**A Re-Evaluation of the Aramaic and Akkadian in the book of Ezekiel**

Foreign influence on the language of the book of Ezekiel has long been noted. In the course of this discussion much attention has been devoted to the Akkadian influence on the book, due to its assumed Babylonian context.[[1]](#footnote-2) In addition, many studies have analyzed the relationship between biblical texts and the Aramaic language. However, the usage of Aramaic in the book of Ezekiel has not been comprehensively studied.[[2]](#footnote-3) In this article we will re-evaluate the Akkadian influence and examine deferent aspects of the Aramaic influence. We will suggest that while the Akkadian influence has been somewhat overstated, the important role played by Aramaic has not been comprehensively evaluated.

**1. Background**

Martti Nissinen has remarked that, “contextualizing the prophet Ezekiel would be a difficult and ultimately impossible task”.[[3]](#footnote-4) While his skepticism is warranted, he too concludes that "Babylonia is in fact the best possible setting for the book".[[4]](#footnote-5) Furthermore, *contextualizing* by its nature is not a clear cut measurable target, but rather the process of identifying the circles in which we may find Ezekiel. Therefore, a scholarly discussion must focus, among other things, on tracking these circles, to provide a framework within which to discuss the Babylonian influence on Ezekiel.

The lacunae in the research on Aramaic influence on Ezekiel can be attributed to the sparse epigraphic evidence for Aramaic in the sixth and fifth centuries BCE.[[5]](#footnote-6) This paucity contrasts sharply with the abundance of Akkadian sources, which have been extensively studied.[[6]](#footnote-7) However, textual evidence and archaeological findings indicate that it is fair to assume that from the sixth century onwards, Aramaic, the official language of the Persian Empire, acquired status and influence among the Judeans exiled to Babylon.[[7]](#footnote-8) Decades later the impact of the exiles’ Aramaic language is evident in biblical books written in Aramaic, while archaeological evidence points to the increasing use of Aramaic for administrative purposes in Judah.[[8]](#footnote-9) Within Babylonia, Aramaic increasingly spread amongst newcomers, including the Judeans,[[9]](#footnote-10) while Akkadian maintained its status, especially within the indigenous urban elite.

Given the fluctuating distribution of these languages, we are unable to accurately assess the Judean exiles’ proficiency in Aramaic and Akkadian in the sixth century specifically.[[10]](#footnote-11) However, it is reasonable to assume that the Judean exiles, like many other foreigners in Babylonia, spoke Aramaic. Additional difficulties stem from the fact that we are not able to assess the interplay between Hebrew and Aramaic, or to identify Semitic words familiar to us now from Aramaic, which may have originally existed also in Hebrew. It would be presumptuous to attempt to determine if words known to us today as Aramaic were at that time Aramaic or Hebrew. Bearing these limitations in mind, this paper discusses the distribution of Aramaic and Akkadian influences in Ezekiel by means of a detailed examination of the grammar, syntax, and vocabulary of its Aramaic words.[[11]](#footnote-12)

**2. The State of the Research**

**Aramaic Influence**

Numerous scholars have studied Aramaisms in Ezekiel. In the introduction to his commentary on Ezekiel, Walther Zimmerli surveyed the state of research up to the end of the 1960s and noted that the presence of Aramaic in Ezekiel is a relatively limited phenomenon.[[12]](#footnote-13) He noted that Emil Kautzsch’s pioneering study in 1902 identified sixteen or seventeen Aramaic words in Ezekiel, out of 153 in the Bible,[[13]](#footnote-14) and that Wagner found 371 Aramaic words in the entire Bible, twenty-eight of which appear in Ezekiel.[[14]](#footnote-15) Zimmerli accepted these findings, concluding that the distribution of Aramaic in Ezekiel is similar to that found in other prophetic books. However, in his own survey, Zimmerli, based on a distinction between Akkadian and Aramaic influence, reduced the number of Aramaic words to twenty-five.

Subsequently, in a comprehensive study of the language of Ezekiel published in 1990, Mark Rooker analyzed linguistic and syntactical influences on the language of Ezekiel.[[15]](#footnote-16) Rooker identified thirty-seven grammatical and lexical features characteristic of Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH), fifteen of which he attributed to Aramaic influence. He concluded that Aramaic influence was prevalent primarily in the Persian period. Finally, the most recent comprehensive research, by Rimon Kasher, concludes that the language of Ezekiel reflects only limited Aramaic influence.[[16]](#footnote-17)

**Akkadian Influence**

Steven Garfinkel identified sixty-eight Akkadisms in Ezekiel, which he evaluated on a five-tier scale (from possible to definite).[[17]](#footnote-18) Garfinkel categorized twenty-four words as definite Akkadisms, fourteen words as probable, and twelve as possible cases.[[18]](#footnote-19) Subsequently, Paul Mankowski identified eleven Akkadisms, three of which he considered Aramaic trans-loans. Thus, the number of what he referred to as *real loans* is eight.[[19]](#footnote-20) A comparison of Mankowski’s eleven Akkadisms (including Aramaic trans-loans), and Garfinkel’s ”definite” twenty-four cases reveals that the differences are not negligible. Four of Mankowski’s Akkadisms are not discussed by Garfinkel at all.[[20]](#footnote-21) This leaves only *six* cases upon which Garfinkel and Mankowski agree.[[21]](#footnote-22) It would thus appear to be beyond our capacity to agree upon a list of Akkadisms in Ezekiel. Therefore, despite the recent progress regarding the Babylonian cultural footprint in Ezekiel,[[22]](#footnote-23) there are many difficulties that we must bear in mind when assessing the linguistic influences on the text.[[23]](#footnote-24)

**3. Words Reflecting Pervasive Aramaic Influence**

Kasher lists twenty-five words and expressions in Ezekiel displaying Aramaic influence. His is the most thorough and accurate list of Aramaic influences to date and includes a comprehensive Aramaic lexicon showing different gradations of borrowing.[[24]](#footnote-25) Although it is not complete, previously identified words, such as בזק, בנין, מהלך, all noted in Kaddari’s dictionary, can be added.[[25]](#footnote-26) The list also includes words that should be removed because they are grammatical rather than lexical: עת"ר, צר"ב, קו"ט, חד and טע"ה.[[26]](#footnote-27) It is also important to note that in addition to this list (found in the introduction to his commentary), Kasher notes additional examples throughout his commentary, such as, סלון, פרש and קח,[[27]](#footnote-28) as well as additional words possibly borrowed from Aramaic into LBH, such as על\אל, בוץ, זע"ק, כנ"ס, מהלך, עזרה.[[28]](#footnote-29) Rooker lists nine words belonging to this category,[[29]](#footnote-30) and the two lists overlap, with the exception of the LBH words הלך and רצפה, which Rooker, unlike Kasher, identifies as Aramaic in origin.[[30]](#footnote-31)

Words found in LBH outside Ezekiel, as well as in Aramaic, include מלח, פחה, מדינה, בוץ, כתב. To these we may add additional LBH words used in an Aramaic-like manner such as מהלך and שלהבת. In all these cases it is difficult to determine whether Ezekiel was merely writing standard Hebrew, because at his time these Aramaic words had already become standard Hebrew words, or whether he was borrowing words directly from Aramaic that at his time were perhaps not yet fully integrated into the Hebrew language.

The aforementioned studies include Aramaic words that could have been borrowed from Akkadian, but we cannot determine whether they were familiar to Ezekiel directly from Akkadian, or via their Aramaic equivalents. These include: כלילה, בוץ, מלח, גלב, גלומה, סלון, דלח, פחה and even אשכר. Moreover, most of these words existed concurrently in both Aramaic and Akkadian, in which case we cannot define their origins with any certainty. These include: בוץ, גלומה, כלילה, דלח, סילון.

