝܬܐ ܕܝܗܘܕܐ

A typical example of a question with הֲלֹוא expecting a positive answer is found in 13:7:

הֲלֹ֤וא מַֽחֲזֵה־שָׁוְא֙ חֲזִיתֶ֔ם וּמִקְסַ֥ם כָּזָ֖ב אֲמַרְתֶּ֑ם

NIV: "Have you not seen false visions and uttered lying divinations...?"

The Targum follows the Hebrew:

הֲלָ֣א נְבוּאָן דִשְׁקַר אִתְנַבֵּיתוּן וּקְסַם כַּדְבִין אֲמַרְתוּן

In this instance, the LXX uses the particle οὐ, expecting a positive answer: οὐχ ὅρασιν ψευδῆ ἑοράκατε καὶ μαντείας ματαίας εἰρήκατε.

The Vulgate uses *numquid*, which is usually the interrogative for a question that expects a negative answer: "numquid non visionem cassam vidistis et divinationem mendacem locuti estis".

The Peshitta does not use a particle: ܘܐܘ ܗܘܐ ܚܙܘܬܐ ܣܪܝܩܬܐ ܕܚܠܬܐ ܩܣܡܐ ܡܟܕܒܐ

A similar example can be found in 21:5 (MT):

וָאֹמַ֗ר אֲהָהּ֙ אֲדֹנָ֣י יְהוִ֔ה הֵ֚מָּה אֹמְרִ֣ים לִ֔י הֲלֹ֛א מְמַשֵּׁ֥ל מְשָׁלִ֖ים הֽוּא

NIV: Then I said, "Sovereign LORD, they are saying of me, 'Isn't he just telling parables?'"

The LXX uses οὐ to invite a positive answer: Οὐχὶ παραβολή ἐστι λεγομένη αὕτη.

The Vulgate uses the same construction as in the previous example: "numquid non per parabolas loquitur iste".

The Targum follows the Hebrew closely:

הלא ממתיל מתלין הוא

The Peshitta does not use a particle: ܠܬܠܐ ܠܡܬܠܐ ܗܘ

In 12:9, a question introduced by הֲלֹ֖א is followed by a second direct question introduced by מֶה:

בֶּן־אָדָ֕ם הֲלֹ֨א אָמְר֤וּ אֵלֶ֙יךָ֙ בֵּ֣ית יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל בֵּ֖ית הַמֶּ֑רִי מָ֥ה אַתָּ֖ה עֹשֶֽׂה

NIV: "Son of man, did not the Israelites, that rebellious people, ask you, 'What are you doing?'"

Both these questions follow the normal pattern of these two kinds of questions.

The LXX also uses a normal pattern, with the first question beginning with οὐκ and the second with τί: Υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου, οὐκ εἶπαν πρὸς σὲ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ Ισραηλ οἶκος ὁ παραπικραίνων Τί σὺ ποιεῖς.

The same pattern is used by the Vulgate: "fili hominis numquid non dixerunt ad te domus Israhel domus exasperans quid tu facis". If *numquid* is used when a negative answer is expected, *numquid non* indicates a positive answer is expected: "This is what Israel did."

The Targum follows the Hebrew closely again:

בַּר אָדָם הֲלָא אִם יֵימְרוּן לָךְ בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל עַמָּא סָרְבָנָא מָא אַת עָבֵיד

The only difference is the addition of אִם after the הֲלָא. The addition may be an attempt to emphasise the positive response that is expected to the first question.

The Peshitta also uses an interrogative particle before each question, using the particle ܐܰ for the first question: ܟܢܫܐ ܐܰ ܐܢܬܘܢ ܠܡ ܐܝܠ ܐܝܬܘ ܟܐܠܐ

ܐܒܝܕ ܓܒܪ ܐܝܟ ܐܝܠܝܢ ܢܣܘܬܐ

A question introduced by הֲלֹא can also be followed by an indirect question, as in וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלַי הָעָם הֲלֹא־תַגִּיד לָנוּ מָה־אֵלֶּה לָּנוּ :24:19

NIV: Then the people asked me, "Won't you tell us what these things have to do with us?"

LXX: καὶ εἶπε πρὸς με ὁ λαός Οὐκ ἀναγγελεῖς ἡμῖν τί ἐστι ταῦτα, ἃ σὺ ποιεῖς

The use of the two particles (Οὐκ and τί) fits into the patterns discussed above.