Words for which both Aramaic and Akkadian etymologies, with different meanings, have been suggested, with varying degrees of certainty, include: ממשח**,** מחי קבלו, ברם. An interesting group of words have known Hebrew equivalents, but are used by Ezekiel with typically Aramaic consonants or vowel patterns that differ from the Hebrew. These include: שאט, קוט\קטט, צרב, כתב, חד, טעה, עתר, סרעפת.[[31]](#footnote-32)

Finally, there are words of probable Aramaic origin with virtually no parallels in either Biblical Hebrew or Akkadian. These include:[[32]](#footnote-33) רמה, איתון, בזק, בנין, דוח, חדר, טרף ממשח, פרש, צורה, רסס,.[[33]](#footnote-34) Several of them can also be found in post-Biblical Hebrew (Qumran, Ben Sira, Mishna, Talmud): בזק, בנין, דוח, חדר, צורה, רסס.

**4. A Detailed Discussion of Thirty-One Selected Words:**

1. אֵם הַדֶּרֶךְ (21:26 [21]) has been explained as a calque from the Akkadian *ummi ḫarrāni*.[[34]](#footnote-35) Although the general sense of the passage seems clear, the exact interpretation of אם הדרך is less so.[[35]](#footnote-36) According to Garfinkel, those who understood אם הדרך to mean a “crossroad” accept an Akkadian origin and see the following words, בְּרֹאשׁ שְׁנֵי הַדְּרָכִים, as a gloss.[[36]](#footnote-37) Garfinkel, while maintaining the Akkadian influence, suggested that Ezekiel used another meaning of *ḫarrānu*, “military campaign”; thus, the king of Babylon stood at the head of a military campaign, rather than at the head of the road. While the military context of this entire passage is clear, the word דרך is attested five times in that passage alone (and a sixth time in 21:2). Garfinkel’s reading would therefore mean that Ezekiel used דרך in two different ways in the same context (and even within one sentence, אל אם הדרך בראש שני הדרכים). Moreover, regardless of its interpretation, it must be stressed that *ummi ḫarrāni* is attested neither as “head of the road” nor as “military campaign” in cuneiform sources.[[37]](#footnote-38) However, there may be an Akkadian influence in Ezekiel’s usage of אם (lit. “mother”) in אם הדרך. While it may seem intuitive, אם as “initial/beginning” is unknown in biblical Hebrew and thus Ezekiel’s אם is unparalleled. Akkadian *ummu*, however, was used in that way. In fact, this can be seen in the phrase *ummi ḫarrāni* in the sense of an initial capital (see below), that is, the capital that *begat* the business venture.
2. **איתון**[[38]](#footnote-39) < את"א (40:15) “entrance”. This hapax legomenon appears within the phrase *“sha’ar ha-iton,”* the “gate of the entrance”. It is written as “היאתון” (*ketiv*) but read as האיתון (*qere*). [[39]](#footnote-40) Although the noun יתון is not found in Aramaic, the verb אתא “to come” is used extensively. For this reason, Kasher has suggested that Ezekiel’s איתון, meaning “entrance,” derives from this verb and that this indicates Aramaic influence.[[40]](#footnote-41)
3. **בּוּץ** (27:16) “fine linen”.[[41]](#footnote-42) Whereas the common Hebrew word for “fine linen” is שש, its synonym בוץ is attested also in Esther (2), Chronicles (4), and Mishnaic Hebrew,[[42]](#footnote-43) its etymology is not clear. The word is attested in Akkadian and Later Aramaic, among other languages.[[43]](#footnote-44) In fact, the linguistic and geographical distribution of שש points to a “northern” setting.[[44]](#footnote-45) It is interesting that Ezekiel uses both בוץ (27:16) and שש (27:7) in the same context, the Tyre prophecy; the former is associated with Aram in the north while the latter with Egypt in the south. This may point to שש being a *Fremdwort*, associated with the areas north of Judah. Ultimately, however, it is difficult to determine if Ezekiel borrowed the word from either of these languages or derived it from LBH.
4. **בָּזָק** (1:14) “spark, flash of lightening”. Kaddari,[[45]](#footnote-46) suggests connecting this hapax legomenon with the Aramaic verb ברק, in the specific meaning of “to shine” (*af’el*).[[46]](#footnote-47) It is attested once in the Babylonian Talmud (Bava Metzi’a 78b) in connection with an eye that “shone” (אבזקת), as it is the Galilean Aramaic translation for the Mishnaic Hebrew הבריקה (Mishna Bava Metzi’a 6:3).[[47]](#footnote-48) As a noun בזק is not attested in any other Aramaic dialect, all of which use the word ברק instead.[[48]](#footnote-49)
5. **בנין** (40:5; 41:12,13, 15; 42:1,5,10) “structure or building” . This word is found seven times in Ezekiel in addition to the Aramaic texts, Ezra 4:5 and the *Proverbs of Aḥiqar* (בִנְיָנָא בָּנַיִן). [[49]](#footnote-50)
6. **בתק** (בִתְּקוּךְ בְּחַרְבוֹתָם) (16:40) “cut you to pieces with their swords”, from Akkadian *batāqu*, “to pierce, cut”.[[50]](#footnote-51) The word is attested neither in Biblical Hebrew nor in Aramaic, though the cognate **בדק** is attested in both.[[51]](#footnote-52) Several other verbs are regularly used in Hebrew to indicate the act of killing by the sword; e.g., **לתקוע** (e.g., Jud 3:21), **לדקור** (e.g., 1 Sam 31:4), and the more general terms: **להרוג**, **להכות**, **להמית**, and **להפיל** are used throughout.[[52]](#footnote-53) Ezekiel’s use of **בתק** thus seems to be an alternative to several other possibilities, strengthening the argument that **בתק** is an Akkadism.
7. **גְּלִוּמָה** (בגלומי) (27:24) “garment, cloak”. This hapax legomenon has close parallels in Babylonian Aramaic and Syriac, albeit with a different vocal pattern (גלימא). Note however the plural גּוּלְמָאנֵי.[[53]](#footnote-54) Aramaic influence on Ezekiel in this case is possible although a derivation from the Hebrew verb גלם “to wrap” (see 2Kings 2:8 ויגלם) should not be ruled out. The word is similar, but not morphologically identical,[[54]](#footnote-55) to the Akkadian *gulēnu* “coat” found in Neo-Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian texts and therefore the possibility that it was borrowed from Akkadian should be rejected.
8. **גֶּנֶּז** (בגנזי) (27:24) “carpet”.[[55]](#footnote-56) On the basis of its usual meaning, “treasury,” some scholars interpret its occurrence in Ezekiel as “(treasure) chest,” but this seems chronologically untenable and contextually unlikely. Kasher’s suggestion to connect it to גנזא “carpet” in Targum Esther 2, 1:3[[56]](#footnote-57) is a more promising approach. However, we must also consider its possible connection to the Akkadian túg*ka-an-zu* (CTMM 38: 1). Both the Aramaic and the Akkadian parallels remain unique occurrences at this point, and the origin of גמז is obscure.
9. **דוח** (יָדִיחוּ) (40:38) “to wash”. The verb is attested here in Ezekiel, perhaps under Aramaic influence,[[57]](#footnote-58) and later in Mishnaic and Talmudic Hebrew.[[58]](#footnote-59) Aramaic parallels are hard to find but exist in later Jewish literature from Qumran (2QEnGiants1.1) and the Targum (TgII Chron 4:6).[[59]](#footnote-60)
10. **דלח** (,וַתִּדְלַח (תִדְלָחֵם )32:2; 32:13) "to stir up, disturb". In light of, the phrase,  *ḥrb tdlḥ myn špyn,* “a sword will trouble calm waters” in the Ahiqar story, written in Imperial Aramaic[[60]](#footnote-61) and the many nominal derivates that exist in Aramaic, from Old Aramaic loanwords,[[61]](#footnote-62) Aramaic influence on Ezekiel in his usage of the verb דלח is likely. However, there would appear to be a direct link with the Akkadian verb *dalāhu,* as the latter is used specifically with respect to water and the actions of Tiamat, the Mesopotamian primordial ocean dragon, as described in *Enūma Elish*.[[62]](#footnote-63) Since both possibilities are reasonable, this is perhaps an example of our inability to reach a definitive conclusion.
11. The form **חד** instead of (and alongside) the Hebrew אחד, especially in the expressionחד את חד “one with the other” (33:30). This form appears also in Aramaic five times in the book of Daniel (2:31; 3:19; 6:3; 7:5, 16). [[63]](#footnote-64)
12. **חדר** (הַחֹדֶרֶת) (21:19) “to surround”. In this meaning, the verb is well known from Middle Hebrew and various later Aramaic dialects (חדר\הדר)[[64]](#footnote-65) which may have influenced Ezekiel.[[65]](#footnote-66)
13. **טרף** (טַרְפֵּי) (17:09) “fresh leaf”.[[66]](#footnote-67) This noun, a hapax legomenon, is related to the later Aramaic טרף, טרפא, אטרפא, אטירפא "leaf”. [[67]](#footnote-68)
14. **הטעו** (13:10) “misled”. The word is spelled with a ט instead of a ת, the standard Biblical form, only in Ezekiel. The root טעה occurs in Aramaic and postbiblical Hebrew.[[68]](#footnote-69)
15. **כְּלִילַת יֹפִי** (27:3), referring to Tyre, is usually translated as “perfect in beauty”,[[69]](#footnote-70) based on the derivation from Akkadian *kilīlu* “circlet, headband”.[[70]](#footnote-71) The phrase is not unique to Ezekiel and is attested elsewhere.[[71]](#footnote-72) Yet a learned reader might have picked up further nuances in this specific context of Ezekiel’s description of Tyre, an allusion not only to the Akkadian *kilīlu*, but also to the Aramaicכלל“to crown”. In this way, Tyre is not only perfect in beauty, it is in fact the “crown jewel”.[[72]](#footnote-73)
16. **מַהֲלַךְ** (42:4) “journey, distance”. Ezekiel’s usage of the Hebrew noun מהלך “journey” here, namely in the construct state before an expression of distance, has its closest parallels in Jonah 3:3 (מְהַלֵּ֥ךְ הֲוָֽה) and Daniel 62:4[[73]](#footnote-74) and in Aramaic, later Jewish Aramaic,[[74]](#footnote-75) and Akkadian.[[75]](#footnote-76)
17. **מְחִי קָבָלּוֹ** (26:9) is frequently mentioned as an example of Akkadisms in Ezekiel: *meḫû* (violent storm) + *qablu* (battle).[[76]](#footnote-77) The phrase מְחִי קָבָלּוֹ, however, may also be read in light of Aramaic: מחא(strike) +קבל(against).[[77]](#footnote-78) It is thus clear that both the Akkadian and the Aramaic based readings fit the context well, and there is no decisive argument in favor or against either of them. It is also possible that there was a deliberate allusion to both languages. A skillful writer, continuously exposed to both Akkadian and Aramaic, would have been able make use of the full range of his linguistic arsenal, thereby yielding a nuanced and layered text. If this is true, the effect would be somewhat similar to code switching (though, to be clear, this is not what we are suggesting here), and the result would be considered a sophisticated text.
18. **מַלָֹּח** (מַלָּחֵיהֶם 27:09; מַלָּחַיִךְ 27:27; מַלָּחִים 27:29) “mariner, seaman”. This word of Sumerian origin was borrowed into Akkadian (*mallāḫu*) and Aramaic[[78]](#footnote-79) where it is attested from Imperial Aramaic onwards. In Hebrew מַלָֹּח is used three times in Ezekiel (27) and once in Jonah (1:5). It continued to be used in Middle Hebrew[[79]](#footnote-80) as well as in the later Aramaic dialects.[[80]](#footnote-81) Whether Ezekiel borrowed the word from Aramaic[[81]](#footnote-82) or directly from Akkadian remains an open question.[[82]](#footnote-83)
19. **מִמְשַׁח** (28:14) **“**measure” is a hapax legomenon. The phrase כְּרוּב מִמְשַׁח remains obscure,[[83]](#footnote-84) notwithstanding the various interpretations that have been proposed.[[84]](#footnote-85) One possibility is a derivation from the Aramaic root משח “to measure,” hence the translation, “a cherub of extension” (i.e. with outstretched wings)[[85]](#footnote-86) or “a cherub of measure” (i.e. virtuous).[[86]](#footnote-87) Other suggestions include “anointed cherub,” “sparkling cherub,”[[87]](#footnote-88) or a loan from Akkadian, from either the verb *mašāhu* “to measure,” [[88]](#footnote-89) or the noun *mišhu*, a still poorly understood literary term referring to a luminous phenomenon in the sky.[[89]](#footnote-90)
20. **סִלּוֹן** (28:24; 2:6) “thorn”. The meaning of this word, attested only in Ezekiel, can be ascertained by its parallelism to קוץ and סרב. Similar words meaning “thorn”, all without the final *nun* in the singular (סלוא, סילוא)*,* are attested in Syriac, Mandaic and Babylonian Aramaic,[[90]](#footnote-91) indicating that Aramaic may have been the source of its occurrence in Ezekiel.[[91]](#footnote-92) It rarely occurs in Middle Hebrew[[92]](#footnote-93) and is likely not related to the Akkadian *ṣillû* “thorn”.[[93]](#footnote-94)
21. **עתר** (הַעְתַּרְתֶּם) (35:13) “to be abundant, be rich”. The *hiphil* form here and the *niphal* in Prov 27:6 (נַעְתָּרוֹת), as well as the noun עתרת meaning “abundance” in Jeremiah 33:6 (עֲתֶרֶת שָׁלוֹם) are derived from this Aramaic verb. Its Hebrew cognate עשר, [[94]](#footnote-95) fits the context here, as it is parallel to תַּגְדִּילוּ in Ezekiel (35:13) and נֶאֱמָנִים in Proverbs (111:7).[[95]](#footnote-96)
22. **פחה** פַּחוֹת וּסְגָנִים)) (23:6, 12, 23) “governor” is generally considered to be a loan from Akkadian *pīḫatu*.[[96]](#footnote-97) The word was clearly known to Hebrew speakers prior to Ezekiel; see the discussion regarding Ezekiel 23:12 below. Furthermore, it is well attested in various Imperial Aramaic dialects, including Biblical Aramaic and later Aramaic.[[97]](#footnote-98)
23. **פרש** (נפרשׁות) (34:12) “to set aside, separate”. This hapax legomenon is clearly a loanword from Aramaic where it is well-attested from Imperial Aramaic onwards [[98]](#footnote-99) , for instance in conjunction with reading, as in Nehemiah 8:8 מְפֹרָשׁ)) and Ezra 4:18 מְפָרַשׁ) קֱרִי) meaning “word by word, distinctively.”[[99]](#footnote-100) There is one attestation in Hebrew "החלה הנפרשת מן העיסה" (*Pesikta Zutarta Bamidbar* 84:1).
24. **צרב** (נִצְרְבוּ) (21:3) “to scorch”. This form has variously been interpreted as an Aramaic variant of the common Semitic root צרף “to burn, refine,”[[100]](#footnote-101) or as a variant of the Hebrew verb שרף “to burn”.[[101]](#footnote-102) In Aramaic צרב is attested only in the Targum literature.[[102]](#footnote-103) In Biblical Hebrew the root is more widely attested in its derivative nominal forms צָרָב (Prov 16:27 כְּאֵ֣שׁ צָרָֽבֶת “scorching”) and צָרֶבֶת (Lev 13: 23, 28 “scar”), so that it would seem unnecessary to assume outside Aramaic influence on Ezekiel. Moreover, the verb continued to be used in Qumran Hebrew,[[103]](#footnote-104) and the noun צרבה\צורבה “scar” occurs frequently in Mishnaic Hebrew.[[104]](#footnote-105)
25. **קוט**  (נְקֹטֹתֶם) (20:43) and **קטט** (נָקֹטּוּ 6:9; וּנְקֹטֹתֶם  36:31) “to loathe”. The verb **קוט** is a by-form of the common Hebrew קוץ “to loathe” attested here in the *niphal*, and further also in the *qal* (Ps 95:10 אָקוּט) and the *hithpael* (Ps 119: 158 אֶתְקוֹטָטָה; 139: 21 אֶתְקוֹטָט), unless the latter are derived from the variant verb קטט. It is found in Ezekiel, presumably under Aramaic influence, (thus using ט instead of צ), although it should be noted that Aramaic has קטט rather than קוט for “to loathe”. [[105]](#footnote-106) Ezekiel alternates between קוט (20:43) and קטט (36: 31; 6:9), as is the case in Job (10:1 [*niphal*]; 8:14 [*qal*]). [[106]](#footnote-107)
26. **קַח** (17:5) “stalk, shoot” or “willow-type plant”. This noun,[[107]](#footnote-108) a hapax legomenon, is well attested in the Semitic language group (e.g. Syriac קחוא) where it generally refers to a waterside plant, perhaps a kind of willow,[[108]](#footnote-109) and may therefore have existed also in Hebrew, at least at the time of Ezekiel.[[109]](#footnote-110) Otherwise, one may assume Aramaic influence, although the only cognate in Aramaic comes from Syriac, where it has the specific meaning of ‘stalk’.[[110]](#footnote-111) In Ezekiel קח occurs in connection with abundant waters and in parallel with צַפְצָפָ֖ה (17:5) and hence it is more likely to refer to a “willow-type plant” than to a “stalk” or “shoot”. [[111]](#footnote-112) Ascribing to it the meaning “meadow” or “seed-field”[[112]](#footnote-113) is contextually problematic. [[113]](#footnote-114)
27. **קרם** (קָרַמְתִּי 37:6;  וַיִּקְרַם 37:8) “to cover, form a crust/skin”. This verb, frequently attested in various later Aramaic dialects[[114]](#footnote-115) as well as in Mishnaic Hebrew,[[115]](#footnote-116) occurs also in LBH, as seen in Ezekiel (*qal* or *niphal*) as well as the later extra-Biblical Ben Sirach (43:20 [*hiphil*]).[[116]](#footnote-117) It is rightly considered by scholars to be an Aramaism in Biblical Hebrew.[[117]](#footnote-118)
28. **רבה** (*piel*). ((רבּתה (19:2) “to rear, bring up (children)”.[[118]](#footnote-119) This meaning of the verb, in the *piel*, is extremely rare in Biblical Hebrew, attested only twice -- here and in Lamentations 2:22,[[119]](#footnote-120) but is common in Aramaic from the Persian period onwards (e.g. Daniel 2: 48).[[120]](#footnote-121) Note that it is also in common usage in Akkadian.[[121]](#footnote-122)
29. **רמה** ((רָמוּתֶךָ (32:5) “to throw”. The derivation and explanation of וּמִלֵּאתִי הַגֵּאָיוֹת רָמוּתֶךָ are uncertain. Three plausible suggestions have been offered:[[122]](#footnote-123) the root רמה “to throw,” רום “to be high” and an emendation of רִמָּתֶךָ from רימה “worm”. If the word is understood to be derived from רמה “to throw” (i.e. “your thrown corpse”/“your refuse”) Aramaic influence on Ezekiel is usually assumed.[[123]](#footnote-124) In any case, behind Ezekiel’s word choice lies a sophisticated word play based on assonances between רמות and the Hebrew and Aramaic words for “height” (רום), “valley” (גאי), “pride” (גְאוֹן גַאֲוָה, Aramaic [[124]](#footnote-125)רמותא), and “worm” (רימה), converging to portray a large pile of rotting corpses being devoured by worms, cast down into the valley as punishment for Pharaoh’s pride.[[125]](#footnote-126)
30. **רסס** ((לרס (46:14) “to sprinkle, soften with water”. The root רסס with this meaning is known from later Aramaic dialects, especially Syriac, and could have been the source of Ezekiel’s word choice.[[126]](#footnote-127)
31. **שַׁלְהֶבֶת**  ((לַהֶבֶת שַׁלְהֶבֶת (21:3) “flame”. This noun is an alternate form of להבת (and להב) “flame” formed with a preformative שׁ that is characteristic of Aramaic (but found also in Akkadian and Ugaritic).[[127]](#footnote-128) The noun is also attested in Job 15: 30 (and Song of Songs 8:6 אֵשׁ שַׁלְהֶבֶתְיָה)[[128]](#footnote-129) and continued to be used in Qumran and Mishnaic Hebrew. It is common in various Aramaic dialects,[[129]](#footnote-130) and generally considered to be an Aramaism in Ezekiel.[[130]](#footnote-131)

**5. Aramaic Forms and Syntax**

Some **Hebrew** words in Ezekiel appear in a grammatical form and syntax that could be attributed to Aramaic influence. However, as several of these words also appear in other Late Biblical books such as Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther and Daniel, it is not clear if Ezekiel was following a new development within the Hebrew language or was influenced directly by Aramaic.

Rooker pointed to seven such features: (1) the increased use of the *piel* stem, for example, לקים (13:6), הלך (18:9); (2) the increased use of the proleptic pronominal suffix, for example, בבאו האיש (10:3),בקומתם כל עצי הים (31:14), and בבאם הבהנים (42:14); (3) the tendency to useל as *nota accusativi,* for example, לדרש לו (14:7); cf. 16:63, 26:3, 34:22 and 44:8; (4) the preference of the *waw conjunctivum* over the *waw consecutivum*, for example, והוליד בן (18:10) and at least thirty-two additional examples; (5) the use of the construction היה + participle, as in היו רעים (34:2) and היה עמד (43:6); (6) the placement of the amount following the measurement dimension, as in קומה קנה אחד )40:5) and compare to 40:11, 40:30; (7) the occurrence of the imperfect in an asyndetic apodosis, for example, כי...ימות (3:19); cf.3:6 and 33:2-4. These seven features are both prominent in Aramaic and characteristic of LBH. [[131]](#footnote-132)

Greenberg and Kasher identify eight **additional** morphological and syntactical features that reveal both Aramaic influence and documented LBH usage (see numbers 10-13 below), as well as cases for which no LBH parallels seem to exist (see numbers 8-9, 14-15 below).[[132]](#footnote-133) In the latter cases, Ezekiel could have been directly influenced by Aramaic.

(8) The plural form ין, found twice in Ezekiel, in חיטין “wheat” (4:9) and האין “coastlands” (26:18),[[133]](#footnote-134) has no parallel in other LBH texts.

(9) The placement of the demonstrative pronoun before the noun, הוא רשע “that wicked man” (3:18; 33, 8),[[134]](#footnote-135) has no parallel in other LBH texts.

(10) The use of the prefix מ in the *qal* infinitive, as in למשאות, “to hoist” (17:09),[[135]](#footnote-136)למשפט “to judge” (44:24) (this is the *qere*, the *ketiv* is לשפט)[[136]](#footnote-137) and כמבוא “enter” (26:10; 33:31). The form למשלוח in Esther 9:19 is a LBH parallel of the forms found in Ezekiel.[[137]](#footnote-138)

(11) The infinitive ending in וּת-: להשמעות “let hear” (24:26)[[138]](#footnote-139) and compare to Daniel 11:23: התחברות.

(12) Use of final א as *mater lectionis* or instead of final ה in feminine endings of the noun (לביא “lioness” 19:2),[[139]](#footnote-140) the verb (גבהא 31:5; 16:50) and the pronoun (אתיקיהא 41:15, *ketiv*),[[140]](#footnote-141) and in the *status determinativus* קרחא) “bald spot” 27:31 and כלא “all of” 36:5)[[141]](#footnote-142). These phenomena are chiefly, though not exclusively, found in Late and Post Biblical Hebrew.[[142]](#footnote-143)

(13) The insertion of a ר between the first two radicals of a noun.[[143]](#footnote-144) סרעפתיו “limbs” (31:5) is in itself a hapax legomenon, but the phenomenon is demonstrated in LBH words such as שרביט, used in Esther instead of the EBH שבט.[[144]](#footnote-145) Alongside the forms with inserted ר, Ezekiel also uses forms without it (31:6 and 8).

(14) תמוז, the month Tammuz, (8:14), a hapax legomenon, reflects the contemporary Aramaic form of the Akkadian *Dumuzȗ.*[[145]](#footnote-146) Due to the lack of contemporary Hebrew evidence, it is hard to determine which form this month could have adopted in Hebrew at the time Ezekiel was written, and whether this form deviated from the accepted Aramaic and post-Biblical form, תמוז. However, the existing evidence suggests that תמוז was the accepted form in both languages.

(15) The apocope of א in verbal and nominal roots ending in א. The feminine form בריה “fat” (34:20) is a variant of בריאה: בְּרִיאָה>\*בְּרִיָּה>בִּרְיָה. Note that Ezekiel uses הבריאה while preserving the א alongside the apocoped form (34:3). The apocope of the א in cases like this is typical for Mishnaic Hebrew (cf. צְבִיָה>צִבְיָה) and generally considered to be of Aramaic origin.[[146]](#footnote-147) Another example of this phenomenon is the use of מָלוּ in place of מלאו (28:16) and נָשׂוּ in place of נָשׂאו (39:26), which demonstrate “assimilation of final-*alef* verbs to the final-*hey* paradigm, a process much further advanced in Mishnaic Hebrew”.[[147]](#footnote-148)

(16) The root שוט/שאט “to despise” occurs six times in Ezekiel, always spelled with א. The plural participles in 16: 57, 28:24, and 28: 26 suggest a derivation from a root with medialו . [[148]](#footnote-149) The infinitives in 25:6, 25:15, and 36:5 suggest a derivation from a root with medial א. The verb שאט, with medial א, meaning “to despise,” has its closest parallels in Aramaic. [[149]](#footnote-150)

In light of this observation, it is possible to see that these structural influences, in addition to lexicographic influences, reinforce the perception that the foreign influence on Ezekiel stems from a deeper recognition of the language.

**6. Vocabulary in Two Topics Demonstrating Particular Influence**

Our examination of the distribution of Aramaic and Akkadian influence in Ezekiel reveals that foreign influence is found throughout the book, including chapters that contain technical descriptions; in other words, this influence is pervasive and not limited to literary aspects alone. To illustrate this conclusion, we will present two different prophetic units in which Aramaic and/or Akkadian influence is particularly notable.

1. **The Prophecy concerning Tyre (26-28)**

Previous studies have focused on Akkadian linguistic and literary influences on the prophecy concerning Tyre,[[150]](#footnote-151) as demonstrated in the discussions above concerning, מְחִי קָבָלּוֹ (26:9), כְּלִילַת (27:3), and בוּץ (27:16). Our research, however, demonstrates that a relatively substantial Aramaic influence can be detected as well, as seen in the Aramaic plural form הָאִיִּן (26:18), גְּלִוּמָה(בגלומי) (27:24), קרחא (*alef* rather than *he* suffix) and (27:31), and סִלּוֹן (28:24). In addition, in many cases, though foreign influence can be reasonably claimed, it is beyond our capacity to distinguish between Aramaic or Akkadian influence, as seen in the discussion regarding: גֶּנֶּז(בגנזי) (27:24), מִמְשַׁח (28:14), מַלָּח (27:9), אֶשְׁכָּרֵךְ (27:15). Phoenician influence in these chapters should also be considered, although given the scarcity of contemporary sources, such an evaluation is beyond our reach. We can conclude that the degree of Aramaic influence is more substantial than previously acknowledged and may very well be more significant than that of Akkadian in these chapters. Given the context and content of the Tyre prophecy, this is not surprising, especially when taking into account the patently excellent literary skills of the author; as demonstrated in the discussions on מְחִי קָבָלּוֹ (26:9), and כְּלִילַת (27:3) above, and Ezekiel 23:12, below.

The Tyre prophecy illustrates the complexity of the issue at hand. It is nearly impossible to assess the interplay between Aramaic influence, Akkadian influence, and the intentional use of Tyre-associated forms and phrases. It would be fair to conclude that the overall content and form of the prophecy reflects Ezekiel’s cultural world as well as his literary skills. Our research reveals that this prophecy contains cumulatively more Aramaic influence than other prophetic units in the book of Ezekiel.[[151]](#footnote-152)

1. **The Future Temple Plan** **(40-43)**

The vision of the architecture and construction of the future temple is conveyed in the following words and forms which can be attributed to Aramaic influence:[[152]](#footnote-153) (40:15) היאתון (הָאִיתוֹן); (40:5; 41:12, 15; 42:1, 5, 10) בִּנְיָן ; (41:15, 16; 42:3, 5) אַתִּיק; (42:4) מַהֲלַך; (43:6) הָיָה עֹמֵד אֶצְלִי ; (43:11) וְכָל צוּרֹתָו; (44:24) לְמִשְׁפָּט. With a מ prefix; (1:27; 8:2; 43:15) מ... וּלְמָעְלָה; (28:12; 43:10) תָּכְנִית.[[153]](#footnote-154)

In this case as well, these words coalesce to form a literary genre influenced by Ezekiel’s Babylonian environment. They are all found in the descriptions of the vision of the construction of the future temple. We suggest that these words reflect local influence connected to the temples in Ezekiel’s surroundings.[[154]](#footnote-155)

**7. Sources of Influence**

As we have demonstrated here, the sources of influence are complex and vague. This conclusion may be further illustrated by Ezekiel 23:12, in which we find four cases of seemingly clear Akkadisms in the description of the Assyrian officers: פַּחוֹת, סְגָנִים, קְרֹבִים, and מִכְלוֹל. The first two, פַּחוֹת (Akk. *pīḫātu*, “governor”) and סְגָנִים (Akk. *šaknu*, “governor”), often paired together, were known to contemporary Hebrew speakers and were used specifically regarding foreign officials.[[155]](#footnote-156) More interestingly, in this respect, are קְרֹבִים, from the Akkadian *qurbūtu* (bodyguard) and מִכְלוֹל from the Akkadian *maklalu* (a special garment).[[156]](#footnote-157) The specific Mesopotamian context and the fact that both קְרֹבִים and מִכְלוֹל were never used by later scribes may point towards an actual borrowing by Ezekiel. On the other hand, the distribution of both Akkadian words in cuneiform sources and the specific attribution to Assyrian officials suggest that, like פַּחוֹת and סְגָנִים, both קְרֹבִים and מִכְלוֹל had entered Hebrew during the Neo-Assyrian domination over the southern Levant in previous centuries.[[157]](#footnote-158) Thus, Ezekiel 23:12, despite four seemingly clear Akkadisms, does not indicate direct Akkadian influence on Ezekiel, but may illustrate his literary skills, his use of *Fremdwörter* and his ability to produce an accurate and nuanced text.

**8. Conclusion**

The discussions above demonstrate that the cultural and linguistic Akkadian influence on Ezekiel has been overemphasized in recent years and that we must be cautious and avoid assigning a simplistic *Babylonian* tag to each Ezekielean peculiarity.[[158]](#footnote-159) The centrality of the Late-Babylonian dialect within the major urban centers and the familiarity of the Judean intellectuals with the urban elite are consistent with the findings of this study. We have not however attempted to determine the breath of Ezekiel’s knowledge of Akkadian. Furthermore, assessment of the extent of Aramaic influence on Ezekiel has been overshadowed by the research devoted to Akkadian influence on the book. We have demonstrated that despite the sparse written evidence of Aramaic from the period, a relatively comprehensive Aramaic influence on Ezekiel’s vocabulary and grammar can be discerned throughout the book.

The complex and interwoven Aramaic and Akkadian influences in Ezekiel reflect the linguistic crossroads in which it was conceived.[[159]](#footnote-160) Moreover, investigation of the distribution of Aramaic and Akkadian influence in the book demonstrates that this is not a phenomenon limited to a particular subject matter. In many cases however, words exist in both Akkadian and Aramaic, and we lack the information necessary to determine which language influenced Ezekiel’s prophecy.
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20. *šāšar* (23:14), *ˀeškār* (27:15), *\*mallāḥ* (27:9, 27:29), and *děror* (46:17) -- a loan adoption according to Mankowski (*Akkadian Loanwords,* 168). [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. *ḥabōlātô* (18:7,12:16, 33:15), *libbatek* (16:30), and *maneh* (45:12) (Mankowski, *Akkadian Loanwords,* 169, no. 46), *nědānayīk*/\**nādan* (16:33), *sūgar* (19:9), and *ˀiššōt* (23:44) -- uncertain according to both. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. See note 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. See, for example: Charles C. Torrey, *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy*, YOSR 18 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), republished by Ktav (New York: Ktav, 1970). The quotation is from the later edition, page xxxvii. Dalit Rom-Shiloni and Corrine Carvalho, “Introduction,” in *Ezekiel in its Babylonian Context*, ed. Dalit Rom-Shiloni and Corrine Carvalho, WO 45/1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. A full discussion of some of these words can be found at the end of this paragraph. Rooker’s research is more limited in its approach than Kasher’s, focusing only on Aramaic forms used to replace EBH forms, and thus basically LBH words. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. The underlined words are discussed in further detail below. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 1:82–83. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. Ibid : סלון (p. 170), קח (p. 351) and פרש (p. 661). [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. Ibid, 1:79–82, and also LBH סביב סביב and כתב listed on page 82 among the certain Aramaic loans. Note that only עזרה is included in Avi Hurvitz, et al, *A Concise Lexicon of Late Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Innovations in the Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Leiden: Brill, 2014). [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transistion*, 179. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 1:79 and 81. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. This is in addition to word formations attributed by some to Aramaic, but which according to others may be of Hebrew origin, such as רצפה and הלך (*piel*). See also the discussion of סחור-סחור and עשתי-עשר in Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 1:82. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. רבה (*piel*) “to raise (children)” and ממשח “measure” have parallels in Akkadian by virtue of the fact that it is a Semitic language like Hebrew and Aramaic, but there is no indication of borrowing. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. These words are discussed in more length below, except for צורה, for which see Hurvitz, *A Concise Lexicon of Late Biblical Hebrew.* [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
34. Garfinkel (*Studies in Akkadian*, 45) evaluates the calque as probable, and see also, George Albert Cooke, *A* *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*,The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936), 232, and Tawil, *An Akkadian Lexical*, 23. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
35. In addition to the Akkadian *ummi ḫarrāni*, an Arabic parallel, ام الطريق, “main road”, literally identical to the Hebrew אם הדרך, has been suggested as well (Joseph Reider, “Contributions to the Scriptural Text,” *HUCA* 24 (1952): 85–106, 90–91). Biblical dictionaries translate “junction” but give no explanation (David J.A. Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* *vol. I א* (Sheffield: [Sheffield Phoenix Press](https://www.logos.com/products/search?Publisher=Sheffield%20Phoenix%20Press), 1993), 307 s.v. אם, Menahem Zevi Kaddari, *A Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew* (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2006), 49, s.v. אם. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
36. Garfinkel, *Studies in Akkadian*, 45. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
37. The phrase *ummi ḫarrāni* relates to a third meaning of *ḫarrānu*, “business venture”, in the sense of the initial capital invested in the business venture; see CAD U/W, 130, sub. *ummu* A 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
38. The LXX reads εξωθεν “exterior” (חיצון), derived from the Aramaic root את"א which means “entrance”. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
39. *HALOT* I, 44 considers the word “unexplained”. Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 36, suggests that it may mean “an entrance”. The noun recurs later in the Copper Scroll from Qumran (3QTr8:2: מיד אתון “beside the entrance” of the temple court). [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
40. Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*,2:784. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
41. Aramaic בּוּץ; see Greenberg, *Ezekiel* *21–37*, 555; Hurvitz, *A Concise Lexicon of Late Biblical Hebrew*,48. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
42. Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (London: Luzac and Co.; New York: G. P Putnam's Sons, 1903), 1:147, s.v. בוץ II; m Yoma 7:1; b Zevachim 18b; b Yoma 12b—the priestly sash, 30a, 31b -- “a sheet of fine linen”. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
43. See *HALOT* I, 115 s.v בוץ; and Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods* (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 2002), 191. For its attestations in Phoenician and Punic, see *DNWSI*, I, 185 s.v. *bṣ*. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
44. Hurvitz, *A Concise Lexicon of Late Biblical Hebrew*, 50 [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
45. Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
46. See the same meaning also in the Babylonian Talmud, ῌagigah 13b: “What is the meaning of ‘as the appearance of a flash of lightning’? […] Like the flame that goes forth from between the potsherds”. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
47. Michael Sokoloff, *Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*,195, s.v. בזק vb. See also, Josua Blau, “Über homonyme und angeblich homonyme Wurzeln,” *VT* 6/3: 97f. and Stephen A. Kaufman, et al., *The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon*, <http://cal.huc.edu>, s.v. בזק. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
48. See for example, Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic from the Byzantine Period* (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 2017)(3rd ed.), 102. Note that the Vulgate and Targum to Ezekiel 1:14 read ברק, and an emendation of the Hebrew in this vein has been proposed by *HALOT* I, 118. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
49. CAP, 5 pl. 2: זי בנה (הקיר בנוי) [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
50. Garfinkel, *Studies in Akkadian*, 56–57, Tawil, *An Akkadian Lexical*, 45, Chaim H. Cohen, *Biblical hapax legomena in the Light of Akkadian and Ugaritic* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 116. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
51. Yehezkel Kaufman, *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*, AS 19 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), 41, reads בתק as an unexpected form of בדק and sees no need to argue for an Akkadian influence. Note, however, that no verbal form of **בדק** is known. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
52. These later verbs are especially common and are in fact found in Ezekiel; e.g., **להכות** (5:2), **ליפול** (6:11-12, 11:10), **למות** (7:15), **להרוג** (23:10, 26:6), to name just a few attestations. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
53. Sokoloff, *Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*, 287–288. Note that Jewish Aramaic uses גולה for “cloak” instead of גלימא, derived from גו"ל “to roll up.” Compare to Syriac גולתא. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
54. Kaufman, *The Akkadian Influences*; Garfinkel, *Studies in Akkadian*,59 (§20). [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
55. Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 162; *DCH* 1:368 [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
56. Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 2:539. Compare to *HALOT* I, 199 s.v. גנז II [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
57. The occurrence הֱדִיחָנִי (Jer 51:34) is derived from דוח II “to reject”. See Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 180.(See, however, *HALOT* I, 216, s.v. דוח); יָדִיחַ meaning “washing” is found in Isa 4:4 as well as 2Chr 4:6. See Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 180. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
58. Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 1:284, s.v. דּוּח. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
59. *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon.* No verb דוח, דיח meaning “to wash” is registered in either Babylonian or Jewish Aramaic (see Sokoloff dictionaries). [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
60. *DNWSI*, I, 249, s.v *dlḥ*. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
61. Kaufman, et al., *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon*. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
62. Garfinkel, *Studies in Akkadian*, 65 (§ 23) [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
63. For the characteristically Aramaic expression חד את חד, see Ada Yardeni, *The Jeselsohn Collection of Aramaic Ostraca from Idumea* (University Park: Penn State Press, 2017), 631; Edward Yechezkel Kutscher, “Aramaic Calque in Hebrew,” *Tarbiz* 33 (1963–1964): 118–130 [in *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies,* ed. Edward Yechezkel Kutscher, et al. (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1977), 394–406], “Aramaic Calque,” 400 {superfluous?}; Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 275. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
64. According to *HALOT* I, 293, the verb is known in Middle Hebrew, Galilean Aramaic, Samaritan Aramaic, Syriac, Mandaic and Arabic. For the Aramaic attestations of the verb and nominal derivatives, see Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 1:427. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
65. Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 1:421; Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 296. On the basis of emendations of the Hebrew text, the assumed attestations of חדר in Job 9:9 and Sirach 50:11 (חֹדֶרֶת a sword “deeply penetrating”), contextually similar to Ezekiel 21:10 and similarly derived from the verb חדר “to surround” (*HALOT* I, 293 s.v חדר II), it has been concluded that the occurrence in Ezekiel is not a hapax legomenon. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
66. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 313: “the hapax *ṭarpe* is an Aramaism”. And appears here in the Peshitta and in the Aramaic Targum”. {not clear. Where is first quotation mark?} The root ט is the Aramaic. See הטעו below. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
67. Whether the adjective טָרָף “freshly plucked (leaf)” (Gen 8:11) is related to the noun in Ezekiel or is derived from the root טרף “to prey, tear” is a matter of dispute. See Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 313. Block, *Ezekiel*, 1:529, note 40; *HALOT* II, 380. Further note the denominative verb טרף “to bring forth leaves” attested in Christian Palestinian Aramaic and Samaritan Aramaic. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
68. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 237; Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 1:298. [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
69. See also בֹּנַיִךְ כָּלְלוּ יָפְיֵךְ (27:4), immediately following. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
70. See e.g. Tawil, *An Akkadian Lexical*, 165–66. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
71. Regarding Jerusalem: **כְּלִילַת יֹפִי** (Lam 2:15), מִכְלַל-יֹפִי  (Ps 50:2), וַיֵּצֵא לָךְ שֵׁם בַּגּוֹיִם בְּיָפְיֵךְ כִּי כָּלִיל הוּא (Ezek. 16:14), and again in Ezekiel when addressing the king of Tyre: אַתָּה חוֹתֵם תָּכְנִית מָלֵא חָכְמָה וּכְלִיל יֹפִי (Ezek. 28:12). [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
72. Winitzer (“Assyriology,” 16613) notes that the phrase “certainly hints at Akk. *kilīlu*, ‘circlet, headband, battlements’, but also seems to maintain the sense of Heb. *kālîl*”. [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
73. Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 585. *DCH*, 5:164, and *HALOT* II, 552 differ (“passage in temple buildings”(. Compare Isaiah 35:8: והיה־שם מסלול ודרך ודרך הקדש יקרא לה לא־יעברנו טמא והוא־למו הלך דרך ואוילים לא יתעו. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
74. Sokoloff, *Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*, 320, especially in targum literature. [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
75. *CAD* M1, 159 s.v. *malāku* mng. 4. Note, however, that this meaning of *malāku* is known from Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions. The early distribution and lack of a military context in Ezekiel point against a direct Akkadian influence in this case. [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
76. See Greenberg, *Ezekiel* *21–37*, 533, Victor A. Hurowitz, “Review of *Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical* *Hebrew*, by Paul V. Mankowski,” *JAOS* 122 (2002): 84–87, 137, and Winitzer “Assyriology,” 166–67, who seems to be more convinced regarding the second element of the phrase. While the combination *meḫû* *qablu* is as yet unattested in the Akkadian sources, we do find the similar, though earlier, *ina miḫê tāḫazišunu,* “in the storm of their battle” (one man could not see another) (BBSt 6 I: 33) from the time of Nebuchadnezzar I (1126–1104 BCE). [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
77. Greenberg (*Ezekiel* *21–37*, 533) also notes the Aramaic Targum, וּמְחַת **פָּגוֹזוֹהִי**, i.e. קבל = projectile. While this translation is certainly reflected in many of the modern translations, in many of which we find the “battering ram”, we are not aware of additional support for קבל = projectile. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
78. Apparently also into Phoenician. See *DNSWI* II, 632. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
79. Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 2:788. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
80. Kaufman, et al., *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon*, s.v. *mlx*, with literature. {and see literature there?} [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
81. Wagner, *Aramaismen*, 168. See also, Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 2:532; Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 618; *HALOT* II, 588; *DCH*, 5:293. [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
82. On the Araramic *versus* Akkadian question, see Stökl, “A Youth without Blemish,” 244. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
83. Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 624 (סתום). [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
84. For an overview of the various proposals, see *DCH*, 5:333. [↑](#footnote-ref-85)
85. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–*37, 583. [↑](#footnote-ref-86)
86. Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 624. [↑](#footnote-ref-87)
87. For the proposal to link the Hebrew with the putative Akkadian *nimšahu* “sparkle”, see *CAD* N1, 247, s.v. *namšahu* “(leather bag) OB” (cf. *AHw* 729a, s.v. *nemšahu, namšuhu*). [↑](#footnote-ref-88)
88. A similar root exists in Akkadian, from which are derived the verb *mašāḫu* “to measure” and the noun *mašīhu* “measurement,” but there is no nominal form with prefix m- in Akkadian. From this it can be concluded that the specific Hebrew form ממשח was not borrowed from Akkadian. Garfinkel differs. See *Studies in Akkadian*, 100 (§ 49). [↑](#footnote-ref-89)
89. *CAD* M2, 121 s.v. *mišhu* A. [↑](#footnote-ref-90)
90. Kaufman, et al., *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon*, s.v. *slw*, with literature. According to *HALOT* II, 756, s.v. סלון, is also attested in Arabic. [↑](#footnote-ref-91)
91. For a rare occurrence in Middle Hebrew, see Jastrow, *Dictionary*,979, s.v. סלון. [↑](#footnote-ref-92)
92. Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 2:979, s.v. סלון. [↑](#footnote-ref-93)
93. *CAD* Ṣ, 193, s.v. *ṣillû* A. [↑](#footnote-ref-94)
94. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37*, 71; Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 2:685; Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 843. *HALOT* II, 906 differs. [↑](#footnote-ref-95)
95. It is possible that the hapax legomenon in Ezekiel 8:11 [“And a thick cloud of incense smoke ascended”] has a related meaning -- that the cloud of incense is rich and full. [↑](#footnote-ref-96)
96. Kaufman, et al., *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon*, 82; Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 854. [↑](#footnote-ref-97)
97. *HALOT* V (*Aram. vol.*), 1955; Kaufman, et al., *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon*, with literature. [↑](#footnote-ref-98)
98. Although it also exists in the meaning of cutoff, or section, in Isaiah 7:58, and Jeremiah 16:7, it is from the Aramaic root פר"ש that means בד"ל (Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 2:661). Kasher interprets the so-called “separated” sheep in Ezekiel as “being far from town”. [↑](#footnote-ref-99)
99. *HALOT* V (*Aram. vol.*), 1959. *DNWSI*, 944 s.v. *prš*1. [↑](#footnote-ref-100)
100. *HALOT* III, 1053. [↑](#footnote-ref-101)
101. Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 924. [↑](#footnote-ref-102)
102. Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 1:412: e.g. וִיהוֹן לְצָרָבָא for the Hebrew וְהָיְתָה לְבָעֵר in *[TgJ Is6:13](http://cal.huc.edu/showachapter.php?fullcoord=5101206131)*. See also Kaufman, et al., *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon.* Note that according to the lexicon, צר(י)ב “hardened (said of eggs)” is derived from the verb צרב. However, Sokoloff, *Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*, 971 considers its etymology to be unclear. [↑](#footnote-ref-103)
103. *DCH*, 7:157. [↑](#footnote-ref-104)
104. Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 2:1299. In the passage in Ezekiel, צרב is used in correlation with לַהֶבֶת שַׁלְהֶבֶת, for which see more below, s.v.שלהבת . [↑](#footnote-ref-105)
105. Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 1:219; Block, *Ezekiel*, 1:231. [↑](#footnote-ref-106)
106. Compare to the Ugaritic which has both *qwṭ* and *qṭṭ.* (Gregorio del Olmo Lete and Joaquín Sanmartín, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition* [Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2003], 719). Note that later Hebrew has a noun קטטה but does not seem to have continued the use of the related verbs. [↑](#footnote-ref-107)
107. For a derivation from the verb לקח rather than a noun קח see Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 567f. and 942; cf. *DCH*, 7:238f. [↑](#footnote-ref-108)
108. For קוח as stalk, see Sokoloff, *Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*, 546. Garfinkel (*Studies in Akkadian*, 127) evaluates the derivation from the Akkadian *aû* ‘flax’ (*CAD*, Q, 286 s.v. *qû* A) as probable. This however should be dismissed given that flax does not grow on or in water. [↑](#footnote-ref-109)
109. It fell out of use in later Hebrew. [↑](#footnote-ref-110)
110. Kasher*, Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 1:351. Jastrow, *Dictionary*,2:1345. [↑](#footnote-ref-111)
111. Already recognized in the Babylonian Talmud (Sukkah 34a) כי קח מקביל במשמעותו לצפצפה. [↑](#footnote-ref-112)
112. *HALOT* III, 1091; Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 310. [↑](#footnote-ref-113)
113. Garfinkel, *Studies in Akkadian*, 127 (§ 67). [↑](#footnote-ref-114)
114. Sokoloff, *Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*, 1043, s.v. *קרם* and the nouns *קרמא, קירמה*. Also in Syriac and Mandaic, see *HALOT* III, 1144. [↑](#footnote-ref-115)
115. See Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 2:1421. [↑](#footnote-ref-116)
116. *DCH,* 7:325 (including examples from *Pesharim* on Ezekiel from Qumran). [↑](#footnote-ref-117)
117. Wagner *Aramaismen*, 103; *HALOT* III, 1144; Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 966 (in contrast to other suggestions of a derivation from *qarmū*). [↑](#footnote-ref-118)
118. Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 1:379. [↑](#footnote-ref-119)
119. Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 984; *HALOT* III, 1176; *DCH*, 7:395ff.; Cf. Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 1:379. [↑](#footnote-ref-120)
120. *HALOT* V (*Aram. vol.*), 1976, s.v. רבה; Sokoloff, *Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*, 1056f, s.v. רבי, pa. mng. 2, as well as several nominal derivates. [↑](#footnote-ref-121)
121. *CAD*, R, s.v. *rabû* A, 45ff. mng. 7. [↑](#footnote-ref-122)
122. Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 1:609; *HALOT* III, 1242b s.v. רָמוּת\*; *DCH*, 7:497, s.v. רָמוּת II. [↑](#footnote-ref-123)
123. Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 1010; Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 2:609; but see also *HALOT* III, 1239, s.v.רמה I, where the verb is considered common Biblical Hebrew, with reference to Ex 15:1, 12; Jer 4:29; and Ps 78:9; Cf. *DCH*, 7:494 and Aramaic language dictionaries: Sokoloff, *Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*, 1085ff, and Sokoloff, *Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*, 525, s.v. רמי “to throw”. [↑](#footnote-ref-124)
124. As pointed out by Kasher (*Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 2:609), Ezekiel’s usage of רמות “height” with its overtone of “haughtiness” is also influenced by the Aramaic, as the noun רמותא “height” can have this specific meaning. However, as is clear from Sokoloff, *Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*, 1085, this is so only in the phrase רמות רוחא (with respect to Jer. 48:29). [↑](#footnote-ref-125)
125. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–*37, 652; Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 1:609. [↑](#footnote-ref-126)
126. Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 2:897; Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 1015. [↑](#footnote-ref-127)
127. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21*–37, 418, “flame of flame” = “blazing flame”; Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 1093f. [↑](#footnote-ref-128)
128. *DCH*, 7:364, s.v. שלהבת cites, in addition to Ezekiel and Job, Song of Songs 8:6 (אֵשׁ שַׁלְהֶבֶתְיָה). In both *HALOT* IV, 1504 and Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 1094, שַׁלְהֶבֶתְיָה is listed separately. [↑](#footnote-ref-129)
129. See the etymological section in *HALOT* IV, 1504, s.v. שלהבת. [↑](#footnote-ref-130)
130. *HALOT* IV, 1504, and Kaddari, *Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew*, 1093f. There are dozens of occurrences in the Babylonian Talmud. [↑](#footnote-ref-131)
131. Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition,* 179. [↑](#footnote-ref-132)
132. Kasher, *Ezekiel: Introduction and Commentary*, 1:82, on שממה (35:12). It is possible that the form *qatala* for third-person verbs reflects an Aramaic influence, perhaps imitating the Aramaic-like feminine plural form of the type *qatala*. [↑](#footnote-ref-133)
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