The Vulgate changes the first question from a yes-no question to a "why" question: "et dixit ad me populus quare non indicas nobis quid ista significent quae tu facis".

The Peshitta retains the negative particle at the beginning of the first question. The context makes it clear that the first sentence must be regarded as a question.

ܐܢܬ ܕ ܓܒܪ ܗܠܝܢ ܠܡ ܦܠ ܢ ܗܘ ܠܐ ܬܚܘܐ ܠܐ ܗܠܐ ܠ ܥܡܐ ܠܝ ܐܡܪܘ

The Targum again follows the Hebrew closely:

ואמרו לי עמא הלא תחוי בר לנא מא אלין לנא דאת עביד

In 18:23 and 25, examples of two questions occur, the first one introduced by הֲ and the second by הֲלֹא. The example in verse 23 will be discussed first:

הֶחָפֹץ אֶחְפֹּץ מוֹת רָשָׁע נְאֻם אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה הֲלוֹא בְּשׁוּבוֹ מִדְּרָכָיו וְחָיָה

NIV: "'Do I take any pleasure in the death of the wicked?' declares the Sovereign LORD. 'Rather, am I not pleased when they turn from their ways and live?'"

Two possibilities are stated in this verse, with the first one expecting a negative answer and the second an affirmative answer.

The Targum follows the Hebrew closely:

הֲמִרְעָא רְעֵינָא מוֹתֵיהּ דְרַשִׁיעָא אָמַר יוי אֱלֹהִים הֲלָא כַד יְתוּב מֵאוֹרְחֵיהּ וְיִתְקַיֵים

LXX: μὴ θελήσει θελήσω τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἀνόμου, λέγει κύριος, ὡς τὸ ἀποστρέψαι αὐτὸν ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς πονηρᾶς καὶ ζῆν αὐτόν

"'By my will do I actually will the death of the lawless one,' says the Lord, 'rather than for him to run back from his wicked way and live'" (Hubler, 2007:959).

For the first question μὴ is used, indicating a negative response. The second question is translated by a comparative clause that follows ὡς.

The Vulgate uses *numquid* for the first question, expecting a negative answer. The second question is linked to the first one with *et non*. This is a good but freer rendering of the Hebrew: "numquid voluntatis meae est mors impii dicit Dominus Deus et non ut convertatur a viis suis et vivat."

The Peshitta renders the two rhetorical questions by statements, reflecting the expected answers to the two questions:

ܠܐ ܓ̈ܝܪ ܨܒܐ ܐܢܐ ܒܡܘܬܗ ܕܪܫܝܥܐ ܐܡ̇ܪ ܡ̇ܪܝܐ ܐܠܐ ܐܠܐ ܕܢܬܦܢܐ ܡܢ ܐܘܪܚܗ ܒܝܫܬܐ ܘܢܚܐ

Ezekiel 18:25 reads as follows:

וַאֲמַרְתֶּם לֹא יִתָּכֵן דֶּרֶךְ אֲדֹנָי שִׁמְעוּ־נָא בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל הֲדַרְכִּי לֹא יִתָּכֵן הֲלֹא דַרְכֵיכֶם לֹא יִתָּכֵנוּ

NIV: "Yet you say, 'The way of the Lord is not just.' Hear, you Israelites: Is my way unjust? Is it not your ways that are unjust?"

This is a very interesting example, also as far as the versions are concerned. The LXX uses the particles μὴ and οὐ, viz. μὴ for הֲ and οὐ for הֲלֹא. In the first question, both the Greek and Hebrew expect a negative reply ("No, the Lord's ways are not wrong!"), and both expect an affirmative answer to the second question ("Indeed, the ways of the people are wrong!").

LXX: καὶ εἴπατε Οὐ κατευθύνει ἡ ὁδὸς κυρίου. ἀκούσατε δή, οἶκος Ισραηλ· μὴ ἡ ὁδός μου οὐ κατευθύνει; οὐχὶ ἡ ὁδὸς ὑμῶν οὐ κατευθύνει

In this instance, the Targum is very interesting, not so much for the translation of the question, but because of the theological problem posed by the first part of the verse. The Hebrew states a challenge of the people that the ways of the Lord are not just. This was too harsh for the translator of the Targum (cf. van Rooy, 2013:17):

וַאֲמַרתוּן לָא מְפַרְשָן לַנָא אוֹרחָת טוּבָא דָיוֹי שְמַעוּ כְעַן בֵית יִשׂרָאֵל הַאוֹרחָת טוּבִי לָא
מְפַרשָן לְכוֹן הֲלָא אוֹרחָתכוֹן דִי לְכוֹן לָא תָקְנָן:

The statement at the beginning is changed to read that the people said, "The good ways of the Lord were not explained to us." The first question is then also changed, as far as the content is concerned, to follow this statement. In both questions, the Targum follows the construction of the Hebrew.

The Vulgate transforms the two questions into one: "et dixistis non est aequa via Domini audite domus Israhel numquid via mea non est aequa et non magis viae vestrae pravae sunt". The first question begins with *numquid*, expecting a negative answer. The second question is incorporated and begins with *non magis*: "Is it not rather the case that your ways are crooked" (a good translation of the Hebrew). The first part of the combined question implies a negative answer and the second a positive one, in agreement with the Hebrew.

The Peshitta does not use questions at all, but transforms the rhetorical questions into statements:

ܘܐܡܪܬܘܢ ܠܐ ܬܩܢ ܐܘܪܚܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ ܫܡܥܘ ܡܟܝܠ ܕܒܝܬ ܐܝܣܪܝܠ
ܐܘܪܚܝ ܗܝ ܕܠܐ ܬܩܝܢܐ ܗܝ ܐܠܐ ܐܘܪܚܬܟܘܢ ܐܢܝܢ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܬܩ̈ܢܢ ܐܠܐ
ܬܩ̈ܢܢ

("Israel, my ways, Israel, are good, but your ways are not good.")

In the examples discussed in this group of questions, the Targum follows the Hebrew very closely, using the corresponding particles in most instances. Of the nine examples the Targum has the corresponding particles seven times. In 12:9, the Targum has הֲלָא אִם, as opposed to the הֲלֹא of the Hebrew. This may be an attempt to emphasise the positive response expected to the first question. As discussed above, the Targum does not follow its normal practice in 18:25, where the first question is rendered by a statement. The Targum probably reflects a theological problem by the first question,

and thus the change into something acceptable.

The LXX does not always follow a fixed pattern, but uses interrogative particles in most instances. It is fairly consistent in its rendering of הֲלֹא, using οὐ in 13:7, 21:5, 12:9, 24:19 and 18:25. In the second question in 18:23, הֲלֹא is rendered by a comparative clause. For indirect questions, it uses τί, as in 8:6 and 24:19, as well as for a direct question following a yes-no question, as in 12:9.

Further, the LXX has different renderings for הֲ. It does not use a particle in 8:6; in 20:3 it uses εἰ; and in 8:17, it does not use a particle for the first הֲ, but it uses μὴ for the second. In the double question in 18:23 and 25, it uses μὴ for the הֲ at the beginning.

Although the Vulgate is more consistent than the LXX, it also does not always follow the same pattern. It uses *num* for הֲ in 20:3 and 8:6. For the two double questions in 18:23 and 25, it uses *numquid* in both verses for the first question with הֲ, and *et non* and *non magis* for the two second questions introduced by הֲלֹא. Both in 8:6 and 24:19, it uses *quid* for the indirect question that follows the first question; also for the direct question in 12:9. In 18:7, it renders the first question as a statement and changes the second question into an indirect question with *numquid*. It uses *numquid* for הֲלֹא in 13:7, 21:5 and 12:9. In 24:19, it changes a yes-no question into a "why" question. It seems as if good Latin style plays an important role in the rendering of the different questions within different contexts.

In many instances of הֲ and הֲלֹא, the Peshitta is the only version not using interrogative particles. Verses in the Peshitta in which particles do not occur are 20:3, 8:6, 13:7 and 21:5. In several of these examples, the Peshitta changes a rhetorical question into a statement, as in 13:7. In 12:9, it uses the particle ܐܘ. As indicated below, this particle is also used in the double question in 22:14. In 24:19, a particle is not used, but the context makes it clear that a question is implied. The two double questions in 18:23 and 25 are transformed into statements. In 8:17, it is close to the Vulgate in not rendering the first particle and changing the second into an indirect question by ܕܠܡܐ. It uses ܡܢ for indirect questions in 8:6, 12:9 and 24:19.

DOUBLE QUESTIONS WITH הֲ AND אִם

There is only one double question with הֲ and אִם in Ezekiel, viz. in 22:14:

הֲיַעֲמֹד לִבֵּךְ אִם־תֶּחֱזַקְנָה יָדַיִךְ לַיָּמִים אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה אוֹתָךְ

> NIV: "Will your courage endure or your hands be strong in the day I deal with you?"

The Targum follows the Hebrew again as far as the construction is concerned:

הֲיִתְקַף לִבִּיךְ אִם יִתְחַסְנָן יְדָךְ לְיוֹמַיָא דַאֲנָא עָתִיד לְמַעֲבַד עִמִיךְ

Although it is not related to the question as such, the translation of עָתִיד לְמַעֲבַד for the Hebrew participle is very interesting, showing insight into the syntax of the Hebrew participle.

The Vulgate uses *numquid* (expecting a negative answer) as the introductory participle and links the first and second questions with *aut*: "numquid sustinebit cor tuum aut praevalebunt manus tuae in diebus quos ego faciam tibi".

The LXX uses the particle εἰ to introduce both questions: εἰ ὑποστήσεται ἡ καρδία σου; εἰ κρατήσουσιν αἱ χεῖρές σου ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις, αἷς ἐγὼ ποιῶ ἐν σοί.

The Peshitta goes in the same direction, only adding "and" to the second ܐܢ: ܐܢ
ܐܢ ܗܟܢ ܠܥܐܬܐ ܡܣܬܥܪ ܐܢ ܘܐܢ ܠܒܟ ܗܘܩܡ

CONCLUSION

From the examples discussed, it is clear that the Targum normally follows the Hebrew closely. The LXX and Vulgate do not have fixed patterns, but use interrogative particles in the majority of examples. The Peshitta is close to the Hebrew in factual questions, but shows a variety of translations for yes-no questions, and in the majority of instances, does not use any interrogative particles.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blass, F, de Brunner, A & Funk, R W 1974. *A Greek grammar of the New Testament and other*

early Christian literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Block, D I 1997. *The book of Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Caragounis, C C 2004. *The development of Greek and the New Testament.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 167. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Conybeare, F C & Stoch, St G 1988. *Grammar of Septuagint Greek*. Peabody: Hendrickson.

Cooke, G A 1970. *The book of Ezekiel*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: Clark.

Dalman, G 1981. *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinisceh Aramäisch*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Funk, R W 1973. *A beginning-intermediate grammar of Hellenistic Greek II*: *Syntax*. Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study, 2. Missoula: Scholars Press

Gesenius, W, Kautzsch, E & Cowley, A E 1966. *Gesenius Hebrew grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gibson, J C L 1997. *Davidson's introductory Hebrew grammar: syntax*. 4th ed. Edinburgh: Clark.

Hubler, J N 2007. Iezekiel, in Pietersma 2007:946-985.

Koehler, L & Baumgartner, W 1994. *The Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament, I*. Leiden: Brill.

_____ 2000. *The Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament, V*. Leiden: Brill.

Moshavi, A 2011. Can a positive rhetorical question have a positive answer in the Bible? *Journal of Semitic Studies* 56/2:253-273.

Muraoka, T 1997. *Classical Syriac*. Porta linguarum orientalium. Neue Serie, 19. Wiesbaden: Harrasswitz.

_____ 2009. *A Greek-English lexicon of the Septuagint*. Louvain: Peeters.

Nöldeke, T 1904. *A compendious Syriac grammar*. London: Williams & Norgate.

Nunn, H P V 1922. *An introduction to Ecclesiastical Latin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pietersma, A (ed.) 2007. *A new English translation of the Septuagint and the other Greek translations traditionally included under that title.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van der Merwe, C J H, Naude, J A & Kroeze, J H 2004. *A Biblical Hebrew reference grammar*. Biblical languages: Hebrew, 3. Sheffield: Academic Press.

Van Rooy, H F 2013. Reading Ezekiel 18 with the ancient versions. *Journal for Semitics* 22/1:5-20.

Waltke, B K & O'Connor, M 1990. *An introduction to Biblical Hebrew syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Zimmerli, W 1979. *Ezekiel 1*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress.

_____ 1983. *Ezekiel 2*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress.