

THE INTERPRETATION OF ISRAEL'S PAST HISTORY IN THE BOOK OF
EZEKIEL AS IS EXEMPLIFIED IN CHAPTERS 16, 20, AND 23.

SRI WISMOADY WAHONO

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

1974



ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate SRI WISMOADY WAHONO.

Address

Degree DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY. Date JULY 31ST, 1974.

Title of Thesis THE INTERPRETATION OF ISRAEL'S PAST HISTORY IN THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL
AS IS EXEMPLIFIED IN CHAPTERS 16, 20, AND 23.

The present study seeks to examine how Ezekiel interprets the past history of the people of Israel as he presents it in chapters 16, 20, and 23, of the book which bears his name. What is involved in the examination is primarily the question of how Ezekiel uses the older traditions in those three chapters. To achieve this purpose, the literary-critical method, which has dominated the studies of Ezekiel since the last decades of last century, and the form-critical method, are not enough. This is so, since the problem posed above is concerned with the history of traditions, especially of those which are used by Ezekiel in his interpretation of his people's past history. Therefore, another critical method is urgently needed; and this is the so called traditio-historical method. All of this means that the acceptance of the traditio-historical method cannot be regarded as the rejection of the literary-critical method. Instead, the traditio-historical method must be regarded as an additional tool and should be used together with the other critical methods.

By using the traditio-historical method, it is now possible to examine Ezek. 16, 20, and 23, in a broader context. This context comprises not only the organic relation between Ezekiel and the book which bears his name, but also their organic relations with the prophetic movement, with other prophetic books, and with the Israelite traditions in general.

The examination of Ezek. 16, 20, and 23 reveals that Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history is found chiefly in Ezek. 16:1-43; 20:1-31; and 23:1-20. And the examination of these three big sections reveals that, on the one hand, Ezekiel depends on the older traditions, and on the other, he uses those older traditions in his own way and for his own purpose. In Ezek. 16:1-43 Ezekiel stands chiefly in the David-Zion traditions, in Ezek. 20:1-31 chiefly in the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions, and in Ezek. 23:1-20 in both the David-Zion traditions and the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions. Apart from the fact that these two streams of traditions, i.e., the David-Zion traditions and the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions, are very central in the life of Israel as the people of Yahweh, they have become both the basic tradition-materials and the frame of reference for the course of Ezekiel's interpretation of his people's past history.

In spite of all this, the examination of the three sections specified above has shown that Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history is unique. This is so, inter alia, (a) no other prophet or Israelite traditionist has ever used since, the metaphor of husband-wife relationship in so an extensive way and for so a radical purpose as Ezekiel (chapters 16 and 23); (b) no other prophet or Israelite traditionist has ever used those two streams of tradition in their reverse meaning and purpose (chapters 16, 20, and 23); (c) no other prophet or Israelite traditionist has ever employed stereotyped formulas and structures in his speech in so an extensive way as Ezekiel (chapter 20); (d) the paratactical juxtapositions of short sentences which make up lengthy descriptions in chapters 16, 20, and 23, are very characteristic of Ezekiel.

(Continued over)

Coupled with the fact that Ezekiel is a genuine insider in the Israelite traditions in that he is both a prophet and a priest, all of these findings lead to the conclusion that : (a) the uniqueness and the radicality of Ezekiel's interpretation of his people's past history lie in his own constant stress on the darker side of that history and in his extravagant elaborations of the tradition-elements which serve his purpose; (b) Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history has very much been influenced by his understanding of the current situation of the people, and in many cases he reads this situation back to the past history of the people; (c) historico-critically, this reading back might be inaccurate, but traditio-historically it is not without basis. This is so, since (1) Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history is only one of many interpretations given by the Israelite traditionists, and (2) the two streams of tradition which Ezekiel uses in his interpretation are living streams of tradition, which, on the one hand, are still in the process of all-Israelitization, and on the other, are subject to any review.

In the context of the ministry of Ezekiel, his interpretation of Israel's past history has shown that, a genuine traditionist as he really is, Ezekiel has been able to understand and to review critically both his people's past history and his people's traditions, and to use them to be the vehicle of the message he is commissioned to deliver.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It gives me great pleasure to record my gratitude and indebtedness, especially to The Rev. Prof. G. W. Anderson, M.A., D.D., Tool. D., F.B.A., who has been so kind and so patient in supervising my study. Without his unfailing and scholarly supervision, the study would never ^{have} come to its present result, although the defects and the blemishes of the present thesis are entirely my own responsibility.

My sincere gratefulness goes also to the Scholarships Offices of The World Council of Churches, The British Council of Churches, and The Council of Churches in Indonesia, whose scholarships programmes have enabled me to come to Edinburgh and pursue my studies for the period of three full years. I also acknowledge my gratitude and indebtedness to Canon A. I. M. Haggart, M.A., LL.D., the Principal of the Episcopal Theological College in Edinburgh, and his Staff, who have helped me to pursue the ecumenical aspect of the scholarships, and have also given me their unfailing help and counsel. My sincere thanks go also to the Board of Mission of The Netherlands Reformed Church in Oegstgeest for their generous help.

My wife, Jektirumentah, who has helped type the draft of the present thesis, deserves special mention.

Finally, I dedicate the present study to the memory of my beloved father, Rev. B. Wahono, who had inscribed Ezek. 2:3a on

the threshold of the Church which he built, and who died unexpectedly while I was writing the present thesis.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgements	iii
Summary	vi
List of Abbreviations.	x
INTRODUCTION	xiii
CHAPTER	
I. A SHORT SURVEY OF EZEKIEL STUDIES	1
II. TRADITIO-HISTORICAL METHOD AND THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL	42
A. The Need of Another Critical Method	42
B. The Debate on the Nature of the Traditio- Historical Method	50
C. On the Book of Ezekiel	70
Preliminary Remarks	81
III. EZEKIEL 20	86
IV. EZEKIEL 16	218
V. EZEKIEL 23	279
VI. CONCLUSION	372
BIBLIOGRAPHY	399

SUMMARY

The present study seeks to examine how Ezekiel interprets the past history of the people of Israel as he presents it in chapters 16, 20, and 23, of the book which bears his name. What is involved in the examination is primarily the question of how Ezekiel uses the older traditions in those three chapters. To achieve this purpose, the literary-critical method, which has dominated the studies of Ezekiel since the last decades of last century, and the form-critical method, are not enough. This is so, since the problem posed above is concerned with the history of traditions, especially of those which are used by Ezekiel in his interpretation of his people's past history. Therefore, another critical method is urgently needed; and this is the so called traditio-historical method. All of this means that the acceptance of the traditio-historical method cannot be regarded as the rejection of the literary-critical method. Instead, the traditio-historical method must be regarded as an additional tool and should be used together with the other critical methods.

By using the traditio-historical method, it is now possible to examine Ezek. 16, 20, and 23, in a broader context. This context comprises not only the organic relation between Ezekiel and the book which bears his name, but also their organic relations with the prophetic movement, with other prophetic books, and with the Israelite traditions in general.

The examination of Ezek. 16, 20, and 23 reveals that Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history is found chiefly in Ezek. 16:1-43; 20:1-31; and 23:1-20. And the examination of these three big sections reveals that, on the one hand, Ezekiel depends on the older traditions, and on the other, he uses those older traditions in his own way and for his own purpose.

In Ezek. 16:1-43 Ezekiel stands chiefly in the David-Zion traditions, in Ezek. 20:1-31 chiefly in the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions, and in Ezek. 23:1-20 in both the David-Zion traditions and the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions. Apart from the fact that these two streams of traditions, i.e., the David-Zion traditions and the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions, are very central in the life of Israel as the people of Yahweh, they have become both the basic tradition-materials and the frame of reference for the course of Ezekiel's interpretation of his people's past history.

In spite of all this, the examination of the three sections specified above has shown that Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history is unique. This is so, since, inter alia, (a) no other prophet or Israelite traditionist has ever used the metaphor of husband-wife relationship in so an extensive way and for so a radical purpose as Ezekiel (chapters 16 and 23); (b) no other prophet or Israelite traditionist has ever used those two streams of tradition in their reverse meaning and purpose (chapters 16, 20, and 23); (c) no other prophet or

Israelite traditionist has ever employed stereotyped formulas and structures in his speech in so an extensive way as Ezekiel (chapter 20); (d) the paratactical juxtapositions of short sentences which make up lengthy descriptions in chapters 16, 20, and 23, are very characteristic of Ezekiel.

Coupled with the fact that Ezekiel is a genuine insider in the Israelite traditions in that he is both a prophet and a priest, all of these findings lead to the conclusion that : (a) the uniqueness and the radicality of Ezekiel's interpretation of his people's past history lie in his own constant stress on the darker side of that history and in his extravagant elaborations of the tradition-elements which serve his purpose; (b) Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history has very much been influenced by his understanding of the current situation of the people, and in many cases he reads this situation back to the past history of the people; (c) historico-critically, this reading back might be inaccurate, but traditio-historically it is not without basis. This is so, since (1) Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history is only one of many interpretations given by the Israelite traditionists, and (2) the two streams of tradition which Ezekiel uses in his interpretation are living streams of tradition, which, on the one hand, are still in the process of all-Israelization, and on the other, are subject to any review.

In the context of the ministry of Ezekiel, his interpretation

of Israel's past history has shown that, a genuine traditionalist as he really is, Ezekiel has been able to understand and to review critically both his people's past history and his people's traditions, and to use them to be the vehicle of the message he is commissioned to deliver.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- A.T.D. Das Alte Testament Deutsch, Göttingen.
- A.T.A.N.T. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Zürich.
- B.A. The Biblical Archeologist, Connecticut.
- BDB. F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Oxford, 1906.
- BHS. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.
- E.J.R.L. Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester.
- B.K. Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament, Neukirchen.
- B.S. Biblisches Studien, Neukirchen.
- B.W.A.T. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament, ed. by R. Kittel, Leipzig.
- B.Z.A.W. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, ed. by G. Fohrer, Giessen-Berlin.
- C.B.Q. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, Washington D. C.
- C.Q.R. The Church Quarterly Review, London.
- ET. English Translation.
- F.R.L.A.N.T. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, ed. by E. Käsemann and E. Wirthwein, Göttingen.
- G-K. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, ed. by E. Kautzsch, (ET. by A. E. Cowley), second edition, Oxford, 1910 (latest reprinting 1966).
- H.A.T. Handbuch zum Alten Testament, ed. by O. Eissfeldt, Tübingen.
- H.K. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, ed. by W. Nowack, Göttingen.
- H.Th.R. The Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge (Mass.).

- I.B. The Interpreter's Bible, Vols. I-XII, ed. by G. A. Buttrick, et al., New York - Nashville, 1952.
- I.C.C. The International Critical Commentary, Edinburgh.
- I.D.B. The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vols. I-IV, ed. by G. A. Buttrick, et al., New York - Nashville, 1962.
- J.B.L. The Journal of Biblical Literature, Philadelphia.
- J.P.O.S. The Journal of the Palestine Oriental Study, Jerusalem.
- J.T.C. The Journal for Theology and the Church, New York.
- J.T.S. The Journal of Theological Studies, Oxford.
- K.A.T. Kommentar zum Alten Testament, ed. by E. Sellin, Leipzig - Erlangen.
- K.H.C. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament, ed. by K. Marti, Tübingen - Leipzig.
- Kurz.H.A.F. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament, Leipzig.
- Lisowsky G. Lisowsky, Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament, zweite Auflage, Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, 1958.
- MT. The Massoretic Text.
- M.F. Manuals of Fellowship, ed. by A. E. Bradfield and G. A. E. Cornforth, London.
- O.T.L. The Old Testament Library, London.
- O.T.M.S. The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. by H. H. Rowley, Oxford, 1951 (latest reprinting 1967).
- S.A.T. Die Schriften des Alten Testaments in Auswahl übersetzt und erklärt, by H. Gunkel, et al., Göttingen.
- S.B.L. The Society of Biblical Literature.
- S.B.T. Studies in Biblical Theology, London.

- T.B. Theologische Bucherei, München.
- T.L.Z. Theologische Literaturzeitung, Leipzig - Berlin.
- Th.R. Theologische Rundschau, Tübingen.
- T.W. Theologische Wissenschaft, ed. by C. Andresen,
et al., Stuttgart.
- T.W.A.T. Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament,
Band I, ed. by G. J. Bottenweck and H. Ringgren,
Stuttgart, 1973.
- U.U.^o Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, Uppsala.
- V.T. Vetus Testamentum, Leiden.
- V.T.Supp. Vetus Testamentum Supplement, Leiden.
- W.M.A.N.T. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und
Neuen Testament, Neukirchen.
- Z.A.W. Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,
Giessen - Berlin.
- Z.D.M.G. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen
Gesellschaft, Leipzig.
- Z.Th.K. Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, Tübingen.

INTRODUCTION

In reading the Old Testament, one finds that, on the one hand, there are themes which are mentioned again and again in more than one book, and on the other, each of the books, with its own characteristics and purpose, seems to have its own way of using and connecting those themes with each other and/or with other themes. This can be seen as for example, in that the theme of exodus is used so extensively in the Book of Exodus, whereas it is only briefly referred to in the Books of Hosea (Hos. 11:1), and Amos (Am. 9:7). The theme is found again in a poem, or part of a poem, in Pss. 78:12-16; 105:23-42; 106:6-12; and in a different context in Neh. 9:9ff.. The theme of Davidic kingship is not only found in the Deuteronomistic historical books, but also in Pss. 2, 110, 132, and others. In the prophetic books, a similar example can be seen in that the metaphor of husband-wife relationship for the relationship between Yahweh and the people of Israel is found in Hos. 1-3; Isa. 1:21; Jer. 2:2ff.; 3:1ff.; Ezek. 16, 23. In all of these references, the metaphor is used in different ways, in different elaborations, and, undoubtedly, for different purposes.

These examples can, of course, be multiplied by mentioning how different books treat similar themes in different ways and

for different purposes.¹ But what has been mentioned above seems sufficient to show that despite the possibility of regarding each of the books of the Old Testament as being distinctive, nevertheless there are elements which connect them with each other. It is true that very often this connection is difficult to trace and that sometimes it is only an indirect one, nevertheless it must be admitted that it does exist.

Such a connection is seen not so much in the final form of the books as in their contents. In other words, the question which arises here is not primarily concerned with the connection between the poetic form of, say, the Psalter and the prosaic form of, say, the Book of Exodus. Rather, it is concerned primarily with the connection between the exodus theme, e.g., in Ps. 78: 12-16 and that in the Book of Exodus or elsewhere. As far as the theme of exodus is concerned, the connection between Ps. 78:12-16 and the Book of Exodus can be described in terms of the history of their common theme. Thus, a study of the theme would be able to reveal how the theme developed and how

¹ See, e.g., C. R. North, The Old Testament Interpretation of History, London, 1946; J. W. Miller, Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels : sprachlich und theologisch untersucht, Neukirchen-Kreis, Moers, 1955; J. Vollmer, Geschichtliche Rückblicke und Motive in der Prophetie des Amos, Hosea und Jeremia, (B.Z.A.W. 119), Berlin, 1971.

different books use it in different ways and for different purposes.

The present study is concerned with the Book of Ezekiel and, more specifically, Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history as is exemplified in chapters 20, 16, and 23. What is meant by 'Israel's past history' is not only the events which happened in Israel before the time of Ezekiel, but, more important than that, also the traditions which arose from them. The events might have happened once and for all, but the traditions about them, or the interpretations of them, can be passed on from one generation to another. In other words, the events might be unrepeatable, but the interpretations of those events go on from generation to generation. As far as Israel's past history is concerned, it is with such an interpretation as is found in Ezek. 20, 16, and 23, that the present study is concerned. To be specific, the present study seeks to examine how Ezekiel interprets the past history of his people as he presents it in those three chapters mentioned above. For this purpose, those three chapters will be thoroughly examined.

However, as far as Ezekiel as a living prophet is concerned, it must be admitted that before and after his time there were some interpretations of that past history which were given by both prophets and other Israelite traditionists. With regard to this, it must be said that there must be a connection or

connections between Ezekiel's interpretation and those of the other prophets and other Israelite traditionists. Due to the fact that each of Israelite prophets and traditionists has his own characteristics, the best way to find out this connection is by examining the tradition-materials and/or the themes which are common in all, and/or unique in each, of those interpretations.

What is involved in this examination is the task of finding out what are the similarities and the differences between those interpretations and how those similarities and differences are to be understood. In terms of Ezek. 20, 16, and 23, this examination involves the task of finding out (a) what are the similarities and the differences between Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history and those of both his contemporary and his predecessors, and (b) how are the similarities and the differences to be understood from the side of Ezekiel. In other words, what is involved in the examination is the history and the development of the tradition-materials as they are found in Ezek. 20, 16, and 23. And the questions are, inter alia : How much Ezekiel's interpretation bears the marks of the older interpretations or older tradition-materials? How does Ezekiel use those tradition-materials? How much his interpretation bears his own characteristics?

In this connection, the Book of Ezekiel as a whole cannot be left untouched. Like any other prophetic book, the Book of Ezekiel has its own characteristics and uniquenesses. Without exaggeration, it is natural to understand these characteristics

and uniquenesses as coming or originating from the prophet Ezekiel himself. After all, it is this prophet himself who has given rise to the existence of the book which bears his name.

With regard to all of this, it is certainly part of the task of the present study to find out the characteristics and the uniquenesses of the Book of Ezekiel. This is so, since the characteristics and the uniquenesses of Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history in chapters 20, 16, and 23, are integral parts of the sum total of the characteristics and uniquenesses which have made his book distinctive.

Speaking about the characteristics and the uniquenesses of both Ezekiel and the book which bears his name will inevitably involve speaking about the relationship between Ezekiel as a prophet and the book which bears his name. The problem of the relationship between Ezekiel and the book has, either directly or indirectly, been dealt with by many scholars since the closing decades of last century. Apart from the fact that the results of their investigations are varied, it can be said that these scholars for the most part used the literary-critical method. Despite the fact that this critical method is very useful for an understanding of the literary problems of the Book of Ezekiel, it must be admitted that it has only a limited scope. This is so, since there are still many problems the solutions of which lie beyond the scope of this method. One of the most important problems concerning the Book of Ezekiel and/or the prophetic books in general, is the problem of prophetic traditions.

This problem is concerned not only with the relationship of a prophet and the book which bears his name, but also with their relationship or connection with other prophets and other prophetic books and, more widely, with the Israelite traditions as a whole. In other words, as far as the prophetic books are concerned, the problem of the prophetic traditions is concerned with the history of the traditions which are used and created by the prophet involved. In the case of Ezekiel and the book which bears his name, the problem is concerned with the history of the traditions which Ezekiel uses and creates. In this connection, and due to the fact that the relationship cannot be understood simply as being dominated by the so called written tradition, it does not seem appropriate to talk about the authenticity and/or otherwise of a prophetic book. Instead, it seems more appropriate to talk about the origin and/or the development of the traditions found in that particular prophetic book. And for this purpose a critical method other than those already devised, especially the literary critical method, is needed. This method is the traditio-historical method.

So, with regard to all of this, the present study will consist of six chapters. In the first chapter a survey of the studies of the Book of Ezekiel will be carried out, the purpose of which is to see, on the one hand, how the studies develop, and on the other, what problems are still left unanswered. The second chapter will deal with the traditio-historical method, the

debate on it, and the general results of its application to the Book of Ezekiel. Chapters three, four, and five, which constitute the main part of the present study, will deal with Ezek. 20, 16, and 23, respectively. These three chapters will be preceded by short preliminary remarks in which both the meaning of the title of the present study and the order of examination of the three chapters of the Book of Ezekiel, are explained. In each of these three chapters the investigation will proceed in two stages : first, an attempt to determine which section of the chapter of the book dealt with there is relevant for the examination of Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history; second, an examination of the relevant section by the use of all critical methods, especially the traditio-historical method, the purpose of which is to describe how Ezekiel uses the older traditions of Israel in his interpretation of the people's past history, and how he creates a new interpretation of that past history. Finally, the conclusions drawn from the whole study are given in the sixth chapter.

CHAPTER I

A SHORT SURVEY OF EZEKIEL STUDIES

The main problems concerning the Book of Ezekiel are three-fold, i.e., (a) the composition and/or the unity of the book, (b) the place or the places in which Ezekiel carried out his ministry, and (c) the chronology or the datings in the book. In order to have an idea about these three problems, a brief outline of each one of them is given below. First, the problem of the composition and/or the unity of the book. This problem is concerned with the fact that the book presents many kinds of interests, ranging from prophetic oracles, priestly language, legal matters, etc., to ecstatic and/or mystical personality and apocalyptic outlook. In addition, the book shows some literary features which seem to presuppose the work of more than one hand. The doublets (e.g., 3:16-21 and 33:1-9; 1 and 10:8-17; 18:21-29 and 33:10-20; cf. the double dating in 1:1-3), the inclusion of the prophecies of promise in the prophecies of disaster in many passages within chapters 1-24, and the fact that chapters 40-48 sound more apocalyptic than prophetic proper (also chapters 38-39), all of this suggests that the Book of Ezekiel is composite. Nevertheless, the orderly arrangement of the book in terms of subject matters, the course of thoughts, and the chronological datings found in it, suggests that the book is a unity. The question which arises out of all of these facts is this : Is the book really a unity or composite?

Second, the problem of the place or the places in which Ezekiel

carried out his ministry. The book as it now stands shows that, on the one hand, Ezekiel carried out his ministry in Babylonia (1:1-3; 8:3; 33:21; etc.), while on the other, most of his prophecies were addressed to the people in Palestine/Jerusalem, and suggests that Ezekiel was himself in Palestine/Jerusalem. The questions which arise in this connection are these : Where did Ezekiel carry out his ministry? In Babylonia, or in Palestine/Jerusalem, or in both Babylonia and Palestine/Jerusalem? Or, still more radically, did Ezekiel really exist at all? Was he not only a fictive literary creation? Third, the problem of the chronology is concerned with two things, i.e., the datings given in the book and the period at which Ezekiel carried out his ministry or lived. (a) The datings are found fourteen or fifteen times, i.e., in 1:1, 2; 3:16; 8:1; 20:1; 24:1; 26:1; 29:1, 17; 30:20; 31:1; 32:1, 17; 33:21; and 40:1. With the exception of those found in 1:2; 33:21; and 40:1 } all of these datings do not have clear indications of events from which they are counted. And out of all of them, the most debated one is that which is found in 1:1, i.e., 'the thirtieth year'. The question here is this : What does the date refer to? Further, despite the fact that all of these datings are arranged in a comparatively good chronological sequence, it is not clear whether or not each of them dates all the prophecies or the oracles which follow it. (b) The answer of the question of the datings can no doubt be a great help to solve the problem of the period at which Ezekiel carried out his ministry. The questions here are these : When did Ezekiel carry out his ministry? Is it before, or after, the fall of Jerusalem? Or, is it before and after the fall of Jerusalem?

The answers to these questions will undoubtedly determine and/or be determined by the answer to the question of the place where Ezekiel carried out his ministry mentioned above.

The present survey is not meant to have a look at how these three problems have been dealt with by scholars throughout the decades. Rather, by using those three problems as a kind of frame of reference, it will have a look at the works of scholars, beginning in the end of the last century until now. The purpose of the survey is, therefore, to try to make notes, as brief and clear as possible, on the development of the studies of the Book of Ezekiel from the end of last century until its recent stage. At the end of the survey, a brief statement will be made of the position or opinion concerning the three problems which is adopted in the present study. At the same time, the brief statement will serve as the basis for the carrying out of the present study.

Until the end of the last century, the problem of the unity of the Book of Ezekiel occupied most of the scholars' discussions, and the widely accepted opinion then was the conservative one. This can be seen, e.g., in the works of R. Smend¹ and S.R. Driver,² who

¹R. Smend, Der Prophet Ezechiel, Leipzig, 1880, pp. xiiif., xxi.

²S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, Edinburgh, 1891 (9th ed. 1913), pp. 278ff.

are of the opinion that the book with its systematic arrangement is the work of the prophet-priest himself, and that Ezekiel was among the first exiles to Babylonia in 597 B.C. and witnessed the second exiles of Judah in 587 B.C. The wide acceptance of the conservative opinion, however, does not mean that there was not any other opinion at all. That there was other opinion is clear from the fact that (a) there was an unknown writer in The Monthly Magazine and British Register¹ who is of the opinion that the author of Ezek. 1-24 is not Ezekiel but Daniel, because, inter alia, the geographical references in them could only be given by a writer such as Daniel who knew the places very well (Dan. 2:48; cf. Ezek. 28:3), and (b) L. Zunz attributed the Book of Ezekiel to the Sopherim of the post-exilic period, or more precisely to 440-400 B.C.,² because, inter alia, the language of the book shows a great deal of resemblance to that of the works of the Persian period, and some of the things and persons referred to in it, e.g., Eden, Noah, Daniel, and Job (14:12ff.; 28:3, 13), were not known before this period.

At the beginning of this century R. Kraetzschmar published his epoch-making commentary on the Book of Ezekiel³ in which he

¹The article is 'Concerning the Author of Some Poems Ascribed to Ezechiel', The Monthly Magazine and British Register, Vol. V, Part I, 1798, pp. 189-190.

²L. Zunz, 'Bibelkritisches. II. Ezechiel', Z.D.M.G. 27, 1873, pp. 676-681, 688; idem, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, Frankfurt a. M., 1892, pp. 179f..

³R. Kraetzschmar, Das Buch Ezechiel, (H.A.P. III.3.1), Göttingen, 1900.

37

presented his distinctive opinion. Kraetzschmar recognized that there are some doublets, or parallel passages, in the Book of Ezekiel. Then, in distinction from both Zunz and the alleged unknown writer, he proposed a theory that out of the original material of Ezekiel two independent recensions had risen which were later put together by a redactor to form the present book. Kraetzschmar said that the first recension used the first person, and that it was longer than the second which used the third person.¹ Kraetzschmar's two--recension theory reminds one of what Josephus said about Ezekiel. Josephus said that Ezekiel wrote two books.² However, it is not clear which 'two books' were meant by Josephus since he did not give any explanation at all. Some six years after the publication, Kraetzschmar's theory was slightly modified by K. Budde. Budde³ was of the opinion that initially the book was compiled by Ezekiel himself. But this original book then underwent several editions which were later worked over together with the aim of producing a unified and standard text-form. The book as it now stands, with its doublets and parallel passages, is the result of the working over. However, a year before the modification of Budde, G. Jahn had already denied Kraetzschmar's theory. Jahn⁴ argued that the literary problems

¹Ibid., p. XIII.

²Josephus, Antiquities X, v, 1.

³K. Budde, Geschichte der althebräischen Litteratur, Leipzig, 1906.

⁴G. Jahn, Das Buch Ezechiel auf Grund der LXX hergestellt, übersetzt und textkritisch erklärt, Leipzig, 1905.

of the Book of Ezekiel were the result of the work of later scribes. These scribes had written in the margin of the original Book of Ezekiel revised versions of many passages which adapted the prophetic message to actualize them. Then still later copyists had inserted these marginal versions into the original text. The Book as it now stands is the mixing up of the original text and those marginal versions.

Another rejection of Kraetzschmar's two-recension theory came from J. Herrmann. Herrmann¹ argued that there were some original, individual, and independent speeches of Ezekiel which were collected and put together by the prophet himself. It was also the prophet himself who from time to time made alterations, modifications, and corrections, of his collected speeches. In other words, Herrmann was of the opinion that all the literary difficulties found in the Book of Ezekiel are due to the prophet's own remodellings of his original speeches. In addition, Herrmann admitted the existence of some very minor additions to the book from a later redactional hand.

Despite all these differing theories and opinions, attack and counter-attack by one scholar against the others, until 1924 the general opinions concerning the problem of the composition of the Book of Ezekiel remained conservative as that of Smend and Driver, namely that the Book of Ezekiel as it now stands is the original

¹J. Herrmann, Ezechiel übersetzt und erklärt, (K.A.T. XI), Leipzig, 1924. Cf. his Ezechielstudien, Leipzig, 1908, especially pp. 4ff..

work of the prophet himself who was exiled to Babylon in 597 B.C., as can be seen, e.g., in the commentaries by W. F. Lofthouse,¹ H. A. Redpath,² A. B. Davidson, and A.W. Streane.³ However, with all these opinions of the scholars, both the conservative and the radical, it can be said that the three problems of the Book of Ezekiel were still far from being settled. This is clear from the fact that although those opinions and theories were really attempts to give solutions to some aspects of the problems, they also gave rise to new questions.

One of the questions which since 1924 have urgently called for discussion is how much of the Book of Ezekiel is an authentic record of the prophet's own words. Apart from the fact that this question was a challenge against the traditional view of the relation between the prophet Ezekiel and the book which bears his name, it has in its turn given rise to some theories about who Ezekiel was. The first attempt to answer the question to be noted is that of Hölscher.⁴

¹W.F. Lofthouse, Ezekiel, (The Century Bible), Edinburgh, 1907.

²H. A. Redpath, The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, (The Westminster Commentary), London, 1907.

³A. W. Streane revised the work of A. B. Davidson, The Book of The Prophet Ezekiel, (The Cambridge Bible for School and Colleges), Cambridge, 1892 (reprinted in 1893, 1896, 1900, 1906). The revision was carried out in 1916, but there is no major change of Davidson's opinion which can be noted as important.

⁴G. Hölscher, Hesekiel, Der Dichter und Das Buch, (B.Z.A.W. 39), Giessen, 1924.

Like Kraetzschmar, Budde, and Jahn, Hölscher recognized that there are two worlds existing side by side in the present Book of Ezekiel, i.e., the genuine Ezekielian world and the secondary world of later redactor(s). According to Hölscher the Book of Ezekiel as it now stands is chiefly the result of the work of later redactor(s) who belonged to the Deuteronomic school. Although it is true that the redactor used the original work of Ezekiel as the basis of his work, the Book of Ezekiel as it now stands is derived from the 5th century B.C., and therefore it is a pseudepigraph. Ezekiel himself, who was deported to Babylonia in 597 B.C., was a poet-prophet, and his original, or authentic, work was chiefly in poetic form. With his theory of 'poet-prophet' Hölscher found that out of the present Book of Ezekiel there are only about 170 verses which are genuine, or authentic, while the bulk of the rest of it is from the redactor(s), or unauthentic.¹ Almost all of those 170 authentic verses are in poetic form.² The second attempt to be noted here is that of Kessler,³ which was presented only two years after that of Hölscher,

¹ Apart from the fact that the proportion of the verses which Hölscher regards as authentic is very small, it is actually not clear what is the exact number of them. According to J. B. Harford, Hölscher's handling leaves to Ezekiel himself only about 143 verses out of 1272 verses of the present Book of Ezekiel (J. B. Harford, Studies in the Book of Ezekiel, Cambridge, 1935, p. 14). The number adopted in the present study is that of Cooke. See G. A. Cooke's review of Hölscher's Hesekiel, Der Dichter und Das Buch in J.T.S. 27, 1926, pp. 201ff..

² Cf. Irwin's remark: 'Not so well recognized ... is the fact that Hölscher admitted the existence of original prose as well. It is false ... to hold that he made poetic form the touchstone of genuineness. But in the end this consideration seems to have weighed heavily with him' (W. A. Irwin, The Problem of Ezekiel, An Inductive Study, Chicago, 1943, p. 11).

³ H. Kessler, Die innere Einheitlichkeit des Buches Ezechiel, (Berichte des theol. Seminar der Brüdergemeinde), Herrnhut, 1926.

and perhaps was meant to be the reaction to it. In distinction from Hölscher, Kessler believed that between a writer and his genuine, or authentic, passage there exists an inner spiritual link which unites the writer and his expressed thought. Before any passage can be declared unauthentic, it must first be shown that this link is wanting. With his 'inner spiritual link' criterion Kessler found that the authentic part of the Book of Ezekiel is larger than that found by Hölscher. In fact Kessler regarded the bulk of the Book of Ezekiel as authentic. Notwithstanding Kessler's conclusion, if any comment must be made on his theory it must be said that his 'inner spiritual link' criterion is too subjective to be convincing. Beside the attempts of Hölscher and Kessler, there is a third attempt which sought the solution of the problem of authentic, and/or otherwise, passages in the Book of Ezekiel. This is the attempt of R. Kittel.¹ Kittel claims that the Book of Ezekiel as a whole is authentic, i.e., it is the original record of the prophet's own words. For the claim Kittel argues that Ezekiel has a dual personality, namely as a prophet and at the same time as a priest. It is due to this dual personality of Ezekiel himself that the present book which bears his name presents so many puzzling points.

Now, as far as the question of the authenticity or otherwise of the Book of Ezekiel is concerned, it is clear that there was no agreement among these three scholars as to how much of the book is

¹R. Kittel, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Vol. III. 1, Stuttgart, 1927.

authentic and how much it is otherwise. While Hölscher's conclusion seems to be the most radical, and drastic, that of Kittel appears to be following the traditional view.

Another question which has called for discussion beginning in the period of 1920s is that of the dating of the Book of Ezekiel as a whole. It appears that M. Burrows¹ was the first to examine the literary relation between the Book of Ezekiel and the other books, or the other literary collections, of the Old Testament. Through his examination Burrows finds that the Book of Ezekiel is later than Trito-Isaiah (Isa. 56-66), Joel, Zech. 9:11 - 11:13, and that the Book is heavily dependent on those, and some other literary collections. The conclusion of Burrows is that the Book of Ezekiel must be a product of a very late period, even probably of the late pre-Maccabean period. Burrows' conclusion is more or less similar to that of his teacher, C. C. Torrey, although the latter's work on the Book of Ezekiel was not published until 1930.² Besides, Torrey's arguments are different from those of Burrows in that Torrey took the canonization of the Book of Ezekiel by the post-exilic Jewish authorities as his starting point. Torrey claimed that the religious confrontation between the Samaritans and the post-exilic Jews was the appropriate background of the purpose, and the composition, of the Book of Ezekiel. He argued that the book is a

¹M. Burrows, The Literary Relations of Ezekiel, Philadelphia, 1925.

²C. C. Torrey, Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy, New Haven, 1930.

pseudepigraph which was written by a man who was probably of priestly rank in Jerusalem about 230 B.C. The writer used the situation in Palestine under the reign of King Manasseh as his main historical background, so that originally the book was Palestine-centred. However, Torrey further maintained that some 30 years later the Book was revised by an editor in order to maintain the view that Jerusalem was then the right place for worshipping Yahweh and not Mt. Gerizim as was claimed by the Samaritans. This editor had devoted Chapters 40-48 for this special purpose. And it was under this editorial work that the former Palestine-centred book underwent a process of Babylonization, so that it now appears that the Book of Ezekiel has an exilic setting and atmosphere.

After the publication of this particular work, there were many scholars who were not satisfied with Torrey's late dating of the Book of Ezekiel. There were many criticisms, and rejections, launched against Torrey's arguments and conclusion, but it would be too long to note all of them in this short survey. However, there is one thing which must be said here, namely in spite of all of the criticisms and the rejections, it appears that Torrey did not by any means change his opinion.¹ Besides, it is interesting to note that almost at the same time as Torrey, but quite independent of him, J. Smith advanced a hypothesis which, though different in some respects from that of Torrey, had some striking resemblances to it.²

¹For Torrey's answers to his critics, see his articles 'Certainly Pseudo-Ezekiel', *J.B.L.* 53, 1934, pp. 291ff.; 'Notes on Ezekiel', *J.B.L.* 58, 1939, pp. 69ff..

²J. Smith, The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel - A New Interpretation, London, 1931.

Smith understands the recurring phrase 'house of Israel' as referring only to Northern Israel, and is of the opinion that Ezekiel was a real historical character who belonged to Northern Israel. He was deported in 734 B.C. together with the exiles from Northern Israel, but in the 30th year after the fall of Samaria he was able to go back to Palestine. Instead of going back to Northern Israel, he went to Jerusalem and continued his prophetic ministry there under the reign of King Manasseh. Concerning the composition of the Book of Ezekiel, Smith is of the opinion that originally it was Ezekiel himself who wrote the major part of it with a Palestinian background; but later in the 6th century B.C. the original work of Ezekiel was revised by a redactor, or redactors, who used the Babylonian, or the exilic, situation as its background. It was this revision that gave the present Book of Ezekiel the exilic atmosphere which it now has throughout.¹

Now, if a comparison between Smith's opinion and that of Torrey is made, one will find that on the one hand their major similarity can be seen in that both scholars held the opinion that the original book of Ezekiel had a Palestinian situation around the reign of King Manasseh as its background, and that the book was later Babylonized by other hands; while on the other, their major difference can be seen in that Torrey held the opinion that the present Book is wholly pseudepigraphic, and that Ezekiel was not a

¹Ibid., pp. 93ff..

historical character, while Smith held the opinion that the greater part of the Book of Ezekiel is historical and authentic, and that Ezekiel himself was a real historical character.

In 1932 V. Hertrich published his Ezechielprobleme¹ in which he examined most of the questions concerning the three problems of the Book of Ezekiel mentioned earlier. Among other things which can be noted from Hertrich's work referred to here are these :

(a) Due to the fact that the book gives no detailed account on the exilic situation, Hertrich is of the opinion that Ezekiel carried out his ministry only in Jerusalem during the last years of the city's existence, i.e., during the reign of King Zedekiah. (b) Concerning the appearance of the two worlds in the book, i.e., the world of Ezekiel and that of later editor, Hertrich is of the opinion that Palestine, especially Jerusalem, was the historical background of the original Book of Ezekiel, and that later on his original book was edited by the disciple(s) of Ezekiel who were living among the exiles in Babylonia. In fact these disciples not only edited the original book, but also added much to it, e.g., chapters 1-3; 8-11, so that the bulk of the present book, including the whole of chapters 40-48, is editorial addition. It was this editorial activity that has given rise to the exilic atmosphere of the present Book of Ezekiel.² (c) All the datings (twelve times)

¹V. Hertrich, Ezechielprobleme, (B.Z.A.W. 61), Giessen, 1932.

²Ibid., pp. 124ff..

in the book were also from these editors. Due to the fact that there are only three datings which are specified, i.e., those in 1:2; 33:21; 40:1, Hertrich argued that these editors had used two systems of dating. All the three specified dates were counted from the exile of King Jehoiachin, as is clearly indicated by 1:2 and 40:1, whereas the other unspecified nine were counted from the enthronement of Zedekiah. The reckoning from the enthronement of Zedekiah is based on the similarity of the figures in Ezek. 24:1 to those in 2 Kings 25:1, which clearly refer to the enthronement of Zedekiah. The two systems of dating were used together by the editors in Ezek. 1:1-2. Since the date in 1:1 should refer to the enthronement of Zedekiah, who was the successor of Jehoiachin, Hertrich preferred to amend it from the 'thirtieth year' to the 'third year'.¹

From these three conclusions of Hertrich, it is clear that the traditional view concerning the three problems of the book is almost completely rejected.

On the part of the defenders of the traditional view, it was G. A. Cooke who first explicitly renounced the radical opinion, especially the Palestinian aspects of the Book of Ezekiel. Concerning the three problems of the Book of Ezekiel mentioned earlier, Cooke is in favour of the traditional view. First, he is of the opinion that

¹Ibid., pp. 60-64.

the book is composite.¹ For this he points out that the present arrangement of the book is not from Ezekiel himself. It might well be true that Ezekiel had intended to arrange his own book chronologically as is suggested by the presence of the datings. But the present arrangement of the datings is definitely not Ezekiel's. Instead, the present arrangement suggests that the book is an anthology of Ezekiel's oracles, which were originally delivered at various times, and collected by editors. Further, the fact that most of the oracles between two subsequent dates do not entirely correspond with the situation referred to by the dates which head them, suggests that the editors had put his own additions and/or later materials to the original oracles of Ezekiel. In addition, Cooke notes that the many legislative proposals in chapters 40-48 bear many resemblances to that of D, P, and H. Second, Cooke maintains that Ezekiel carried out his ministry wholly in Babylonia among the exiles. For this he argues that (a) the vision of God and his glory took place outside the land of Israel (cf. 3:23; 8:4; 10:15; 20, 22; 43:3); (b) as in the case of his and other prophets' prophecies against nations far away from Jerusalem, Ezekiel's prophecies to/against Jerusalem do

¹See, G. A. Cooke's review of G. Hülscher's Hesekiel, Der Dichter und das Buch in J.T.S. 27, 1926, pp. 201ff.; also his 'New Views on Ezekiel', Theology 24, 1932, pp. 63ff.. For his fuller explanation and arguments, see his standard work, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1936 (reprinted 1967).

not always demand Ezekiel's physical presence in Jerusalem. Third, concerning the dates in the book, Cooke maintains that most of them refer to the exilic period and to the period not long before it. To be specific he refers to 588-583 B.C., i.e., the years just before and after the fall of Jerusalem. This traditional view is also followed by W. E. Barnes, who, inter alia, argued that Babylonia was the only appropriate place for Ezekiel's whole ministry, and that it was from there that Ezekiel uttered his whole prophecies.¹

Notwithstanding this support of the traditional view, it is interesting to find that in 1934 W. O. E. Oesterley launched a new solution for the problems. In his examination of the book he found that (a) the book as a literary unity presents Ezekiel as living among the exiles in Babylonia who were deported in 597 B.C., (b) as a true prophet Ezekiel addressed himself almost exclusively to the people in Jerusalem (especially in chapters 1-24), and (c) it is difficult to see how the writer of chapters 1-24 can be the same as the writer of the later chapters of the book. Based on these three points, Oesterley² opined that (a) Ezekiel was called to be a prophet in 602 B.C., i.e., in the reign of King Jehoiakim, and worked in Jerusalem until he was deported to Babylonia together with the first

¹W. E. Barnes, 'Ezekiel's Denunciation of Tyre', J.T.S. 35, 1934, pp. 50ff.; 'The Scene of Ezekiel's Ministry and His Audience', J.T.S. 35, 1934, pp. 163ff..

²W. O. E. Oesterley, 'The Book of Ezekiel - A Survey of Recent Literature', C.Q.R. 116, 1933, pp. 187-200. And with Th. H. Robinson, An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament, London, 1934, pp. 318-329.

exiles of Judah in 597 B.C.; in Babylonia Ezekiel continued his ministry as a prophet among the exiles; (b) it was Ezekiel himself who first put both his Palestinian, and his exilic, prophecies into writing, but later on 'his co-religionist ... edited them in such a way as to make it appear that the whole material was written in Babylonia'. To the edited work were still later added some minor additions by one, or more, redactors.

Nearly the same conclusion as that of Oesterley, namely that Ezekiel exercised a double ministry in Palestine and in Babylonia, was independently arrived at by Bertholet in 1936.¹ Bertholet is of the opinion that (a) Ezekiel was called twice : the first call (Ezek. 2:3 - 3:9) came in ca. 593 B.C. which was followed by Ezekiel's ministry in Jerusalem until the fall of the city, i.e., when he was taken into the exile together with the second deportation in the year 587 B.C.; the second call (Ezek. 1:4 - 2:2) came to him in Babylonia and was followed by his second ministry there among the exiles; (b) it is due to the double call, and the double ministry, of the prophet that some doublets or parallel passages, exist in the present Book which bears his name. According to Bertholet, most parts of the Book of Ezekiel were originally written by Ezekiel himself, but there was a later editor who compiled them, and transferred the prophet's ministry wholly to Babylonia. It is from the later editor that the present Book of Ezekiel has all its exilic atmosphere.²

¹A. Bertholet and K. Gallig, Hesekiel, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe, 13), Tübingen, 1936.

²Ibid., pp. xivff..

Prior to Bertholet, J. B. Harford¹ had already held the position which is in favour of that middle-way. To begin with, and like other scholars prior to him, Harford recognized that there are two kinds of material mixed up in the present Book of Ezekiel. They are the original materials, which are contained mostly in chapters 1-39, and the editorial additions, which are mostly contained in chapters 40-48. Based on the fact that the date in Ezek. 24:1 is exactly correspond with that in 2 Kings 25:1, all the dates in the Book of Ezekiel, with the exception of those mentioned in 1:2; 33:21 and 40:1, must be counted from the accession of Zedekiah. Then Harford opined that the original materials were from Jerusalem during the last years of the existence of Southern Kingdom, especially the time of King Zedekiah and the beginning of the second exile,² and that the editorial additions were from the editor of the exilic and/or post-exilic periods.³ Concerning the final form of the book, Harford said that it 'is not the work of one man, still less was it produced in one sustained effort at one time'.⁴ Then he continued : 'There are two main authors and it (i.e., the

¹J. B. Harford, Studies in the Book of Ezekiel, Cambridge, 1935.

²Cf. ibid., pp. 40f., 47f., 51, 60.

³Cf. ibid., pp. 63f..

⁴Ibid., p. 70.

book) has received additions by later hands. The first author was a prophet living in or near Jerusalem during the last years of the Southern Kingdom. ... (And the second is a) man of prophetic soul, who belongs to the period of the Captivity and who dwells in Babylonia'.¹ About the second man, Harford remarks further : 'He may have been a young disciple of the older man and he imbibed much of his spirit. He may well have treasured up the recorded utterances of his Master and woven them in with his own oracles to form the first edition at least of the Book as we now have it'.² According to Harford the symmetries found in the present Book of Ezekiel are due to the second author. And concerning the two authors Harford said that the 'two men are essentially one at heart, although each has his own method of expressing the message'.³

To return to the three problems of the book, it appears that so far the efforts to find their solutions had not reached any general consensus at all. The opinions offered by Oesterley, Bertholet, and Harford, were just as varied as could be expected. Meanwhile, another solution was proposed by G. Dahl.⁴ Rejecting the theories of Kraetzschmar, Herrmann, Hölcher, and Harford, Dahl

¹Ibid., pp. 70f..

²Ibid., p. 71.

³Ibid., p. 72. In the earlier part of his book Harford points out that there is a considerable number of passages in the Book of Ezekiel which can be attributed 'to a prophet living in exile in Babylonia, who may or may not be Ezekiel himself' (ibid., p. 60).

⁴G. Dahl, 'Crisis in Ezekiel Research' in Quantulagumque : Studies presented to K. Lake, ed. by R. Peasy et al., London, 1937, pp. 265ff..

maintained that the book is a unity. This is so since (a) the book has an extraordinary and almost monotonous uniformity of style, (b) the book has some characteristic words and phrases which are constantly repeated, e.g., 'son of man', 'abominations', 'gillulim', 'that they/you know that I am Yahweh', etc., (c) the book is very well arranged and organized with a clear chronology and a clear course of thoughts. Concerning the so called doublets and parallel passages, Dahl said that they derived from the fact that Ezekiel was a priest and a prophet at the same time. Concerning the date of the book, Dahl was in favour of the view that the book is a pseudepigraph. This is so since (a) the book abounds in Aramaisms, (b) in terms of theology the book depends on P, (c) compared with the Book of Daniel and the Book of Enoch, the book contains the more advanced and developed phase of apocalypticism, (d) the amazing clairvoyance, e.g., in 12:12ff.; 24:1f., 15-18; and the prophecies against foreign nations in chapters 25-32 are oracles after the events, (e) Gog of Magog in chapters 38-39 reflects the author's memory of Alexander the Great. On the basis of all of this, Dahl dated the composition of the book ca. 226 B.C., and said that both the prophet Ezekiel and the chronological datings in the book are mere literary creations.

On closer examination, it appears that the tenability of Dahl's solution depends very much on (a) whether the book does abound in Aramaisms, (b) whether Aramaisms as such can be regarded as indicating a late dating, and (c) whether Ezekiel's prophecies are really predictions after the events. Although the answers of these three

questions are likely to be negative, which means that Dahl's solution is untenable, nevertheless there were already two scholars who held the view that the Book of Ezekiel is wholly a pseudepigraph. Yet the late dating of the Book of Ezekiel did not seem to have gained much acceptance. Even G. R. Berry, who long before both Torrey and Dahl had been in favour of the view that the Book of Ezekiel is a very late post-exilic production, felt obliged to modify his opinion. Until around 1930 Berry was in favour of the late dating of the Book,¹ but since 1939 he has modified his view. He is now of the opinion that Ezek. 1-24 was the work of Ezekiel himself in Jerusalem in the years 597 - 586 B.C., and that in the 3rd century B.C. it was Babylonized by a reviser, or revisers, who also added chapters 40-48 to it.² A similar opinion to that of Berry was independently arrived at by I. G. Matthews.³ But, in contrast to Berry, Matthews put the date of the reviser(s) not in the 3rd century B.C. but 3 centuries earlier, i.e., in the period of the exile. In addition, Matthews recognized the existence of a third, and still later, hand which he assigned to the apocalyptic school.

¹G. R. Berry's articles : 'The Authorship of Ezekiel 40-48', J.B.L. 34, 1915, pp. 17ff.; 'The Date of Ezekiel 45:1-8a and 47:13 - 48:35', J.B.L. 40, 1921, pp. 70ff.; 'The Date of Ezekiel 38:1 - 39:20', J.B.L. 41, 1922, pp. 224ff.; 'Was Ezekiel in the Exile?', J.B.L. 49, 1930, pp. 83ff..

²See note 1 above, and G. R. Berry's 'The Composition of the Book of Ezekiel', J.B.L. 58, 1939, pp. 163ff., especially p. 175.

³I. G. Matthews, Ezekiel, (An American Commentary on the Old Testament), Philadelphia, 1939.

In distinction from Matthews, Berry, and Dahl, O. R. Fischer gave a fairly new solution to the problems of Ezekiel.¹ Fischer is of the opinion that Ezekiel was first deported to Babylonia together with the first exiles in 597 B.C. and received his call there (2:3), and that soon afterwards Ezekiel was able to go back to Jerusalem and worked there until the fall of the city in 586 B.C., and that together with the second exiles he once again went to Babylonia to carry his new message of encouragement to the exiles.

With the opinion of Fischer, it is clear that the view of a double-ministry of Ezekiel is once again accepted. Soon afterwards the same view was also accepted by R. Pfeiffer (1941).² Notwithstanding the other achievements of the non-traditional trend in Ezekiel studies, the acceptance of the view of Ezekiel's double ministry by both Fischer and Pfeiffer could probably be regarded as progress. And one could perhaps agree that it is probably only on this view that the authenticity of both Palestinian and Babylonian atmospheres of the book could be understood. However, the problems of the Book of Ezekiel are not as simple as that, as will be seen in the following survey.

The question of authentic, and/or otherwise, passages of the Book of Ezekiel was revived by W. A. Irwin.³ Before a note is made

¹O. R. Fischer, The Unity of the Book of Ezekiel, (an unpublished dissertation referred to by both H. H. Rowley in his Men of God, p. 181, and R. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, 1941 edition, p. 539), Boston, 1939.

²R. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, London, 1941, pp. 535, 537ff..

³W. A. Irwin, The Problem of Ezekiel, An Inductive Study, Chicago, 1943.

on Irwin's view on this particular problem, it seems necessary to have a look at what Irwin said about the prophet Ezekiel himself. According to Irwin, Ezekiel was a prophet and never became a priest; besides, Ezekiel carried out his ministry in Palestine from about 600 B.C. until 586 B.C.,¹ when he was deported, or voluntarily went, to Babylonia, joining the Jewish community, where he became very famous.² Ezekiel was a man of healthy mind and belonged to the orthodoxy of Hebrew prophecy. Further, Irwin is of the opinion that Ezekiel delivered his prophecies only in Palestine, and that these original prophecies were later on interpreted, added to, and edited, by exilic hand(s). In connection with this editorial work of the book the question which then arose was this : Is it possible to rediscover Ezekiel's original prophecies? It is to answering this question that Irwin has devoted most of the pages of his book referred to here. Irwin was very sure that it is not only possible, but that the authentic prophecies of Ezekiel may with a high degree of probability be distinguished from later additions to the book. He also criticised almost all of the scholars prior to him for their being unable, according to Irwin, to present satisfactory arguments. He said : 'No one at all has given us reason to believe that he knows what the prophet taught';³ then he declared that 'we must discover reliable criteria that will enable us to

¹Cf. ibid., p. 323.

²Cf. ibid., p. 329.

³Ibid., p. 29.

distinguish with some reasonable approximation to finality between Ezekiel's own utterances and those of his disciples or followers'.¹ However, it is clear that with this declaration Irwin was just restating the aims of the scholars whom he criticised, although no one of them had been as optimistic as he was in saying that 'such criteria exist ... is my firm conviction'.² By following an order of investigation which he believed to have been 'dictated by the nature of the book',³ Irwin examined and scrutinized very carefully, and minutely, each chapter of the Book, beginning with chapter 15! Through his examination and investigation he tried to sift the original kernel of Ezekiel's prophecies from its later additions. For this he claimed that the original prophecies of Ezekiel had been interpreted falsely by his disciples, or later interpreters, and that out of the whole book there are only about 251 verses, in whole or in part, which are really genuine, or authentic; while on chapters 40-48 he said: 'There is nothing whatever in these nine chapters that reveals even slight relationship with the genuine work of Ezekiel'.⁴ From his reconstruction of the genuine prophecies it is also clear that Irwin regarded them as only poetic in form. Now,

¹Ibid., pp. 29f..

²Ibid., p. 30.

³Ibid...

⁴Ibid., p. 258.

having noted all this, one should not be very surprised that through his careful analysis and laboured examination, which is a very worthwhile exercise, Irwin was only led to a conclusion which was very near, or almost similar, to that of Hölscher in 1924.

However, it is interesting to find that two years later the same problem was dealt with by M. J. Gruenthaner.¹ Like Irwin, Gruenthaner began with examining the radical efforts which had been made to solve the problems from 1924 (Hölscher) until 1939 (Matthews). On these efforts he, like Irwin, remarked : 'None of these scholars ... has been able to evolve a trustworthy set of principles by which the genuine could be discriminated from the allegedly spurious'.² Then Gruenthaner singled out Irwin's work to be the subject of the remainder of his article. Although basically Gruenthaner was in favour of the traditional view, in one point he seems to be in agreement with Irwin in that he accepted that the parable in Ezek. 15 had been commented on. However, he was against Irwin in that he could not find the reason why Irwin regarded the commentary of the parable as false or spurious. According to his own examination, both the parable and its commentary are in perfect harmony and authentic. This is so since, argued Gruenthaner, 'the application which the commentary makes grows naturally from the parable' itself.³

¹ M. J. Gruenthaner, 'Recent Theories about Ezekiel', C.B.Q. 7, 1945, pp. 438ff..

² Ibid., p. 440.

³ Ibid., p. 446.

Another strong criticism against Irwin came from R. Gordis.¹ In spite of Gordis' appreciation of Irwin's scholarship, he was against Irwin at least in two points. First, Gordis just could not confine Ezekiel and his authentic prophecies to the poetic parts of the text alone, and, second, more or less like Gruenthaner, he could not see that Irwin's method in separating a prophecy from its interpretation was successful. With these two criticisms Gordis then remarked that 'we must regretfully conclude that the case is not proved and that we have not yet reached a definite solution to the problem of Ezekiel'.²

Apart from Gruenthaner and Gordis, in the following years there were other critics who likewise launched some criticisms against Irwin. A minor criticism first of all came from L. P. Smith in his review of Irwin's book referred to earlier.³ In contrast to both Gordis and Gruenthaner, Smith regarded the supposed 'false interpretations' as a kind of 'prophetic Targums' which came from a very late period, and that they were not entirely false, but they 'frequently ... offer a true homily'.⁴ The other criticisms,

¹R. Gordis, 'The Book of Ezekiel in Contemporary Criticism', Jewish Review 4, 1946, pp. 51ff..

²Ibid., p. 65.

³L. P. Smith's review is in J.B.L. 68, 1949, pp. 384ff..

⁴Ibid., p. 387.

which perhaps could be regarded as major, came from both C. J. Mullo Weir and H. H. Rowley. But, as their works will be noted later, it seems unnecessary to give notes on their criticisms here.

In his answer to all of the criticisms Irwin¹ did not only maintain and defend his theory and its accuracy, but also claimed that all of his critics had missed his point. He said: 'No sound objection to my view has been presented in these eight years ... (and) on reexamination the case stands in yet greater cogency'.² With this claim of Irwin perhaps we could leave him here, and go on to have a look at the works which followed.

In 1945 N. Messel published his Ezechielfragen³ in which he argued that (a) the addressees of Ezekiel were really in Palestine and it is from there that Ezekiel delivered his prophecies (4:1 - 5:17; 6:1-10; 22:1-22; etc.); (b) Ezekiel delivered two kinds of prophecies, i.e. the prophecy of doom (Unheil) for those who were in Palestine during the exilic period (13:17-23; 14:1-11; 33:30-33; etc.) and the prophecy of salvation (Heil) for the exiles (28:24-26; 34:11-16; 36:16-38; 37: 12-14; etc.); (c) on the basis of Ezra 6:16, 19; 10:8; Zak. 6:10; etc., in which the word גולה is used to denote those who had returned from the exile, the word גולה used in the Book of Ezekiel is also to be understood as referring to

¹W. A. Irwin, 'Ezekiel Research since 1943', V.T. 3, 1953, pp. 54ff..

²Ibid., p. 65.

³N. Messel, Ezechielfragen, Oslo, 1945.

them.¹ So, according to Messel, Ezekiel carried out his ministry only in Palestine in ca. 400 B.C.² and that he belonged to the group of Jewish people whose worship was purer than that of the people who remained in Palestine. Concerning the composition of the book, Messel regarded passages such as 1:2f.; 12:1-6; etc. as secondary and are evidences of the work of the redactor. Then he opined that Ezekiel's original book had been edited, and added to, by an editor, or editors,³ who worked between 361 and 344 B.C. To a certain extent Messel is actually on the same lines as are M. Burrows and C. C. Torrey in that all of them are in favour of the view that the whole Book of Ezekiel is a product of the post-exilic period. Further, it is interesting to find that the post-exilic dating of the book was arrived at by L. E. Browne in 1952.⁴ However, in distinction from Torrey, Burrows, and Messel, Browne is of the opinion that (a) Ezekiel was among the exiles in Hyrcania in 344-343 B.C. and worked under the reign of Alexander the Great; and (b) it was Ezekiel himself who deliberately gave the false air to his original book to deceive the authorities, and that chapters 40-48 were his main concern.

Now, it is clear that until this stage this survey has noted

¹Cf. ibid., pp. 14ff..

²Cf. ibid., pp. 21ff..

³Cf. ibid., pp. 21ff., 30ff..

⁴L. E. Browne, Ezekiel and Alexander, London, 1952.

various opinions, or views, and arguments, which mostly come from the non-traditional trend of the study. From all of this one perhaps could get an impression that the further this trend goes, the more problems it solves, but also the more new problems it creates. Yet, in spite of all of the ever-growing problems, one cannot certainly say that the non-traditional trend has been without any success, or without any contribution at all. Since it is beyond the scope of this survey to deal with the question of how far the non-traditional trend of the study has contributed to the understanding of the Book of Ezekiel, it seems better to leave the question, and the problems involved in it, open.

Meanwhile the progress of the studies of the Book of Ezekiel since 1949 seems to have been dominated by those scholars whose views, on the one hand, tend to follow, and to support, the traditional view, e.g., that Ezekiel exercised his ministry wholly in Babylonia, and, on the other, vary so much as to whether the Book of Ezekiel is composite or not. The first among them to be mentioned here is C. G. Howie¹ who, following the information given in the book, says that Ezekiel lived out his ministry and life in Babylon with the exiles, and that only in spirit did he return to his beloved homeland.² Further, taking the captivity of Jehoiachin

¹C. G. Howie, The Date and Composition of Ezekiel, (J.B.L. Monograph Series 4), Philadelphia, 1950.

²Ibid., p. 6.

as the time to which all the dates in the book refer, he says that 1:1 is the superscription of the book, and that the dates indicated there refer to the time when (a) Ezekiel began to recollect and dictate chapters 1-24 to his disciples and (b) chapters 25-48, which were already in existence as individual prophecies either in written form or in oral form, were collected, edited, and attached to chapters 1-24 by his disciples. In his conclusion Howie says that 'the book ... can be ascribed in the main to Ezekiel'¹, although he admits that there is a very small amount of secondary element in it which came from the disciples.

Next is C. J. Mullo Weir² who, in reacting against the view that most of Ezekiel's prophecies were delivered in Palestine, maintained that Ezekiel's locale was definitely Babylonia. For this Mullo Weir marshalled not less than twelve arguments and criticisms against the radical view, some of which are noted below, although they are concerned mainly with chapters 1-24. First, the topographical references of the book indicate very clearly that Babylon is the true locale of Ezekiel's ministry. Second, Ezekiel's knowledge of Jerusalem, e.g., in chapter 8-11, is due to his having been in residence there before he was deported, and that the phrase 'Set your face toward' as is used in, e.g., 6:2; 13:17; 21:2, 7; etc., can very well be understood only if the prophet was in Babylonia. Third, as in the case of the prophecies against

¹ Ibid., pp. 98f..

² C. J. Mullo Weir, 'Aspects of the Book of Ezekiel', V.T. 2, 1952, pp. 97ff..

foreign nations (chapters 25-32), it is not necessary that in delivering his prophecies against Jerusalem Ezekiel should always be factually, and physically, present there. However, despite his preference for the Babylonian locale of the whole ministry of Ezekiel, Mullo Weir's remark that the author of the book was Ezekiel is not explicit.¹

Slightly in distinction from the opinions of both Howie and Mullo Weir is that of Fohrer.² On the one hand, and like both Howie and Mullo Weir, Fohrer maintains that according to the information given by the book Ezekiel carried out his whole ministry in Babylonia and on the other, he argues that Ezekiel's original oracles, which were chiefly in poetic form, were both spoken and written by Ezekiel himself. To those original oracles Ezekiel himself had added some explanation, usually at the end of the units, which Fohrer calls glosses. Further, due to the orderliness of the present book in terms of both chronology and subject matters, Fohrer argues that the original prophecies and their original glosses have been collected and transmitted through several stages, in which process some new glosses and transpositions were made. Neither ~~of~~ the process of the collecting and transmitting, nor the new glosses and transpositions, are the responsibility of Ezekiel.

¹ Ibid., p. 97.

² G. Fohrer, 'Die Glossen im Buche Ezechiel', Z.A.W. 63, (N.F. 22), 1951, pp. 33-53; idem, Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel, (B.Z.A.W. 72), 1952; Introduction to the Old Testament, (ET. by D. E. Green), Nashville-New York, 1968, pp. 404ff.; and with K. Galling, Ezechiel, (H.A.T. I.13), Tübingen, 1955.

In spite of his similarity with Hölscher and Irwin on the poetic form of the original prophecies, Fohrer's most interesting contribution to the solution of the problems is probably his stress, or re-stress, on the existence of the redactional process. Further, it is very interesting to note that the problem of redactional process, and its possible complications, were later on dealt with by O. Eissfeldt in one of his essays.¹ Taking the Book of Ezekiel as one of his examples for examination of the redactional process in the prophetic literature, Eissfeldt said : 'The literary questions must be settled first as such, and only after their solution can we form an historical reconstruction'.² Now, as far as the Book of Ezekiel is concerned, Eissfeldt³ is of the opinion that the Book is exilic, and was compiled, or edited, by the disciples of the prophet; the compilation was carried out by using Ezekiel's own written notes as its essential parts which can still be clearly seen in the first person oracles and in the dated passages. About the date of Ezekiel's ministry, Eissfeldt said that Ezekiel was

¹O. Eissfeldt, 'The Prophetic Literature' in The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. by H. H. Rowley, London, 1967, pp. 115ff..

²Ibid., p. 155.

³For Eissfeldt's further treatment of the Book of Ezekiel, see his The Old Testament, An Introduction, (ET. by P. R. Ackroyd), Oxford, 1966, pp. 365-382.

'called to be a prophet in the exile in 593 and ... (became) active there as such until 573 or perhaps somewhat longer'.¹

Following Bissfeldt, H. H. Rowley² is of the opinion that Ezekiel exercised his ministry wholly in Babylonia among the exiles as is stated by the book itself. However, Rowley's opinion on the date of the compilation of the Book of Ezekiel is different from that of Bissfeldt. Rowley argued that the Book of Isaiah, the Book of Jeremiah, and the Book of Ezekiel, are the product of the same group, or the same circle, of compilers. This is so, because the arrangements of those three Books are quite similar. Since Rowley assigned the date of such a group, or circle, of compilers to the post-exilic period, he regarded the Book of Ezekiel as the product of that period. But, more important than that, Rowley argued that the date of the production is not the same as the date of the materials used. The date of the materials is always earlier than the date of the production. Therefore Rowley maintained that the materials which were used by the compiler(s) of the Book of Ezekiel were entirely exilic and came from no one other than Ezekiel himself. For the explanation of the last remark Rowley followed Widengren's theory of tradition, namely that it seemed justified to assign both the prose and the poetic materials to Ezekiel himself. This is so, since it was probable that Ezekiel, like Muhammad, had

¹Ibid., p. 372.

²H. H. Rowley, 'The Book of Ezekiel in Modern Study', B.J.R.L. 36, 1953/4, pp. 146ff.. (reprinted in his Men of God, London, 1963, pp. 169ff.).

given his own explanation, or interpretation, to his original prophecies : the original prophecies are in poetic form and the explanations are in prose form. Further, Rowley admitted that the compiler(s) themselves had also added their own additions to the original Ezekielian materials, although these were only very few.¹ For all of this Rowley confessed that his position was probably traditional. But he maintained that his views 'better justify the evidence we have'.²

The development of the studies on the Book of Ezekiel during the last 20 years seems to have followed the traditional view too. This is clear from the fact that most of the works done on the Book of Ezekiel during this period have inclined to revive, and to follow, the traditional view which was dominant during the first quarter of this century and before. However, despite the inclination to the traditional view, it must be pointed out that the existence of redactional process in the prophetic literature, especially in the Book of Ezekiel, has received more and more acceptance as well. Having noted these two points, i.e., the revival, and the support, of the traditional view, and the acceptance of the redactional process of the Book of Ezekiel, this survey arrives now at the latest phase of Ezekiel studies; and below is the list of the scholars who, in spite of their being varied in many details and arguments,

¹Cf. ibid., pp. 186ff..

²Ibid., p. 210.

are in favour of the two points : Th. H. Robinson,¹ D. N. Freedman,² W. Zimmerli,³ To these three must be added the name of C. Kuhl whose contribution on the survey and the bibliography on Ezekiel⁴ is very worthwhile. Next is H. L. Ellison⁵ who follows all G. A. Cooke's arguments and conclusions. Next are G. W. Anderson⁶ and J. Muilenburg.⁷ Muilenburg said that the Book of Ezekiel as a whole came from Ezekiel in Babylonia, and that although 'there are expansions here and there ... and perhaps numerous glosses, even these represent essentially the prophet's own point of view...';

¹Th. H. Robinson, The Old Testament : A Conspectus, London, 1953, especially pp. 103f..

²D. N. Freedman, 'The Book of Ezekiel' (Studia Biblica XXVII), Interpretation 8, 1954, pp. 446ff..

³W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, (B.K. XIII/1), Neukirche-Vluyn, 1956-1969; 'The Message of the Prophet Ezechiel', Interpretation 23, 1969, pp. 131ff..

⁴See C. Kuhl's articles in Th.R. 5, 1933, pp. 92ff.; Th.R. 20, 1952, pp. 1ff.; and Th.R. 24, 1956/7, pp. 1ff.. Cf. his The Old Testament, Its Origin and Composition, (Ed. by C. T. M. Herriot), London, 1961, p. 193.

⁵H. L. Ellison, Ezekiel: The Man and His Message, London, 1956.

⁶G. W. Anderson, A Critical Commentary to the Old Testament, London, 1959 (reprinted with new bibliography 1972), pp. 129ff..

⁷J. Muilenburg, 'Ezekiel', in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, eds. M. Black and H. H. Rowley, London, 1952, pp. 586ff..

this is so, because, according to Muilenburg, 'the redactors stand in close relation with the master's teaching'.¹ Next is W. Eichrodt² who said that Ezekiel was very much influenced by the religious reformation of Josiah during his youth,³ and that although he was called to be a prophet and worked in Babylonia in 594 - 571 B.C., his priesthood was still very influential.⁴ Further, Eichrodt is of the opinion that Ezekiel had collected his own writings and arranged them in order to make a book,⁵ but there^{was} still a considerable number of them which was not yet included. These spare writings were later on collected, and then added to the first collection by a redactor, together with the redactor's own additions which were using a prophetic, or a priestly, bias; and it is due to this redactional work that now there are some discontinuities and later additions in the book. In other words, according to Eichrodt, the present Book of Ezekiel is the result of 'ein komplizierter Vorgang der Neuordnung, Überarbeitung und Ergänzung ...'.⁶

¹Ibid., p. 569.

²W. Eichrodt, Ezekiel, (ET. by C. Quinn), (O.T.L.), London, 1970.

³Cf. ibid., p. 3.

⁴Cf. ibid., pp. 1, 24.

⁵Cf. ibid., p. 18.

⁶W. Eichrodt, Der Prophet Hesekiel, (A.T.D. 22), Göttingen, 1959--1966, p. 16* (ET. p. 21).

Lastly, D. M. G. Stalker,¹ J. B. Taylor,² and J. W. Wevers.³

Once again, in spite of the wider acceptance of the existence of the redactional process, the present stage of Ezekiel studies shows that the traditional view seems to get more and more acceptance than the otherwise. The reasons for this acceptance can perhaps roughly be outlined as follows. First, the fact that the whole book shows a single mind and an orderly course of thoughts suggests that it is a unity. Although the literary composition of the book is not entirely the responsibility of Ezekiel, which means that the book is composite, nevertheless the content of it bears witness that it is a unity. The diversity of interests, the existence of doublets, or of parallel passages, are not necessarily to be regarded as not coming from the prophet himself. However, in spite of all this, a provision must still be made for the presence of later additions as are found chiefly in chapters 38-39 and 40-48. To a great measure these chapters resemble the apocalyptic writings, i.e., a literary group the interests of which lie very much outside those of Ezekiel the prophet and the priest. Second, although Ezekiel's prophecies are mostly directed against the people in Palestine, it does not necessarily always mean that, as in the case of his prophecies against foreign nations (chapters 25-32), Ezekiel was present among them. Third, the chronology, which is also the

¹D. M. G. Stalker, Ezekiel, (The Torch Bible Commentaries), London, 1968.

²J. B. Taylor, Ezekiel, (The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries), London, 1969 (reprinted 1971).

³J. W. Wevers, Ezekiel, (The Century Bible - New Series), London, 1969.

historical allusions, can best be understood as referring to the exilic period itself.

Having noted all this, however, one must always be reminded that an arrival at a certain general acceptance does not mean that the problems have been finally solved. Nor does it mean that views which have been rejected have no significance at all. This is so, since it is obvious that despite their different conclusions both trends of the study have tried to solve the problems of the Book of Ezekiel. Moreover, it is here that one should remember that sometimes the criticisms and the arguments of a scholar against those of the other fall into the same weaknesses. Yet it would be a mistake to exaggerate the weaknesses; because all of the opinions of the scholars have obviously given their respective contributions to the understanding of the Book of Ezekiel.

To return to the three problems of the book mentioned in the beginning of this survey, it seems appropriate now to state briefly the position, or the opinion, which is adopted or taken in the present study.

1. The book, with its orderly arrangement in terms of both subject matters and datings, is the result of a very long process. Anticipating what will be discussed in the next chapter, it can be said that this process, which involves both written materials and oral traditions derived from the prophecies of Ezekiel, must have taken place organically and originated with Ezekiel himself. In this connection, it can be said further that the many impressions about Ezekiel and his ministry given by the book must also have derived from Ezekiel himself.

Although Ezekiel may not be the sole author of the book as it now stands, it is difficult to exclude him entirely from all of the organic processes which have produced it. The existence of the doublets, parallel passages, phraseological repetitions, and the so called expansions, cannot be regarded as entirely the responsibility of later hands. Rather, they are the responsibility of that organic process itself, the originator of which was Ezekiel himself. This implies that to talk about the authenticity and/or otherwise of a passage or part of it is undesirable, and that all the variations of interest contained in the book are due to Ezekiel himself who was a many-faced character rather than a one-faced one.

2. According to the information given in the book, Ezekiel was a priest (1:3), and was one of those who were deported together with King Jehoiachin and the first exiles of Judah in 598 B.C. (1:1-3). He was called to be a prophet in Babylonia (2:1ff.; 3:1ff.; etc.), and it was there that he carried out his ministry. His experience as a priest, especially before he was deported, was the source of his knowledge of both Jerusalem, the Temple, and Israel's situation in terms of both politics and religion. As a prophet, it is not necessary for him to be present physically in Jerusalem/Palestine, although most of his prophecies, including his symbolic actions, were delivered to and/or for her. The case is similar to that of his, and of other prophets', prophecies against foreign nations (Ezek. 25-32), which do not require the prophet's presence among those nations.

3. The problem of the chronology of the book is complicated.

This is so, since out of the fifteen or fourteen dates mentioned in the book there are only three which explicitly refer to the time or the event from which they are counted, i.e., those in 1:2; 33:21; 40:1, and that the relationship between the two dates in 1:1 and 1:2 is not clear.

Whatever the relationship between the two dates in 1:1 and 1:2, and whatever the event from which the other twelve unspecified dates were counted, might be, on the basis of what is stated in 1:2; 33:21; 40:1, it seems justified to hold that each of those dates refers to the length of time of Ezekiel's being exiled in Babylonia.

Having said all this, however, it appears that these three problems, with all their aspects, are inseparable from each other. The solution of one of them will certainly affect that of the other two. And in dealing with a prophetic book such as that of Ezekiel, one must remember that what he now has is a book in its written form. This means that (a) he should rely very much on the information given by the book, (b) he is faced with some limitations the solutions of which are very frequently not, or cannot be, found in the book itself. Nevertheless, there is a general presupposition that a prophetic book, such as the Book of Ezekiel, has a very close relationship with the prophet whose name it bears. As a matter of fact, it is the prophet himself who, on the one hand, has given rise to the existence of the book, and on the other, has made the book distinctive. However, due to the fact that the Book of Ezekiel has some similarities with the other books of the Old Testament,

both in terms of arrangement, content, and background, it would be a mistake to treat it in isolation.

The relationship of the Book of Ezekiel with both the prophet Ezekiel and the other books of the Old Testament can best be understood in the framework of the whole Israelite tradition. This is so since Ezekiel himself was not an isolated and solitary character. On the one hand he belonged to the priesthood of Israel, and on the other he belonged to the prophetic movement. In other words, in terms of Israelite traditions, Ezekiel was indeed an insider just like the other prophets of Israel. Likewise, the book which bears his name is inseparable from the rest of Israelite traditions.

There are of course many questions that can be asked concerning the details of this double relationship of the Book of Ezekiel, such as : How is the relationship of the book with both Ezekiel himself and the rest of Israelite traditions to be explained? How far is the book characteristically Ezekielian and how far is it not?

Although these two questions can to some extent be regarded as a reformulation of the old ones which had occupied most of the scholars whose works were surveyed above, their being posed against the Israelite traditions, or more precisely, against the prophetic traditions, deserve fresh answers. However, it is beyond the scope of the present study to answer all of these questions in fuller scale.¹

¹These questions are dealt with in a fuller scale by K. W. Carley in his unpublished thesis Ezekiel's Place in the Prophetic Traditions, (University of London, 1968).

CHAPTER II

TRADITIO-HISTORICAL METHOD AND THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL

A. The Need of Another Critical Method.

The survey above shows quite clearly that so far the studies of the Book of Ezekiel are dominated by the use of the literary-critical method. Despite the variety of the answers given to the literary-critical questions of the book, however, this method has proved itself to be successful in that it has shown that the Book of Ezekiel is one of Israel's literary products. In its present form the book is a written literature which is to a great extent subject to the literary-critical method.

However, the fact that the Book of Ezekiel cannot be isolated, or be separated from either the prophet Ezekiel himself or the other prophetic books or, more widely, the Israelite traditions, has given rise to new questions. It is true that some of these new questions can be answered by the use of the literary-critical method, but it is also true that most of them lie beyond the capacity of this particular method to answer. This is so, since all of this, namely the traditio-context of the Book of Ezekiel, involves not only written materials, but also the prophet himself, the people who lived before, around, and after, him, oral materials and oral transmission, the Israelite traditions, and the organic interaction among all of these factors. In other words, like in the case of the other prophetic books, the present form of the Book of Ezekiel

is the result of an organic process which had taken place involving many factors. As a rule, this process is both long and complicated, but generated from the prophet himself.

Due to the fact that this organic process involved tradition materials, people, institutions, and everything which surrounded, and originated from, the prophet, the problem which now arises is not about the possibility to isolate the prophet and his authentic speeches or oracles, rather it is about the possibility of finding the characteristics of the prophet and the book which bears his name. In other words, in view of the traditio-context of both the prophet and the book which bears his name, it is impossible to isolate him and his authentic words or oracles. In this connection, one of the questions which deserves immediate answer is how far the book is characteristic and how far it is not. In terms of the Book of Ezekiel the question may be put this way : How far the book is Ezekielian and how far the non-Ezekielian elements have been used for its formation.

In order to be able to answer this question, the whole organic process and development which took place behind the book under consideration must be examined.¹

The first method of investigation other than the literary--critical one which has been devised for this purpose is the so called

¹Cf. D. A. Knight, Rediscovering The Traditions of Israel, (S.B.L. Dissertation Series 9), 1973, p. 2.

form-critical method. It is not necessary to describe this method in detail here. Instead, it seems suffice to outline its nature and its aims, and to see how far this method has been useful in unfolding the organic process and development mentioned above.

This method, which was advocated first by H. Gunkel (1862--1932),¹ is concerned primarily with the literary-types which are found in the literature of the Old Testament. It consists of not less than six interrelated steps of investigation, through which the organic process behind the present form of the Old Testament books is traced. The first step is to define the exact limit of every literary-unit in a given passage or book, and to isolate it from that which either precedes or follows it, or both.² The second step is the determination of literary-types which are found in that particular literary-unit. The basis of this step is that in ancient time literary-units played very important role in the writings of the people, including those of the prophets,³ and that the writers were, one way or the other, bound by them in expressing what they would like to express.

The third step is to trace the history of those literary-types.⁴

¹K. Koch, The Growth of the Biblical Tradition, (ET. by S. M. Cupitt), London, 1969, p. 3.

²Ibid., p. 115.

³H. Gunkel, 'Einleitung', in H. Schmidt's Die grossen Propheten, (S.A.T. II. 2), second edition, Tübingen, 1923, p. XXXV.

⁴K. Koch, op. cit., pp. 16ff..

The basis of this step is that in the present form of prophetic books there is hardly any one independent literary-type at all. They are always found either as component literary-types or as complex literary-types. In addition, very often two or more prophets used the same literary-types but in different ways. This means that every literary-type found in one particular passage or unit has its history, which comprises its whole development from the time when it was written for the first time until its present form in the midst of a component, or a complex, literary-type. The fourth step is the investigation of the literary-types against their individual setting in life (Sitz im Leben).¹ The basis of this step is that each literary-type is meaningful only if it is used in a particular situation. Although there is possibility that one particular literary-type is used in more than one setting in life, nevertheless it is impossible to understand the meaning of the former without the latter. This is so, primarily because the content of that literary type would be understandable only so long as the literary-type is related to that particular setting(s) in life. And, interestingly enough, one of the implications of the possible change of setting in life is that very frequently more than one literary-types are mixed, forming a component or a complex of literary-types with new meaning.²

¹Ibid., pp. 26ff..

²Ibid., pp. 35ff..

The fifth step is to trace as far ~~as~~ back as possible the history of an individual literary-unit in which those mixed literary--types are found. The basis of this step is that many biblical passages, or literary-units, have been passed down over a long period of time and have, therefore, been much modified before reaching their present respective shapes. Although this step would to some extent be similar to that of the tracing of the history of individual literary-type, i.e., the third step, there is one important distinction between both in that this step is concerned with a literary-unit which consists of more than one literary-type. The aim of this step is chiefly to bring out the background of the unit under consideration, its literary-types, and its settings in life, and to give its historical outline which is necessary for its interpretation.

The sixth, and the last, step of the method is to trace the redaction history of the unit. If the fifth step tries to trace the earliest form of the unit by using the unit's present form as its starting point, the sixth step goes in the reverse order. It starts from the earliest form of the unit, then follows the redactional development which has taken place and has resulted the present shape of it. Using K. Koch's words : 'It (i.e., the redaction history or the sixth step) traces the path the unit has taken from the time it was first written down until the time it achieved its final literary form.'¹

¹Ibid., p. 58.

Having outlined the nature of this method, one may now raise the question of how is this method applied to the prophetic books. To answer this question it must be said that, on the one hand, the fuller description of the method as is outlined above was given only very recently,¹ whereas on the other, the use of the method, or that which may be called its application, to the prophetic books was made for the first time by H. Gunkel in 1915 when he wrote his 'Einleitung', especially its third section, for H. Schmidt's Die grossen Propheten (S.A.F. II. 2).² Despite the fact that Gunkel does not really follow the steps outlined above, his analysis of the prophetic books in that 'Einleitung' does show that he is trying to describe form-critically how the process and the development behind the present shapes of the books took place. Gunkel's lead has been followed by many scholars whose works would be too numerous to be mentioned here. As far as the Book of Ezekiel is concerned, the usefulness of this method can be seen chiefly in W. Zimmerli's commentary,³ to which we will return later.

In spite of all this, there is one essential thing in the organic process and development behind the present shape of the prophetic

¹ See, e.g., K. Koch's book referred to above, and the references he gives on p. 183.

² W. Klatt, Herman Gunkel, (F.R.L.A.M.T. 100), Göttingen, 1969, pp. 199ff.; H. Schmidt, op. cit., pp. XXXIVff.; cf. H. Gunkel, Die Propheten, Göttingen, 1917, especially pp. 104ff..

³ W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, (B.K. XIII/1-2), Neukirchen, 1955-1969.

books, which is not considered by, or is beyond the reach of, the form-critical method. This is the so called oral tradition and/or oral transmission and its role. H. Gunkel himself said quite explicitly that originally the prophets were 'Redner' and that only later they became 'Schriftsteller'.¹ Yet, surprisingly enough, he did not elaborate the implication of what he said for the transmission of the prophets' oracles. It seems that, for Gunkel, the oral tradition and the oral transmission do not have any significant, or decisive, role for the formation of the prophetic books. The fact that the oral tradition and the oral transmission lie outside the concern of form-critical method can also be seen in that none of the six steps of this method outlined above pay any attention to it at all.

K. Koch is right in saying that the extent to which 'a biblical text is moulded by the oral tradition and ... by the written will depend on the literary-type and the setting in life.'²

This implies that the form-critical method does take account of the role of the oral tradition. However, it must be said that it is difficult to find full consideration of the central, and continuous, role of oral tradition in the form-critical analysis. This is clear not only in the work of H. Gunkel referred to above, but also in K. Koch's own example of the application of the method to the prophetic books.³ In other words, the form-critical method is very

¹H. Gunkel, 'Einleitung' in H. Schmidt, op. cit., pp. XXXVif..

²K. Koch, op. cit., p. 91.

³Ibid., especially pp. 210ff..

useful only in unfolding the process and the development of the written form of prophetic books, but is not sufficient to enable us to consider fully the central, and continuous, role of oral tradition and oral transmission in that process. Therefore, in addition to the form-critical method, another critical method, which would enable us to unfold as comprehensive and clear as possible the organic process with all of its factors, is needed. This method is called the traditio-historical method. This is so, since it is concerned primarily with the history of the tradition itself. In terms of the prophets and the prophetic books, this method is concerned with the history of the prophetic traditions the centre of which is the individual prophet himself.

It is said above that the organic process which took place behind each of the present prophetic books involves many factors, especially the living people and the oral tradition, and that the process itself is generally complicated and long. In fact it can be said that this process is also the history of the book itself, the centre of which is the prophet whose name it bears. Seen from the side of the prophet, it can be said that the book which bears his name is the result of the history of both the traditions which he originated or created and those which he used. And as far as the prophetic books are concerned, it is with this history that the traditio-historical method deals.

In spite of the fact that the history of tradition and the role of oral tradition have been known since long time ago, it must be said that it is the Old Testament scholars in Scandinavia who were responsible for introducing traditio-historical considerations

to the prophetic literature'.¹ In other words, compared with both the literary-critical method and the form-critical method, this method is relatively new. And for this reason it seems necessary to have a look at the debate on its nature, aims,² and place in the Old Testament scholarship, in order to enable us to have a better understanding of it. This will be done in the following section.

B. The Debate on the Nature of the Traditio-Historical Method.

It is said above that generally speaking the traditio-historical method and its full employment in the study of the Old Testament is fairly new, especially if it is compared with the literary-critical method, the historical-critical method, and the form-critical method. It is so, because the rise and the full recognition of this method has much to do with the growing recognition of the importance and the reliability of oral transmission. On the oral transmission, it is said that before the Old Testament traditions became written there was a period in which the role of oral transmission was very important; and that this role did not cease although the traditions were written down, but, on the contrary, it went on side by side

¹ D. A. Knight, op. cit., p. 3.

² This method has been dealt with very thoroughly by D. A. Knight in his book referred to above which was published only very recently. For fuller account of this method, this book must be consulted. The present author wishes to thank Prof. G. W. Anderson for lending him his own copy of the book.

with the written transmission, and often still continued to influence the written one. In other words, the Old Testament traditions, particularly the prophetic traditions, did not come into existence only through and by a mechanical or technical process, but they had a history. This history was a living one because the traditions themselves were living traditions.

However, in spite of the growing acceptance of this new understanding of the Old Testament traditions, the acceptance of traditio-historical method does not come automatically. Even among those scholars who have already accepted it, there are still many different opinions, especially concerning the nature of this method and its relation to the other critical methods. Engnell, for instance, summarises the characteristics of this method as follows :

'In the first place, the traditio-historical method is an analytical method which demands a thoroughly unprejudiced reconsideration of all aspects of the entire materials. Its particular task is to delineate as far as possible the tradition works, the traditional collections, the tradition complexes, and individual tradition units, as well as possible strata within the oral tradition. It also includes the task of comparing different works with each other in order to ascertain their individual peculiarities and of analysing the different complexes and units within each particular tradition work to determine their place, function, and possible different original order of material. This task might be summed up under the concepts of form-analysis and composition analysis'.¹

This summary is quoted here not because there is no other definition or summary of the characteristics of the method given by scholars, but because it clearly points out some of the characteristics of

¹ I. Engnell, Critical Essays on the Old Testament, (Ed. by John T. Willis), London, 1970, p. 4.



the method and its distinction from the other ones.¹

However, like any other kind of definition, especially those of the other critical methods, this summary of Engnell can easily create differences, and probably many contradictions, in its details, its applications, and its presuppositions. This can already be seen in the criticisms of many scholars which have been launched against Engnell's arguments. In this connection, and for the sake of the understanding of traditio-historical method itself, it seems good to have a brief look at the progress of the discussion.

First of all, Engnell is of the opinion that 'to a large extent, Old Testament literature ... has the character of an oral literature which was written down only at a relatively late period. Not only the smaller units, but also the longer complexes ... had already reached a fixed form in the oral stage, so that the writing down implies nothing new or revolutionary'.² This opinion of Engnell is really very radical, especially if it is compared with that of the literary critics, and therefore it is not surprising that there are so many criticisms launched against it. Yet, if one follows the discussions, it is not less surprising to find that most of Engnell's critics are of the same opinion, namely that they could accept the existence and the importance and the reliability of oral

¹For scholars' various understandings of the traditio-historical method, see, D. A. Knight, op. cit., especially pp. 177-193.

²I. Engnell, op. cit., p. 6.

transmission, although not in so radical a way as Engnell. Besides, one must be reminded that the recognition of the existence of oral transmission, or of oral traditions, in the Old Testament tradition is by no means the invention of Engnell, and that it would be a mistake to assume that in this case those other scholars are dependent on him.¹ However, it is necessary to make it clear that what these other scholars reject is Engnell's opinion that the present shape of each of the O.T. books has been preceded by an oral literature in which the composition and the combination of its materials have been fixed so that the writing down of it implies nothing new or revolutionary.

Engnell's second argument, which is no less radical than his first, is that with the rise of traditio-historical method the literary-critical view must be dismissed.² This argument has also given rise to many criticisms. One of the accusations directed against it is that the traditio-historical method seems to have put all its weight only on the oral transmission, or on the oral traditions, and lack full consideration on the literary-analysis of the present written form of the materials.³ However, as far as traditio-historical method is concerned, it is interesting to find Engnell's

¹D. A. Knight has shown quite clearly that the significant role of oral tradition and oral transmission behind the present written form of the Old Testament was already recognized by J. C. Nachtigal in 1794, who was followed by H. Gunkel in the latter's Schöpfung und Chaos (1895). It is from these two scholars that Engnell must have derived his recognition (D. A. Knight, op. cit., pp. 61ff., 81 and note 12, 88ff..).

²I. Engnell, The Call of Isaiah, Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1949, p. 20.

³Cf. H. G. May, 'Ezekiel', I.B. Vol. VI, New York, 1956, p. 50.

appreciation of those criticisms, especially when he says that 'the question of whether literary-criticism can and should be undertaken along with the traditio-historical method is still much debated'.¹ In other words, he is willing to consider the fact that the present form of the materials is by no means dependent only on oral transmission.² He acknowledges too that the traditio-historical method to a certain extent has something to do with the written sources in the Old Testament in which 'a traditional, analytical method of the literary type' is needed. But, in this case he does not want to attach the name 'literary criticism' to the 'traditional, analytical method of the literary type'. Instead, he would like to call it 'the written literary method', and so this method 'is one of the methods of investigation which the traditio-historical critic has at his disposal'.³ However, regarding the actual nature of the material and the manner of its transmission, i.e., the role of oral transmission as it is understood by Engnell, Engnell is still of the opinion that this 'written literary method' has only 'a very limited value' and it 'is completely out of place in dealing with the prophetic literature'.⁴ In other words, according to

¹I. Engnell, Critical Essays on the Old Testament, p. 10.

²Cf., I. Engnell, Critical Essays on the Old Testament, pp. 6f., 166ff..

³I. Engnell, Critical Essays on the Old Testament, p. 10.

⁴Ibid., p. 11.
Ibid., p. 11.

Engnell, for the prophetic literature the traditio-historical method is the only alternative and no other method is valid for it.

The problem of traditio-historical method, especially in its application to the prophetic literature, is also dealt with by Mowinckel in his Prophecy and Tradition.¹ In this book, which was written in 1946, Mowinckel says : 'Any statement in principle of what is meant, or should be meant, by the "traditio-historical method", however, has not yet appeared'.² Further, he is of the opinion that the real need for the traditio-historical view-point in Old Testament research is not primarily caused by the recognition of oral transmission, but rather by ~~finality and the limit~~ *the limitations* of the literary-critical method and the accumulating number of materials from the ~~ancient~~ *ancient* Orient.³ Therefore the traditio-historical view-point is possible and is a necessity, and enables us 'to get beyond the schematism of "literary-criticism", to new problems and further results'.⁴ In other words, Mowinckel seems to be of the opinion that traditio-historical point of view is the necessary continuation of literary-criticism, and it is not, and should not be, the exclusive alternative to literary-criticism as Engnell insists.⁵ And,

¹S. Mowinckel, Prophecy and Tradition, Oslo, 1946.

²Ibid., p. 6.

³Cf., ibid., pp. 17f..

⁴Ibid., p. 9.

⁵Mowinckel says : '... we are not concerned with an either-or, but with a both-and' (ibid., p. 7). For fuller account of the debate between I. Engnell and S. Mowinckel, see D. A. Knight, op. cit., pp. 260ff., 275ff..

continuing his criticism against Engnell, Mowinckel says : 'If the traditio-historical point of view is to be something more than a pretext to "refuse the fences", it also has to attempt to be real history'.¹

However, what Mowinckel really means by 'the traditio-historical point of view' is by no means clear. On the basis of his explanations, it could perhaps be said that he is of the opinion that the traditio-historical point of view is something more than, but also has a close connection with, form-critical method. Mowinckel says that 'the criticism of form and "type" ("Form- und Gattungsforschung", "Form- und Gattungsgeschichte")' is only the first task of, and therefore does not exhaust, the whole traditio-historical method.²

The same account of the traditio-historical method is given by K. Stendahl.³ But taking a step further than Mowinckel, Stendahl remarks very clearly that, on the one hand, the form-critical method is concerned with 'the analysis of the nature, growth, and function of the forms',⁴ while on the other, the traditio-historical

¹S. Mowinckel, Prophecy and Tradition, p. 86.

²Ibid., pp. 9, 24; but contrast, ibid., p. 42.

³K. Stendahl, 'Implications of Form-Criticism and Traditio-Criticism for Biblical Interpretation', J.B.L. 77, 1958, pp. 33-38.

⁴Ibid., p. 33.

method is concerned with 'the organic growth of traditions' in which there is 'the strong accent on oral tradition';¹ again, on the one hand, 'form criticism is sometimes used as a tool to reach back to the ipsissima verba',² while on the other, 'the organic growth of the tradition in the circles of (the prophetic) disciples bars the straight path' to it.³ From this remark of Stendahl it is clear that the emphasis on the history of traditions and the 'creative role' of those who handled the transmission of them is not neglected in the traditio-historical method. This is very important, and it is in this connection that his other remark, i.e., that traditio-historical criticism 'is best understood as a critique of literary criticism of a book-minded, "scissors and paste" type',⁴ must be understood, otherwise one could fall back to Engnell's position.

Up to this stage, it seems justifiable to say that there is a growing recognition among scholars that the relation between literary-criticism, form-criticism, and traditio-historical method, does positively exist. Literary-criticism alone is not enough, nor is form-criticism alone. Something more is needed. And in saying

¹Ibid., p. 34.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 35.

⁴Ibid., p. 34.

this, one must be reminded that the insufficiency of these critical methods, as a matter of fact, does not derive primarily from their respective natures, but rather from the growing recognition and understanding of the tradition,¹ to which they are applied.

The fact that something more than the form-critical method is needed can be seen from the following brief observation. First, from the work of H. Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos (1895). In this work Gunkel deals with the creation-tradition in Gen. 1. To a great extent this work was carried out by the use of what later on called form-critical method. Nevertheless, Gunkel goes further to deal with the oral tradition which lies behind the written creation-tradition itself. His comparison of the creation-tradition in Gen. 1 and the Babylonian myth brings him to a conclusion that there is a historico-traditional relationship between both, and that this historico-traditional relationship must have been very close and strong during the oral period long before the creation-tradition in Gen. 1 was written down for the first time.² It is obvious that this conclusion lies outside the scope of the form-critical method which Gunkel originally devised. In addition, and due to this fact, it seems appropriate to say that Gunkel was

¹D. A. Knight, op. cit., pp. 5ff..

²Ibid., pp. 75ff.; W. Klatt, Herman Gunkel, pp. 54f..

in fact the first to advocate the traditio-historical method.¹

Second, from the works of both G. von Rad² and M. Noth.³ These two scholars, who are called the fathers of the modern traditio-historical method by D. A. Knight,⁴ deal in particular with Hexateuch and Pentateuch respectively. Apart from the fact that there are some fundamental differences between the methodology and aim of von Rad and that of Noth,⁵ these two scholars are in agreement in regarding the Hexateuch and Pentateuch respectively as the 'Endstadium' of traditio-historical processes. And in this connection it is interesting to find that in their respective works neither of these two scholars finishes their respective investigations by using the critical methods which they originally used. Instead, they go further and use the traditio-historical method. This is clear from the fact that, on the one hand, von Rad starts his investigation by using the form-critical method but continues it by using the traditio-historical method, and on the other, Noth

¹For fuller account on Gunkel's works, see references in note 2 on previous page.

²Especially G. von Rad, 'The Form Critical Problem of the Hexateuch' in his The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, (ET. by T. Dickens), Edinburgh-London, 1966, pp. 1-75.

³Especially M. Noth, A History of Pentateuchal Traditions, (ET. by B. W. Anderson), Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972.

⁴D. A. Knight, op. cit., pp. 97, 143.

⁵For fuller account of this, see especially ibid., pp. 172ff..

starts with the literary-critical method and then continues by using the traditio-historical method.

In a sense G. von Rad's methodology is like that of H. Gunkel, namely that something beyond the capacity of the form-critical method is still to be dealt with, for which purpose the traditio-historical method is appropriate. However, they are different from each other in that Gunkel seeks to find the origin of the individual literary-units, in his case those of the creation-tradition, whereas von Rad seeks to find how those individual units were amalgamated to form the 'Endstadium'. In other words, Gunkel would like to go as far back as possible, whereas von Rad would like to go forward towards the final result of the process.

As far as the Hexateuch is concerned, and as the result of his form-critical analysis, von Rad finds that initially there were two independent traditions, i.e., the one centred on the *cr do* concerning the exodus and the conquest, the other centred on the Sinai-event. Apart from the fact that both of these traditions have their respective, and independent, histories, eventually they are amalgamated by the Jahwist (J). This amalgamation, which in itself constitutes a significant traditio-history, is later on used by the Jahwist as the framework of his composition of the present Hexateuch. So, as it now stands, the Hexateuch is the 'Endstadium' of that traditio-historical process which took place before, and finished by, the Jahwist.¹

¹For fuller account of all this, see, *ibid.*, pp. 97ff..

In distinction from von Rad, Noth uses the literary-critical method as his starting point. In his A History of Pentateuchal Traditions he maintains that the Pentateuch is the 'Endstadium' of a very long, and complicated, traditio-historical process. He, accepting the literary-critical analysis of the Pentateuch into J, E, and P, documents, argues that P is the basis of the literary-work of the present Pentateuch, and that J is the basis of the literary amalgamation of J and E, and that due to the similarities between J and E these two documents must have independently derived from a common source or a Grundlage (G).¹ It is in his examination of this Grundlage that Noth's traditio-historical work can very clearly be seen.

First, he argues that initially there were five independent tradition units, the centres of which are the five basic themes which are contained in the Credo of Israel.² These themes, arranged according to their traditio-historical priority, are : the guidance out of Egypt, the guidance into the arable land, the promise to the patriarchs, the guidance in the wilderness, and the revelation at Sinai.³ Each of these five themes has its own independent traditio-history before they are merged with each other.⁴

¹M. Noth, op. cit., pp. 8-41.

²Ibid., p. 46.

³Ibid., pp. 46f..

⁴For M. Noth's investigation of the traditio-history of each of these themes, see, ibid., pp. 47-62.

Second, Noth argues that beside those five basic themes, there are several individual traditions which, like each of those themes, have their own respective, and independent, histories.¹

Third, Noth argues that the merging of those five basic themes and those individual traditions did not take place at once, but gradually and mainly orally. This process, according to Noth, took those five basic themes as its framework so that its result is a thematic composition. If von Rad regards the Jahwist as the one who was responsible for the merging of the creedal traditions and the Sinai tradition and for the composition of the Hexateuch, Noth regards the amphictyony of the twelve tribes as a cultic body who was responsible for the merging of those five basic themes and those individual traditions. It is from these thematically merged tradition-materials that all the three authors, i.e., J, E, and P,² took their substance for their respective literary, and theological, works. Due to the fact that those thematically merged tradition materials were mainly in oral state, it is understandable that, on the one hand, those three authors have substantial similarities, whereas on the other, they have their respective linguistic, and

¹For M. Noth's investigation of the traditio-history of each of these individual-traditions, see, ibid., pp. 65-188.

²M. Noth regards J, E, and P, as three independent individual authors and not as three schools (ibid., p. 228 and note 601).

stylistic, characteristics. However, whereas the works of J and E consisted to a large extent only in the formulation of the materials handed down, that of P shows much greater individuality in the formulation and the shaping of its composition.¹

With all of these examples, it is clear that, on the one hand, the traditio-historical method has its own merits and uniqueness which deserve full acceptance, and on the other, it is not an exclusive alternative. Putting it another way, all of these examples show that neither the literary-critical method, nor the form-critical method, nor both of them, is sufficient to unfold the process or the history which took place behind the present shape of the literatures of the Old Testament. On the one hand, both Gunkel and von Rad show that the form-critical method is not enough, and on the other Noth shows that the literary-critical method is not to be dismissed. In all of this, it is also clear that the traditio-historical method is not an exclusive alternative to either the form- or the literary-critical method, or both.

The positive relationship between the traditio-historical method and the other critical methods can also be seen from the remarks of the following scholars, although their starting points vary one from the other. On the one hand, G. W. Anderson says that 'the traditio-historical method is a valuable addition to the

¹M. Noth even admits that in composing his work P has added material of his own to the materials he receives from G (*ibid.*, p. 229).

equipment of the critics.... (It is) an additional tool, and not one which supplants all others';¹ while on the other, K. Koch, having proved the limitations of literary-criticism and the need for form-criticism, says : 'Properly understood, literary-criticism can now only be considered as a branch, along with many others, of form-criticism'.² Further, Muilenburg, examining the subject matter of the form-criticism, particularly the formation of the literary type, says that form-criticism alone is not yet sufficient either. In support of this judgement, Muilenburg goes on saying that form-criticism 'is concerned with what is common to all the representatives of a genre, and therefore applies an external measure to the individual pericopes'. As a result, form-criticism 'does not focus sufficient attention upon what is unique and unrepeatable, upon the particularity of the formulation ...'.³ Therefore, according to Muilenburg, after all has been said and done about the forms and types of biblical speech, 'there still remains the task of discerning the actuality of the particular text, and it is with

¹G. W. Anderson, 'Some Aspects of the Uppsala School of Old Testament Study', H.Th.R. 43, No. 4, October, 1950, p. 248.

²K. Koch, The Growth of the Biblical Tradition, London, 1969, pp. 68., 77.

³J. Muilenburg, 'Form-Criticism and Beyond', J.B.L. 88, 1969, p. 5.

this ... that we must reckon, as best we can, for it is this concreteness which marks the material with which we are dealing'.¹ As Muilenburg identifies this 'actuality of the particular text' as something rhetorical in character, he says that something more than merely form-criticism is needed, i.e., what he calls 'rhetorical criticism' or 'form-criticism and beyond'.²

From all of this, it seems clear that there is not yet any definition of what is really meant by traditio-historical method, although its uniqueness can roughly be grasped. Meanwhile, it is clear that there is an acute demand for something more than just both literary-critical method and form-critical method - not to mention the other ones. And as far as the material is concerned, it is the nature of the traditions itself which will judge which method(s) could serve the best. This especially applies to the prophetic traditions.

Now, as far as the prophetic traditions are concerned, it was pointed out earlier that these traditions do not come into existence, or grow, mechanically or technically.³ In this connection it seems worthwhile to reemphasize, if not to add, two important points.

¹Ibid., p. 18.

²Ibid., pp. 8, 18.

³See, supra, pp. 38ff..

First, about the prophets and the traditions : N. W. Porteous has pointed out that the prophets are not the creators of the traditions of Israel, but rather the inheritors of them.¹ This remark of Porteous is very important because it implies that it is not true to consider every individual prophet as a solitary figure who stands outside and apart from the people and their traditions. Although it is true that every individual prophet has his own uniqueness, and this is very important, it must be said that to a very large extent he is also one of the transmitters, or one of the bearers, of Israel's traditions. He belongs to the living traditions of the Israelite people and he is one of the exponents and supporters of them. Therefore if one is to speak about the prophetic traditions, he must always remember that he will speak only about a part of Israel's entire traditions, and that it is against, or within, these 'entire traditions' that that 'part' must be understood. In other words, it will be too one-sided to talk about the prophet and the book which bears his name without referring to the living people around him and/or the living traditions in which he lived.

Second, about the relationship between oral and written transmissions : In dealing with the problem of the oral transmission of the prophetic traditions, the emphasis is very often laid only on

¹N. W. Porteous, 'Prophecy', in Record and Revelation, ed. by H. Wheeler Robinson, Oxford, 1938, p. 217.

the relation between the prophets and the books which bear their names, while the relation between the prophet as an individual and the whole of Israel's traditions, particularly those handed down within the prophetic movement, is forgotten. This does not mean, however, that the result yielded by that kind of treatment is to be despised or rejected. But, on the contrary, the conclusions of that treatment will certainly be more fully vindicated, if this latter fact is also dealt with. In this connection, it is very useful to study North's survey of the interpretation of Israel's past history by each of the prophets.¹ From North's work it is clear that no one of the prophets seems to have, literally or mechanically, been so faithful to his predecessors, especially in preserving what they had already said or written. Yet, there is an undeniable fact that almost everyone of them knew quite well what his predecessor(s) was talking about. For example, Amos (Amos 2:9ff.), Hosea (Hos. 11:1ff.), Jeremiah (Jer. 2:2ff.), Micah (Mic. 6:2ff.), Ezekiel (Ezek. 20:5ff.), all of these prophets are, in these particular passages at least, talking about the same thing. Yet, surprisingly enough, there is hardly any similarity whatsoever among them, as far as their language, their styles, and above all, their interpretations of that particular thing, are concerned. As far as the traditio-historical relationship among these prophets is concerned, the point is whether or not that relationship, especially

¹C. R. North, The Old Testament Interpretation of History, London, 1946, especially pp. 40ff..

that of the so called 'canonical prophets', is determined and limited only by the existence and reliability of written transmission or written traditions. The example given above clearly disproves this. Instead, it shows that to a great measure every individual prophet has his own freedom in expressing his own opinion, and that the similarity between two or more prophets cannot be regarded as a sign that the one is mechanically and/or technically referring to, or even dependent on, the other. This does not mean, however, that every individual canonical prophet has not written anything or, at least, left some written materials after his death. But it does mean that the later prophet(s) did not use those written materials mechanically or technically. Instead, and in most cases, he processed them and, using his own knowledge of the same thing, and of others, which he got from the living traditions, and his own understanding and the divine involvement, interpreted them and made them relevant to his own contemporaries. Besides, in this organic process, it is clear, and it must always be emphasized, that oral transmission is not the same as learning by heart or recitation. It is more than just that.¹ Had it not been so, the relationship of those canonical prophets among themselves would not be as it is now.

So, as far as the canonical prophets, the books which bear

¹Cf., J. Hempel, 'The Forms of Oral Tradition', in Record and Revelation, ed. by H. Wheeler Robinson, Oxford, 1938, p. 31.

their names, and the relationship between both, are concerned, it seems justified to say that there is an organic relationship and reciprocal influence between oral and written transmissions. In other words, the traditions of the Israelite people were not created and transmitted mechanically, but organically, in such a way that oral transmission, written transmission, and the bearers of the traditions, i.e., both the traditionists and the people around them, played very important roles. It is here that the traditions really became living traditions. And it is to these living traditions that each of the prophetic books must be attached; each of them belongs to the whole of Israel's traditions, and it is not an independent entity which stands by itself. It is a part of the whole tradition; its process of coming into existence is also a part of the whole process; its history is also a part of the whole history of Israel's traditions, especially that of the traditions handed down within the prophetic movement. And if between two or more successive prophets there was no mechanical relationship or process, it is also hardly possible to say that between each prophet and the book which bears his name there was only a mechanical, and rigid, process.

One of the implications of this is that it is unnecessary and seems impossible to recover the impissima verba of each one of the prophets, but, on the contrary, one is always compelled to find the uniqueness of each one of them. In view of all this the traditio--historical method is indispensable, although it is definitely not an exclusive alternative. In other words, in approaching the

prophetic books every available critical method must be devised. Even in several particular instances a hitherto untried one must also be devised.

C. On the Book of Ezekiel.

Since the application of what is discussed in the previous section will chiefly be found in the main part of the present study, i.e., in Chapters III, IV, and V, what is attempted below is to show briefly how distinctive the Book of Ezekiel is compared with the other prophetic books.

The special character of the Book of Ezekiel is so obvious that almost every critic, be he a literary critic or a historical critic or a form critic or a traditio-historical critic or a combination of all of them, does not fail to pay great attention to it. This is evident from the history of scholarship on the subject, which were partly surveyed earlier. In choosing an approach to this book, the aim of the present study is to follow the results of the most recent investigations of it, without, however, forgetting the fruits of the earlier works. Like all other works, and for the sake of the progress of the understanding of the book concerned, the present study will make use of them critically and as extensively as possible.

In his account of the prophetic literature, Lindblom's remark on the origins of the Book of Ezekiel runs as follows :

'While the Book of Ezekiel may be said to bear more traces

than other prophetic books of the activity of traditionists, we may nevertheless recognize that by their work they have given us a reliable account of Ezekiel's religious thought in its principal features'.¹

And in talking about the role of the redactor for the final stage of the genesis of the book, again, he clearly shows the characteristic of the book concerned. He says that 'the activity of an individual redactor is less evident than in other books', and that in the Book of Ezekiel 'the collector was also in essence a redactor'.² Apart from the fact that it is not the primary concern of the present study to analyse how far the Book of Ezekiel may be regarded as authentic or otherwise,³ it seems justified to say that it is along the lines suggested by the remarks of Lindblom that the organic relation between the prophet Ezekiel, the book which bears his name,^{and} his unique message, can best be understood.

As far as this view is concerned, it must be emphasized that it is not a new one, and that Lindblom is not alone either. In a rather different context from that of Lindblom, Zimmerli says that 'even though a complex redactional work can be recognized in the Book of Ezekiel, it preserves for us on the whole the peculiar characteristics

¹J. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel, p. 267, and the note there.

²Ibid., p. 388.

³For comparison, see, e.g., H. G. May, op. cit., in which he provides a list of some phrases which he regards as redactional; on other works of this kind, see, supra, pp. 6ff..

of the prophet'.¹ So, from the remarks of these two scholars, it seems clear that the important question to ask about the Book of Ezekiel is not whether or not the book has an unauthentic addition, i.e., redactional or secondary or whatever it might be called, but what is, or what are, the characteristics of the book itself. In carrying out this task the present study adopts much of the results of Zimmerli's investigation, as is listed below.

1. Out of the 52 form-critical units which Zimmerli finds in the Book of Ezekiel, there are not less than 45 units which are introduced with similar introductory sentence, i.e., וַיְהִי דְבַר יְהוָה אֵלַי. This formula is found again in the Book of Jeremiah (Jer. 1:4, 11, 13; 2:1; et al.), but not in the other prophetic books. It is also found in 2 Sam. 7:4 et al., 1 Kings 21:17, 28 et al. and in some other passages in the Book of Jeremiah, but now in a narrative context, i.e., in the 3rd person.² On the abundant number of occurrences of this formula in the 1st person sing. Zimmerli says: 'By means of this personal account, Ezekiel subordinates everything else to the intrusion of the divine word and vision ...'.³

2. The five units of the visions of Ezekiel are also introduced

¹W. Zimmerli, 'The Special Form- and Traditio-historical Character of Ezekiel's Prophecy', V.T. 15, 1965, p. 515.

²Instead of using the words וַיְהִי, these narrative passages of Jeremiah use the word וַיִּקְרָא.

³W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 516.

X
X

with more or less similar introductory sentence, i.e., 'the hand of Yahweh came (ה'ה) or fell (פ'ל) upon me'. They are Ezek. 1:3b (reading פ'ל instead of פ'ל), 3:22a; 8:1b; 37:1a; and 40:1b. This formula is also found in 2 Kings 3:15 and 1 Kings 18:46, but is completely missing in the other prophetic books.¹

3. The picture of the prophet sitting in his own house with the elders of Judah or Israel in front of him, i.e., in Ezek. 8:1ff.; 14:1ff.; 20:1ff.; cf. 33:31, is not found in the books of the other canonical prophets. But it is found again in 2 Kings 6:32.

From these three critical findings it seems possible to draw a conclusion that there must be a strong affinity between Ezekiel and those who are behind these Deuteronomistic books (1-2 Samuel, 1-2 Kings).

4. There are two autodramatic visions² in the Book of Ezekiel, the kind of which is not found in any other major canonical prophets' books. They are in Ezek. 11:1-12 and 37:7. In both of these passages it is said that Ezekiel was in a visionary state, in which he was prophesying, and that his prophecies were effective forthwith.

¹In Isa. 8:11 and Jer. 15:17 (~~however~~), the context and the meaning are different from that in Ezekiel. Cf. W. Zimmerli, 'The Special Form- and Traditio-historical Character of Ezekiel's Prophecy', V.T. 15, 1965, pp. 516ff..

²Autodramatic vision is a vision in which 'the visionary himself plays a conspicuous role in that which happens in the vision'. See, J. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel, p. 41.

5. It is very extraordinary to find that Ezekiel has no less than 12 prophetic sign acts or prophetic symbolisms, while Isaiah only 3 and Jeremiah 7. These 12 prophetic signs of Ezekiel are in Ezek. 3: 22-27; 4:1-3; 4:4-8; 4:9-11; 4:12-15; 5:103; 12:1-16; 12:17-20; 21:11f.; 21:23-29; 24:15-24 and 37:15-28.¹ What is characteristic here is that it is not the prophetic signs themselves which are expressly told, but the words of God which are either introduced with the formula of 'The word of the Lord came to me' or simply put in direct address. This characteristic is clearly in a close connection with the one alluded to in point 1 above. Another surprising characteristic of these prophetic signs is that they are almost always directed towards the fall of Jerusalem. As far as Ezekiel's prophetic signs are concerned, it is also surprising that Ezekiel dramatized what the other prophets had only expressed in figurative speech. What is figuratively expressed in Jer. 15:16, cf. Pss. 19:11; 119:103, is ~~found in~~ dramatic expression in Ezek. 5:11; and figurative expression in Ezek. 37:11ff., dramatic expression in Ezek. 37:1-10. *given*

Whatever the organic relation between the passages in each couple might be, it is clear that Ezekiel has a very deep dramatic sensitivity.²

¹On 'prophetic sign act', see, e.g., H. Wheeler Robinson, 'Prophetic Symbolism', in Old Testament Essays (Collection of S.O.T.S.' papers), London, 1927, pp. 10ff.. Contrast, however, G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. II, (EP. by D. M. G. Stalker), Edinburgh, 1965 (reprinted 1970), p. 233.

²In this respect one could perhaps compare Ezekiel with Hosea, in spite of the variety of the interpretations of Hos. 1-3.

6. There are at least seven passages in the Book of Ezekiel in which a formula of a type of 'Qibla'¹ occurs, i.e., Ezek. 6:2ff.; 21:2ff.; 25:2; 35:2 which point to a country or a place, and Ezek. 13:17; 29:2 and 38:2 which point to a certain man or people. This type of formula is also found in Num. 22:41; 23:13 and 24:1f. in connection with Balaam's oracles, but is completely missing in the books of the other canonical prophets.

7. It is very striking that there are some lengthy units in the Book of Ezekiel which almost exhaust one particular theme, while in the books of the other canonical prophets there are hardly any such phenomena. It is striking also because the themes of those particular, long, passages of Ezekiel are in fact found in ~~that~~ other ^{those} books as well. For example, the theme of the whole of Ezek. 7 is found in Amos 8:2, the theme of Ezek. 16 in Hos. 1-3, and the theme of Ezek. 23 in Jer. 3:6ff..² Although it is impossible in this case to detect that Jeremiah is dependent on Ezekiel or vice versa, still it is possible to show that both of them are dependent on Hosea (Hos. 1-3).

In addition, the characteristic of the long unit is found in Ezekiel's oracles against foreign nations or foreign people, e.g., Ezek. 26:1 - 28:19 (against Tyre), 29 - 32 (against Egypt) and 38 - 39

¹This type of formula shows the direction to which the prophet is announcing his oracle(s).

²Zimmerli understands אִשָּׁרָה and בְּיָהוּדָה in Jer. 3:6ff. as personal names for Israel and Judah respectively (op. cit., pp. 521f.).

(against Gog of Magog). Further, it is perhaps part of this characteristic that there are no less than 13 pairs of passages in the Book of Ezekiel which can be regarded as doublets or parallel passages or the like.¹

8. A particular form of speech which is rather common in the Book of Ezekiel is that of discussion or disputation. As a rule it is created by a certain mockery, accusation, complaint, or the like, on the part of the public which is then answered or replied by the prophet; from there a style, or a type, of discussion develops. This can be seen, e.g., in Ezek. 12:22; 12:27; 18:2; 18:25; 20:3; 25:3; 26:2; 33:10; 37:11; etc..

9. In connection with the form of the discussional speech, there are some passages which bear a very special character, i.e., the so called 'speeches of accusation', in which the prophet is to judge the people and to make their abominations known to them. This is found in Ezek. 20:4; 22:2; 16:1 (sic); and 23:36 (sic). On this particular characteristic Zimmerli says that there is perhaps a relation between this form and the priestly sphere in which the practice of accusing people is officiated.²

10. From Ezek. 22:6ff.; 18:5-9; 18:10-13; 18:14-17; and 33:15, it seems clear that the series of the laws which are used by this

¹J. Lindblom, op. cit., pp. 288ff..

²Cf. W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 522.

prophet bear a great resemblance to the formulation of the Code of Holiness in Lev. 17 - 26. This is different from that of Hos. 4:1f. and Jer. 7:9, in which the series bear the resemblance to the Ritual Decalogue in Exod. 20:2-17 and Deut. 5:6-21. These three prophets, i.e., Hosea, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, use different series of laws obviously for the same purpose, namely, accusing the people for their sins or transgressions.

11. In Ezek. 3:19; 14:13; 18:5; and 33:2, 6, 9, there is a type of casuistic law in which the word 'כ is found after the subject of the sentence. This construction is of course different from that which is used in the Book of the Covenant (i.e., Exod. 20:22 - 23:33), but is similar to that which is used in 'the priestly casuistic' type in Leviticus (e.g., Lev. 1:2; 2:1; 27:2, 14; etc.). Besides, in Lev. 17 there is a type of speech which runs as follows :

אִשׁ אִשׁ נֹבֵיט שְׂדֵאֵל אִשׁ

and which occurs four times, i.e., in vv. 3, 8, 10, and 13. This special type of speech is also found in Ezek. 14:4, 7, but not in the other prophetic books.

From the last three points it is clear that there is a close connection between Ezekiel's language and that of the priestly circle, and that the connection could confirm the information in Ezek. 1:3, i.e., Ezekiel himself was a priest.

12. According to Zimmerli there are two strong lines of traditions in Israel, i.e., 'the Jerusalem-David tradition' and 'the "total-Israel" perspective of Exodus tradition'. Whereas Hosea firmly stands in the latter line, and Isaiah in the former, Ezekiel (chapters 16, 20, and 23), does not have that kind of

exclusive alternative.¹ This characteristic can also be seen, on the one hand, in Ezek. 34:23ff.; 37:25, in which a new David is both mentioned and expected, and on the other, in Ezek. 40 - 48, in which a new Jerusalem and a new Temple are to become the centre of the whole nation, North and South.

13. The characteristic of Ezekiel is clear also from the lack of the vocabularies which often surround the name of Yahweh. In the book which bears his name there is no mention of 'Yahweh Ts^ebaoth' at all, a divine name which is also missing in the priestly narratives (P); no mention of the love of Yahweh; nothing of יהוה יסוד or of יהוה יסוד, which are very important for both Hosea and Jeremiah; nothing about יהוה יסוד ('the fear of Yahweh'); nothing about 'trust in God', or 'plan', or 'work', or even קדש, of Yahweh.

14. There is a form of speech which characterizes Ezekiel the most, because with the verb in either 2nd. or 3rd. person it occurs no less than 63 times in the book which bears his name. This form of speech is 'And they (or you) shall know that I am Yahweh'.² This form of speech is also found in 1 Kings 20:13, 28, and Exod. 14:4; 16:12, which points to the Deuteronomistic writer and P narrator respectively. But it is completely missing in the books of the

¹ W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 524. Cf., however, infra, pp. 111ff., 237ff..

² For the number of this form's occurrences in the Book of Ezekiel, see, e.g., G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1936 (reprinted 1967), p. 71.

canonical prophets before Ezekiel.

As its number of occurrences shows, this special form has a very central meaning for Ezekiel. 'With this particular form of proclamation', says Zimmerli, 'the prophet not only announces a future act of Yahweh but formulates this announcement in a manner which expresses the hidden intention of Yahweh's act Yahweh acts, and the goal of that action is the creation of knowledge, the knowledge that he is Yahweh'.¹ Further, Zimmerli calls this peculiar formula 'Erweiswort', and says that 'we have in this a formula of self revelation, by which Yahweh steps out ~~in~~ his incognito, just as we find it in the preamble of the Decalogue or in the postscript of the Code of Holiness'.² This characteristic is clearly close to that which is observed in point 1 above.

Summing up all these observations, it can be said that, on the one hand, Ezekiel does belong to a wider circle of traditions, e.g., the P circle, the prophetic movement, and probably the Deuteronomistic circle, while on the other, his characteristics are really conspicuous. He is not only one of the inheritors of Israel'd traditions, but also one of the most prominent exponents of them. Zimmerli says :

'Ezekiel, this prophet of sensitivity, of dramatic personal involvement who is seized by the sudden intrusion of the word of Yahweh, who paints his pictures with the glaring colour of extreme phantasy but nevertheless stands in a passion-filled dialogue with his peers, who speaks out of a rich

¹W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 526. See also, W. Eichrodt, Ezekiel, (ET. by C. Quin), (O.T.L.), London, 1970, p. 15.

²W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 526.

priestly heritage and takes up many themes which have reached him through the earlier traditions of Israel and her prophets, this prophet Ezekiel with all his characteristics recedes into the background, when one asks about the goal of his proclamation. And in his place appears the one who is revealed by his intrusion, who desires to make the mystery of his person known to the world'.¹

¹W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 527.

P r e l i m i n a r y R e m a r k s .

1. As is stated in the beginning of the present study, the purpose of the present investigation is to examine Ezekiel's treatment of Israel's past history in the Book which bears his name. In this context, one might ask whether it is possible to separate, or to isolate, Israel's past history from her contemporary and her future ones. This question can be answered both negatively and positively.

First, the negative answer. It is impossible to separate Israel's past history from both her contemporary and her future ones. This is so, since theologically there is only one history of Israel which comprises both her past, her contemporary, and her future times. In this context, if a division of that history must be made, the designation of 'past', 'contemporary', and 'future', must be regarded as only superficially possible. This is clear from the fact that in most cases in which Israelite traditionists talk about Israel's past history they are at the same time talking about Israel's contemporary and future histories as well. In other words, most, if not all, of the references to Israel's past history in the Old Testament have, one way or another, something to do with Israel's contemporary and future histories.¹ And, vice versa, the

¹See, e.g., A. Jirku, Die Älteste Geschichte Israels im Rahmen lehrhafter Darstellungen, Leipzig, 1917; J. Vollmer, Geschichtliche Rückblicke und Motive in der Prophetie des Amos, Hosea und Jesaja, Berlin, 1971.

references to either Israel's contemporary history or her future one are very frequently, if not always, accompanied by the reference(s) to either her future or her contemporary, or her past, histories, or both her future, her contemporary, and her past, histories. Therefore, once again, it is impossible to separate, or to isolate, Israel's past history from both her contemporary and her future ones.

Second, the positive answer. Despite all that is said above, the chronological division of the whole of Israel's history into three periods, i.e., past, contemporary, and future, must not be regarded as impossible or strange. Although it would, indeed, be a mistake to take each one of the three chronological periods as standing independently from the other two, nevertheless it is not improbable to regard each one of them as constituting a unit of time which is, to a very large extent, unrepeatable and unique. It is true that in many a passage Israel's future history is referred to by explicitly comparing it with her past history. Yet, it would be a mistake to absolutize this comparison as if the future history were really the same as that of the past. What is true in this case is that there are similarities and dissimilarities between the future and the past, and yet each one of the two periods has its own uniqueness. It is on the basis of this uniqueness, therefore, that each one of the three chronological periods of Israel's history must be regarded as in itself constituting a unit.¹ In this

¹Cf. C. R. North, The Old Testament Interpretation of History, London, 1946, especially pp. 40ff..

context it seems justified to confine the scope of the subject examined in the present study to Ezekiel's treatment of Israel's past history.

2. In the light of what is said above, it is necessary at the present stage to decide which passages of the Book of Ezekiel can be regarded as representative and relevant for the purpose of the present study. As far as the Book of Ezekiel is concerned, there are indeed many passages in it which, either directly or indirectly, or both, refer to Israel's past history or to the fragments of it. The references to the whole of Israel's past history are, as is well known, found in chapters 16, 20, and 23, whereas the references to its fragments are found in 20:36; 28:25f.; 33:2ff.; 34:23f.; 36:28; and 37:2f..¹

A closer examination of the latter group of passages shows that the fragments of Israel's past history referred to in it can be classified under three themes: first, the land-giving to Israel's forefathers (28:25f.; 33:2f.; 36:28; 37:25ab); second,

¹One might wish to include Ezek. 14:12-20 and 28:3 in this group. However, it must be said that it is difficult to see the relationship between the three characters (Noah, Daniel, and Job) mentioned in these two passages and Israel's past history. For this, see, e.g., M. Noth, 'Noah, Daniel und Hiob in Ezechiel xiv', V.T. 1, 1951, pp. 251-260; George A. Barton, 'Daniel, A Pre-Israelite Hero of Galilee', J.B.L. 60, 1941, pp. 213-225.

the Davidic kingship (34:23f.; 37:25b); and third, the wilderness wandering, or wilderness punishment, of the fathers (20:36). Further, as far as the contexts and the form-critical units of the passages in which these references are found are concerned, the examination shows that the units are concerned primarily with Israel's future history rather than with her past. In other words, each of those fragmentary references to Israel's past history is used as only one of the descriptions of that future history rather than as the dominating issue in the whole of the passage or the unit in which it is found. In that sense, those references can be regarded as having only subordinate functions in their respective contexts or units. Therefore, they are neither representative for the Book of Ezekiel nor relevant for the purpose of the present study.

Now about chapters 16, 20, and 23. The references to Israel's past history in these three chapters are not fragmentary, but, instead, they are comprehensive. This is so, since in each one of them the reference does not confine itself to parts of that past history, but, on the contrary, it comprises the whole of it, right from its beginning to its very end. It is true that not the whole of each of these three chapters deals with Israel's past history, nevertheless, due to the fact that (a) Ezekiel devotes the biggest section of each of them to his treatment of Israel's past history, and (b) the past history of Israel constitutes the kernel of the issues in that section, it seems justified to regard these three chapters as being representative for the Book of Ezekiel

and relevant for the purpose of the present study.¹

In spite of this, however, it must be remembered that the taking of these three chapters for the purpose of the present study does not at all mean their being isolated from the rest of the Book of Ezekiel.

As far as the language of these three chapters is concerned, it must be said that that of chapter 20 is different from those of both chapters 16 and 23. This is so, since chapter 20 uses plain and ordinary language, whereas both chapters 16 and 23 use metaphorical language. On the basis of this difference, it seems wise to deal first with chapter 20 and then with chapters 16 and 23. And this is the sequence which is taken in the following examination of these three chapters.

¹As a matter of fact, these three chapters were long ago noted by scholars as the place in the Book of Ezekiel in which Ezekiel's treatment of Israel's past history can chiefly be found. This judgement is still valid. For all this, see, e.g., A. B. Davidson, Ezekiel, (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges), first edition, Cambridge, 1892, pp. xlivf., and very recently W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel : Gestalt und Botschaft, (B.S. 62), Neukirchen, 1972, p. 74.

CHAPTER III

EZEKIEL 20

A general reading of this chapter would easily give the impression that it is a unity. This is so because this chapter presents an idea which, on the one hand, is conveyed in the setting of the presence of 'the elders of Israel' in front of the prophet making enquiry of God (vv. 1-4, 30ff.) and, on the other, is dominated by two exodus themes, which give the impression that it consists of two parallel sections (vv. 5ff.: old exodus; vv. 33ff.: new exodus). The structures of the presentation of the theme in both sections are similar, i.e., the bringing out of the people Israel from foreign lands (v. 10: Egypt; v. 34: countries of Exile), the wilderness period (vv. 10, 15, 23 and vv. 35ff.), and the entry into the promised land (v. 28; vv. 42f.). In addition, it is clear that the old exodus is the prototype of the new one, that Israel of the present is not different from that of the old exodus, and that in both exodus events it is God himself who acts and will act.¹

Scholars are, generally speaking, in agreement in dividing this chapter into two sections, although there is no unanimity

¹G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1936 (reprinted 1967), p. 231; W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, (B.K. XIII/1), Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1956-1969, p. 437.

about the precise delimitation of these two sections. Bertholet divides the chapter into two sections, i.e., vv. 1-32 and vv. 33-44, and says that they refer to Jerusalem and to exilic standpoints respectively.¹ This division is followed by Fohrer, who points out that in view of their close relationship, vv. 1-3 and vv. 31b-32 are complementary to each other, and that they form the beginning and the end of the first section respectively.² Fohrer dates the first section in the year 591/590 B.C., while for the second he says that it presupposes the catastrophe of 587 B.C..³

Unlike Bertholet and Fohrer, Herrmann sees the first section in vv. 1-31 and the second in vv. 32-44,⁴ and dates them in 591 B.C. and after 586 B.C. respectively.⁵ This delimitation is also adopted by Eichrodt,⁶ and its comprehensive explanation

¹A. Bertholet - K. Galling, Ezechiel, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 13), Tübingen, 1936, p. 71.

²G. Fohrer - K. Galling, Ezechiel, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 13), Tübingen, 1955, pp. 107f., 114. Further, Fohrer uses these two passages, i.e., vv. 1-3 and vv. 31b-32, as the basis of his explanation of the historical background of the first section (ibid., p. 108).

³Ibid., pp. 108, 114.

⁴J. Herrmann, Ezechiel, (K.A.T. XI), Leipzig, Erlangen, 1924, pp. 122, 126.

⁵Ibid., pp. 122, 125f..

⁶W. Eichrodt, Ezekiel, (ET. by Cosslett Quin), (O.T.L.), London, 1970, pp. 263, 276.

is provided by Zimmerli.¹

From the form-critical point of view Zimmerli argues that the use of the 'Schwuraussage' ('] X ' [) in the Book of Ezekiel, which occurs sixteen times, and with only one or two exceptions, does not constitute the beginning of a sentence. In most cases its use is contextual, as for example in Ezek. 18:2f.; 33:10f., 24, 27, in which the 'Schwuraussage' is used in connection with, and is inseparable from, the preceding quotation.² Based on this argument, Zimmerli refers to v. 32 and v. 33, which contain a quotation from what the people said and a 'Schwuraussage' ('] X ' [) respectively, and says that these two verses are very closely related and even inseparable.³ In connection with the division of the chapter, Zimmerli points out that it would be unusual to use the quotation in v. 32 as the conclusion of the first section. Therefore, so Zimmerli continues, the first section must end with v. 31, and the second section begins with v. 32. Thus, the chapter is now divided into two sections, i.e., vv. 1-31 and vv. 32-44, and this is the division which is adopted in the present study.

¹In distinction from all these scholars, Cooke does not divide Ezek. 20 into two sections. Instead, he says that this chapter seems to have been constructed on a plan with the following divisions: vv. 1-4(?); vv. 5-9; vv. 10-14; vv. 15-22, 23-26; (vv. 27-29 later addition?); vv. 30-32; vv. 33-39; and vv. 40-44 (G. A. Cooke, op. cit., p. 213).

²W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 438.

³W. Zimmerli, op. cit., in loc..

In view of the purpose of the present study, i.e., examining Ezekiel's treatment of Israel's past history, it is necessary to examine these two sections and their sub-sections further, in order to find out which section or sub-sections are relevant. In this connection the second section will be examined first. According to its form and content, it seems possible to divide this section into two sub-sections or units, i.e., vv. 32-38 which deals with the theme of new exodus, and vv. 39-44 which deals with the theme of (re-)entry into the promised land and Israel's worship there. The delimitation of these two units is based on the fact that both sub-sections begin with a form of speech which is characteristic of Ezekiel, i.e., the disputation form (vv. 32, 39),¹ and are ended by an 'Erkenntnisformel' which is also characteristic of Ezekiel (vv. 38, 42-44).²

Now, as far as the first unit, i.e., vv. 32-38, is concerned, it is interesting to find that the new exodus theme is used in connection with the dispute between Yahweh and the exiles. To that extent the theme of the new exodus must be distinguished from the exodus theme in Pentateuch, since the latter is not at all related with any dispute between Yahweh and Israel in Egypt.

¹For this form of speech, see, supra, p. 76.

²Cf. W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 452.

way or another, related to the disputation form of speech, or the so called rib-pattern. Putting it the other way round, in regard to the formal context of its occurrences, it seems possible to infer that the word $\text{וֹשַׁל$ in its Niph'al form is one of the integral factors of the disputation form of speech.¹

However, whereas in both 1 Sam. 12:6ff. and Isa. 43:25-28 the references to Israel's past history are parts of the arguments in the controversies, the one in Ezek. 20:32-38 is not. Instead, the reference to Israel's past history in Ezek. 20:36b is one of the descriptions of the judgement which Yahweh will carry out against his people. This is so since this judgement is described in this unit in at least three ways. First, it will be 'face to face' between Yahweh and the people (v. 35b β); second, it will be like that which was carried out by Yahweh on the fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt (v. 36); and finally, it will be like the collecting, counting, and sorting out, of sheep by their shepherd (vv. 37f.).² In this connection, it is of

¹For the inclusion of the Niph'al of וֹשַׁל , especially that of Ezek. 17:20; 20:35-36, in the rib-pattern, see, e.g., B. Gensler, 'The rib- or Controversy-Pattern in Hebrew Mentality', V.T. Supp., Vol. III, 1955, pp. 120-137, especially p. 131.

²For the last one see, J. Herrmann, Ezechiel, (K.A.T. XI), pp. 121, 125f.; G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), p. 221; W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 456. Cf. Jer. 33:13; Lev. 27:32; Isa. 40:26; Matt. 25:31ff..

course possible to regard each one of the descriptions as only repeating the other two, or one of the other two; but, since Ezekiel often gives a long, and sometimes repetitious, description of one particular thing,¹ it seems better to regard those three descriptions of judgement in Ezek. 20:35-38 as having equal significance. To that extent, it would be a mistake to regard the reference to Israel's past history in v. 36b as the predominating, or perhaps a subordinate, description of the judgement. Besides, this unit is, as a matter of fact, dominated by verbs in the imperfect tense which refer to future actions of Yahweh. In other words, this unit does not seem to be concerned with Israel's past history so much as with her future one. Thus it seems justifiable now to say that this unit is not relevant to the present study.

As was said earlier, the second unit, i.e., vv. 39-44, is in a disputation form of speech, as is clear from the fact that (a) the negative statement which refers to Israel's unwillingness to hear Yahweh, as is stated, e.g., in Ezek. 3:7, is now used as the condition for the strong command to the 'house of Israel' to follow and serve their idols (v. 39);² this command itself

¹See, supra pp. 75f., and infra pp. 129ff..

²As far as the text of v. 39 is concerned, and apart from the word 'אָהַר, the only word that matters much is וְאַחַר; otherwise it does not seem necessary to make a major emendation or correction. (Contrast, however, W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 437; BHS.). As it now stands, the way-copula in the word וְאַחַר seems to be a dittography of the way in the word וְאַחַר, and that the particle וְ in the words אִם-אֵינְכֶם was probably confused with the original suffix ים of the word אַחַר, so that in a sense it is a haplography of it. So, the word וְאַחַר is probably originally the word אַחַרִים. Cf. Josh. 23:16; Deut. 13:7, 14; 17:3; 28:14; 29:17. For the word אִינְכֶם, see, G-K. paras, 100o; 152m..

is in fact the reverse of the prohibition to do the same thing as is stated in Ezek. 20:7;¹ and (b) this unit is ended with the use of the 'Erkenntnisformel' (v. 44).

As far as Israel's past history is concerned, there is a very brief reference in v. 42b:

'the land which I swore to give to your father'.

In the context of this unit, this brief reference is used only as the explanation of what אֲדַמַת יִשְׂרָאֵל is. In that sense, it seems possible to say that the reference itself has only a subordinate significance compared to that of the אֲדַמַת יִשְׂרָאֵל. On the other hand, it is interesting to find that the use of the phrase אֲשַׁתֵּי אָבוֹתַי in connection with Yahweh's oath to give the land to 'the fathers' is found six times in Ezek. 20:1-31, i.e., in vv. 5 (twice), 6, 15, 23, and 26. This fact alone, if need be, seems sufficient to show that (a) this unit, i.e., Ezek. 20:39-44, cannot by any means be separated from Ezek. 20:1-31, and (b) the significance of the reference to Israel's past history in this chapter is not primarily to be found in this unit. In addition, and like in the unit of vv. 32-38, the verbs which are used here are almost dominated by their reference to the future actions of Yahweh. In other words, this unit does not seem to have been concerned with Israel's past history as much

¹For this controversial command, cf. Amos. 4:4; Noh. 3:15; 1 Kings 22:15.

as it does with Israel's future.¹

So, as far as Israel's past history is concerned, this unit is not relevant for the purpose of the present study.

In view of all this, it seems now justifiable to say that Ezekiel's treatment of Israel's past history in this chapter is not to be found primarily in the second section of the chapter, i.e., Ezek. 20:32-44, but in its first one, i.e., Ezek. 20:1-31.

However, as far as its formal structure and content are concerned, there is a part of this first section which seems to have formed a sub-section by itself. This is vv. 27-29. In the context of the first section, it is interesting to find that both vv. 27-29 and vv. 30-31 appear to be two conclusions of what is said in vv. 1-26. This is so since both of them begin with two similar prophetic concluding words which are introduced by כן (vv. 27, 30). Nevertheless, the two conclusions are different from each other in that in v. 27 the concluding words are not followed by a conclusion appropriate for what is said in vv. 1-26. Instead, it is followed by a new command to the prophet (v. 27a β : וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם; cf. v. 3a) to utter a new accusation against the people (v. 27b-28).² This accusation seems to

¹W. Zimmerli wants to put the whole section, i.e., vv. 32-44, in front of chapters 40-48 primarily because of its concern with the future of Israel (op. cit., p. 453).

²Notice the emphatic phrase וְיָדַעְתָּ in v. 27b α !

be rounded off by the word-play in y. 29 which refers to the aetiological explanation of the name $\overline{\text{הלל}}$. Compared with vy. 27-29 the concluding words in vy. 30f. contain not only the summarized reference to what is said in vy. 5-26, but also clearly refer back to what is said in vy. 1-3, i.e., the rejection of Yahweh to be enquired of ($\overline{\text{שאל}}$) by the elders of (the house of) Israel. Besides, it has been shown earlier that y. 31 with its 'Schwuraussage' ($\overline{\text{שבע}}$) constitutes the end of the first section.

In view, then, of the close connection between vy. 1-3 and vy. 30f., it can be said that these two passages are actually the beginning and the end of the first section respectively. To that extent, it seems justifiable to regard vy. 30f., and not vy. 27-29, as the appropriate conclusion for the first section.

Having said this, there are now two questions concerning vy. 27-29 which must be answered. First, what is the relationship between vy. 27-29 and vy. 1-26? Second, what is the relationship between vy. 27-29 and vy. 30-31? Putting these two questions in another way, does vy. 30-31 conclude what is said in vy. 1-26 only, or does it conclude what is said in vy. 27-29 as well? In answering this question it must be emphasized that from the point of view of prophetic traditions, it seems difficult to regard vy. 27-29 as ~~additional~~ secondary, or the like. Even if it is, it is not the intention of the present study to prove it. Now, as far as the relationship between vy. 27-29 and what precedes

a/

addition/

it is concerned, there are some points which can be made. First, form-critically this sub-section, i.e., vv. 27-29, can hardly be regarded as the continuation of what precedes it, which is stereotypically structured. Whereas the stereotyped structure of vv. 5-26 can be seen, e.g., in the recurrence of the similar phrases in vv. 8f., 13f., 21f., there is no such occurrence at all in vv. 27-29.¹ Besides, the word $\eta \gamma \lambda$, which is found in v. 28, and which can be regarded as a substitute for the recurring word $\eta \gamma \chi$ in vv. 5-26, is found again in the Book of Ezekiel only in 5:15 (as a substantive); and the word $\delta \psi \omega$ is found only in 20:28. Second, it is interesting to find that vv. 27-29 clearly deals with the history of Israel in the period after the entry into the promised land (v. 28), whereas vv. 5-26 deals with the history before that period, and that the histories in both periods are the same, i.e., they are the histories of sins. Third, on the basis of the two points above, Zimmerli prefers to regard vv. 27-29 as containing 'einen ungeschickt eingeführten Nachtrag zum Geschichtsbericht 5-26'² or as 'ein weiteres Stück Nachexegese'.³ This preference of Zimmerli is supported by G. W. Coats,⁴ although the latter's argument is slightly different

¹See, further, W. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, (B.K. XIII/1), pp. 439, 450f..

²Ibid., p. 439.

³Ibid., p. 450.

⁴G. W. Coats, Rebellion in the Wilderness, Nashville, 1968.

from that of the former. Due to the subject-matter of his particular study referred to here,¹ Coats takes the murmuring tradition as his starting point, and from there he looks at Ezek. 20:1-31. He demonstrates that Ezek. 20:1-31, in spite of its Ezekielian characteristic and uniqueness, does inherit the murmuring tradition.² But, due to the facts that (a) the elements of the murmuring, with its wilderness reference, is found only in vv. 5-26, and (b) form-critically vv. 27-29 is different from vv. 5-26, Coats infers that vv. 27-29 is 'not to be considered as part of the basic unit'.³

From these three points, it seems clear that both form-critically and traditio-historically vv. 27-29 is different from vv. 5-26. And in that sense vv. 27-29 can perhaps be regarded as separating vv. 5-26 from its conclusion in vv. 30f.. However, the fact that vv. 27-29 is form-critically and traditio-historically different from vv. 5-26, does not necessarily mean that it must be excluded from the context of the whole section. This is so for the following reasons. First, vv. 27b-28 can be regarded

¹See note 4 on p. 96. What Coats means by the murmuring tradition is the traditions of the wilderness wandering of Israel whose particular motive is the negative response of Israel to the exodus event. The key word for this murmuring motive is the word ן followed by the preposition ב (ibid., pp. 13-15, 21f.).

²G. W. Coats, op. cit., p. 241.

³Ibid., p. 231.

as referring concisely to Israel's past history, i.e., Israel's history in Palestine until the time of Ezekiel (Ezek. 16:23).

Despite the fact that some of the words used in this reference to Israel's past history are different from those in vv. 5-26, it must be noted once again that this history is also a history of sin, which is the same as that described in vv. 5-26.

Second, apart from the word יָבֹשׁ, the phraseology used in v. 27a is similar to that which is used in v. 3a α . This suggests that the reference to the sinful history of Israel's past in vv. 27b-28 might be intended to serve the same end as in vv. 5-26. Third, the phraseology used in v. 28a is interesting.

This is so because :

(a) It is similar to the one used in v. 42a β b. It has been said earlier that the significance of the use of ' ט' אַחֲשׁוּבָה ' is not primarily to be found in v. 42, but in vv. 1-31. This, in fact, applies also to the one found in v. 28, which means that the significance of the phrase ' ט' אַחֲשׁוּבָה ' is to be found primarily in vv. 5f., 15, and 23.¹

(b) It is only in v. 28 and v. 42 that the phrase ' ט' אַחֲשׁוּבָה ' is used in connection with the reference to the entry into the land which is promised to be given to the 'fathers'. Anticipating

¹For this, see, below.

the inference that the phrase $\text{ׁ} \text{ׁ} \text{ׁ} \text{ׁ} \text{ׁ}$ is genuinely Ezekielian, it must be said that the phrase which is used in the theme of the entry into the land can hardly be Ezekielian. This is so, not only because the theme of the giving ($\text{ׁ} \text{ׁ} \text{ׁ}$) of the land to the 'fathers' was already known to Israel's traditionists long before Ezekiel (e.g., JE : Gen. 12:3, 7; 13:14-16; 15:3, 7, 18; etc.),¹ but also because the use of the Hiph'il of $\text{ׁ} \text{ׁ} \text{ׁ}$ plus $\text{ׁ} \text{ׁ} \text{ׁ}$ in the phraseology of this theme is Deuteronomistic rather than otherwise (cf. Deut. 6:23; 26:3; 31:20f.).² Besides, it seems true that there is a close relationship between Ezek. 20:27b-28 and Deut. 31:20f., in that these two passages contain the same theme : the saving act of Yahweh, i.e., his having brought (Hiph'il of $\text{ׁ} \text{ׁ} \text{ׁ}$) Israel into the land, is, or would be, responded to by sinful deeds on Israel's part.³ Also, the phrase $\text{ׁ} \text{ׁ} \text{ׁ} \text{ׁ} \text{ׁ}$ in v. 28 (and 42) is clearly a substitute for the Deuteronomistic term $\text{ׁ} \text{ׁ} \text{ׁ}$ which normally goes together with the original Deuteronomistic term for the bringing of the people Israel into the promised land (Deut. 1:8; 6:10; 7:13; 8:1; 11:9, 21; etc.).

¹Cf. G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, (ET. by D. M. G. Stalker), Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1965, pp. 168f..

²H. D. Preuss, ' $\text{ׁ} \text{ׁ} \text{ׁ}$ ', IV, T.W.A.T., cols. 544ff..

³See also how close is the idea which is contained in Deut. 31:21b to that of Ezek. 20:32a, i.e., Yahweh knew what was in the mind of the people.

Fourth, although it is not clear whether in this case Ezekiel copies from the Deuteronomistic documents or vice versa, it is clear that, as it now stands, y. 28a preserves the idea that Yahweh's bringing Israel into the promised land is part, or the last part, of the whole saving history (Deut. 26:9).¹ Now, if this saving act of Yahweh is followed up, or is responded to negatively by the people (y. 28b; cf. y. 27b; Deut. 31:20b, 21), does it not mean that yy. 27b-28 has the same structure as that of yy. 5-26? Moreover, it must be said that y. 28a is not only the counter-part of the negative statement in y. 15 which is basically also using Deuteronomistic phraseology, but it is also the continuation of it.

From all this, it can now perhaps be inferred that (a) although form-critically and traditio-historically yy. 27-29 is different from yy. 5-26, its structure is the same as that of yy. 5-26; (b) as it now stands, yy. 27-29 constitutes part of Ezekiel's reasoning to support his conclusion in the disputation address which is formulated in yy. 30f.; and (c) due to the fact that yy. 27-29 also deals with (the last part of) Israel's past history, its inclusion into the whole section must be regarded as relevant for the purpose of the present study.

¹Cf. G. von Rad. op. cit., pp. 224f..

Having said all this, it is time now to examine Ezekiel's treatment of Israel's past history in this section, i.e., in vv. 1-31. To begin with, it must be said that Ezekiel's treatment of that history proper is clear only from y. 5 onwards, while vv. 1-4 and vv. 30f., constitute its framework.

Verse 1 : The dating.

This verse is one of the eleven whose dates have no explicit historical reference at all.¹ Battersby Harford argues that on the basis of the similarity between Ezek. 24:1f. and 2 Kings 25:1 all of these eleven datings might have their reckoning from the enthronement of King Zedekiah as does the date of 2 Kings 25:1.² Whatever the historical reference, or the historical references, of these eleven datings in the Book of Ezekiel might be, it is interesting to find that among them there are only two in which 'the elders' are mentioned, i.e., 8:1 (the elders of Judah) and 20:1 (the elders of Israel).³ The problem which is involved in the

¹They are : Ezek. 1:1; 8:1; 20:1; 24:1; 26:1; 29:1, 17; 30:20; 31:1; 32:1, 17.

²J. Battersby Harford, Studies in the Book of Ezekiel, Cambridge, 1935, pp. 40f..

³Ezek. 14:1 mentions 'the elders of Israel' but without dating.

mentioning of the names 'Israel' and 'Judah' in the Book of Ezekiel has been very crucial for some scholars. A lengthy discussion about this can be found in Battersby Harford's book referred to above.¹ However, despite some possible further discussions about the historical and the chronological references of the dates in the Book of Ezekiel, particularly that of Ezek. 20:1, it is generally agreed that this particular date in Ezek. 20:1 could be assigned to the year 591 B.C. (Cooke, Zimmerli) or 590 B.C. (Davidson), i.e., before the fall of Jerusalem and the Temple.

The mentioning of the elders sitting in front of the prophet (8:1ff.; 14:1ff.; 20:1ff.; cf. 33:31), is one of Ezekiel's characteristics. And as has been pointed out earlier, this kind of situation or setting is not found in any other prophetic book or in other books in the Old Testament except in 2 Kings 6:32. Ezek. 20:1 shows that the purpose of those elders who sat before the prophet was to inquire of God, a special purpose which is also explicitly stated in 14:1ff.. Nevertheless it is not clear what in fact they were inquiring of God, despite some suggestions that they might be waiting for some comforting words of God through the prophet (Zimmerli, Eichrodt, Taylor), or that they had some particular questions to ask (Cooke). What seems to be certain here is that the presence of the elders in front of a priest-prophet

¹J. Battersby Harford, *op. cit.*, pp. 27ff.; cf. W. Zimmerli, 'Israel in Buche Ezechiel', *VT.* 3, 1958, pp. 75-90; *idem*, 'The Special Form- and Traditio-historical Character of Ezekiel's Prophecy', *VT.* 15, 1965, p. 524.

like Ezekiel points to an activity which is in some way connected with the cult.¹ To that extent it can perhaps be said that the setting, or the background, of this chapter, i.e., Ezek. 20, is the cult rather than any other formal institution. This is also clear from the vocabulary which is predominant in it, e.g.,

חֲקוּרָה, מִשְׁפָּטִים, לְמַעַן שְׂמִי, etc..

The mentioning of the making inquiry of God which is followed by the recitation of Israel's past history in this chapter is in parallelism with the structure found in Ezek. 36:37f., in which the mentioning of the making inquiry of God is followed by the mentioning of God's past promise. And the mentioning of the inquirers' accusation (Ezek. 30:1ff., 30f.) is found again in Ezek. 14:1-11.

Verse 2.

This is a typical prophetic formula which announces the word-event of God's revelation to the prophet.² Although the formula in this verse is very frequently found elsewhere in the Old Testament, the use of the first person suffix in the word יָבִיא

¹Cf. H. Graf Reventlow, Wächter Über Israel : Ezechiel und seine Tradition, Berlin, 1962, pp. 76f..

²For the term 'word-event', see, however, K. Koch, The Growth of the Biblical Tradition, (ET. by S. M. Cupitt), London, 1969, p. 202.

seems to be very characteristic of Ezekiel.¹ Although this formula does not seem to be the invention of Ezekiel, its frequent occurrence in the book which bears his name is impressive. According to Zimmerli, this formula, with some small variations, occurs not less than 52 times in the Book of Ezekiel.²

Verse 3-4.

The use of the phrase $\square\tau\lambda\text{-}\gamma\text{-}\gamma$ is characteristically Ezekielian. This is so for at least two reasons. First, whereas its occurrences outside the Book of Ezekiel are found only fourteen times, i.e., in Num. 23:19; Isa. 51:12; 56:2; Jer. 48:18, 33; 50:40; 51:43; Pss. 8:5; 80:18; 146:3; Job 16:21; 26:6; 35:8; and Dan. 8:17, it occurs not less than 93 times in the Book of Ezekiel. Second, whereas in all of those occurrences outside the Book of Ezekiel, with the exception of Dan. 8:17, the phrase $\square\tau\lambda\text{-}\gamma\text{-}\gamma$ could either be a title of king (e.g., in Pss. 80:18; 146:3) or refer to mankind in general,³ in those of Dan. 8:17 and the Book

¹W. Zimmerli, 'The Special Form- and Traditio-historical Character of Ezekiel's Prophecy', VT. 15, 1965, p. 516; idem, Ezekiel, (B.K. XIII/1), pp. 88ff..

²W. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, (B.K. XIII/1), p. 88.

³H. Haag, ' $\square\tau\lambda\text{-}\gamma\text{-}\gamma$ ', II. 1, T.W.A.T., cols. 685-686; G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), pp. 30f.; W. Eichrodt, Ezekiel, (ET. by Cosslet Quin), (O.T.L.), London, 1970, p. 61.

The relationship of the Hebrew phrase $\square\tau\lambda\text{-}\gamma\text{-}\gamma$ and the Aramaic $\omega\text{-}\gamma\text{-}\gamma$ is both too complicated and irrelevant to be discussed here. The discussion of this relationship can be found, e.g., in S. Mowinkel, He That Cometh, (ET. by G. W. Anderson), Oxford, 1956, especially pp. 346-450; G. Dalman, The Words of Jesus, (ET. by D. M. Kay), Edinburgh, 1902, pp. 234-267; H. Haag, op. cit., cols. 682-689.

of Ezekiel it refers to a private individual. In Dan. 8:17 it refers to Daniel and in the Book of Ezekiel it refers to Ezekiel himself.¹ As far as its occurrence in the Book of Ezekiel is concerned, most scholars are in agreement in taking this phrase as referring to the contrast between Ezekiel, a man with his human weaknesses, lowliness, and creatureliness, and Yahweh, the Lord, with his glory, majesty, and almightiness.²

As it now stands, its being used immediately after the complete word-event formula (v. 2) is regarded by Cornelis B. Houk as one of the signs of the authenticity of the passage or the section which follows.³

(1) ¹The form-critical and literary-critical significances of the phrase $\square\tau\aleph\text{-}\{\}\beth$ in the Book of Ezekiel are clear from the statements of both W. Zimmerli and Cornelis B. Houk. On the one hand W. Zimmerli says: 'Die formel leitet in der Regel eine neue Redeeinheit ein und ist infolgedessen eines der wesentlichen Hilfsmittel zur Abgrenzung der einzelnen Redeeinheiten im Buche Ez' (op. cit., p. 88), and on the other Cornelis B. Houk points out that the phrase is one of the signs of the authenticity of the passage or the section which immediately follows it (' $\square\tau\aleph\text{-}\{\}\beth$ Patterns as Literary Criteria in Ezekiel', J.B.L. 88, 1969, pp. 184ff.).

²See, supra, p. 104 note 3, and A. B. Davidson, Ezekiel, (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges), revised by A. W. Streane, who prefers to translate $\square\tau\aleph\text{-}\{\}\beth$ as 'child of man' (pp. 15f.).

³Cornelis B. Houk, op. cit., loc. cit..

In y. 3a α it is stated that Ezekiel is commissioned by Yahweh to deliver his words to the elders of Israel. As was noted above, this command is similar to that which is found in y. 27, although the presence of the word לכך in the latter has caused some problems. The use of the word רַבֵּן (Pi'el imperative) which is followed by waw consecutive plus ~~imperfect~~ (= imperative), וַאֲמַרְתָּ, and prep. -לָא in this command reminds one of the affinity of Ezekiel to P. This is clear from the fact that this combination of רַבֵּן (Pi'el imperative) and וַאֲמַרְתָּ plus prep. -לָא, which occurs four times in the Book of Ezekiel (14:4; 20:3, 27; 29:3; 33:2), is found again only in P sections of the Pentateuch, i.e., in Leviticus (e.g., 1:2; 17:2; 18:2; 22:18; etc.) and Numbers (e.g., 5:12; 6:2; 8:2; 15:2, 18, 38; etc.).

Further, the interrogative sentence in y. 3a β seems to refer to what is stated in y. 1a β , and that the negative sentence in y. 3b is the answer to it. In other words, as it now stands, vv. 1-3 appears like a disputation-form of speech.¹ In addition, the way the negative answer of Yahweh is presented seems to support this assumption.

The use of the phrases 'הוּא אֵלֵינוּ and וְהוּא אֵלֵינוּ before and after the answer respectively shows how emphatic the answer is. The combination of these two phrases is frequently used by

¹For this form of speech, see, supra, p. 76.

about v. 4. The most interesting thing in this verse is the use of the word שׁוֹפְטִים (Qal imperf. interrog.). In the Old Testament this word in its present form is found only five times, and all are in the Book of Ezekiel, i.e., Ezek. 20:4 (twice), 22:2 (twice), and 23:36.¹ In all of these three passages the word שׁוֹפְטִים is followed by, or more precisely, is combined with, another sentence which contains the command to the prophet to make known² the abominations (subst. from רָעוּת) of Israel.³ The facts that (a) this combination is uniquely Ezekielian, and (b) in Ezek. 20:4 this combination is used as an integral part of the disputational speech, suggest that that combination is one of the most important parts of the disputational speech itself.⁴ And in that sense it confirms the conclusion drawn earlier, i.e., that Ezekiel's treatment of

¹S. Mandelkern, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae, Akademische Druck-u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, 1955.

²Whereas in both Ezek. 20:4 and 22:2 the word שׁוֹפְטִים is used, in Ezek. 23:36 the word רָעוּת .

³In Ezek. 20:4 Israel is referred to as the 'fathers', in 22:2 as 'the bloody city' of Jerusalem, and in 23:36 as 'Oholah and Oholibah'.

⁴Cf. G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), who says that each time the context explains that the word שׁוֹפְטִים means 'to set out the case' against the people (p. 214).

Israel's past history (vv. 5-29), which immediately follows that combination (v. 4), is part of the arguments in the disputational speech itself.

Verses 5-29 : Israel's past history.

This section is remarkable in that in dealing with Israel's past history it does not use metaphorical language. In other words, this section is remarkable in that it does not speak about a foundling baby-girl (cf. Ezek. 16), or about a vine (cf. Ezek. 15; 19:10ff.), or about a lion (cf. Ezek. 19:1ff.), or about adulterous women (cf. Ezek. 23). Instead, it speaks clearly, openly, and directly, about the 'fathers' of Israel in the literal sense of 'ancestors'.¹ If the 'elders of Israel' or the current generation, who are the addressees of the speech in this section, feel that they are the children of these 'fathers' (cf. Ezek. 2:2; 18:2, 19; etc.), this direct address must have sounded more emphatic than if it had been expressed metaphorically. A direct address which is coupled with a clear mention of the name of the addressee, is essentially stronger than a metaphorical one. This is so because essentially the latter is more meditative than the former. The direct address found in this section gives the impression that Ezekiel knew very well how to use the social,

¹W. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, (B.K. XIII/1), p. 439.

religious, and anthropological background of his audience for the benefit and the effectiveness of his message. This is so since to the eastern mind, and in a disputational speech such as is found here, the effect of the mentioning of the abominations of the fathers is almost as strong as that of the mentioning of the abominations of the children itself. So, by looking at Israel's past history, Ezekiel is actually looking at the history of his audience itself.

Further, it is remarkable that this section does not use any political phraseology or any political term at all. Instead, it uses phraseologies and terms which refer to the religious life of the 'fathers'. This fact suggests that the issues of the speech in it are religious, and not political. In other words, the abominations of the 'fathers' which are made known here are religious abominations, and not political ones (cf. Ezek. 23, below). The fact that these religious abominations are told in relation to Yahweh's choice of the seed of the house of Jacob (v. 5) and, most significantly, to the exodus event, has made this section unique. In this connection Zimmerli rightly warns that in dealing with this section one must be very careful not to say that this section can be understood as containing an arbitrary remembrance of Israel's past history. Instead, so Zimmerli opines, this section must be looked at in its traditio-historical setting or background.¹

¹Ibid.

As in Ezek. 15; 19:10-14 in which Ezekiel puts the stress of his understanding of Israel on the negative side (cf. Hos. 1-3; Isa. 5:1-7; Jer. 2:1ff.), in this section his interpretation of Israel's past history is also dominated by his negative stress. As it now stands, the formal structure of this section reminds one of the Credo. Therefore, according to Zimmerli, Ezekiel's negative interpretation of Israel's past history in it could be oriented antithetically to the outline of the salvation-history which is found in the credo-formulas.¹ In this connection he says that, on the one hand, the elements of Israel's disobedience in Ezek. 20:1-29 can be related to the ancient traditional elements of the murmuring of the people in the wilderness, of the sinning ('Verständigung') with the golden calf (Exod. 32), and the rebellion of part of the people in relation to the sending out of the spy to Palestine (Num. 13f.; Deut. 1:19-46), and on the other, in Ezek. 20:1-29 Ezekiel is not called to enumerate the sins of Israel, but to declare that the great events of her salvation-history are themselves the 'Stationen eines Weges der greulichen Sünde Israels'.²

As is said above, G. W. Coats takes up and develops one aspect of what Zimmerli says here in that he demonstrates that

¹Ibid., pp. 439ff..

²Ibid., pp. 440-442.

Ezek. 20:1-29 does inherit both the rebellion tradition and the murmuring one.¹ What can be inferred from Coats's particular work referred to here is that, from the point of view of both the rebellion tradition and the murmuring one, the recitation of Israel's sinful past history in Ezek. 20:1-29, or rather Ezek. 20:1-26, is neither new nor unique. This is so because the traditions of Israel's sinful past history were already in existence and in transmission long before Ezekiel's time (cf. Exod. 32; Num. 13f.; Deut. 1:19-46; etc.)².

However, Coats's analysis of Ezek. 20:1-29 must be regarded as one-sided in that it has ignored the form and the structure of this section. Despite the fact that the tradition-materials which were used by Ezekiel were already in existence and in transmission long before his time, their being organically used by Ezekiel in this particular part of the book which bears his name seems to point to something new and, perhaps, unusual. In this connection, Zimmerli's remark that the similarity of the form and the structure of this section to that of the Credo-formula is very important. Zimmerli says that in this section Ezekiel takes the elements of the 'little historical credo'. In this 'little

¹G. W. Coats, op. cit., pp. 24, 78, 231-241.

²One of the important aspects of Coats's work referred to here is to show the rise and the transmission, or the development, of these two traditions, i.e., the rebellion tradition and the murmuring tradition.

historical credo' the great salvation-acts of Yahweh from the exodus onwards are praised, whereas in this section they are used by Ezekiel to show the history of the punishable disobedience of Israel.¹ Besides, the fact that in this section there is a three-fold stereotyped formal structure, especially in vv. 5-26, is quite distinctive. This is so since in the Book of Ezekiel there are some passages which also show that Ezekiel is really fond of the number three, e.g., the casuistic course of the three generations in Ezek. 18, and the triple casuistic lay-out of Ezek. 3:17ff.; 14:12ff.; 33:1ff..²

From all this it can be inferred that although Ezek. 20:1-29 depends very much on tradition-materials older than Ezekiel himself, nevertheless its present form and structure show quite clearly that it is distinctively Ezekielian. In other words, although to some extent Ezekiel depends on the older traditions he appears to have used those traditions organically and not mechanically.

This inference is also supported by the result of the following general examination of some passages outside the Book of Ezekiel in which the recitation of Israel's past history is found. These passages are, among others, Deut. 6:20-24; 26:5-9; Johs. 24:2-13, 17f.; 1 Sam. 12:8ff.; Ps. 78:9ff.; 105:7ff.;

¹W. Zimmerli, op. cit., pp. 439ff..

²Ibid., p. 440.

106:6ff.; 136:4ff.; Neh. 9:6ff.. Disregarding the dates of all of these passages, the most outstanding among them are Pss. 136 and Neh. 9:6ff., in that the former begins Israel's history with the creation (Ps. 136:4-9) and ends it with the occupation¹ of the land of Palestine, while the latter begins it with the patriarchs and ends it with the exiles (Neh. 9:27ff.). These two passages are called outstanding because none of the other passages listed above begins Israel's history as far back as to the creation² or ends it as late as the exile. In other words, what is involved in those other passages is Israel's past history ranging from the period of the patriarchs to the period of the occupation of Palestine by Israel. If this span of Israel's past history is divided thematically, it would be clear that some of those passages have less, or more, themes than the other and that some of them deal with one or more themes differently. This can be seen from what follows. The patriarchal theme is found and is used as the beginning of Israel's past history only in Deut. 26:5-9; Josh. 24:2-13; and Ps. 105:17ff.; whereas Deut. 6:20-24; Josh. 24:17f.; 1 Sam. 12:8ff.; Pss. 78:9ff.; 136:4ff., use the exodus theme as the beginning of Israel's past history.

¹The term 'occupation' is used here in the sense of 'entering', 'conquering', and 'occupying', the land and Israel's settling down there.

²Isa. 51:12-16 does refer the beginning of Israel's history to the creation, but it is not considered here because it does not refer to the end of that past history.

The wilderness theme is not mentioned at all in Deut. 6:20-24; 26:5-9; 1 Sam. 12:8ff., and is only briefly mentioned in Josh. 24:7b, 17b; Ps. 136:16, although it is mentioned in lengthy measure in Pss. 78:17ff.; 105:37ff.; 106:13ff.; and Neh. 9. Finally, the theme of the occupation is found in all of those passages, except in Ps. 106 in which it is only implicitly indicated (Ps. 106:34ff.).

Now, if a comparison between Ezek. 20:5-29 and all of these passages is made, it will appear that Ezek. 20:5-29 lacks both the patriarchal theme and that of the exile because it begins Israel's past history with the theme of exodus (Ezek. 20:5ff.; the same as in Deut. 6:20-24; Josh. 24:17f.; 1 Sam. 12:8ff.; Pss. 78:9ff.; 136:4ff.), and ends with the theme of occupation as do all of those passages, except Neh. 9. In addition, it must be said that, as far as the wilderness theme is concerned, it is only in Ps. 78:17ff.; Ezek. 20:10-24, that this theme is mentioned in relationship to, and with an emphasis on, the people's rebellion against Yahweh. Whereas Ps. 106:13-33 and Neh. 9 mention this theme in relation to the confession of sins and the penitential prayer of the people, those other passages in which this theme is found mention it in relation to, and with an emphasis on, the merciful salvation act of Yahweh. In the light of this, a comparison between Ps. 78:17ff. and Ezek. 20:10-24 must be made. From this comparison it is clear that, on the one hand, Ps. 78:17ff. conceives the people who rebelled against Yahweh in the wilderness as the Ephraimites (v. 9), and that the

psalmist has used this particular theme to justify both the rejection of the Northern Kingdom and the acceptance of Judah by Yahweh (vy. 67ff.), while on the other, Ezek. 20:10ff. conceives the rebel as the whole of Israel,¹ and uses the reference to the wilderness theme as the reason for the coming judgement of Jerusalem.

From all this, it can be concluded that Israel's past history was treated, or recited, in various ways by Israelite traditionists. On the one hand their treatments show some differences, while on the other they still preserve some similarities. In other words, Israel's traditions of her past history were not transmitted mechanically, but organically, the result of which shows that both similarities and differences have equal place.

In this connection it is interesting to find both G. von Rad and M. Noth arguing that within the Hexateuch or Pentateuch (Tetratauch) each of the themes alluded to above constitutes a basic element in a confessional statement. Von Rad believes that traditic-historically the earliest confessional statement can be found in Deut. 26:5-9, in which two themes, i.e., exodus and occupation, are inseparably juxtaposed.² To these two themes, the statements of which initially still confine themselves to

¹W. Zimmerli, 'Israel im Buche Ezechiel', V.T. 8, 1958, pp. 75-90.

²G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, (ET. by D. M. G. Stalker), Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1965, p. 122; idem, The Problem of Hexateuch and Other Essays, (ET. by E. W. Trueman Dicken), Edinburgh, 1966, pp. 3ff..

the objective historical facts, were later on added some other themes whose statements are more theologically elaborated. And the Hexateuch as it now stands is, according to von Rad, the result of traditio-historical growth which is based on those basic elements of the confessional statements or themes.¹

In distinction from von Rad, M. Noth believes that each of the themes initially had its own cultic setting. Even the two themes, i.e., exodus and occupation, which von Rad believes to be inseparable from the outset, are regarded by Noth as representing two tradition-themes which were initially independent from each other. Only later these two themes were joined together.² These two tradition-themes and the other ones, which form the frame work of Pentateuch, were gradually joined together and became the property of 'all Israel' in Palestine.³

Despite the differences of opinion between von Rad and Noth, it is interesting to find that these two scholars do not seem to regard Pentateuch (Noth) or Hexateuch (von Rad) as a result of

¹G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, (ET. by D. M. G. Stalker), Vol. I, pp. 122ff.; idem, The Problem of Hexateuch and other Essays, (ET. by E. W. Trueman Dicken), pp. 77ff..

²M. Noth, A History of Pentateuchal Traditions, (ET. by B. W. Anderson), Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1972, pp. 46f..

³Ibid., pp. 42ff., 50ff.

a mechanical and rigid processing of those themes. Besides, they regard the themes of patriarchs, exodus, wilderness, and occupation, as being very old. However, von Rad is sceptical concerning the date of the joining together of those themes,¹ whereas Noth is of the opinion that that joining together must have taken place 'between the time of the occupation of the land and the beginning of the formation of the state'.²

Indeed, apart from those four themes alluded to above there are some others which are equally important for the analysis of Israel's history. But, in connection with the main concern of the present study, those four themes are mentioned here because they are probably the only ones referred to in Ezek. 20:5-31.

Now from all this, it can be said that, as far as the themes of Israel's Credo are concerned, there are at least two kinds of traditio-historical developments. First, if von Rad and Noth are right, the Pentateuch or the Hexateuch must be regarded as the outcome of the development of the tradition themes. Second, the passages listed above, in which all or most of the themes are found, show another kind of traditio-historical development which does not lead to any specific end-product.

¹G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, (EP. by D. M. G. Stalker), Vol. I, p. 122 note 21.

²M. Noth, op. cit., p. 45.

These two kinds of development seem to be in contrast to each other. If Noth's dating of the joining together of those themes is right, it is possible to argue that some of those passages listed above, especially those which do not belong to Pentateuch, are dependent on the Pentateuchal traditions. This seems true, not only from the fact that they are later than the date proposed by Noth, but also because of the cultic setting of each of the themes, or of the Credo as a unity, which at the same time has become the vehicle for the transmission of those themes and/or the Credo. This is assuming, of course, that those passages outside the Pentateuch bear the marks of being cultic in one way or the other.

However, there is some evidence which shows that those passages outside the Pentateuch do not entirely depend on the Pentateuchal traditions. If it is true that the Pentateuchal traditions are an all-Israelite tradition, one wonders why Ps. 78:11ff. singles out Northern Israel to be the subject of those Credo-like recitals of Israel's past history. Besides, the rejection of Northern Israel and the acceptance of Judah and Zion (Ps. 78:67ff.) seem to presuppose the fact that the process of all-Israelizing of those themes did not take place very smoothly. G. von Rad¹ and R. E. Clements² have pointed out that the David-Zion

¹G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, (ET. by D. M. G. Stalker), Vol. I, pp. 46f..

²R. E. Clements, God and Temple, Oxford, 1965, p. 58; idem, Prophecy and Covenant, London, 1965, p. 52.

traditions lived predominantly in Judah, whereas the traditions of exodus-wilderness-occupation lived predominantly in Northern Israel until at least the fall of Samaria.¹ The fact that some of the passages listed above miss out one or two of the themes whereas others elaborate them almost excessively, does seem to show that there is no dependence of those passages on the Pentateuchal traditions. In addition, it is indeed very difficult to find in the Pentateuch, or in the Hexateuch, any parallel to what is said in Ezek. 20:7-8!

From all this, it can be concluded that the development of the themes of Israel's past history which led to the formation of the Pentateuch or Hexateuch was not the only development which ever took place. In other words, if some passages outside the Pentateuch or Hexateuch contain some or all of the themes of the Credo it does not necessarily always mean that they quote, or depend on, the Pentateuchal/Hexateuchal traditions. Instead, it must be said that both the Pentateuchal/Hexateuchal traditions and those passages which contain the themes of the Credo depend on a common source, i.e., the cult in which the setting of each of the themes is found. In this connection the question about the date of the joining together of all of those themes must be coupled with the question of the dates of the successive joining together of each individual theme to the others. Putting it in

¹See below, on Ezek. 16.

another way, it seems impossible to answer the question, when were the themes of creation, patriarchs, exodus, wilderness, and conquest, joined together. This is so, since in the passages in which the themes of the Credo are found, two of the themes, i.e., that of exodus and that of occupation, are always present, whereas the others are not. In other words, although some of those passages miss out one or two of the themes, they always have the themes of both exodus and occupation. It can therefore be inferred that the joining together of these two themes must have taken place very early.¹ And, consequently, if there is any question of the date of the joining together of all of those themes, it must be only the question of the dates of the gradual, or successive, joining together with the others of these two themes which had already been combined.

However, before anything can be said about the joining together of the themes of patriarchs, exodus, wilderness, and occupation, in Ezek. 20:5-29, there is another part, or another line, of Israel's traditions which must be looked at. This is the prophetic traditions. It has been shown earlier² that Ezekiel does not stand in isolation from the traditions of Israel, or the prophetic traditions in particular. As far as

¹Beyerlin argues that the exodus-Sinai traditions were reshaped as soon as their bearers invaded Canaan (W. Beyerlin, Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions, ((ET. by S. Rudman)), Oxford, 1965, pp. 151ff.). Cf. G. von Rad, op. cit., p. 122 and note 21.

²See, supra, pp. 40f..

the themes of the Credo are concerned, it is interesting to find that the joining together, or the juxtaposition, of three of them (i.e., the themes of exodus, wilderness, and occupation) is found only in Amos 2:10f.¹ as parts of Yahweh's address, or arguments, against 'Israel'; and that it is only in Ezek. 20:5-29 that the joining together of four of them (i.e., the themes of patriarchs, exodus, wilderness, and occupation) is found. This fact does not mean that Amos or Jeremiah does not know the theme of patriarchs, and neither does it mean that the other prophets who do not make any mention of any of them do not know them at all. Indeed, the theme of patriarchs can be found in passages such as Amos 7:9, 16; Hos. 10:11f.; 12:1f, 12; Mic. 7:20, and the theme of exodus in Hos. 11:1; 12:13; Mic. 6:4f. (exodus and occupation); 7:15; the theme of wilderness in Hos. 9:10f.; and the theme of occupation, either explicitly or implicitly, in almost all of the prophetic books.² Nevertheless, this fact means that the joining together of three or more themes does not

¹Some scholars, not without reason, would like to transpose v. 9 and v. 10 which, indeed, may make a good result. See, e.g., W. R. Harper, Amos and Hosea, (I.C.C.) Edinburgh, 1905, in loc.; G. A. Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets, Vol. II, revised edition, New York and London, n. d., in loc.

²It is surprising that in Isa. 1-39, with the exception of 10:26, there is no explicit allusion at all to any of those four themes.

seem to have been known in the prophetic traditions. Even that one which is found in Amos 2:10f. or, say, Amos. 2:9-11, can hardly be regarded as coming from the time of Amos himself. A closer examination of this passage shows that it is Deuteronomistic rather than purely Amosian.¹ Again, the juxtaposition of three themes in Jer. 2:6-7 does not appear very even, since the themes of exodus and wilderness in v. 6 are in a quoted sentence, whereas the theme of occupation in v. 7 seems to continue the theme of wilderness in vv. 2-3. As it now stands, v. 6 is parallel to v. 8a in that both of them contain the same kind of quotations. As they now stand, these two quotations look like two liturgical formulas which were usually used in cultic activities.² If it is really so, it is interesting to find that, as far as v. 6 is concerned, the joining together of the themes of exodus and wilderness was found, or even deliberately initiated, in the cult. This fact does not only support both von Rad's and Noth's theses that the joining together of the themes of the Credo took place in the cult, but also provides a strong basis for the conclusion that it was this cult, or the cultic activities, which had become the most

¹H. W. Wolff, Dodekapropheten 2: Joel und Amos, (B.K. XIV/2), Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969, pp. 137f., 172f., 204ff.; G. W. Anderson, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, London, 1959 (reprinted with new bibliography 1972), p. 149; cf. A. S. Kapelrud, Central Ideas in Amos, Oslo, 1961, pp. 30ff., 47f..

²Cf. H. Cunliffe-Jones, Jeremiah, (The Torch Bible Commentaries), second edition, London, 1972, pp. 53f..

important vehicle for the preservation and/or the transmission of the joined themes. In other words, although each one of those themes of the Credo might well have been transmitted individually and independently, their gradual and successive joining together can only be found and be transmitted chiefly in, and through, cultic activities.

In the light of all this, a detailed examination of Ezek. 20:5-29 can now be made. To begin with, it can be said that due to Ezekiel's priestly origin (Ezek. 1:3; etc.), the joining together of some of the themes of the Credo must have been quite familiar to him. Although among the books of the prophets it is only in Ezek. 20:5-29 that the joining together of four of the themes is found, it cannot be said that before the time of Ezekiel that joining together did not exist. In other words, although within the line of the prophetic traditions Ezek. 20:5-29 is the first to record the joining together of the themes of patriarchs, exodus, wilderness, and occupation, nevertheless the origin of that joining together must probably be found chiefly in the cult which is earlier than Ezekiel himself.

It has been shown earlier that, as it now stands, Ezek. 20:5-29 is part of a disputational-speech between Yahweh and Israel.¹ To this extent it is similar to Jer. 2:2-8 and Amos 2:9ff.. However, a closer examination of the comparison between Ezek. 20:5-29 and these two passages shows that Ezek. 20:5-29 is unique :

¹ Supra, pp. 107f..

In the disputational-speeches in both Jer. 2:2ff. and Amos. 2:6-16 Israel's past history is referred to in its positive meaning, i.e., as salvation history, and that it is only after the occupation that Israel showed her sinful deeds, whereas in Ezek. 20:5-29 Israel is accused as having sinned from the time when she was still in Egypt! Besides, Ezek. 20:5-29 tells the sinful past history of Israel in four periods, i.e., the period when Israel was still in Egypt (vv. 6-9), the period of the first generation in the wilderness (vv. 10-17), the period of the second generation in the wilderness (vv. 18-26) and the period after the occupation (vv. 27-29). From this chronological division it is clear that Ezekiel is also unique in that he seems to have conflated the themes of patriarchs and exodus into one period (vv. 5-10), and that in the theme of wilderness he distinguishes the first generation of Israel (vv. 10-17) from the second one (vv. 18-26). This uniqueness does not stop here in that the first three periods are spoken of in a stereotyped structure with the almost verbatim repetition of some or most of its phraseologies.

All of these facts show, on the one hand, how binding the traditions of Israel were for her traditionists, while on the other, how free Ezekiel was in handling and transmitting them. On the basis of this organic relationship between the traditions of Israel and her traditionists, it seems justified to carry out a close examination of Ezek. 20:5-29 according to the order of the chronological division mentioned above rather than

according to the themes of the Credo which are involved in it. This does not mean that the former order will, or should, exclude the latter. As a matter of fact, in Ezek. 20:5-29 both orders are inseparable.

Now, before that close examination is carried out, something must be said about the relationship between the two orders which are involved in this particular section, i.e., Ezek. 20:5-29. First, what is involved in the thematic order of the Credo is the saving acts of Yahweh, or the salvation history, in which Yahweh is the subject and Israel is the object. This can be seen in vv. 5-7 (the theme of patriarchs), v. 10 (the theme of exodus), vv. 11, 18 (the theme of wilderness), and v. 28a (the theme of occupation). Second, what is involved in the chronological order is the abominable deeds, or the abominable history, of Israel.

This is clear in v. 8 (first period), v. 13 (second period), v. 21 (third period), and vv. 27b, 28b (fourth period). Third, the traditional Credo of Israel is concerned only with the saving acts of Yahweh or the salvation history. But now the course of this salvation history is used by Ezekiel to reveal openly the abominations of Israel, so that in this particular section Israel's past history is the history of her punishable abominations rather than the history of her glorious salvation.

The first period : Israel in Egypt (vv. 5-9).

As far as content and structure are concerned, the speech

depicting the first period can be analysed as follows : (a) the element of the salvation history (vv. 5f.), (b) the element of law (v. 7), (c) the element of Israel's rebellion (v. 8a), (d) the element of Yahweh's judgement (v. 8b), and (e) the element of Yahweh's forgiveness or the suspension of the judgement (v. 9). These five elements are so beautifully and systematically arranged that no one will fail to recognize how artistic is Ezekiel's speech in this particular part of the book which bears his name. As a matter of fact, this systematic, and beautiful, structure is used again in his speeches which depict the second and the third periods.

a. The element of salvation history (vv. 5f.),

The expressions in which the element of salvation history is contained are so emphatic that, on the one hand, they look so repetitious, while on the other, it is difficult to remove any part of them without damaging their wholeness. This is clear especially in the fact that the expression ך' יי וי is found three times, a number of occurrences which seems to be excessive for a short speech of two verses such as this.

Besides, it is only in its third occurrence, i.e., in v. 6a, that this expression seems to be appropriate, because here it is followed by an accusative ~~object~~ which denotes the substance of the oath, whereas in the first two occurrences it seems to be hanging in the air without any definite accusative object.

Many scholars have noticed this uneven literary structure,

א
ב

and their contributions towards its solution are worth noting. Fohrer, who believes that Ezek. 20:1-32 consists of twenty strophes with seven short lines each, regards v. 5b as a 'variierende Glosse nach 5a' and it must be deleted.¹ In distinction from Fohrer, Eichrodt attempts to solve the unevenness on theological grounds. According to him, Yahweh's revelation ($\text{׃} \text{ׁ} \text{ׂ} \text{׃}$) must precede Yahweh's oath ($\text{ׁ} \text{ׂ} \text{׃}$), therefore the expression $\text{ׁ} \text{ׂ} \text{׃}$ in v. 5b is not in the right place. However, despite the smooth translation of his reconstructed text, it is difficult to follow Eichrodt's explanation.² Another solution is offered by Cooke, who says : 'The first I lifted up my hand (v. 5a) is not followed as anywhere else, by a clause giving the substance of the oath; the second does not go naturally with I am Yahweh; while the third (v. 6a) is in its proper place'. Then he continues : 'The three together can hardly be original'.³ However, it is not clear what Cooke means by his latter remark, since in his textual note on this particular phrase he says : 'The second $\text{ׁ} \text{ׂ} \text{׃}$ certainly interrupts the sentence, and may

¹G. Fohrer - K. Gallig, Ezechiel, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 13), Tübingen, 1955, p. 109.

²W. Eichrodt, Ezekiel, (ET. by Cosslett Quin), (O.T.L.), London, 1970, pp. 258ff. note d-e.

³G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), 1936 (reprinted 1967), p. 214.

be an accidental repetition'.¹

These three examples of the attempt to solve the problem of the unevenness of vv. 5f. are enough to show that the joining together of those short sentences is really problematic. However, all of those attempts seem to have forgotten one important feature which is characteristic of Ezekiel. This is Ezekiel's habit of describing one particular thing by using several short sentences, which sometimes look very repetitious or excessive. Given this particular characteristic of Ezekiel, it is unlikely that there is any textual or phraseological problem at all in vv. 5f.. Besides, one must remember that in these two verses Ezekiel has very concisely joined together the descriptions of two, or even three, themes of Credo, i.e., the theme of patriarchs (v. 5a), the theme of exodus (v. 6a), and the theme of occupation (v. 6b). So, it seems unnecessary to reconstruct the text of vv. 5f., because as it now stands its form is really characteristic of the prophet himself.

The word לְיִשְׂרָאֵל in v. 5a is interesting because it is not found again in the Book of Ezekiel. This word, with Israel as its ~~accusative~~ object, is most frequently used in the Book of Deuteronomy (Deut. 4:37; 7:7; 10:15; 14:2); and scholars have argued that this word, with Yahweh as the subject and Israel as

¹Ibid., p. 224.

the object, came into use only at a fairly late period, i.e., from the time of the Deuteronomist onward.¹ Even so, the word contains an idea which is much older than the Deuteronomist, and Rowley has shown that this idea might well have originated from the time of Abraham.² By mentioning the name of Abraham, there is now a question of whether the word קָרַב with a private individual as its object is the same as the word קָרַב with the people of Israel as its object. There is evidence to show that the word קָרַב is used with private individuals as its object in the pre-Deuteronomic period.³ But since none of these private individuals is one of the patriarchs, it is difficult to see their relationship with Israel as a people. The only passages which clearly mention the patriarch(s) as the object of the word קָרַב are mostly exilic or post-exilic. This can be seen, e.g., in Isa. 41:8f., 44:1-2; Neh. 9:7. Now, because it was the Deuteronomist who first used the word קָרַב with the people of Israel as its object, it can be concluded that the use of this word with the patriarch(s) as its object came still later. In other words, although there is a strong relationship between the patriarchs and the people

¹G. von Rad, *op. cit.*, p. 178 and the notes there; G. E. Mendenhall, 'Election', *I.D.B.* Vol. II, pp. 76ff.; H. Seebass, ' קָרַב ', III. 5., *T.W.A.T.*, cols. 602ff..

²H. H. Rowley, *The Biblical Doctrine of Election*, London, 1950, pp. 15-44.

³See, e.g., 1 Sam. 2:28; 10:24; 16:8-10, 12; 2 Sam. 6:21; 16:18.

of Israel, the identification of the former as being chosen by Yahweh came later than that of the latter.

Returning to the use of the word רָחַב in Ezek. 20:5a, there is the question whether or not in this case Ezekiel is dependent on the Deuteronomist. It has been shown earlier that, on the basis of Ezek. 20 in particular, there is a close relationship between Ezekiel and the Deuteronomist.¹ It is certainly not very difficult to see this relationship again in the use of the word רָחַב with the people of Israel as its object. But it is not clear whether this kind of use of the word רָחַב was really the invention of the Deuteronomist. In this connection, it is interesting to find that most of the scholars give a negative answer to this problem, although they do not give any clear solution either as to where, when, and by whom, the word רָחַב with the people of Israel as its object originated.²

Outside the Book of Deuteronomy and the Book of Ezekiel the word רָחַב with the people of Israel as its object, or its

¹ *Supra*, p. 99, in which it is shown that the word רָחַב (in Hiph'il) in Ezek. 20:27b-28 is also found in the Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic traditions.

² G. E. Mendenhall suggests that if the word רָחַב was known before Deuteronomy, 'the religious meaning of God's "choosing" must be looked for within the framework of the religious bond which held early Israel together. This can only be the covenant tradition' (*op. cit.*, p. 79); cf. H. H. Rowley, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-44; G. von Rad, *op. cit.*, pp. 178f.; W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel*, (B.K. XIII/1), p. 442.

implied object, is found chiefly in the Psalms (e.g., Pss. 33:12; 47:5; 65:5; 78:67f.; 105:6, 43; 106:5; etc.) and in Deutero-Isaiah (e.g., Isa. 41:8f.; 44:1f.; 45:4; 49:6; etc.).¹ In the case of the occurrence of this particular use of the word $\gamma\pi\lambda$ in the Psalms, K. Koch asks whether or not there is any influence of the Deuteronomistic circle on the part of the psalmists.² Koch's answer is negative. Then he argues that in this particular case both the psalmists and the Deuteronomist have been dependent on the cultic traditions of Israel.³ The same is true with the question of the occurrence of this particular use of the word $\gamma\pi\lambda$ in Deutero-Isaiah. Koch has rightly shown that, on the one hand, in both the Psalms and Deuteronomy this particular use of the word $\gamma\pi\lambda$ is always connected with the recital of Israel's Heilsgeschichte, and on the other, in Deutero-Isaiah it is connected with the Heilsorakel of the prophet.⁴ The fact that Deutero-Isaiah's Heilsorakel is

¹For 1 Kings 3:8, see K. Koch, 'Zur Geschichte der Erwählungsvorstellung in Israel', Z.A.W. 67 (N.F. 26), 1955, p. 228 note 45, whereas for Isa. 14:1, see infra, p. 133 note 2.

²'Sind die Erwählungsaussagen der Psalmen, soweit sie sich auf das Volk Israel beziehen, auf deuteronomischen Einfluss zurückzuführen?' (K. Koch, op. cit., p. 214).

³Ibid., pp. 214, 217. Cf. A. Weiser, The Psalms, (ET. by H. Hartwell), (O.T.L.), London, 1962, pp. 59f..

⁴K. Koch, op. cit., pp. 206-222.

very much based on Israel's past Heilsgeschichte¹ suggests that Deutero-Isaiah has taken this particular use of the word from the same source as that from which both the psalmist and the Deuteronomist do. This source is the cultic traditions of Israel.² So, from all this it can be concluded that the origin of the word קָדַשׁ with the people of Israel as its object, or its implied object, is the cult.³ It is from this cultic common source that both the Deuteronomist and Ezekiel have taken this particular use of the word קָדַשׁ . In Ezekiel's case, this is strengthened by the fact that Ezekiel himself was a priest, who must have been quite familiar with the recitation of the Heilsgeschichte in the cult.⁴

¹For this problem see especially R. P. Carroll, The Significance of the Election Traditions of Ancient Israel for the Prophets and Their Developments in Jeremiah and the Exilic Prophets, (unpublished thesis), University of Edinburgh, 1967, pp. 364-404.

²Koch remarks: 'Der fast ausschliesslich Gebrauch von קָדַשׁ im Heilscrakel (in Deutero-Isaiah) weist auf die kultische Tradition als Herkunftsort' (op. cit., p. 221). This remark is also applicable for the solution of the use of the word קָדַשׁ in Isa. 14:1. See also, A. Schoors, I Am God Your Saviour, (V.T.Supp. Vol. XXIV), Leiden, 1973, pp. 50f..

³K. Koch, op. cit., pp. 205-226. For further discussion of the use of the word קָדַשׁ in the Old Testament, see, e.g., Th. C. Vriezen, Die Erwählung Israels nach dem Alten Testament, Zurich, 1953; H. Seebass, ' קָדַשׁ ', II-III, in T.W.A.T., cols. 593-608.

⁴The recital of the Heilsgeschichte is one of the priests' duties in the Qumran community. See, A. Weiser, op. cit., pp. 679f. and the note there.

Thus, on the basis of all this, the relationship between Ezekiel and the Deuteronomic circle in terms of the usage of the word $\Gamma\Pi\Gamma$ with Israel as its object cannot be explained without the reference to the cultic common source. The direct relationship between Ezek. 20 and Deuteronomy, or the dependence of the former on the latter, is also ruled out by the use of the phrase $\Gamma' \text{XWS}$ by Ezekiel for Yahweh's oath instead of the word YRW . Although the word YRW is also found in the Book of Ezekiel (Ezek. 16:8; 21:28 and 32:4), its use for Yahweh's oath to the patriarchs is almost exclusively characteristic of Deuteronomy (Deut. 1:8, 35; 4:31; 6:10, 18, 23; etc.).¹ Besides, the phrase $\Gamma' \text{XWS}$ is used by Ezekiel not only for Yahweh's oath to the patriarchs, (Ezek. 47:14), but also, quite uniquely, for Yahweh's oath to the people of Israel who, as is stated in Ezek. 20:5, was to go out from Egypt.

In Ezek. 20 the phrase $\Gamma' \text{XWS}$ occurs seven times, and in vv. 5-6 alone it occurs three times. The triple occurrence of the phrase $\Gamma' \text{XWS}$ in vv. 5-6 must also be regarded as Ezekielian. This is so because the statements, or the short sentences, in vv. 5-6 cannot be understood as referring to the chronological sequence of some historical events, since the

¹S. R. Driver, op. cit., p. lxxix; cf. W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, (B.K. XIII/1), p. 443.

introductory ביום ההוא in y. 6 only specifies, or refers back to, the statement $\text{ביום בחרתי בִּישְׂרָאֵל}$ in y. 5a α . In other words, all the statements, or the short sentences, in vv. 5a β -6 are actually repetitions of the statement $\text{ביום בחרתי בִּישְׂרָאֵל}$ in y. 5a α , which are paratactically arranged. Each one of the descriptions has a significance equal to that of the others, and to that extent, the triple use of the phrase נִשְׂאָ יְד must not be regarded as unusual repetition for Ezekiel. As has been said above, ביום ההוא in y. 6a is in fact a repetition of the statement $\text{ביום בחרתי בִּישְׂרָאֵל}$ in y. 5a α ! So, what is meant by these paratactically arranged short sentences is that the day when Yahweh chose Israel is also the day when Yahweh swore to the seed of Jacob, is also the day when Yahweh made himself known to them in Egypt, is also the day when Yahweh swore to them saying 'I am Yahweh your God'. That particular day is also the day when Yahweh swore to Israel to bring them out of the land of Egypt to the land which he has searched out

Now, from these paratactically arranged short descriptions, there are at least two things which deserve attention. First, for Ezekiel Israel is the seed of Jacob. Although it is possible to trace the mentioning of the name 'Jacob' traditio-historically back to the patriarchal traditions, what is significant here is that for Ezekiel Jacob is the father of the people Israel, or the father of the twelve tribes.¹ It is, of course, possible to

¹According to L. Hicks, who adopts H. Gunkel's analysis of the Jacob traditions, the making of Jacob to be the father of Israel the twelve tribes was a very late development of the traditions of Jacob as an individual. L. Hicks, 'Jacob (Israel)', I.D.B., Vol. II, pp. 783f..

understand the name 'Israel' as referring only to the Northern Kingdom (cf. Ezek. 4:5; 25:3; 37:17);¹ but its being paratactically joined with the name 'Jacob', which was originally popular in Judah,² only strengthens Zimmerli's argument that for Ezekiel the name 'Israel' means the whole people of Israel,³ i.e., North and South. Second, it is interesting to find that according to Ezek. 20:5-6 Israel's past history begins in Egypt, and that the beginning of that history is associated with an important salvation act on the part of Yahweh which is described by the words ךן , ך' אשן , and ךך' . In other words, the beginning of Israel's history is the time when Yahweh chose them, swore to them, and made himself known to them (theophany?), and that these three salvation acts of Yahweh took place in Egypt.⁴ In addition, this element of salvation history is coupled with

¹J. Smith, The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel - A New Interpretation, London, 1951, pp. 55ff.; cf. J. B. Hartford, Studies in the Book of Ezekiel, Cambridge, 1935, pp. 31f., 93-102.

²L. Hicks, op. cit., pp. 783f..

³W. Zimmerli, 'Israel im Buche Ezechiel', V.T. 8, 1958, pp. 75-90.

⁴The similarity of Ezek. 20:5 to Exod. 6 must be understood as originating from the common cultic source which was used by the authors of these two passages. W. Zimmerli regards the phraseologies of both passages as referring back to the priestly way of speech, or to the priestly circle (Ezechiel, ((B.K. XIII/1)), p. 443).

Yahweh's oath ($\text{ט}^{\text{ז}} \text{אש}$) to bring the people out of Egypt to the land which Yahweh has searched out for them (y. 6). The long statement of the oath in y. 6a b can be divided into four or five short sentences or descriptions, and their respective parallelisms can very easily be found elsewhere.¹ But, as it now stands, that statement of Yahweh's oath consists only of two important points, i.e., the oath to bring the people out of Egypt (and the oath to bring them in-)to another land. This land is then described by two short sentences which follow the statement אש ארץ in y. 6b. These two points in fact constitute two themes of Credo which, as has been shown earlier, were from a very early time joined together in the cult. This fact alone shows that here Ezekiel has a direct relationship with the cult. This relationship is also clear from the paratactical arrangement of the three descriptions of the land, which Zimmerli calls 'die dreifache, fast liturgischfeierliche Prädikation',² The uniqueness of Ezekiel is also clear in that in stating all these aspects of the beginning of Israel's history, especially that of the exodus, he does not make any mention at all of the elements of oppression by the Egyptians, the cry of the oppressed, and their deliverance (cf. Exod. 3; 6). In other words, the promises of

¹For this, see in particular, G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), p. 214; W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, (B.K. XIII/1), p. 444.

²Ibid..

the exodus and of the bringing into the land which Yahweh has searched out do not seem to be linked to the traditions about the slavery in Egypt. Whether Ezekiel knew these traditions or not is difficult to decide, because there is no hint at all about it in the book which bears his name (cf. Ezek. 23:1-4, for which, see below).¹

Having said all this, it can be concluded that in referring to, or in reciting, the beginning of the salvation history, Ezekiel is both standing in the cultic or priestly line and emphasizing only the saving acts of Yahweh without contrasting them with the situation of the people in Egypt.² Moreover, despite the fact that some of the aspects of the salvation acts of Yahweh recited here could refer to different saving acts of Yahweh which began outside Egypt, for Ezekiel all of them began in Egypt.

b. The element of law (v. 7).

As it now stands, the form of the statement of law in v. 7 reminds one of that of the statement of law in Lev. 19:13, in that it begins with וְיָ and ends with a self-proclamation formula

¹Even in the big collection of the addresses against Egypt in chapters 29-31 there is no hint at all of the traditions of the slavery of Israel in Egypt.

²The constant use of the first pers. sing. verbs in vv. 5-6 is quite impressive.

אני יהוה אלהיכם . In terms of the Old Testament law, this concluding self-proclamation formula is also called the motive clause or, more specifically, the motive refrain. As it is found here, the motive refrain is connected with the command *asyndetically*, and to that extent it reminds one of the similar structure of some of the commandments in the Code of Holiness.¹

The similarities as well as the dissimilarities of the commandments in the Code of Holiness and in the Book of Ezekiel, especially in Ezek. 40-48, have long been noticed by scholars.² How these similarities and these dissimilarities are to be explained is outside the scope of the present study. However, there are some points which are worth noting. First, as far as form goes, the motive refrain אני יהוה אלהיכם which is *asyndetically* connected with a commandment, is found again in the Book of Ezekiel only in Ezek. 20:19. Second, the *asyndetic* connection between this motive refrain and a commandment, or a compound commandment, is very frequently found in the Code of

¹For this, see especially, B. Gemser, 'The Importance of the Motive Clause in Old Testament Law', *V.T. Supp.*, Vol. I, 1953, pp. 50-66, more especially p. 55. Gemser also regards the motive clauses as being attached to Old Testament law from a very early time, and that they are not later redactional additions. Contrast, however, W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, (B.K. XIII/1), p. 445.

²See, e.g., *infra*, p. 147 note 1 ; L. Zunz, 'Bibelkritisches II : Ezechiel', *Z.D.M.G.* 27, 1873, pp. 676-689.

Holiness,¹ and it could perhaps be regarded as one of its characteristics.

Third, Zimmerli rightly points out that, on the one hand, the parallelism between Ezek. 20:7 and some commandments in the Code of Holiness cannot be denied, and on the other, the language of Ezek. 20:7, i.e., the use of the words $\zeta\iota\pi\omega$ and $\square\text{'}\zeta\iota\beta\alpha$, is exclusively Ezekielian. From these three points it can perhaps be inferred that, as far as the commandment in Ezek. 20:7 is concerned, Ezekiel could not have been dependent on the Code of Holiness. The formal similarity between the commandment in Ezek. 20:7 and that in Lev. 19:3 is due to their common source rather than to the dependence of the former on the latter or vice versa.² This is so, primarily because Ezekiel was himself a priest and Lev. 19:3 is generally regarded as a priestly commandment.³

Now, although formally Ezekiel seems to be dependent on the common and priestly source, essentially he seems to be free to handle the legal or judicial traditions. This is clear in that (a) in Ezek. 20:7 he uses his own vocabulary, i.e., $\zeta\iota\pi\omega$ and $\square\text{'}\zeta\iota\beta\alpha$, and (b) there is no other recorded evidence that Yahweh had ever given his commandment to the people of Israel

¹B. Gemser, op. cit., pp. 55.

²O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament : An Introduction, (ET. by P. R. Ackroyd), Oxford, 1966, p. 238.

³Ibid., pp. 204f..

in Egypt before the exodus except in Ezek. 20:7. A few words must be said about the fact stated in (b) above. As it now stands, what is stated in y. 7 is actually one of the descriptions of the beginning of Israel's history. This is clear in that form-critically vv. 6-7 is parallel to y. 5. This parallelism can be seen in the following evidence : a) the words ביום ההוא in y. 6 is parallel to the words ביום בחרתי בשראול in y. 5; b) the self-proclamation formula at the end of y. 7 is similar to that at the end of y. 5. Due to this fact, the significance of the waw-consecutive in the word ואמר at the beginning of y. 6 is also to be regarded as equal to that of the waw-consecutive in the words ואש (twice) and ואמר in y. 5. This is to say that what is stated in y. 7 cannot be regarded as an event which historically took place after those which are stated in vv. 5-6. Instead, the statement must be regarded as a part of the descriptions of the beginning of Israel's history. In that sense, the statement must be regarded as the continuation of the descriptions which are stated in vv. 5a β b-6; and it is so, because of one of Ezekiel's characteristics, i.e., his habit of arranging such long and detailed descriptions paratactically. All these descriptions of the beginning of Israel's history are to be understood not as referring to some events in a chronological

order.¹ Rather, they refer to the aspects, or to the dimensions, of the beginning of Israel's history as it is understood by Ezekiel.

So, if it was said above that the day when Yahweh chose Israel is also the day when he swore to the seed of Jacob, made himself known to them in Egypt, swore to them saying 'I am Yahweh your God', swore to them to bring them out of Egypt into the land which he has searched out ..., it must be said that that very day is also the day when he commanded each individual Israelite to cast away the detestable things of their eyes and the idols of Egypt. In other words, according to Ezek. 20:5-7 the beginning of Israel's history cannot be separated from the commandment, or the law, of Yahweh. Putting it the other way around, the commandment, or the law, of Yahweh is from the outset an integral part of the beginning of Israel's history. This does not mean, however, that for Ezekiel the salvation history is conditional (cf. 16:3ff.; 23:2-4). Rather, it means that for him the salvation history cannot be perceived without its legal, or judicial, element.

¹ Contrast J. van Seeters, 'Confessional Reformulation in the Exilic Period', *V.T.* 22, 1972, whose translation of Ezek. 20:5-6 shows how he would understand the descriptions in v. 5a β b as referring to events in the chronological sequence. His translation reads as follows:
 'Thus says the Lord, Yahweh: "On the day when I chose Israel, I made an oath to the descendants of the house of Jacob after having revealed myself to them in Egypt, and after having made an oath to them stating: "I am Yahweh your God". On that very day ..."' (pp. 448f.).

In this connection there are at least two things which must be examined. First, Ezekiel's thought that from the outset the salvation history is not conditional, yet cannot be perceived without its legal element. In his book The Law and The Prophets,¹ Zimmerli has pointed out that theologically the Old Testament law is embedded in the covenant between Yahweh and his people Israel.²

Within the context of the covenant the law can neither be understood as a threatening power nor be ignored. Although on the one hand "'law" is a commandment which has the power to expel men, or even the whole nation of Israel, from the covenant',³ on the other, and in its relationship with the covenant, 'the law stands ... as something which hides a curse behind it, even though, because of its connection with the covenant, it recalls God's great act of salvation, and so is continually a reason for rejoicing'.⁴ With this understanding of the function of law, Zimmerli rejects the opinion of von Rad, i.e., that the prophets

¹W. Zimmerli, The Law and The Prophets, (ET. by R. E. Clements), Oxford, 1965.

²Ibid., pp. 51f..

³Ibid., p. 51.

⁴Ibid., p. 60.

were the preachers of law full of threat and judgement.¹ Instead, he is of the opinion that the prophets always used the law in its relation with the covenant. This is so, because the addressee of the prophets is the covenant people of Israel, who for a long time 'had lived with its divine law'.² Further, according to Napier, the covenant (ברית) between Yahweh and Israel cannot be separated from Yahweh's election (בחר) of the people of Israel. Napier says : 'Election with reference to Israel is perpetuated and realized in covenant'.³ Although the terms ברית and בחר are very rare in the classical prophets, 'the notion of covenant is unmistakably and persistently present : covenant as the working extension and implementation of election'⁴

From all this it can perhaps be inferred that the concepts of election, covenant, and law, with reference to Israel, are not the invention of the prophets. Rather, they are the property of the people as a cultic community and/or, before that, cultic

¹Ibid., pp. 51, 61ff..

²Ibid., p. 76.

³B. D. Napier, 'Prophet, Prophetism', Id., I.D.B., Vol. III, p. 913.

⁴Ibid..

communities, and that from there the prophets took them over. This is also the line which R. E. Clements argues for in his book Prophecy and Covenant.¹ Moreover, Clements quite rightly shows that for the pre-exilic prophets the traditions of the exodus, the covenant, and the law are inseparable.² Although it is not clear when the joining together of these three traditions took place, the use of the law by the pre-exilic prophets presupposes the function of the law within the covenant context. In other words, for the pre-exilic prophets the law, which was already extant, is not a pre-condition for the covenant or the election. Rather, it is a part of it.³ In terms of the salvation history, the law or the commandment is not a pre-condition for Israel's deliverance by Yahweh, rather, it is part of Yahweh's saving act itself. As far as Ezekiel is concerned, it can hardly be denied that he also follows this line of the theology of law. This is clear, for example, from the fact that in Ezek. 20:5-7 he describes the election of Israel by referring to the covenant and the covenant law (v. 7).⁴ So, as

¹R. E. Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, (S.B.T. 43), London, 1965.

²Ibid., pp. 45ff..

³Ibid., pp. 69ff..

⁴Cf. W. Zimmerli, op. cit., pp. 80ff..

in other pre-exilic prophets, the salvation history for Ezekiel is also unconditional, yet inseparable from the obligation of the commandment(s) or law.

However, as far as Ezek. 20:5-7 is concerned, it is remarkable that this passage shows quite explicitly both the element of salvation history (vv. 5-6) and the element of law (v. 7). This explicit statement is not found in the parallel passages of the other pre-exilic prophets. In the latter in which Egypt, or exodus, is regarded as the beginning of Israel's history, it is only the element of salvation history which is explicitly mentioned, whereas the element of law is sometimes only presupposed. This is clear, e.g., in Amos 2:9-11; 9:7; Hos. 11:1; 12:10; 13:4f.; Jer. 2:6. The explicit mentioning of the element of law is also missing in the passages such as Jer. 2:2f.; 31:2f. in which the wilderness period is regarded as the beginning of Israel's history. Coupled with the fact that the words עֲשֵׂה and דִּבְרֵי in Ezek. 20:7 are characteristically Ezekielian, the explicit mentioning of the element of law here must be regarded as unique. This uniqueness is also clear in that in the other pre-exilic prophets and in the other collections of laws in the Old Testament the element of law is almost always associated with the wilderness period or Sinai event, in Ezek. 20:7 it is associated with the period when Israel was still in Egypt.

Second, this uniqueness of Ezek. 20:7 creates a question of the historical reference(s) of the commandment stated there.

Elsewhere in the Old Testament a commandment which is similar to this one is found only in Lev. 18:3. Apart from its form-critical problem and its function in the context of the whole Lev. 18,¹ the commandment in Lev. 18:3a does not seem to refer to any prohibition of religious idolatry as does the commandment in Ezek. 20:7. However, the mentioning of the names of Egypt and Canaan in such a parallelism in Lev. 18:3 could give the impression that in this particular passage the Egyptians' way of life is regarded as similar to that of the Canaanites.² This is so, because as it now stands Lev. 18:3 (cf. Lev. 18:24ff.) presupposes Israelite cult in Palestine and not at Sinai (v. 1f.).³ Now, although it is difficult to find other evidence for the idea that the Egyptians' way of life is regarded as similar to that of the Canaanites, it might well be that in Israel's cultic life,

¹For this, see, e.g., H. Graf Reventlow, Das Heiligkeitsgesetz: formgeschichtlich untersucht, (W.M.A.N.T. 6), Neukirchen, Kreis Moers, 1961, who notes that in Lev. 18:1-5 there is a double situation: the Sinai situation (vv. 1-2) and the Palestinian situation (v. 3). About this, Reventlow says: 'Diese Doppelheit der Situation ist aber ... ein wesentliches Kennzeichen der Bundesfestsituation. Im Bundesfest findet sozusagen eine Begegnung zwischen Gegenwart und Geschichte statt ...' (p. 60); K. Elliger, Leviticus, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 4), Tübingen, 1966, pp. 233ff..

²Cf. M. Noth, Leviticus, (ET. by J. E. Anderson), (O.T.L.), London, 1965, p. 134.

³See, note 1 above.

in which commandments played their important role, this idea is not entirely strange or alien. To that extent it is not surprising that Ezek. 20:7 must have had this idea too as its background. This is based on the fact that Ezek. 20:7 is form-critically unintelligible without a cultic setting or cultic background.¹ In Lev. 8:3 this similarity is understood in ethical terms, i.e., sexual licentiousness (vv. 6ff., especially vv. 24ff.), whereas in Ezek. 20:7 it is understood in religious terms, i.e. worshipping deities other than Yahweh. Whether this similarity really has any historical and factual evidence, is not clear.

From all this it can now be concluded that due to the cultic covenantal setting of the recitation of the Credo, the reference to the element of salvation history cannot be separated from the element of law. As Ezekiel here takes Egypt as the place of the beginning of Israel's history, so he puts the element of law in that locality too. As far as this element of law is concerned, Ezekiel is unique in that he makes it explicit that this element is really present in the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel. In other words, Ezekiel has taken these two elements, i.e., that of salvation history and that of

¹Form-critically Ezek. 20:7 is similar to Lev. 19:3, for the Sitz im Leben of which see, e.g., H. Graf Reventlow, op. cit., pp. 31ff., 68.

law, gathered them together with the other descriptions of the beginning of Israel's history, and localized them in Egypt. For this Zimmerli's remark is undoubtedly appropriate : 'Die eigenwillige Raffung ist Ez's eigentliches Werk und soll der Dichte seiner Verkündigung dienen'.¹

c. The element of Israel's rebellion (v. 8a).

The relationship of v. 8a and v. 7 is in itself clear. In the whole proclamation of Ezekiel, the 'detestable things' (׀ִזְקִיָּו) and the 'idols' (׀ִבִּלְבָּל) which profane Israel are always regarded as the opposition or the rivals of Yahweh.² The mentioning of these two things in vv. 7-8a must have belonged to Ezekiel's interpretation of the similarity of the Egyptians' way of life and that of the Canaanites.³ However, the mentioning of these two things in v. 8a is now associated with a double statement which describes the deeds of Israel against Yahweh :

'But they rebelled against me and would not listen to me...'
(v. 8a α).

¹W. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, (B.K. XIII/1), pp. 445f..

²Cf. ibid., pp. 149f., 446.

³See, supra, pp. 147f..

In this connection the use of the word מרה ('to rebel') is very important. This is so, because Ezekiel also uses this word to create a new name for Israel. Not less than thirteen times Israel is called בית-מרי ('house of rebels' or 'rebellious house') by Ezekiel instead of בית ישראל.¹ The meaning of this new name is not directly clear without a close examination of its context, save that it sounds very pejorative. This new name is used as a motive clause no less than seven times,² and once as vocative,³ in which its meaning is not explained. However, in four places, i.e., Ezek. 2:5,7; 3:27; 12:2, this new name is related to either the willingness or the unwillingness of the people to hear (שמע) the words of Yahweh through the prophet. In other words, the new name must have been used partly because the people are no longer willing to hear the words of Yahweh. The significance of the word שמע in its cultic setting can be seen, e.g., in its use in Deuteronomy in which, apart from Deut. 6:4, it is frequently connected with the announcement of Yahweh's statutes (חקות) and ordinances (משפטים) (Deut. 4:1; 5:1; etc.). And in creating and using that new name Ezekiel, who is himself a priest, has undoubtedly known the significance of the word שמע too. Besides, the

¹They are Ezek. 2:5, 6, 7, 8; 3:9, 26, 27; 12:2, 3, 9; 17:12; 24:3 (44:6?).

²In Ezek. 2:5, 6, 7; 3:9, 26, 27; 12:3.

³Ezek. 12:25.

root of the new name, i.e., הָרָב , can in some cases be understood as the exact opposite of the root-word יָשָׁע , especially if it is used with Yahweh or his commandments as its object. As for example, in Micah 5:14; Isa. 1:19; 2 Sam. 22:45 (= Ps. 18:45), the word יָשָׁע can be understood as meaning 'to obey' or 'to be obedient', and in Deut. 1:26, 43; 9:23; Josh. 1:18; 2 Sam. 12:14; etc., the word הָרָב can be understood as meaning 'to show disobedience', or 'to be disobedient'. From all this it can now be inferred that the use of the word הָרָב for the new name of Israel by Ezekiel has an emphatic meaning in that it shows exactly the rebellious deeds of the people against Yahweh.¹

The rebellious deeds of Israel against Yahweh are described in various ways by Ezekiel. In Ez. 2:3 the word הָרָב is replaced by a stronger word, i.e., דָּבַר ('to rebel', or 'to revolt'), and Israel is called 'the revolter' (הַמְּוֹדֵיִם).² In this connection Israel, i.e., both the current generation and their fathers, is described as having rebelled (פָּשָׁע) against Yahweh 'to this very day'. What is meant by this

¹Cf. W. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, (B.K. XIII/1), p. 74.

²For the text of this verse, see, e.g., G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), p. 36; W. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, (B.K. XIII/1), p. 9.

description is not specified, save that it can already indicate the pejorative identification of Israel, both in the past and in the present. Another general description of the word מרה is found in Ezek. 2:8 in which it is the prophet who is commanded by Yahweh to hear (שָׁמַע) what Yahweh says to him and not to be rebellious (אֶל-תְּהִי-מָרִי) like the rebellious house. The context of this verse shows that what is meant by אֶל-תְּהִי-מָרִי is to do what is commanded by Yahweh. By doing what Yahweh commands him to do the prophet is then regarded as not rebellious.

Now, if these general descriptions of the word מרה are applied to the house of Israel, it is clear that their being called בֵּית מָרִי is because they are disobedient (מרה) and revolting (מרה) against Yahweh, and do not do what Yahweh commands them to do. It is in this context that Ezek. 20 can be regarded as the place in which Ezekiel specifies what he means by the word מרה when he uses it with Israel as its subject.

In Ezek. 20:8a α the statement that Israel rebelled (מרה) against Yahweh is strengthened by a negative statement in which the word שָׁמַע is used :

'and they would not listen to me'.

The two statements in y. 8a α are actually the same, although the former is positive and the latter is negative. But their being juxtaposed as such indicates that they are meant to emphasize what is stated there. What is emphatically stated in y. 8a α is then specified in y. 8a $\beta\gamma$:

'they did not cast away the detestable things of their eyes, and they did not forsake the idols of Egypt'.¹

Now, what Ezekiel means by 'the detestable things of their eyes' and 'the idols of Egypt' is very difficult to understand. This is because the words $\zeta\iota\kappa\omega$ ('detestable thing') and אֱלִילִים ('idols') are characteristics of Ezekiel. Nevertheless, there is one thing which is clear here, namely that the two statements refer back to the commandment of Yahweh in v. 7.

Although the word אֲשֶׁר in v. 8a seems to have a more general meaning than the word אֲשֶׁר in v. 7a, it is clear that the commandment of Yahweh is not obeyed at all by Israel. Israel rebelled against Yahweh and would not listen to him. It is this rebellion of Israel against Yahweh, i.e., the unwillingness and the total refusal of Israel to obey Yahweh's commandments, which seems to have occupied Ezekiel's mind.

That this rebellion of Israel took place in Egypt has created a special historical problem. There is hardly any other evidence to support what Ezekiel alludes to here. G. A. Cooke (1936), for instance, makes two points on this. First, he believes that while the 'fathers' were still in Egypt they no doubt practised the rites which were common to their race but in some cases would have seemed heathen enough to Ezekiel.² Second, on the basis

¹For the deletion of the word אֲשֶׁר , see, G. A. Cooke, W. Zimmerli, W. Eichrodt.

²G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), p. 215.

of the language used by Ezekiel, here Ezekiel might have been thinking of the wilderness period and reading back Israel's outstanding rebellious character into the Egyptian period.¹ More than twenty years later, the problem of the historical reference of what Ezekiel says here, does not seem to have been solved. This is clear from W. Eichrodt's commentary on the Book of Ezekiel (1955-1966), in which he says that although there is hardly any historical ground for such a remark of Ezekiel, nor does this feature appear in the whole exodus tradition, 'yet Ezekiel lays remarkable, if not excessive, stress upon it'.²

However, there are some passages which could be regarded as illuminating this charge of Ezekiel. First of all Exod. 4:1-9 and Exod. 5:15-21. The theme of Exod. 4:1-9 is Moses' second refusal to the call of Yahweh to come to the people of Israel in Egypt (4:1). In this passage the miraculous signs which Yahweh was going to give to Moses are presented in an antithetic way against the possibility of the people's disbelieving. Eissfeldt assigns this passage to what he regards as the oldest source of Pentateuch, i.e., L.³

¹ Ibid...

² W. Eichrodt, Ezekiel, (ET. by Cosslett Quin), (O.T.L.), London, 1970, p. 266.

³ O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament : An Introduction, (ET. by P. R. Ackroyd), Oxford, 1966, p. 194f..

If Bissfeldt is right here, then Exod. 5:15-21 (JE) can perhaps be regarded as containing a small reminiscence of the tradition of Israel's disbelieving ~~to~~ Moses in Egypt (vv. 20f.).¹ m/

Moreover, it might be true that Exod. 5:20f. does not refer to Israel's unfaithfulness in terms of worshipping idols in Egypt;² but it is possible that in this case Ezekiel received this tradition and articulated it in terms of Israel's worshipping deities other than Yahweh in Egypt. In the time of Ezekiel Egyptian cultic practices seem to have been regarded as similar to those of the Canaanites. The author of Lev. 8:3 and Ezekiel both describe Israel's rebellion against Yahweh in Canaan and in Egypt by using the same words.³ Despite all this, however, it is not clear how Ezekiel received that tradition of Israel's disbelieving in Moses in Egypt.

The second passage is Josh. 24:14. On this passage G. W. Coats remarks that the word $\square^{\prime}75\lambda\beta\lambda$ is secondary addition, and that there is no reference to the gods of Egypt whatsoever.⁴ He then says that there is 'no basis for supposing

¹That the tradition of Israel's disbelieving in Moses in Egypt is different from that of Israel's murmuring and rebellion in the wilderness has been shown by G. W. Coats in his Rebellion in the Wilderness, Nashville, New York, 1960, pp. 225f., 255f..

²Cf. W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 446; G. W. Coats, Rebellion in the Wilderness, Nashville, 1968, pp. 255f..

³Cf. supra., pp. 146f..

⁴G. W. Coats, op. cit., p. 233; cf. W. Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 266.

that this verse is earlier than Ezekiel and evidence for a pre-exilic tradition of Israel's apostasy in Egypt'.¹ Now, as far as the written tradition of Israel's apostasy in Egypt is concerned, perhaps Coats's opinion can be accepted, namely that the writing down of that tradition, as found in Josh. 24:14, did not take place until a very late time, presumably in the post-exilic period. But the case is not yet solved by this acceptance.

The third passage is Ps. 106:7. To begin with, Ps. 106 shows that Israel's past history is recited in connection with the people's confession of sins in the cult.² However, it is remarkable that a rather comprehensive account of the sinful history of the 'fathers' is presented here, and that this sinful history begins with the period when the 'fathers' were still in Egypt. To that extent it is true that in v. 7 the sinful deeds of the 'fathers' are emphasized, yet it seems difficult to extend the meaning of this verse and to understand it in terms of idolatrous sins as is required by Ezek. 20:8b. This is so because (a) in this verse there is no explicit reference to idols, and (b) the sins of the 'fathers' here are understood in terms

¹G. W. Coats, Rebellion in the Wilderness, p. 233.

²S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, (ET. by D. R. Ap-Thomas), Vol. II, Oxford, 1962, p. 112. Cf. A. Weiser, The Psalms, (ET. by Herbert Hartwell), (O.T.L.), London, 1962, pp. 679, 681.

of their having neglected and forgotten Yahweh's wonderful works and grace.¹ At best what is likely to be feasible here is to refer this psalm back to its cultic Sitz im Leben, and to say that it is in this cultic circle that the traditions of the sins of the 'fathers' are preserved. It is from this cultic source that both Ezekiel and the psalmist have taken their reliable materials.²

From all this, it seems justifiable to say that it is impossible to deny the sinful deeds of the 'fathers' when they were still in Egypt. Although the passages mentioned above give a variety of information about those sinful deeds of the 'fathers', it seems impossible to say that they are without basis. The fact that each of those passages has its own terminology and phraseology must not be regarded as unusual. Even the writer of Acts 7, especially vv. 22-29, 35, has his own terminology and phraseology too! In this connection, Ezek. 20:8a must be regarded as unusual only in that it interprets the sins of the 'fathers' in Egypt as idolatrous sins, which are centred in two characteristic words of Ezekiel, i.e., קדש and מלכות .³

¹Cf. A. Weiser, The Psalms, (ET. by Herbert Hartwell), p. 681. Notice the word קדש is used in connection with the fathers' rebellion at the Reed Sea (קדש קדש), and not in Egypt.

²Ibid., pp. 680ff..

³Cf. G. W. Coats, op. cit., p. 234.

Now the relationship between Ezek. 20:7 and Ezek. 20:8a must once again be examined. From the examination of their historical problem above, it is clear that what is specifically mentioned in vv. 7-8a does not find any parallelism elsewhere, and that the question of its historical reference(s) cannot be pressed too far. Instead, the examination reveals that a cultic circle, or cultic setting, plays an important role behind the mentioning of both Yahweh's commandment and the people's rebellion against it. In other words, as far as vv. 7-8a is concerned, the question of its historical reference(s) does not seem to be more important than that of their cultic setting and tradition-history. It does not seem important to ask what kind of commandment Yahweh gave and what kind of rebellion the people did. But, it seems very important to know that Yahweh has given his commandment and that the people have transgressed or rebelled against him by disobeying the commandment. This is so, partly because in vv. 7-8a the specification of both the commandment and the rebellion is entirely the responsibility of Ezekiel himself,¹

¹As far as the two characteristic words, i.e., קִרְוֹת and בְּלִבָּיִם , are concerned, elsewhere in the Book of Ezekiel they are always used to denote the detestable things and idols of Israel in Palestine, or those which were brought from Palestine (קִרְוֹת : 5:11; 7:20; 8:10; 11:18, 21; cf. Hos. 9:10; Jer. 7:30; 16:18; בְּלִבָּיִם : 6:4, 5, 6, 9, 13; 8:10; 14:4, 5, 7; 18:6, 12, 15; etc.). With this evidence it can probably be said that the specification of both the commandment of Yahweh 'in Egypt' and the rebellion of the people there is a reading back of what Ezekiel saw as a specific rebellion of the people against Yahweh's commandment in Palestine.

About the word בְּלִבָּיִם in Ezek. 30:13, see, e.g. G. A. Cooke, who prefers to regard it as addition (op. cit., p. 333), and W. Eichrodt, whose translation implies the emendation of the word בְּלִבָּיִם to בְּלִיבָיִם (op. cit., in loc.).

and partly because in vy. 1-13a, 19-21a, the phraseologies of which are similar to that of vy. 7-8a, both Yahweh's commandments and the people's rebellions are also stated in general terms.¹

So, once again, as far as Israel's rebellion against Yahweh is concerned, what Ezekiel seems to have been concerned with in this chapter is not primarily the details of that rebellion, but the fact that, on the one hand, Yahweh had given the people his commandments, and on the other, the people had rebelled against, and disobeyed, those commandments. Whatever the details of the people's rebellion were, they were clearly and emphatically understood by Ezekiel in terms of rebellion against Yahweh.

d. The element of judgement (y. 8b).

Again, the question of the historical reference(s) of this element is very difficult to answer. But, the fact that this element is put immediately after the statement of Israel's rebellion or transgression against Yahweh, indicates that Ezekiel here follows a logical structure, i.e., Yahweh's fury ($\text{אֵתֶּן$) will be poured out (Qal of שָׁפַךְ) and his anger ($\text{אֵתֶּן$) will be spent (Pi'el of שָׁפַךְ) because of the sin of the people (contrast

¹For the mentioning of the sabbaths, see below.

Exod. 4:24; 2 Sam. 6:7). The juxtaposition of these two expressions, i.e., לשפך חמתי עליהם and לכלות אפי בהם is interesting. This is so, not only because these two expressions basically mean the same thing, but also, and primarily, because their being juxtaposed shows Ezekiel's emphasis on the judgement.¹ For that reason it is not necessary to delete the second expression as Fohrer would do,² although it is true that in y. 13b it is only the first expression which recurs, whereas in y. 21b both of them are found. The absence of the second expression in y. 13b does not mean that originally Ezekiel used only the first expression. This is so, because in y. 13b Ezekiel has used another expression which is by no means less emphatic than the one which is absent.³

These two emphatic, but also similar, statements of Yahweh's judgement have their own peculiarities in that they are

¹See below.

²G. Fohrer - K. Gallig, Ezechiel, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 13), Tübingen, 1955, p. 109.

³The expression -ל שפך חמתי עליהם is found again outside chapter 20 in 9:8; 14:19; 22:22; 30:15; 36:18; cf. Jer. 10:25; Isa. 42:25. For the second expression, i.e., לכלות אפי בהם, cf. 6:12; 13:15 in which the word חמה is used instead of the word אפי. These two words are actually synonymous (B. T. Dahlberg, 'Wrath of God', l. a., I.D.B., Vol. IV, p. 904).

mostly used to describe Yahweh's judgement against Israel's idolatrous sins (Exod. 32:1-10; Num. 25:1-5; Deut. 11:16-17; 13; 29:16-28; Judg. 2:11-15; 2 Kings 22:16-17; etc.). In that context the judgement usually means the annihilation of the idols' worshippers (cf. Ezek. 7:1-23; 9:1-11). So, the fact that these two statements are now used together by Ezekiel in Ezek. 20:8b against the idolatrous sins of Israel in Egypt, means that for Ezekiel the threat of Israel's annihilation has also begun since Israel was still in Egypt.

Because of the difficulty to look for the historical reference(s) of this threat of annihilation, and because of the fact that there is not likely to be any other evidence in Old Testament which could support this allusion, it seems better to examine this statement of threat against its cultic background as in the case of the elements of Yahweh's commandment (v. 7) and the people's rebellion (v. 8a). It was shown above that all of the elements of salvation history, commandment or law, and rebellion of the people, are very frequently taken from the cult in which, in connection with the commemoration of the covenant between Yahweh and his people, they are preserved and transmitted. In this connection, Dahlberg has shown that there is a close relationship between the threat of the wrath of Yahweh against the sinful people and the renewal of the covenant.¹ According to

¹B. T. Dahlberg, 'Wrath of God', 2. e.f., I.D.B., Vol. IV, pp. 905f.

Dahlberg there are at least two ways which lead to the renewal of the covenant. First, through the people's repentance, i.e., 'a complete turning about and return to the obedient service of Yahweh', which would lead Yahweh to turn his wrath away (Jer. 4:4; 36:7; Amos. 5:15; Mal. 3:7, 16). Second, if the requirements for the deliverance are 'found to lie beyond human accomplishment ... the fulfilment of the necessary condition is carried through by Yahweh himself', i.e., 'by his establishing a new covenant with Israel' (Deut. 30:6; Jer. 31:31-34; 32:39-40; cf. Ezek. 36:36-37).¹ Out of these two ways, the second one seems to be relevant for Ezek. 20:8b. But, in order to understand the relevance of the second way, the threat of the judgement in Ezek. 20:8b must be understood in connection with the question of whether or not the threat is executed by Yahweh. For this purpose Ezek. 20:9 must be examined.

e. The element of forgiveness (v. 9).

The change of the statement of v. 8b to that of v. 9 is so drastic that G. A. Cooke points out that here 'we must supply in thought but I did not or but I relented'.² It is surprising

¹Ibid.

²G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), p. 215.

that Ezekiel, whose detailed and lengthy statements have become one of his characteristics, should make such a drastic change. Nevertheless, the context of yy. 8b-10 shows that what is meant by Yahweh's action for the sake of his own name is not that he executed the threat of the judgement in y. 8b, but, on the contrary, that he postponed the judgement, or withdrew that threat, ~~at all~~. Whether this postponement should be understood as either Yahweh's forgiveness or Yahweh's own fulfilment of the necessary condition for the cultic renewal of the covenant, or both, is just a matter of choice. But, in view of what Dahlberg pointed out above, the significance of this drastic statement seems to lie in that it quite clearly shows that the survival of Israel and the renewal of the covenant depend entirely on Yahweh's gracious act. This is so, not only because the contradictory statements in y. 8b and y. 9 have Yahweh as their respective subjects, but also because there is no call to the people to repent, and neither is there any hint that the people would like to do so.

Now, before a conclusion can be drawn, the examination of y. 9 must be carried out further. As it now stands, this verse is in fact a long sentence with several clauses. The main part of the sentence is to be found in y. 9a β i, i.e.,

ואני למען שמי לבלתי החל לעיני הגוים

and the clauses begin with אשר המה onwards. The function of these clauses is to describe הגוים in the main part of the sentence, and to that extent they must be regarded as subordinate

to the main sentence.¹ The question of the historical reference(s) of what is stated in this verse must not be pressed too far, since there is a historical anachronism in mentioning 'the peoples' (׀'יגה) in the Egyptian context. Therefore it is better to examine this verse form-critically against its cultic background,² bearing in mind that here Ezekiel is still describing the beginning of Israel's history. It was said above that the postponement of the judgement by Yahweh is not primarily for the sake of Israel's salvation, but for the sake of Yahweh's name (יגה ׀'יגה), that it should not be profaned in the sight of the people (׀'יגה ׀'יגה). The use of this

¹For the problems of these clauses, see, e.g., A. Bertholet - K. Galling, Hezechiel, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 13), Tübingen, 1936, who would like to regard the last clause as a doublet of the first three words in v. 10, which are lacking in LXX's version (p. 70); G. Fohrer - K. Galling, op. cit., would like to delete the first clause, i.e., ׀'יגה ׀'יגה ׀'יגה, because it is a 'näherbestimmende Glosse', and to opine that '4 Kurzverse sind ausgefallen' between v. 9b α and v. 9b β (p. 111). What these '4 Kurzverse' are is not clear, and therefore it is difficult to follow Fohrer's effort to unite these missing '4 Kurzverse' with the last clause in v. 9b and the whole of v. 10, to reconstruct a strophe of seven 'Kurzversen'. Finally, W. Zimmerli, op. cit., would like to insert a few words in between v. 9b α and v. 9b β which he translates 'mit dem Versprechen' (p. 432). This insertion is adopted by W. Eichrodt, with a comment 'unless one prefers to delete the last clause altogether' (op. cit., pp. 259, 261 note h).

²This is also the case with the references to the election of Israel and the revelation of Yahweh's name which are juxtaposed in v. 5 with, anachronistically, Egypt as their locality. See supra, pp. 126ff..

motivation for the postponement of the judgement by Ezekiel must be regarded as unique. The verse recurs almost verbatim in vv. 14, 22, and in the same context as well, i.e., in connection with the postponement of Yahweh's intended judgement. The uniqueness is also clear in that in these verses Ezekiel combines three or four ideas which elsewhere stand independently.

First, the idea of Yahweh's action. In the Old Testament the use of the word אָוַד with Yahweh as its subject can be classified in two ways. (a) It is used in combination with an object of historical events (e.g., Exod. 18:9; Num. 14:11, 22; 33:4; Deut. 1:30; 10:21; 11:3, 7; Josh. 24:17; 1 Sam. 28:18; Ezek. 5:8, 10; 25:11; 28:26). (b) It is used absolutely, i.e., without an explicit object: 1 Kings 8:32, 39; Jer. 14:7; Pss. 22:32; 37:5; 52:11; Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22; and Dan. 9:19. Even so, it is only in Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22 that the act (אָוַד) of Yahweh means his postponement of the judgement against Israel. In other words, whereas in most cases the act of Yahweh means positive action, it is only in Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22 that it means negative one. Moreover, as far as judgement as the object of Yahweh's act is concerned, it is only in Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22 that the act of Yahweh means its postponement, whereas elsewhere it means its execution. Now, as far as Ezek. 20:9 is concerned, it can be said that despite its negative meaning, the use of the word אָוַד still retains its legal, or judicial, background. This is so, because the postponement of a judgement cannot have any other setting or background than a legal or a judicial one.

Second, the idea of 'for the sake of my name' (למען שמי). With Yahweh in the suffix of the word אש , the phrase למען אש occurs not less than fifteen times in the Old Testament.¹ From the context of its occurrences, it can be inferred that the Sitz im Leben of this phrase is the cult, or at any rate, that this phrase has a very close connection with the cult. Except in 1 Kings 8:41, in all these occurrences the phrase is used as the motive of Yahweh's own act, either in the past, or in the present, or in the future. Even so, the combination of this phrase with the word אש occurs only in Ps. 109:21; Jer. 14:7 and Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22.

While in Ps. 109:21 and Jer. 14:7 the word אש is used in connection with the psalmist's, or the people's, confidence in Yahweh's will to help,² in Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22 it has nothing at all to do with that confidence. Besides, the use of the word אש with its legal/judicial background shows that these passages, i.e., Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22, refer to Yahweh's judicial act rather than otherwise.

Third, the idea of the prevention of the profanation of Yahweh's name (לבלתי יהיה). As it stands, the whole

¹ 1 Kings. 8:41; Pss. 23:3; 25:11; 31:4; 79:9; 106:8; 109:21; 143:11; Jer. 14:7, 21; Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22, 44; Isa. 48:9.

² G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, (ET. by D. M. G. Stalker), Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1965, p. 184.

statement in v. 9 presupposes the idea that Yahweh's name is holy. This idea is certainly not the property of Ezekiel alone. It is found elsewhere, e.g., in Lev. 20:3; 22:32; Pss. 33:21; 103:1; 105:3; 106:47; Isa. 57:15; Amos. 2:7; etc.. However, the idea of the profanation of Yahweh's holy name seems to be found only in the Code of Holiness (Lev. 18:21; 19:12; 20:3; 21:6; 22:2, 32) and in the Book of Ezekiel (Ezek. 20:9, 4, 22, 39; 36:20-22; 39:7, 25; 43:7, 8). Whereas in the Code of Holiness this idea is always related to cultic activities, in Ezekiel this is not always so. This is clear from the fact that in Ezek. 20:39; 39:25; 43:7, 8 the idea of the profanation of Yahweh's name is related to the bilateral relationship between Yahweh and Israel, whereas in Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22; 36:20-22; 39:7 it is also related to the role of foreign nations. However, as far as Ezekiel is concerned, it is interesting to find that the mention of both the profanation of Yahweh's name and the foreign nations in relation to the legal decision of Yahweh against Israel are only found in Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22 and 36:20-22. In Ezek. 36:18-19 it is clearly stated that the scattering of the Israelites among the nations is the result of Yahweh's judgement; and in Ezek. 36:20-22 it is stated that Israel's being scattered outside their land has given rise to the saying of the nations which profanes Yahweh's name. In other words, what is involved in Ezek. 36:20-22 is not the profanation of Yahweh's name in its cultic sense, but in its legal sense. This is so because in Ezek. 36:20-22 there is no mention at all

of either foreign gods, or idols, or the cultic association of the profanation. It is also in this legal sense that the idea of the profanation of Yahweh's name in Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22 must be understood. Otherwise, the postponement of the judgement would only make the idolatrous worship of Israel in Egypt continue and Yahweh's name would be cultically profaned.

Fourth, the idea which is contained in the phrase $\square^{\prime}\text{לעני הַגִּוִּים}$. H. Graf Reventlow has rightly shown that this phrase must have its Sitz im Leben in legal practices.¹ In that legal setting the function of those who are referred to, or mentioned, after the word לעני (in the construct state), is to witness what is taking place.² This is clear especially in Ezek. 5:8; 16:41 in which the nations ($\square^{\prime}\text{לעני הַגִּוִּים}$) and 'many women' ($\square^{\prime}\text{רבות נשים}$) will become the witnesses of Yahweh's judgement against his people.

But, as far as Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22 is concerned, it is clear that the function of the nations ($\square^{\prime}\text{לעני הַגִּוִּים}$) here is not to witness the judgement of Yahweh or its postponement. In vv. 14, 22 it is explicitly stated that these nations were the witnesses of the leading out of Israel from Egypt by Yahweh. According to Num. 14:13-16 the exodus event was witnessed by the Egyptians,

¹H. Graf Reventlow, 'Die Völker als Jahwes Zeugen bei Ezechiel', Z.A.W., 71 (N.F. 30), 1959, pp. 38f..

²According to H. Graf Reventlow, the combination of the word לעני (in the construct state) and a noun (in the absolute state) occurs thirteen times in the Book of Ezekiel: with $\square^{\prime}\text{לעני הַגִּוִּים}$ (5:8; 20:9, 14, 22, 41; 28:25; 39:27); with $\square^{\prime}\text{לעני נשים}$ (22:16); with $\square^{\prime}\text{לעני רבות נשים}$ (38:23); with other nouns (5:14; 16:41; 28:18; 36:34) (ibid., p. 39 notes 25-28).

but the profanation of Yahweh's name would be made by the nations in Canaan whom the Egyptians told about the event, whereas in Deut. 9:26-29 the profanation would be made by 'the land' from which Yahweh had brought out Israel. Now, what is interesting here is that the nations (אֲרָצוֹת) in Num. 14:13-16 and 'the land' in Deut. 9:26-29 would only profane Yahweh's name when Yahweh executed his judgement against Israel, as far as they are not the witness in the judgement itself. This distinction between the witness in the judgement and the witness of Yahweh's mighty acts is very important.¹ The witness of Yahweh's mighty acts could profane Yahweh's name, whereas the witness in the judgement could not.

If M. Noth is right in regarding Num. 14:13-16 as a Deuteronomistic insertion,² it can be inferred that this distinction is not a strange thing for the Deuteronomistic circle. This distinction is found very clearly in Ezekiel in that in Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22 he is talking about the witness of Yahweh's mighty acts, or Yahweh's promise to do mighty acts, and not about the witness in Yahweh's judgement against Israel, whereas in Ezek. 5:8; 16:41 he is talking about the witness in the judgement and

¹Cf. H. Graf Reventlow who does not seem to have made this distinction at all (*ibid.*, pp. 33-45.)

²M. Noth, *Numbers*, (EF. by J. D. Martin), (O.T.L.), London, 1968, pp. 108f..

not otherwise. The profanation of Yahweh's name would be made by the witness of Yahweh's mighty acts, or by other nations, but never by the witnesses in the judgement itself.

Whether the similarity between the Deuteronomistic circle and Ezekiel in this case can be understood as the dependence of the latter on the former or vice versa, is difficult to decide. In any case the quotations in both Num. 13:16 (= Deut. 9:28) and Ezek. 36:20 seem to suggest that the profanation is judicial rather than religious. Therefore the profanation must have originated from legal activities rather than from cultic ones. Yet the probability that the intercessions of Moses, which are recorded in Num. 14:13-19 and Deut. 9:25-29, are used in the cult can hardly be denied. This is so, since these intercessions find their counterpart or parallelism in Exod. 32:30ff., the origin of which may have been the responsibility of 'some specific event in Israel's cultic history'.¹ In this cultic setting the idea of the postponement of Yahweh's judgement against the sinful Israel must be very important for both the continuation of Israel's existence and her cultic activities. Nevertheless, in the context of Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22 it must be reemphasized that the postponement is not primarily for the sake of Israel's salvation, but for the sake of Yahweh's name.

¹W. Beyerlin, Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Tradition, (Ed. by S. Rudman), Oxford, 1965, p. 133 and note 568.

So, to return to Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22, there are three conclusions which can be drawn. First, what is involved in the phrase $\square' \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל}$ is not the idea of the function of 'the nations' as the witnesses in the judgements, but of their function as the witnesses of Yahweh's mighty acts for Israel. With that function those nations could certainly profane Yahweh's name if he executed his judgements against Israel. Second, there is a close traditio-historical relationship between Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22 on the one hand, and Num. 13:16; Deut. 9:28 on the other. But, their difference is also clear in that Num. 13:16 and Deut. 9:28 are closely attached to a cultic setting whereas Ezek. 20:9, 14, 22 is to a legal or judicial setting. Third, what is called 'the element of forgiveness' above is in fact the reference to the postponement, or the suspension, of Yahweh's judgement against Israel, despite her punishable sins.

With the presentation of these five elements in such a composition, i.e., the element of salvation history, the element of law, the element of rebellion, the element of judgement, and the element of forgiveness, Ezekiel has described the beginning of Israel's history in Egypt (Ezek. 20:5-9). As they now stand, it is not clear which element(s) is, or are, occupying the mind of Ezekiel most. What is clear here is that the arrangement of those five elements in such a juxtaposition is really remarkable. As far as that arrangement and that juxtaposition are concerned, it seems true to say that they are only found in Ezek. 20, and to that extent they must be regarded as unique.

The second period : Israel in the wilderness (vv. 10-17).

To begin with, it must be said that the structure of this subsection is similar to that of the preceding one. This is clear in that the five elements of the preceding subsections are found here in an exactly similar composition and juxtaposition. However, this subsection (vv. 10-17) is different from the preceding one (vv. 5-10) in that it has an additional length in which the elements of law, judgement, and forgiveness, are repeated in a slightly different order (vv. 15-17). If the preceding subsection has those five elements in the order of 1-2-3-4-5, the present subsection has them in the following order : 1-2-3-4-5 (vv. 10-14) plus 4-3-5 (vv. 15-17).

In view of the repetitions of these three elements, the only problem which seems to have arisen is whether or not the repetitions of the fourth and the third elements in vv. 15-16 is to be excluded from the unit of vv. 10-17. The only evidence which seems to support their exclusion is that v. 16 is similar to v. 13 and that v. 15, which is introduced by the word $\square\lambda\iota$, is in contradiction to v. 14 and v. 17. However, the contradiction of v. 15 to vv. 14, 17 is not a strange thing in the context of both this unit and the preceding one, since this kind of contradiction is already found in v. 8b and is repeated in v. 13b and v. 14. Besides, despite the fact that there is a similarity between the structure of this unit or subsection and that of the preceding one, it would be a mistake to use that definite and

stereotyped structure to be a measure to rule out any verse which causes structural unevenness or structural disturbance. In connection with Ezekiel's characteristics, it would be a mistake to regard any repetition of either phrase or word as a sign of an additional or secondary insertion.¹ So, it seems better to regard vv. 15-17 as an integral part of the unit or subsection, which gives a further explanation of the three elements repeated there.

a. The element of salvation history (v. 10).

It is remarkable that this element if contained in a concise, but clear, statement :

'And I led them out of the land of Egypt, and I brought them into the wilderness'.

The allusion here is clearly to the exodus event, for which the use of the word יָצָא (in High'il) is characteristic.² With Yahweh as its subject, this word is used to refer to the exodus event (Exod. 18:1; 20:2; Josh. 24:6; Num. 20:16; Lev. 19:36; 22:33; Deut. 1:27; etc.), although in some passages it is Moses, or Moses and Aaron, who is, or are, its subjects (Moses : Exod.

¹ Contrast A. Bertholet - K.alling, Hezechiel, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 13), 1936, who regard vv. 15f. as a redactional insertion which has destroyed the clear context in the unit (p. 73).

² J. Wijngaards, ' יָצָא and הֵצִיא a Twofold Approach to the Exodus', V.T. 15, 1965, pp. 91ff..

3:10-12; 14:11; Moses and Aaron : Exod. 6:13, 26). In the Book of Ezekiel the use of this word with Yahweh as its subject, and in reference to the exodus event, is only found in Ezek. 20.¹ This means that, as far as the Book of Ezekiel is concerned, this chapter must have something to do with the exodus traditions.

Even so, it must be said that Ezekiel does not receive and transmit these traditions mechanically, but organically. This is clear from the fact that his statement is simple and straightforward (v. 10), without hinting at any element of Israel's cry, or complaint, in Egypt. And neither does Ezekiel make any reference to the plagues, Moses, or other things, which are integral parts of the exodus traditions. What he seems to have been concerned with is that the exodus event is a mighty act of Yahweh for Israel which was witnessed by the nations (vv. 9, 14, 22).² However, the concise statement of exodus in v. 10, in which no mention of the nations is made, seems to suggest that Ezekiel knew perfectly well that the exodus event is primarily for the benefit of Israel and not for that of the nations (Cf. v. 6). In other words the simple mentioning of the exodus

¹It is used eight times altogether : five times in reference to the old exodus (vv. 6, 9, 10, 14, 22), and three in reference to the new one (vv. 34, 38, 41).

²Notice the statements of Yahweh's mighty hand, his outstretched arms, and the pouring out of this wrath in Ezek. 20:33 are not connected with the exodus event. Instead, they are connected with Yahweh's claim to be the king over the people of Israel.

event in y. 10 refers only to the bilateral relationship of Yahweh and Israel, and in that sense it points to the Credo-theme of Israel itself.

Now, before an examination of the other individual elements in this subsection or unit (vv. 10-17) is carried further, it seems necessary to have a general look at the unit itself. After the leading out of Israel from the land of Egypt, the locality of both the scene and the elements in this subsection is now changed from Egypt to the wilderness. The short mention of the wilderness in y. 10b is as interesting as that of the exodus event itself (y. 10a). This is so, since there is no mention of either Marah, Meribah, Sinai, Kadesh, or any other big event which took place during the wilderness wandering. Instead, what is mentioned by Ezekiel is that Yahweh gave his commandments again (cf. y. 7), and that Israel rebelled again (vv. 13a, 16), and that Yahweh thought again to punish them (vv. 13b, 15), but again postponed it (vv. 14, 17). With these recurring elements, and with the fact that 'the wilderness' is not described further, it might well be that the historical references of all of these things, which are mentioned in this subsection or unit (vv. 10-17), are less important than the case which Ezekiel is arguing. It is of course possible to say that the giving of both the statutes (סִוְרִוּ) and the ordinances (דְּבָרֵי שְׁפָטִים) by Yahweh (y. 11) refer to the Sinai event, and that Israel's rebellion (y. 13a) refers to the golden Calf event (cf. Exod. 32), etc., but it seems difficult to see whether

what Ezekiel is stressing is those individual events themselves or the law, the rebellion, and the postponement of the judgement. However, granted that Ezekiel puts his stress on the law, the rebellion, and the postponement of the judgement, more than on the individual historical events behind those individual elements, it is interesting to find that he presents the case of Israel's rebellion by following the course of Israel's history. It is in this connection that Ezekiel's treatment of Israel's past history must be understood : on the one hand, he follows the course of Israel's history as it is set out in Israel's Credo, while on the other, he has his own stress on the interpretation of that history. For that purpose he leaves out the details of that history, but, instead, confines himself to the case which he wants to present and to argue. Therefore, it is no wonder that Ezekiel devotes more space to the elements of law, Israel's rebellion, and Yahweh's suspension of his judgement, rather than to the element of salvation history and/or the descriptions of Egypt, the exodus event, and the wilderness wandering.

Now, this result of the general look at vv. 10-17, surprisingly enough, applies also to what Ezekiel is dealing with in the third period of Israel's history, i.e., vv. 18-26. Although it is the children of the generation who came out of Egypt who are now being dealt with, the locality of the scene of this period is still the wilderness (vv. 18, 23). Moreover, the order of the juxtaposition of the five elements in this subsection (vv. 18-26) is similar to that in the preceding one,

despite a small difference in the extension of some of them.

In vv. 10-17 the order is 1-2-3-4-5 plus 4-3-5, that in vv. 18-26 is 2-3-4-5 plus 4-3-1/5.¹ Because in this unit or subsection Ezekiel also devotes more space and proportion to the elements of law, rebellion, judgement, and postponement of the judgement, than to the details of the history, it can be said that, as in vv. 5-9 and vv. 10-17, here Ezekiel is following the course of Israel's history set out in her Credo, but applying his own stress of interpretation to it.

The similarity between this unit (vv. 18-26) and its preceding one (vv. 10-17) can also be seen in that most of the words and phrases of both of them are the same. Roughly speaking, the following similarities or parallelisms are undeniable : vv. 11-12 with vv. 19-20; vv. 13-14 with vv. 21-22; vv. 15-16 with vv. 23-24; and the vocabulary of vv. 25-26 is similar to that of vv. 11ff., 16. Besides, the form-critical structures of both of these subsections are similar. The formulas in vv. 13-14 are repeated almost verbatim in vv. 21-22, and both

¹These numbers refer to the following elements : 2=law (vv. 18-20, 25f.); 3=rebellion of Israel (vv. 21a, 24); 4=judgement (vv. 21b, 23); 5=forgiveness or postponement of the judgement (v. 22). If v. 17 could be regarded as implying the element of salvation history (element 1), it would be possible to include it in the present unit (vv. 18-26) as well, so that the order of these elements here would be : 1-2-3-4-5 plus 4-3-2.

the introducing words, and the concluding ones, of the giving of the commandments and the sabbaths in vy. 11-12 are similar to those of vy. 25-26. Despite the fact that the form-critical structures of y. 17 and vy. 18-20 do not find any parallelism in either of these two units, it can be said quite definitely that all of these similarities suggest that the case of the first generation in the wilderness (vy. 10-17) and that of the second (vy. 18-26) are the same. And a comparison of these two similar cases with that of the generation in Egypt, i.e., the generation at the beginning of Israel's history (vy. 5-9), shows that all of the three cases are the same.

Having noted all of these similarities, one must not forget that there are some differences too among all the three subsections or units. These differences will be noted in the detailed examinations of the second and the third periods of Israel's past history below. Returning to the second period, we are now in a position to examine the second element of the unit concerned.

b a. The element of law (vy. 11-12).

The substance of this element consists of two groups of commandments, i.e., 1) the statutes and the ordinances and 2) the sabbaths.

1) The statutes (וְקִיּוֹם) and the ordinances (מִשְׁפָּטִים).

In his small but important book Die Ursprünge des israelitischen

Rechts,¹ A. Alt describes these two words, i.e., חֻקֹת and מִשְׁפָּטִים, as the termini technici of the apodictic laws and the casuistic laws respectively.² This description could perhaps be accepted only as far as these two Hebrew words stand independently from each other. As they are now found in Ezek. 20:11, 13, 16, 18 (חֻקֹת, masc.), 19, 21, 24, 25, their being used together as a couple suggests that they have a different tradition--history from that of their being used separately. In the Book of Ezekiel alone this couple occurs not less than thirteen times,³ whereas elsewhere in Old Testament it is only found in the Code of Holiness (Lev. 18:4, 5, 26; etc.) and Deuteronomy (always חֻקֹת, masc.: Deut. 4:1, 5, 8, 14, 15; etc.).⁴ Although in both Ezekiel and Leviticus the order of these words is either מִשְׁפָּטִים---חֻקֹת or חֻקֹת---מִשְׁפָּטִים, whereas in Deuteronomy always מִשְׁפָּטִים---חֻקֹת, it seems justifiable to say that due to the frequency of its occurrence,

¹A. Alt, Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts, Leipzig, 1934, now also as 'The Origins of Israelite Law' in his Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, (ET. by R. A. Wilson), Oxford, 1966, pp. 81-132.

²Ibid., pp. 17, 59 note 2. (ET. pp. 92, 123f. note 106).

³Ezek. 5:6, 7; 11:12, 20; 18:9 (cf. 18:19, 21); 20:11, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25.

⁴G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1936 (reprinted 1967), p. 59.

i.e., not less than thirty-eight times altogether in the Old Testament, the use of the couple must not be confused with the use of each of the words.

The fact that the couple is very frequently found in both the Code of Holiness and Deuteronomy, may give rise to a tradition--historical question of the relationship of these two literary collections with the Book of Ezekiel. Now, as far as the two terms (סִיטָה/סִיטָה and אֲשֶׁר־עִיטָה) are concerned, it can be said that H. Graf Reventlow is right in pointing out that the Sitz im Leben of their coupling is the cult.¹ It is from there that both the Code of Holiness, Deuteronomy, and Ezekiel, have derived their respective uses of the couple.² It must also be said that despite its cultic Sitz im Leben, the coupling of these two terms does not seem to have been transmitted mechanically. Instead, it was transmitted organically. In other words, despite the fact that both Ezekiel and those who were behind the Code of Holiness and Deuteronomy can to a large extent be regarded as cultic persons, they still have freedom in receiving and transmitting the use of these coupled terms.³

¹H. Graf Reventlow, Wächter über Israel : Ezechiel und seine Tradition, (B.Z.A.W. 82), Berlin, 1962, p. 110.

²Ibid., pp. 9ff; G. A. Cooke, op. cit., pp. 62f..

³Cf. H. Graf Reventlow, op. cit., pp. 9ff..

This is clear not only from the fact that these two terms are found in an interchangeable order, but also from the fact that the verbs which always go with them are interchangeable as well. The latter can be seen, e.g., in Ezek. 20:13, 16, 19, etc., in which the words לא הִלַּךְ ב are used with the term חֻקֹּת , whereas in v. 24 the word מֵאֵד is used; in a positive statement the term מִשְׁפָּטִים is used either with the verbs עָשָׂה (Lev. 18:4, 5), or both עָשָׂה and שָׁמַר (Ezek. 20:19), whereas in a negative statement it is used with either מֵאֵד (Ezek. 20:13, 16), or אֶל-שָׁמַר (Ezek. 20:18), or לֹא-שָׁמַר (Ezek. 20:21), or לֹא-עָשָׂה (Ezek. 20:24).¹

What Ezekiel means by the statutes (חֻקֹּת/חֻקִּים)² is by no means clear. The only descriptions in this unit are found in vv. 11, 13, and all are positive. In connection with these descriptions, it is of course possible to argue that these two terms, i.e. מִשְׁפָּטִים and חֻקֹּת , must be treated separately because they are described individually.³ But, due to the fact

¹Ibid., p. 10.

²It is not clear why Ezekiel uses חֻקֹּת in 20:11, 13, 21 and חֻקִּים in 20:18, 25. However, due to the fact that חֻקִּים is preferred by Deuteronomy, it seems justified to say that these two terms, i.e., חֻקֹּת and חֻקִּים , are interchangeable.

³In vv. 11, 13, 21 the descriptions use a masc. suffix which refers only to מִשְׁפָּטִים . See also v. 25 in which the description of חֻקִּים is different from that of מִשְׁפָּטִים .

that the coupling of these two terms has its own Sitz im Leben,¹ it seems better to treat them together as referring to a single idea. This togetherness is also clear from the fact that in Ezek. 18:9 the walking in Yahweh's statutes (חֲקוֹת) and the observance of his ordinances (מִשְׁפָּטֵי) are related only to one idea, i.e., life (cf. Lev. 18:5).² So, on this basis it can perhaps be concluded that the observance of those positively described statutes and ordinances (Ezek. 20:11, 13) would bring life.³

2) The sabbaths (שַׁבָּתוֹת).

The fact that in this section, i.e., Ezek. 20:1-31, the word שַׁבָּתוֹת is always used in its plural form (vv. 12, 13, 16, 20, 21, 24) indicates that (a) it must not be confused with its use in singular form and in that sense (b) it is in a parallelism to the plural forms of both the words חֲקוֹת/חֻקִּים and מִשְׁפָּטֵי. As in the case of both חֲקוֹת/חֻקִּים and מִשְׁפָּטֵי, the question of the detailed meaning of שַׁבָּתוֹת must not be pressed too far. It seems sufficient to say that what is meant

¹See, supra, pp. 180f..

²It is of course possible here to combine the ideas of righteousness (צְדָקָה) and life (חַיִּים) as G. A. Cooke did (op. cit., p. 199). But, since the idea of righteousness is mostly related to the observance of the casuistic laws (cf. the detailed casuistic laws in Ezek. 18:5-8), it seems better to distinguish it from the idea of life. Cf. W. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, (B.K. XIII/1, pp. 398f., 406ff.; W. Eichrodt, Ezekiel, (ET. by Cosslett Quin), (O.T.L.), London, 1970, pp. 238ff. and the references on p. 288 note 1.

³On the contrary, the observance of the negatively described statutes and ordinances in Ezek. 20:25 will bring death.

by these 'sabbaths' is all the sabbatical laws or the sabbatical activities, be it the day of sabbath or the seventh day, or the day of rest, or the sabbatical years, or other things referred to in the sabbatical regulations. But in connection with its particular use in Ezek. 20 it is interesting to find that (a) these sabbaths are in fact given by Yahweh to be a sign between Yahweh and Israel (v. 12) and in that sense they should be hallowed (v. 20) and not be profaned (cf. vv. 13, 16, 21, 24); and (b) by hallowing and observing the sabbaths the people will know that it is Yahweh who sanctifies them, i.e., the people of Israel.¹

In the Old Testament the description of the sabbath(s) as a sign between Yahweh and Israel is only found five times, i.e., Exod. 31:13, 16, 17; Ezek. 20:12, 20; whereas the relation of their hallowing and observing and the sanctification of Israel by Yahweh (v. 12b) is found again only in Exod. 3:13. The fact that Ezekiel's descriptions of the sabbaths are similar to that of Exod. 31:13ff., suggests that there is a relationship

¹Taking the third pers. masc. pl. suffix in the word מִקְרָשׁ in v. 12 as referring back to Israel, and not to the sabbaths (שַׁבָּתוֹת) which is in feminine form. However, see, G-K. para. 1350 which shows that the third pers. masc. pl. suffix could refer to fem. pers. pl. noun. On its application in Ezek. 20:12, cf. Lev. 21:23; 22:16.

between Ezek. 20 and Exod. 31:13ff..

For the problem of this relationship, Niel-Erik A. Andreasen has rightly pointed out that this similarity is due to the fact that both Ezekiel and the author of Exod. 31:13ff. shared the traditions of Israel from the cult, and therefore, the allusion to the sabbaths in Ezek. 20:12 passim must not be regarded as addition or secondary.¹ Further, Andreasen points out quite rightly that the two descriptions of the sabbaths as found in Ezek. 20:12, have their functions in the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel, and that it is in this covenant context that Ezekiel has used the word שבת throughout the book which bears his name.²

With these two general instances of the element of law, it is clear that Ezekiel is referring to the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel. The fact that both of these instances are understood by him as being the gifts (שבת) of Yahweh to Israel also points to the covenantal setting, in which, after having done a saving act for Israel (v. 10),

¹Niel-Erik A. Andreasen, The Old Testament Sabbath, (S.B.L. Dissertation Series 7), Published by the Society of Biblical Literature, no place, 1972, pp. 42-47, 210.

²Ibid., pp. 204-213.

Yahweh requires her to keep the covenant by observing his statutes and ordinances and hallowing his sabbaths (vy. 11, 12).

c. The element of rebellion (v. 13a).

As in y. 8a, the details of Israel's rebellion against Yahweh in y. 13a is described in terms of Israel's total rejection of Yahweh's commandments : Israel did not walk in Yahweh's statutes (חקוּת), rejected his ordinances (מצַוֵּי), and profaned his sabbaths (שַׁבָּתוֹת). In other words, in terms of the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel, the rebellion of Israel is total, which means that Israel's life or death depends entirely on whether or not Yahweh would like to renew the covenant or to forgive her.

d. The element of forgiveness (v. 13b).

As in y. 8b, what is called the element of forgiveness here is in fact the postponement, or the suspension, of Yahweh's judgement against Israel. The difference between y. 8b and y. 13b lies in that in the former the judgement is not explicitly described, whereas in the latter it is, i.e., לְכַלּוֹת ('to finish them'). Even so, this explicit description does not actually make any essential difference, since it was shown above that the intended judgement in y. 8b is the annihilation of Israel in Egypt. Besides, the motive of the forgiveness or of

the suspension of the judgement in v. 14 is similar to that of the suspension of the judgement in v. 9. The only difference here is that the reference to the exodus in v. 14 is chronologically more accurate than that in v. 9.

With the mentioning of this motive the whole case of the first generation in the wilderness is understood by Ezekiel as exactly the same as that of Israel in Egypt. However, the fact that in this subsection (vv. 10-14) Ezekiel elaborates the element of law still further, i.e., by using the terms תקנת, אשכנז, and שבתות, which have wider meanings than those used in v. 7 do, suggests that Ezekiel measures Israel's past history in terms of her obedience to do what those terms convey.¹ This is also clear in vv. 15-17 in which Yahweh's judgement is announced because Israel does not obey the commandments of Yahweh which are classified in those three terms (v. 16). Ezekiel's elaboration of the element of law can be seen again in his treatment of the third period of Israel's history in vv. 18-26.

As it now stands, vv. 15-17 is problematic in terms of both formal structure and content. First, as far as the stereotyped

¹Cf. G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, (ET. by D.M. G. Stalker), Vol. II, Edinburgh, 1965, p. 224 and the notes there.

formal structures of both vv. 5-9 and vv. 10-14 are concerned, the introducing words 'יָשָׁב־בְּאֶרֶץ' in v. 15 suggest that vv. 15-17 does not seem initially to have belonged to the original structure of the section (vv. 1-31). This seems to be strengthened by v. 17 which does not have any parallelism in vv. 5-9. It is perhaps because of these reasons that A. Bertholet regards v. 17 as 'die ursprüngliche Fortsetzung' of 'Jahwes Handeln' in v. 14,¹ and that vv. 15f. is a 'redaktioneller, nur umliegendes Material verarbeitend Einschub' which destroys the smooth context of vv. 14, 17ff..² Second, some scholars treat vv. 15-22 as a unity,³ although they do not explain why.

It was shown earlier⁴ that in vv. 15-17 there are recurrences of the fourth, the third, and the fifth elements, i.e., the elements of judgement (v. 14), law (v. 16), and forgiveness (v. 17). This repetition must not by any means be regarded as strange for Ezekiel. A closer examination shows that vv. 15-17, taken as a whole, is in fact the description, or the clarification, of what is stereotypically presented in vv. 13-14.

¹A. Bertholet - K. Galling, op. cit., p. 70.

²Ibid., p. 73.

³Cf. G. A. Cooke, op. cit., p. 217; G. Fohrer - K. Galling, op. cit., p. 112.

⁴Supra, pp. 175ff..

What is stated in v. 13a is clarified in v. 16, what is stated in v. 13b is clarified in v. 15, and what is stated in v. 14 is clarified in v. 17. In this sense, and from the point of view of prophetic traditions, to regard vv. 15-17 as additional, or secondary, or an insertion, seems to be baseless. Besides, compared with the content of vv. 13a-14, what is stated in vv. 15, 17 seems to have clearer historical reference(s) : it is Ezekiel's interpretation of what is recorded in Num. 13f. and Deut. 1:19-46.¹ This interpretation is organic rather than mechanic, and, in the context of Ezek. 20:1-31, the negative statement in v. 15 is extremely emphatic over against the positive one in v. 6. The mentioning of the idols in v. 16b reminds one of what Ezekiel seems to have been particularly concerned with in this section.² The historical reference(s) of these idols of the wilderness period (cf. vv. 24, 26) are as difficult as that of the idols of the Egyptian period (vv. 7f.). So, in this particular connection it must be said that Ezekiel reads back Israel's religious life in Canaan to her religious life in the wilderness,³ as he does in the case of Israel's

¹Cf. W. Zimmerli, op. cit., pp. 447f..

²Contrast G. Fohrer - K. Galling, who regard v. 6b as an 'erläuternde Glosse' which must be deleted (op. cit., p. 111). Cf. G. A. Cooke, op. cit., p. 217.

³G. A. Cooke says : 'Israel in Canaan might have deserved this sweeping condemnation, but not Isr. in the wilderness'. Yet he continues, '...only two outbreaks of idolatry during the wanderings are recorded, Ex. 32:1-6(E), Deut. 9:16 (the golden calf) and Num. 25:1-3, Hos. 9:10' (op. cit., p. 217).

religious life in the beginning of her history in Egypt (v. 8).

The third period : the second generation in the wilderness
(vv. 18-26).

As was stated earlier, v. 17 can be regarded as implicitly containing the element of salvation history for the birth of the second generation in the wilderness. Yet Ezekiel does not seem to have been concerned with this element as much as he does with the elements of law, rebellion, and judgement. Therefore he begins his interpretation of the third period of Israel's history by stating explicitly the element of law (vv. 18-20) which he elaborates still further in vv. 23-26.

With the lack of explicit statement of the element of salvation history, the order of the other elements in this subsection is as follows: 2-3-4-5 plus 4-3-2 or 5.¹ With this order, it is clear that this subsection still preserves the stereotyped structures of vv. 5-9 and vv. 10-17. The stereotyped structure is also clear in that this subsection has some verbatim repetitions of the formulas or the statements used in vv. 5-9 and/or in vv. 10-17.² However, this subsection is in many respects different from the preceding two. These differences

¹For the references of these numbers, see, supra, p. 177 note 1.

²E.g., vv. 21, 22 is similar to vv. 8-9 and vv. 13-14; vv. 23-24 is similar to vv. 15-16; vv. 25-26 is similar to vv. 11-13.

will be hinted in the detailed examination of this subsection below.

As far as the content of this subsection is concerned, it is clear that Ezekiel is now dealing with a part of Israel's past history in the wilderness (vy. 18, 21, 23) in which Israel is referred to as the children of the generation who was led out of Egypt by Yahweh (vy. 10, 18). Again, it is very striking that in this subsection the detailed information or reference to the history of these 'children' is as little as that of the generation dealt with in the preceding two subsections. However, despite all this, it is clear that Ezekiel is still following the course of Israel's history as it is set out in Israel's Credo, and that it is against this credal background that he presents his interpretation of that history. In other words, Ezekiel knows very well the course of Israel's past history, but his interpretation of each period of that history is entirely his own.

a. The element of salvation history (v. 17).

It was said above that this verse does not state explicitly the element of salvation history for the birth of the second generation in the wilderness. Yet it can perhaps be justified to regard it as implying this element. This is so, since the negative sentence in y. 17b uses vocabulary which is similar to that of y. 13b. It was also said above that y. 17 is actually the explanation of the stereotyped formula in y. 14; therefore

a statement similar to that of y. 10 could be expected after y. 17. The lack of this statement shows that Ezekiel's interest does not lie in this element of salvation history. So, once again, the element of salvation history in the third period is only implied in y. 17.¹

b. The element of law (vv. 18-20).

There are two kinds of commandments here, i.e., (1) the statutes, the ordinances and the idolatry, of 'your fathers' (y. 18) and (2) the statutes, the ordinances and the sabbaths, of Yahweh (y. 19-20).² The detailed meanings of the statutes and the ordinances of 'your fathers' are as vague as those of the statutes and the ordinances of Yahweh. However, the explicit reference to the idols of the fathers in y. 18b suggests that the idolatrous worship of Israel has become the particular interest of Ezekiel. It is in that particular reference that Israel's rebellion against Yahweh is manifest at its clearest (cf. vv. 7, 8b, 16b, 24b, 28).

Form-critically the use of particle ל plus an imperfect or a jussive in y. 18b reminds one of the prohibitive law in Lev. 18:24; 13:4, 29, 31. Yet the difference between them is

¹See, also on y. 19a α , below.

²For the interchangeability of ל and ל , see, supra, pp. 179ff..

also clear in that in Ezek. 20:18b the particle ל follows the substances of the law, whereas in Lev. 18:24; 19:4, 29, 31 precedes them, and that in the former it is used in combination with the preposition ב , whereas in the latter with either the preposition ב , or את , or אל . Whether these different prepositions signify anything is not clear. Moreover, the use of the motive clause אני יהוה אלהיכם in the prohibitive law does not seem to be regular. This motive clause is immediately used after the prohibitive law in Lev. 19:4, 31, whereas in Lev. 18:24; 19:29 is not. If this irregularity means anything at all, it must be that the prohibitive law can be ended either with a motive clause or without. As far as Ezek. 20:18b is concerned, the form of the prohibitive law here is still a little problematic. This is so since in $\text{v. 19a}\alpha$ there is a motive clause אני יהוה אלהיכם which can be regarded as either concluding the prohibitive law in v. 18b or introducing the command in $\text{vv. 19a}\beta$ b-20. However, as it now stands, the commandment in $\text{vv. 19a}\beta$ b-20 has its own motive clause, i.e., the Erkenntnisformel in $\text{v. 20b}\beta$, a formal structure which suggests that the motive clause אני יהוה אלהיכם in $\text{v. 19a}\alpha$ should belong to v. 18 .

In this connection W. Zimmerli is right in referring to Lev. 18:2f. in which the formula אני יהוה אלהיכם constitutes the preamble of the commandments stated there.¹ But the fact

¹W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, (B.K. XIII/1), p. 448.

that the commandment in Lev. 18:2f. is not concluded with another motive clause,¹ suggests that this formula cannot be used together with another motive clause. And to that extent its role is determined by the context and the place in which it is used. In Lev. 18:2f. the formula must be regarded as the introducing motive clause or the preamble of the commandment, whereas in Lev. 18:4 it constitutes the concluding one (cf. Lev. 18:30; 19:3, 4, etc.). So, in the light of all this, it seems better to regard the formula יהוה אלהיכם in Ezek. 20:19a as the concluding motive clause of the prohibition in Ezek. 20:18 (cf. Ezek. 20:7).²

The reference to the statutes and the ordinances of 'your fathers' here is unique, i.e., it does not occur anywhere else in the Book of Ezekiel. Its being juxtaposed with the positive admonition in vv. 19a β b-20 suggests that Ezekiel elaborates his description of law so straightforwardly that Israel is faced with an either-or situation. This straightforward elaboration, or this straightforward presentation of the either-or situation, is also clear in that (a) Ezekiel uses the same terms for both the fathers' statutes and ordinances and those of Yahweh and (b)

¹ Taking the prohibition in Lev. 18:2f. and the commandment in Lev. 18:4 as two separate things.

² Cf. W. Zimmerli, who says that in Ezek. 20:19f. the role of the motive clause is not clear (op. cit., p. 448).

in vv. 19a β b-20 he uses verbs in imperative mood, whereas in vv. 11-12 he mentions none of them.

c. The element of rebellion (v. 21a).

Although form-critically this half-verse is similar to, or the stereotyped repetition of, vv. 8a, 13a, its being juxtaposed with the positive admonition in vv. 19a β b-20 shows how emphatic Ezekiel's presentation is. But, the fact that the positive admonition in vv. 19a β b-20 is still preceded by a prohibition (vv. 18-19a α), makes this presentation more emphatic than that which is found in vv. 7-8a. This is so, since the rebellion of the children against Yahweh in v. 21a is understood by Ezekiel as their having made the wrong choice in the either-or situation set out by the elements of law in vv. 18-20. By doing so the children's history is worse than that of their fathers.

d. The element of judgement (v. 21b).

The formula in v. 21b is a stereotyped repetition of that which is found in both v. 8b and v. 13b. Its occurrence in v. 21b is the last in this chapter. Even so, a close examination does not find any major elaboration of it, except the change of a phrase which makes the formula relevant to each period of the history being dealt with.¹ In the first period, or in the unit

¹The presence of the phrase לכחותם and the lack of the phrase לכחות אפי' בהם in v. 13a do not seem to signify anything which can be regarded as an elaboration of the element of judgement contained in the whole formula.

which deals with the beginning of Israel's history (vv. 5-9), this formula has the phrase $\text{בְּתוֹךְ אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם}$ (v. 8b), and in the second and the third periods (vv. 10-17 and vv. 18-26 respectively) has the phrase $\text{בְּאֶרֶץ בְּרַבְרָב}$ (vv. 13b, 21b). So, in comparison with Ezekiel's treatment of the element of law in this subsection (vv. 18-26), it can be concluded that Ezekiel's elaboration of the element of judgement is only minor. In other words, Ezekiel is putting his emphasis more on the element of law rather than on the element of judgement.

e. The element of forgiveness or postponement of judgement (v. 22).

Apart from the phrases $\text{וְהָשַׁבְתִּי אֶת־יָדַי$, the whole formula in v. 22 is similar to that which is found in vv. 9, 14. Due to this fact, some scholars prefer to leave the phrase $\text{וְהָשַׁבְתִּי אֶת־יָדַי}$ out. For instance, G. Fohrer deletes this phrase because, according to him, it is a 'variierende Glosse',¹ whereas W. Zimmerli notes that it is not original.² In contrast

¹G. Fohrer - K. Gallig, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

²After noting that there is no trace of the phrase $\text{וְהָשַׁבְתִּי אֶת־יָדַי}$ in LXX, Vulg., and Syr., W. Zimmerli says: 'Das im Erzählungszusammenhang 21f. schwer enträglich perf. cons., die bei Ez sonst nie von Jahwegebrauchte Redewendung $\text{וְהָשַׁבְתִּי אֶת־יָדַי}$ (von Mensch 18:8, 17; 38:12) und das Fehlendes Passus in den parallelen Ausführungen 9.14 scheinen die Aussage als nicht ursprünglich zu erweisen' (*op. cit.*, p. 435). See also W. Eichrodt, whose reason for the deletion of the phrase is similar to that of W. Zimmerli (*Ezekiel*, ((EF. by Cosslet Quin)), p. 261 note q).

to both G. Fohrer and W. Zimmerli, A. Bertholet and G. A. Cooke retain the phrase although they do not give reason for it.¹ This is also the position which is adopted in the present study. From the point of view of prophetic traditions, it seems better to retain the phrase. W. Zimmerli is right in pointing out that the phrase $\text{ך' } \text{ב'שׁוּח}$ in the Book of Ezekiel is only used for man (18:8, 17; 38:12).² But the fact that this phrase is also used for man in Josh. 8:26 is interesting. In this particular passage in the Book of Joshua the phrase $\text{ך' } \text{ב'שׁוּח}$ is used exactly as the opposite of the word שׁוּח ('to stretch out'). The word שׁוּח is often used in the phrase $\text{ך' } \text{שׁוּח}$ which is used for Yahweh in Isa. 5:25; 9:11, 16, 21; 31:3; Jer. 21:5, which denotes that Yahweh's anger is (still) burning. In other words, the phrase $\text{ך' } \text{שׁוּח}$ is used for Yahweh as a gesture that Yahweh's judgement is not yet finished. On the basis of this, it can perhaps be said that the phrase $\text{ך' } \text{ב'שׁוּח}$ is a suitable opposite of the phrase $\text{ך' } \text{שׁוּח}$. This is so since the opposite of the phrase $\text{ך' } \text{שׁוּח}$ (Exod. 15:12) is also the phrase $\text{ך' } \text{שׁוּח}$ (Lament. 2:3). Besides, the phrase $\text{ך' } \text{שׁוּח}$ for Yahweh is found in Ps. 74:11 in which the psalmist appeals to

¹A. Bertholet - K. Gallig, op. cit., pp. 72f.; G. A. Cooke, op. cit., p. 218.

²W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 435.

Yahweh to help him face his enemy. So, the use of the phrase

וְהִשָּׁב יְיָ for Yahweh in Ezek. 20:22 cannot be regarded as completely unusual.¹ Therefore the phrase וְהִשָּׁב יְיָ אֶת-יְיָ in Ezek. 20:22a is Ezekiel's own description or elaboration of the stereotyped formula in the rest of the verse.

If this description means anything at all, it must be that it emphasizes the postponement of Yahweh's judgement. This is so, since the use of the phrase וְהִשָּׁב elsewhere means self-withdrawal or self-suspension from doing something (cf. Ezek. 18:8, 17; 38:12; Ps. 74:11).

So, as far as vv. 18-22 is concerned, it is clear that, on the one hand, Ezekiel is emphasizing the rebellion of Israel by elaborating the element of law, while on the other, he is emphasizing the postponement of Yahweh's judgement against Israel. With these two emphases, it is also clear that for Ezekiel the course of Israel's past history is the course of the increasing tension between Israel's rebellion against Yahweh and Yahweh's postponement of his judgement against Israel. This tension is still developed further by Ezekiel in vv. 23-26.

¹It might well be that the phrase וְהִשָּׁב יְיָ אֶת-יְיָ is the counterpart of the phrase וְהִשָּׁב יְיָ אֶת-יְיָ אֶת-יְיָ which frequently occurs in Ezek. 20. But the fact that the latter is never used in connection with Yahweh's oath to punish, or to execute his judgement, makes it difficult to regard the former as the opposite of the latter.

As it now stands, vv. 23-26 is problematic in terms of both formal structure and content. This is so, primarily because (1) the use of the phrase 'יָסֵד בְּרֵאשִׁית in vv. 23, 25 can be regarded as showing its additional character, and (2) the recurring stereotyped formulas are not found in an order similar to that of the preceding subsections (vv. 5-9; vv. 18-22), and (3) the content of this subsection is irrelevant for the situation in the wilderness. However, it was shown above¹ that, despite these three reasons, vv. 23-26 still shows many features in terms of both formal structure and content which support its being an integral part of Ezekiel's presentation in this chapter. Besides, due to the fact that this subsection (vv. 23-26) preserves some of the elements found in the preceding subsections, i.e., the fourth, the third, and the second or the fifth, elements,² its exclusion from the chapter as a whole, or its pejorative labellings, would really be baseless. As far as its content is concerned, its irrelevance for the wilderness period can be compared with that of the substance of laws referred to in vv. 7f., 18. Moreover, it was shown above³ that in chapter 20

¹Supra, pp. 177ff..

²For the references of these ordinal numbers, see, supra, p. 177 note 1.

³Supra, pp. 156ff., 173ff..

Ezekiel's interest in the details of Israel's past history is far less than his interest in Israel's rebellion against Yahweh and his commandments. Therefore, it is better to keep this subsection as it is¹ and where it is, and regard it as an integral part of the chapter as a whole. And in this sense it seems justified to say that vv. 23-26 constitutes a further description of what Ezekiel stereotypically lays out in vv. 18-22.²

The repetition of the fourth, the third, and the second elements in this subsection shows how close is the relationship of this subsection to that which precedes it, i.e., vv. 18-22. In fact, v. 23 can be regarded as explaining v. 21b, and v. 24 is similar to v. 21a (and v. 16); and vv. 25-26, which is form--critically similar to vv. 11-12, can be regarded as both the counterpart of vv. 18-20 and the explanation of v. 22.

¹ Contrast A. Bertholet - K. Galling, who argue that like vv. 15f., which disturbs the smooth context of vv. 10-14 and v. 17, so does vv. 23-27 disturb the context of v. 22 and v. 28. According to them the rebellion of Israel (v. 21) is again answered by Yahweh's gracious act in that Yahweh led the people to Palestine (v. 28). It is because of Israel's sinful deeds in Palestine that Yahweh threatens them with what is stated in vv. 23-27. Therefore, so A. Bertholet - K. Galling opine, v. 28 must be transposed after v. 22 and before v. 23 (op. cit., pp. 73f.). This opinion of A. Bertholet - K. Galling is later on adopted by W. Eichrodt (op. cit., pp. 259, 269ff.). See also, G. Fohrer - K. Galling, who regard the Palestine period as beginning with v. 23, although they do not transpose v. 28 before it. (op. cit., pp. 107, 112).

² In this sense the function of vv. 23-26 is similar to that of vv. 15-17 in its relationship to vv. 10-14. See, supra, pp. 186f..

A close examination of this subsection shows that the substance of both the description of judgement in y. 23 and of the law in vv. 25-26 are problematic.

First, the element of judgement in y. 23. In the preceding subsections the elements of judgement, which are contained in the stereotyped formula in vv. 8b, 13b, 21b, are described by the reference to the substance of judgement relevant to the period of history being dealt with. In y. 8b the judgement means the annihilation of the whole people of Israel, although there is no explicit statement of it.¹ The meaning of the judgement in y. 13b is the same as that of the judgement in y. 8b. But the description in y. 15 shows that the substance of the judgement in y. 13b is the prohibition of the first generation of wilderness to enter the promised land. This description is also implied in y. 17. In reference to what historically took place during the Egyptian and the wilderness periods, these two descriptions of the judgement are relevant. This is so, since, on the one hand, the exodus event presupposes that the annihilation of Israel did not take place, and on the other, it can be said that none of those who went out of Egypt ever saw the promised land at all.

¹In y. 10 it is implied that had the judgement referred to in y. 8b been executed, the exodus event would not have taken place at all.

In comparison with these two descriptions, what is stated in y. 23 does not seem to be historically relevant at all for the second generation of wilderness. The description in y. 23 would be relevant only for the generation in Palestine, for whom exile can really be regarded as judgement.

The reason why Ezekiel uses this irrelevant description for the threatening judgement mentioned in y. 21b is not clear. Yet it seems clear that in doing so Ezekiel shows that his concern with the details of Israel's past history is less than his concern with Israel's rebellion and Yahweh's judgement on it. Moreover, the juxtaposition of the threat of judgement with the stereotyped reasons of it (y. 24) shows how Ezekiel develops that descriptions of the judgement. It was noted above how contrasted are the formal structure and the content of the description of judgement in y. 15 to those of the promise of the land in y. 6.¹ Now, in yy. 23-24 the form of the description is the same as that of the description in yy. 15-16, but its content is more drastic. In y. 15 it is stated that the first generation in the wilderness is not allowed to enter the promised land, whereas in y. 23 the promised land will not be the final destination of the second generation either!²

¹Supra, p. 188.

²Cf. G. Fohrer - K. Gallig, op. cit., p. 112.

What is more, the reason for the latter is the same as that which is stated in v. 16. This reason is centralized by Ezekiel in the idolatrous worship of Israel (vv. 16b, 24b).

Elsewhere in the Old Testament, the threat of deportation or exile is always based on Israel's idolatrous worship. This can be seen, e.g., in Deut. 4:25-28; 28:64f.; Lev. 26:27-35; Jer. 9:13-15; cf. Deut. 28:15, 36, 58, 64ff.. Although the precise datings of these passages outside the Book of Ezekiel are difficult to decide, their similarity in this particular case presupposes a kind of theology, or traditions, about the exile and its reason. The question of when this kind of theology began is difficult to answer. However, the fact that in Israel's history exile per se did not happen until the fall of Samaria (722/721 B.C.) suggests that this theology did not arise before then. In the light of all this, it can be concluded that Ezekiel himself must have known this theology or traditions of exile (cf. Ezek. 1:1-5; 5:12; 22:15; etc.). Yet Ezekiel is different from those behind the passages listed above in that he applies the threat implied in this theology not to Israel in Palestine, but to the second generation in the wilderness (Ezek. 20:23). Whether this application is historically accurate or not does not seem to concern him very much. Besides, from the very beginning of his treatment of Israel's past history, Ezekiel does not seem to have been concerned with the question of whether or not his detailed historical references are accurate. This kind of tendency is in fact not a strange thing in the Old

Testament. After all, each one of Israelite traditionists can be regarded as showing freedom in his interpretation of Israel's past history.¹

Second, the description of the element of law in vv. 25-26.

The historical irrelevance of this description is clear in that it is in Palestine rather than in the wilderness that the idolatrous worship of Israel can be regarded as really flourishing and destructive for the covenantal relationship between Israel and Yahweh.²

This irrelevance can perhaps be understood, like in v. 23, as one of the indications that Ezekiel is not concerned with the detailed historical references as much as with what he is arguing for in this disputational speech. However, the most puzzling problem of this description is that it is Yahweh himself who is said to have given all the bad commandments which led to Israel's appalling idolatrous worship.³ Accordingly, it is no wonder that some of the scholars have devoted more space to discussing this problem than to discussing other parts of this chapter.⁴

¹This is clear from the survey of C. R. North, The Old Testament Interpretation of History, London, 1946.

²W. Zimmerli related this situation particularly to the times of King Ahaz and King Manasseh (op. cit., pp. 449f.).

³Notice the emphatic use of the first person pronoun in these two verses (25-26).

⁴A. B. Davidson, op. cit., pp. 143 ff.; G. A. Cooke, op. cit., pp. 218f.; W. Eichrodt, op. cit., pp. 270-273.

It has been shown above that form-critically vv. 25-26 is similar to vy. 11-12, and that substantially the former is the reverse of the latter.¹ However, what is the meaning of the 'statutes which were not good, and ordinances in which they could not have life' (v. 25) is as vague as that of the 'statutes ... and ordinances by whose observance man shall live' (v. 11). It was said above that Ezekiel's specification of what he means by the 'statutes' and the 'ordinances' (and the 'sabbaths') in v. 11 can be seen in his attitude towards Israel's idolatrous worship. In parallelism to this, it can be said that what Ezekiel means by the 'statutes which were not good, and ordinances in which they could not have life' (v. 25) is also specified in his reference to Israel's idolatrous worship in v. 26. The fact that in v. 26 the word 'idols' (גלולים) is not used does not mean that what is described there is not idolatrous worship. That what is described in v. 26 means idolatrous worship seems to be clear in that the phrase בהעביר כל־פֶּסֶד רָחֵם in v. 26a β is used to specify what is meant by the phrase בַּאֲתֹנֹתָם in v. 26a α .²

¹ Although the Erkenntnisformel in v. 26 is slightly different from the usual one, it is difficult to regard it as late or additional. Cf. W. Eichrodt, op. cit., in loc.; contrast W. Zimmerli, G. Fohrer, G. A. Cooke.

² אֲתֹנָה, in pl. or in sing., is one of the terms which are used to denote sacrifices as gifts in general. See, T. H. Gaster, 'Sacrifices and Offerings, O.T.', I.D.B., Vol. IV., p. 148.

Elsewhere in the Old Testament the phrase עבר כל־פֶּשֶׁר רַחַם is found only in Exod. 13:12 as part of a commandment. The problem about this phrase lies in that most scholars would like to add the word באשׁ to it which would make a meaningful phraseology עבר באשׁ 'to pass through/by fire'.¹ This combination is supported by the fact that it is already found in Deut. 18:10; 2 Kings 16:3; 17:17; 21:6; 23:10 and Ezek. 20:31. With this combination or addition, it is then possible to argue that in both Exod. 13:12 and Ezek. 20:26 the commandment of Yahweh does mean the commandment to sacrifice the human first born (child sacrifices). However, a closer examination shows that in all of these passages the phrase עבר באשׁ is never used with the phrase (כֹּל)פֶּשֶׁר רַחַם. Instead it is used with either בְּנוֹת/בֵּת or בָּנִים/בֶּן and בְּנוֹת/בֵּת. And it is with these two phrases, or sometimes with the word זָרַע, that the idea of child sacrifice is expressed (see also, Lev. 18:21; 20:2f.; Jer. 19:5; 32:35; Deut. 12:31; Ezek. 16:21; 23:37), but never with the phrase (כֹּל)פֶּשֶׁר רַחַם. As far as the phrase (כֹּל-)פֶּשֶׁר רַחַם is concerned,² its occurrence in the Old Testament,

¹For Exod. 13:12, see, e.g., S. R. Driver, The Book of Exodus, (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges), Cambridge, 1911, p. 108; for Ezek. 20:26, see, e.g., A. Bertholet - K. Calling, op. cit., p. 73; G. Fohrer - K. Calling, op. cit., p. 113; G. A. Cooke, op. cit., p. 218; W. Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 259.

²See, e.g., Exod. 28:38; Lev. 23:37f.; Num. 18:6, 11, 29; Deut. 16:17; Ps. 68:19.

with some variations, is found not more than seven times, i.e.,
Exod. 13:2, 12, 15; 34:19; Num. 3:12; 18:15 and Ezek. 20:26.

It is only in Exod. 13:15b that the phrase is used as the acc.
object of the verb זָבַח ('to sacrifice'). Yet Exod. 13:15b
states quite clearly that human first born is not included in
that sacrifice. The same is true with Num. 18:15 in which the
verb קָרַב is used. In Exod. 13:2; 34:19 and Num. 3:12 it is
stated that כָּל-פֶּשֶׁר רַחֵם and כָּל-בְּכוֹר פֶּשֶׁר כָּל-רַחֵם
are Yahweh's, although in Num. 3:12 they are substituted by

הַלְוִיִּם ('the Levites'). Besides, although the term

מִתְּנָה, or plural מִתְּנֹת, means gifts in general and
offering or sacrifice in particular,¹ in none of its occurrences
in the Old Testament does it include child sacrifice. As a
matter of fact, in Ezek. 20:31 the 'gifts' and the 'child
sacrifice' are very clearly distinguished from each other.

With all of this it can be concluded that although the phrase

כָּל-פֶּשֶׁר רַחֵם, or its variations, denote the first born
as the substance of sacrifice, it never included human first born
at all. What happens with the human first born is that they
should be passed over (לָעַר, Exod. 13:12) to, or be consecrated
(לְקַדֵּשׁ, Exod. 13:2) for, Yahweh, because, like other non-human
first borns, they are Yahweh's.

So, to return to Ezek. 20:26, and in parallelism to the

¹See, supra, p. 204 note 2.

reversal of Yahweh's statutes and ordinances in Ezek. 20:25, it can be said that what is meant in Ezek. 20:26 is also the reversal of Yahweh's commandment concerning the human first born. In the light of the examination above, it can be said that here Israel did what was forbidden by Yahweh, i.e., to include their human first born in the sacrifice.¹ In that context they are not worshipping Yahweh, but worshipping their idols. The fact that her idolatrous worship is described as her obedience to the commandment of Yahweh cannot by any means be regarded as Ezekiel's reference to the permissiveness of Yahweh.² Instead, and in the context of the disputational speech in this section, it must be regarded as Yahweh's explicit accusation or blame against Israel. In that sense Yahweh's threat against Israel is clear, i.e., Israel will have no life.

In contrast to the historical inaccuracy of all these descriptions, namely their application to the wilderness period, what is unique here is that Ezekiel has elaborated his arguments in such a way that vv. 23-26 can be regarded as approaching the

¹Cf. R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel : Its Life and Institutions, (ET.by John McHugh), London, 1961, pp. 442ff..

²Contrast R. de Vaux, who says that in Ezek. 20:25-26 Ezekiel 'is attributing to divine causality all the actions, good and bad, of men', and here Ezekiel 'is referring to the permissive will of God' (ibid., p. 444).

climax in which the judgement of Yahweh against Israel will be decisive and final.

The fourth period : Israel in Palestine (vv. 27-29).

What is interesting in this subsection is that it only contains two of the five elements found in the preceding subsections.

They are the elements of salvation history (v. 28a) and the rebellion (vv. 27b, 28b, 29?); and as they now stand, the latter is predominant, since the former is in fact found within the latter. Due to the fact that none of the stereotyped formulas occurs here, these two elements can be regarded as further descriptions of their counterparts in the preceding subsections. The element of salvation history (v. 28a) shows that the locality of the scene is now in Palestine, whereas the element of rebellion (vv. 27b, 28b, 39) describes further the details of the rebellion itself.

a. The element of salvation history (v. 28a).

The introductory formula in this half-verse, i.e., ^{-בא אגיד}, is similar to that which is used in Israel's Credo in Deut. 26:9; Josh. 24:8; and so is the substance of this element to that of the Credo in both passages. These similarities show that Ezekiel is really reviewing Israel's past history as it is set out in her

Credo. To that extent the inclusion of the Palestinian period to the review is to be regarded as natural.

b. The element of rebellion (vv. 27b, 28b, 29).

Instead of using the recurring stereotyped formula וַיִּנְרָם-בַּי this subsection uses the words הָדָא and לַעֲלֹם לַעֲלֹם. The fact that the word הָדָא in the Book of Ezekiel is found again only in Ezek. 5:15 (as subst.) does not mean that it is not Ezekielian. The use of לַעֲלֹם לַעֲלֹם in this book is found again in Ezek. 14:13, 15:8; 17:20; 18:24; 39:26; whereas in 39:23 only לַעֲלֹם. The juxtaposition of the two clauses in v. 27b, the predicates of which are the words הָדָא and לַעֲלֹם respectively, must be regarded as unique and emphatic. With Yahweh as their acc. object, both of these words are more straightforward than the word הָרָם in its stereotyped use in the phrase וַיִּנְרָם-בַּי. What is meant by the straightforward expressions in v. 27b is described in detail in vv. 28b-29 which points to Israel's idolatrous, religious activities. The description is also unique in that it does not explicitly accuse Israel because of her idolatrous activities, but describes these activities in a very humiliating way. It begins with Israel's seeing the high hills and the leavy tree, then proceeds with Israel's worshipping there (cf. the stype of Ezek. 23:14-16).

Compared with vv. 25-26, this description is shorter, but more straightforward and specified. However, both of these

descriptions, i.e., that in vv. 25-26 and that in vv. 27b-28b, have an important similarity in that they do not show a rough or a rigid style. Their style is smooth and calm. To eastern mind, a smooth or a calm style of expression could very often be a vehicle of an accusation and/or a blame stronger and sharper than otherwise.

Having read this description of the element of rebellion, one may expect that a threat of Yahweh's judgement would follow afterwards. But the threat is lacking here, and so is the element of forgiveness. Yet, if the description of the element of rebellion is connected with the conclusion of the whole disputational speech in this section, which is found in vv. 30f., it is possible to detect why they are lacking.

(1) The interrogative sentence in v. 30a β b¹ must be understood in the same way as is the bad commandment in vv. 25-26. By putting that question forward Ezekiel is in fact stressing what his audience has been doing.² In a sense, such a question might sound very cynical, but in a disputational speech it is very appropriate. This is so, because in what follows, i.e., in v. 31a α , Ezekiel describes in detail and in an emphatic way

¹For the use of η plus Dageš forte in this interrogative sentence, see, G-K, para. 1001.

²G-K, para. 150e.

what is implied in his question in v. 30aβ b.

The description in v. 31aα, surprisingly, not only corresponds with what Ezekiel describes in vv. 25-26, but also emphasizes further that idolatry is the main content of Israel's rebellion against Yahweh 'to this day'.

(2) For this reason Yahweh is not willing to be inquired of by the 'house of Israel' (v. 31aβ b). This is expressed in two ways. First, in a form of an interrogative sentence, the answer of which is definitely negative (v. 31aβ).¹ Second, in a descriptive sentence which is preceded by a 'Schwuraussage' (v. 31b). The combination of these two emphatic sentences will not fail to impress any in Ezekiel's audience, or the reader of this section, that Yahweh no longer thought that he would pour out his wrath upon Israel (vv. 8b, 13b, 21b), but he has already begun to carry out his judgement. And if the date in v. 1 really means the year 591/590 B.C., the judgement which was then threatening must be the fall of Jerusalem in 578 B.C..

Having said all this, one may wonder, with G. Fohrer,² how Ezekiel could single out idolatry to be the kernel of his argument in this disputational speech, and how could he not say

¹G-K. para. 150a.

²G. Fohrer - K. Gallig, op. cit., pp. 113f..

anything about David, Solomon, the Temple, Josiah, etc.. This question can easily be answered in that all of these non-idolatrous historical references are not included in the Credo of Israel, and therefore they are not included in Ezekiel's review of the whole Israel's past history in this chapter.¹ This can be compared with the lack of other non-idolatrous historical references both in the Egyptian period and the wilderness period such as Moses, Reed Sea, Sinai, Joshua, etc..² Nevertheless it would really be a mistake to say that this lack means that Ezekiel does not know those particular references.

¹It is indeed questionable whether G. Fohrer's philosophical answer of the question is appropriate (ibid.).

²It is astonishing that in the Book of Ezekiel very little mention on these names, or even none at all, is made.

Conclusion.

1. Having examined Ezekiel's treatment of Israel's past history in this chapter, which is found particularly in vv. 5-31, one is struck, first of all, by the stereotypically formulated presentation of the prophet. The stereotyped formulas begin in v. 5 and are carried through until v. 27 in which they break up into more descriptive and straightforward expressions.

The fact that the stereotyped formulas are composed in a structure, which in its turn makes three stereotyped units (vv. 5-9; vv. 10-17; and vv. 18-26), is very interesting. However, there are two things which must be said in connection with these stereotyped formulas and units.

a. To a large extent these stereotyped formulas and units, which are never used in so an extensive scale by other prophets or other Israelite traditionists, make Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history very clear right from the beginning. This is so, since this interpretation is presented as his argument against Israel in a disputational form of speech. On the one hand, Ezekiel is answering the inquiry made by the representative of the 'house of Israel', while on the other, everything that he said recurs in each one of the units. In other words, by looking at the first unit (vv. 5-9), which also deals with the beginning of Israel's history, one could find straight away what Ezekiel's interpretation of that period is. Besides, the fact that each of the three stereotyped units, plus

the last non-stereotyped one (vv. 27-31), deals with one period of Israel's past history, makes it clear that Ezekiel's interpretations of all of these periods are the same. In short, for Ezekiel, and particularly in this chapter, the history of Israel right from its beginning until his time is the same.

b. The stereotyped formulas and units have in fact limited the content of Ezekiel's interpretation of that history. It is true that, with the exception of vv. 27-29, each unit or subsection contains five elements, i.e., the elements of salvation history, law, rebellion, threat of judgement, and forgiveness or suspension of judgement. But the fact that the phraseology of each of these elements is repeated almost verbatim in each of the units, does not seem to provide large room for other historical details or references.

And the fact that out of those five elements only two which are developed or elaborated in the third, fourth, and fifth units, shows quite clearly the particular emphasis of Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past.

2. As far as content is concerned, it is interesting to find that in this section Ezekiel regards the Egyptian period as the beginning of Israel's history (cf. Ezek. 23; but contrast Ezek. 16), and that the chronological division of the history corresponds with that of the structure found in Israel's Credo (Deut. 26:5-9; Josh. 24:2ff.). It is also interesting to find that the phraseology of the element of salvation history in each of the units, i.e., in vv. 5-6, 10, 28, which refers to the

themes of election, exodus, wilderness, and conquest, respectively, is similar to that of the salvation history recited in the Credo. On the basis of all this it can be said that Ezekiel follows the course of Israel's past history as it is set out in Israel's Credo. And to that extent it is unique that his interpretation does not ignore what is said in the Credo.

Despite the fact that these similarities between Ezek. 20:5-31 and Israel's Credo cannot be understood as the dependence of Ezekiel's historical review on the Credo-formulation in Deut. 26:5-9 and Josh. 24:2ff., nevertheless they do show that traditio-historically it is against, or with the background of, that Credo that Ezekiel does his historical review. Besides, the fact that the element of law is the first which is elaborated by Ezekiel, means that Ezekiel is also standing in Israel's judicial traditions. Coupled with the mentioning of the sabbaths, it is clear that his concern with Israel lies more on this judicial aspect than on the salvation history itself. However, the fact that this judicial aspect is seen in the context of salvation history, it would be a mistake to regard Ezekiel as the champion of the legalistic life of Israel. Instead, he is the champion of the covenantal life of Israel rather than that of her legalistic life.

It is within the covenant tradition that Ezekiel does his review of Israel's past history, in which the obedience, or the disobedience, of Israel to Yahweh is his main concern. This is so, since the elaboration of the elements of law throughout this section (vv. 5-31), and the constant reference to Israel's

rebellion against, and/or disobedience to, that law, show how Ezekiel measures the life of Israel throughout her history. In this particular part of the book which bears his name, i.e., Ezek. 20:1-31, it is clear that for Ezekiel the history of Israel, from its very beginning in Egypt until his time, is a history of rebellion against Yahweh.

Further, it is interesting to find that this rebellion is understood by Ezekiel in terms of Israel's disobedience to Yahweh's commandments, and that he specifies the manifestation of it in the rank idolatry of the people. As a matter of fact, this kind of rebellion and its manifestation are suitable chiefly for the situation of Israel in Palestine rather than elsewhere. And Ezekiel has undoubtedly been content with this situation for quite some time (cf. Ezek. 8-11; 14; 16; 18; etc.).¹ But his application of the same measure to Israel's history both in Egypt (vv. 5-9) and in the wilderness (vv. 10-26), seems to be inaccurate as far as historical references are concerned.

The examination above has shown, however, that this inaccuracy does not signify anything. The reasons are : a) Ezekiel is in fact not concerned with the detailed historical references

¹It is not true that in chapter 20 Ezekiel thinks that Israel never entered Palestine as is argued by J. Lust. (I am unable to get access to his book on this particular chapter). See, also W. Zimmerli's review of J. Lust's book in T.L.Z. 4, 1971, cols. 258ff., and that of M. W. Schoenberg in C.B.Q. 33, 1971, pp. 126-128.

of what he presents in this particular chapter. This is not surprising since he is in fact not concerned with the bright aspect of Israel's history as much as he is with Israel's rebellion in the course of her history. b) He is reading the current situation of Israel's history back to its very beginning and onwards. This is possible since in terms of the covenant the current Israel is the same as their 'fathers' and vice versa. And Ezekiel's review is in fact covenantal rather than otherwise.

Finally, the suspension of Yahweh's judgement in the first three periods will no longer be applicable to the current generation. The salvation history in which Yahweh is the prime actor is now reversed to a history of rebellion and idolatry, in which Israel is the prime actor. The land which was sincerely promised to them and to their fathers will now only become their temporary place. The judgement of Yahweh is inevitable. Ezekiel shows all this in his elaboration and detailed description of the element of law, against which he presents the element of rebellion.

This is very clear in vy. 23-26, and still clearer in vy. 27-29, in which it is only the element of rebellion which is described in detail.

CHAPTER IV

EZEKIEL 16.

As with chapter 20, a quick look at chapter 16 gives the impression that the whole chapter is a unity which consists of three elements, i.e., accusation (vv. 1-34), judgement (vv. 35-52), and promise of a bright future (vv. 53-63). However, the investigations which have so far been carried out by scholars show that this chapter can be divided into some sections. Despite the fact that it is difficult to find agreement among scholars on what criterion or criteria which should be used in the analysis, most, if not all of them, are agreed in dividing the chapter into two or three sections.¹ Although it is difficult, or perhaps impossible, to formulate a precise delimitation of each of these sections,² it

¹G. Fohrer - K. Gallig, Ezechiel, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 13), Tübingen, 1955, pp. 83, 92; J. Herrmann, Ezechiel, (K.A.T. XI), Leipzig, 1924, divides the chapter into two sections, which he divides again into some subsections (pp. 98-102). J. Herrmann's division is adopted by W. Eichrodt, Ezekiel, (ET. by Cosslett Quin), (O.T.L.), London, 1970, pp. 201f.. Unlike all of them, W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, (B.K. XIII/1), 1969, examines this chapter according to its formal structure and content, and finds that there are three sections in it, i.e., vv. 1-43; vv. 44-58; and vv. 59-63 (pp. 341ff.). W. Zimmerli's division is adopted by J. W. Wevers, Ezekiel, (The Century Bible - New Series), London, 1969, p. 119. To all of this, however, contrast, A. B. Davidson, Ezekiel, (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges), revised by A. W. Streane, Cambridge, 1916, p. 109.

²Cf. W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 342.

is the intention of the present study to take vv. 1-43 as its main concern. The reasons are, first, many scholars are agreed on regarding this section as the kernel of chapter 16, and second, Ezekiel's treatment of Israel's past history is to be found in this section.

In taking up the first reason, one is faced with the question of whether or not the whole section is authentic. This question is, as a matter of fact, inseparable from the question of delimitation, which deals with the problem of deciding which part is authentic and which part is not. In this connection it must be said that it is not the main concern of the present study to deal with these two questions. Yet, it seems good and helpful for the purpose of the study to have a brief look at the discussions which have so far been carried out concerning them. J. Herrmann regards vv. 1-43 as 'die ursprüngliche literarische Einheit' to which vv. 44-58 and vv. 59-63 were later added.¹ Further, he believes that vv. 1-43 is derived directly from Ezekiel himself, and therefore it is authentic.² In distinction from J. Herrmann,

¹J. Herrmann says : 'Für die literarische Analyse des Kapitels hat sich ergeben, dass die ursprüngliche literarische Einheit von 1-43 reicht, an die eine Fortsetzung angefügt ist' (op. cit., p. 102); cf. W. Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 202.

²J. Herrmann, op. cit., pp. 98f..

G. Fohrer regards vv. 44-58 and vv. 59-63 as unauthentic because they do not come from Ezekiel.¹ In addition he does not regard the whole of vv. 1-43 as authentic. Instead, he says that vv. 16-21, 26-29 are later additions, and that vv. 30-34 is 'ein von einem anderen Verfasser herrührender Zusatz'. Further, G. Fohrer believes that the authentic verses within the section of vv. 1-43 are in a poetic form which consists of twenty strophes with five lines each.² In distinction from G. Fohrer, but in the same line as J. Herrmann, A. B. Davidson, J. W. Wevers, and G. A. Cooke, seem to regard the whole of vv. 1-43 as authentic.³

Despite the variety of their opinions concerning the authenticity and/or the unauthenticity of vv. 1-43 or part of it, all of those scholars are the same in that they do not provide any reason at all for their respective opinions. In contrast to this, it is interesting to find W. Zimmerli who treats the chapter differently.

Referring with disapproval to both G. Hölscher's thesis of the poet Ezekiel and G. Fohrer's attempt to reconstruct the poem out of the so called authentic verses,⁴ W. Zimmerli says that 'hier wirkt

¹G. Fohrer - K. Gallig, op. cit., p. 92.

²G. Fohrer - K. Gallig, op. cit., pp. 83f.; see also, G. Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament, (ET. by David E. Green), Nashville, New York, 1968, p. 410.

³A. B. Davidson, op. cit., pp. 108ff.; J. W. Wevers, op. cit., pp. 119ff.; G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1936 (reprinted 1967), p. 159.

⁴W. Zimmerli, op. cit., pp. 342f..

die Abtrennung der Kurzverse zur Gewinnung des Strophenmasse oft wenig 'überzeugend'. Then he opines that the whole of chapter 16 is neither pure prose nor pure poetry, but like chapter 7 it is 'eine gehobene Prosa' which consists of short sentences with two or three beats each, which are mostly arranged in a paratactical sequence.¹ As far as the division of chapter 16 is concerned, W. Zimmerli is of the opinion that form-critically vv. 44-58 and vv. 59-63 should be regarded as two units which are different from vv. 1-43². However, W. Zimmerli does not regard these two units

¹W. Zimmerli says : '... die Kurzverstese ... führt hier nicht zu einem einleuchtenden strophisch-metrischen Erklärung des Gesamtgebildes'. Then he infers : 'So wird man denn im Grundbestand von Ez 16 mit einer freien Handhabung gehobener Erzählsprache, die sich von reiner Prosa unterscheidet und gelegentlich die Form der Parallelsätze streift, aber sich keinem straffen Metrum fügt, zu rechnen haben. Kennzeichen dieser gehobenen Prosa ist vor allem der knappe, mit zwei oder drei Akzenten zu lesende Kurzsatz, der im Eingang von Ez 16 in meist parataktischer Reihung herrscht' (op. cit., p. 343).

²The delimitation of these two units is clear from the following facts. a) The 'Gottespruchformel' in v. 43b α is the concluding formula of vv. 35-43a, whereas v. 43b β is a new connecting verse which introduces a new charge in vv. 44-58. This new charge is concluded by a 'Gottespruchformel' in v. 58b. b) Verses 59-63 is introduced by a 'Botespruchformel' in v. 59a α and is ended by a 'Gottespruchformel' in v. 63b β . For this, see, W. Zimmerli, op. cit., pp. 341f..

as separable from vv. 1-43 because they are thematically dependent on the latter.¹ Therefore, instead of regarding the two units as unauthentic, he regards them as a result of a 'Traditionvorgang' which derived from the time after the fall of Jerusalem.² In other words, on the one hand, W. Zimmerli does not want to exclude both vv. 44-58 and vv. 59-63 from the rest of the chapter, while on the other, he regards vv. 1-43 as the 'Kernstück' of the whole chapter.

Further, W. Zimmerli argues that this 'Kernstück' consists of what he calls 'der Grundbestand' and/or 'der Grundtext' to which 'Erleuterungen' and/or 'Erweiterungen' are later on added either by Ezekiel himself or by his disciples. From his analysis and his reconstruction of the 'Grundtext' it is clear that W. Zimmerli regards the following verses as 'das unkommentierte Wort an Jerusalem' : vv. 4*, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9*, 10, 11, 12, 13*, 15, 24, 25aβ b, 35, 36aα *, 37aα ii, 39, 40, 41a.³

¹W. Zimmerli, op. cit., pp. 341f..

²W. Zimmerli, op. cit., pp. 342, 365, 369.

³W. Zimmerli, op. cit., pp. 353-364. Cf. W. Eichrodt, who, on the one hand, seems to regard vv. 17-21, 26-29 as disturbing the evenness of the speech (op. cit., pp. 196ff.), and on the other, excludes vv. 30-34 from the section, saying that these verses 'leave the general direction of the parable' (op. cit., p. 208).

With this opinion of W. Zimmerli, it is clear that the problem of authenticity and/or unauthenticity of the whole, or the part, of vv. 1-43 cannot easily be resolved. Apart from the possibility that this section does have a 'Grundbestand' or a 'Grundtext', it is, however, difficult to give a pejorative label to those verses which do not belong to that 'Grundbestand' or 'Grundtext'. Therefore an alternative way of dealing with this section must be sought. In this respect it seems justified to say briefly that from the point of view of the prophetic traditions it is better to regard vv. 1-43 as a piece of production of the prophetic traditionists' activities in which the question of authenticity and/or unauthenticity is less important than that of the traditio-history.

Now, about the second reason. As far as content is concerned, it is clear that beginning with v. 44 there is a new topic which to a large extent is different from that of vv. 1-43a. This is so since beginning with that verse it is no longer Jerusalem alone which is dealt with, but the comparison of Jerusalem's life with that of whom Ezekiel calls Jerusalem's sisters, i.e., Sodom and Samaria.¹ Another new topic is found in vv. 59-63 in that this

¹This comparison of the lives of the sisters is different from that which is found in Ezek. 23:11ff.. This is so since in Ezek. 16:44-58 the comparison is made under the proverb כִּי־כַּמֶּתֶר־אִמִּי־כִּי־בָתָּר־בְּנֹתָי ('like mother, like daughter' - v. 44b), in which three sisters are dealt with, whereas in Ezek. 23:11ff. no such proverb is mentioned and the comparison deals only with two sisters. For further discussion of this difference, see, infra, pp. 351ff..

passage deals with the covenant and the future of the three sisters. Although the reference to the covenant reminds one of v. 8 in which covenant is mentioned, it is clear that this passage or subsection has closer relationship to vv. 44-58 than to vv. 1-43. Besides, the fact that vv. 59-63 deals chiefly with the future thing, it can be inferred that this passage is not relevant for the purpose of the present study.

The irrelevancy of these two units or sections (vv. 44-58 and vv. 59-63) to the purpose of the present study does not necessarily mean that it could become a reason to regard the units as non-Ezekielian or secondary additions. As a matter of fact, it is always difficult to argue whether a section or part of it is addition or otherwise without imposing certain criteria which are mostly alien to the text itself. Especially in the Book of Ezekiel, and particularly in chapter 16, a changing of the topics and/or an excessive description of any of them, cannot be understood as an evidence that one of them is authentic while the other not or vice versa. However, as far as this particular chapter is concerned, it is clear that the topics of the last two sections are different from that of vv. 1-43. And since Ezekiel's treatment of Israel's past history is found chiefly in vv. 1-43, it is therefore appropriate to say that this section is the most relevant one for the purpose of the present study.

Before a detailed examination is made, it seems necessary to have a general look at this section of vv. 1-43. To begin with, this section can be regarded as a big unit which is introduced with a 'Wortereignisformel' (v. 1) and ended with a 'Gottespruchformel'

(v. 43b α). Despite this, it seems possible to see that this big unit consists of some smaller subunits whose respective ending is a 'Gottespruchformel' which is found six times in it.¹ However, the fact that throughout the whole of the big unit it is Jerusalem which is dealt with, this division must be regarded as only superficially possible. This is so since (a) throughout this big unit Jerusalem is personified as a woman who is addressed constantly in the second pers. fem. sing., and (b) neither of those six 'Gottespruchformelen' is followed by an expression which can be regarded as an introductory formula for the subsequent passage. What is found after each of those 'Gottespruchformelen' is either a verb in $\bar{\text{}}$ -consecutive imperfect (vv. 8-9, 14-15, 19-20, 23-24) or an infinitive (vv. 30a-30b), which shows that the speech does not really stop with the respective 'Gottespruchformel'.

Nevertheless, there is a part of this big unit which in this respect deserves further attention, i.e., vv. 35-43b α . As it now stands, this particular part has a clear form-critical sign which makes it possible to be regarded as a small unit. This passage begins with a formula of 'appeal for attention' (וְאַתָּה , v. 35), which is followed by a 'Botenspruchformel' ($\text{כֹּה אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה}$, v. 36), and ends with a 'Gottespruchformel' (וְאַתָּה יְהוִה , v. 43b α).

¹They are vv. 8b β , 14b β , 19b, 23b β , 30a β , and 43b α .

Besides, this passage is self-contained in that it contains a prophecy of disaster.¹ So, it can be inferred that this passage is a self-contained unit. However, this self-contained unit is inseparable from the rest of the section because the diatribe in v. 36a β b has a very close, and essential, connection with what is said in vv. 1-34. As a matter of fact, that diatribe can be regarded as a concise repetition of what is said in vv. 1-34, which means that what is said in vv. 35-43bα cannot be understood without that which is said in vv. 1-34. Putting it the other way around, what is said in vv. 1-34 would be aimless unless it is connected with that which is said in vv. 35-43bα.² In addition, within the context of the prophetic traditions and especially Ezekiel's characteristics, this kind of repetition is not a strange thing. Therefore, in spite of its being a self-contained unit, vv. 35-43bα is still relevant for the purpose of the present study.

Verse 2.³

As has been said earlier,⁴ Ezek. 16:2 can be compared with

¹K. Koch, The Growth of the Biblical Tradition, (ET. by S. M. Cupitt), London, 1969, pp. 210-213.

²Cf. W. Zimmerli, op. cit., pp. 359f.; H. Graf Reventlow, Wächter über Israel : Ezechiel und seine Tradition, (B.Z.A.W. 82), Berlin, 1962, pp. 90f..

³For Ezek. 16:1, see the explanation of Ezek. 20:2, supra, pp. 103f..

⁴Supra, pp. 107f..

both Ezek. 22:2; 23:26 and 20:4. In this context it is clear that Ezek. 16:2 is different from all of these other passages in that it contains only one command, i.e., the prophet is to make known to Jerusalem her abominations. However, if the section which follows this single command is read through, it will also be clear that the command is later on confronted with the fact that vv. 35-43b α no longer speaks about the making known of Jerusalem's abominations. Instead, this unit of vv. 35-43b α speaks about the judgement which will befall Jerusalem. Due to this fact, the question which now arises is this : How is the command to make known Jerusalem's abominations (v. 2) to be related to the announcement of the judgement (vv. 35-43b α)? In answering this question, a comparison must be made between the form of the command in Ezek. 16:2 and that which is found in Ezek. 20:4b; 22:2b; 23:36b. Apart from the fact that in Ezek. 16:2 there is only one command, this comparison seems to show that there is an established, stereotyped, form of command of this kind which Ezekiel seems to have been familiar with. W. Zimmerli has shown that the command to make known the abominations of the people of Israel can be compared with the task of the priest in giving guidance ($\eta \eta \eta$) to the people and in differentiating ($\eta \eta \eta$) between the sacred and the profane.¹ If this is really the case, Ezekiel's acquaintance

¹W. Zimmerli, op. cit., pp. 344f..

with this kind of task must be taken for granted since he himself was a priest.

Further, the juxtaposition of the command to make known the abominations of the people and the command to judge them, as is found in Ezek. 20:4; 22:2 and 23:36, seems to show that the two commands have often been combined and used together. Apart from the fact that this kind of command is unique in that it is only found four times, and all are in the Book of Ezekiel, it is not clear whether this combination could be understood as a guarantee that if one of the two is missing then the one which is present presupposes the other. However, the combination of these two commands has a parallelism in the prophetic speech, especially that which is called the prophecy of disaster. In the prophecy of disaster, the announcement of judgement is very frequently, if not always, preceded by the announcement of the sins of those who are to be punished.¹ The announcement of the sin is usually called the diatribe, i.e., part of the speech which generally shows the reason of the announcement of the judgement. As a prophet, Ezekiel must have known this kind of speech as is shown in, e.g., Ezek. 16:35-43bx. Moreover, it is shown above that the diatribe found in this particular prophecy of disaster, i.e. Ezek. 16:35-43bx, is closely connected with what is said after the command in Ezek. 16:2.

¹K. Koch, op. cit., loc. cit..

On the basis of all these facts, it seems possible to infer that Ezekiel's being a priest and a prophet might well have something to do with the combination of the command to make known Israel's abominations with the command to judge her, as is found in Ezek. 20:4; 22:2; 23:36. Consequently, it seems possible to say that in the case of Ezek. 16:2 the presence of the command to make known the abominations of Jerusalem might well presuppose the command to judge her as well. In other words, the making known^{of} Jerusalem's abominations in Ezek. 16:2 cannot be understood without relating it to the announcement of the judgement for Jerusalem, which in this particular case is found in Ezek. 16:35-43b α .

The important word in this command to make known Jerusalem's abominations is ׃׃׃׃ . This word is used in the same command in Ezek. 20:4b; 22:2b, but is substituted by the word ׃׃׃ in 23:36b. According to W. Zimmerli, the word ׃׃׃׃ can be regarded as belonging to the vocabulary of the priestly office as is shown, e.g., by Ezek. 32:26; 44:23 (cf. Exod. 18:16, 20; 1 Sam. 6:2; 10:8; 16:3; 28:15). This is also supported by the fact that the vocabulary of Ezek. 16:2 is itself priestly,¹ a phenomenon which is not surprising in the case of Ezekiel.²

¹W. Zimmerli, *op. cit.*, pp. 344f..

²According to Paul Humbert, in his 'Le substantif *to'eba* et le verbe *t'eb* dans l'Ancien Testament', *Z.A.W.* 72, 1960, in the Book of Ezekiel the word ׃׃׃ as is used in Ezek. 16:2 occurs twice as a verb and fortyeight times as substantive (p. 219). In no other book of the Old Testament does it occur so often as in the Book of Ezekiel.

However, it seems difficult to see how is this priestly language to be connected with the office of a reprover (נִבְּרָן) in the procedure of the justice in the gate as W. Zimmerli wants it.¹ It is true that the word נִבְּרָן as is used in Isa. 29:21; Amos 5:10, and Ezek. 3:26, refers to this Sitz im Leben. And it is true that the priests were very frequently involved in the problem of justice.² But whether the priestly word שָׁרִיף in Ezek. 16:2 is to be related to the procedure of justice in the gate seems to be doubtful. What seems to be feasible here is that this word שָׁרִיף has its Sitz im Leben in the priestly court in the sanctuary. What is the difference between the priestly court in the sanctuary and the court in the gate is not clear, since in Israel the distinction between the civil and the religious laws does not seem to exist. However, R. de Vaux shows quite clearly that there were at least three kinds of judges in ancient Israel's court system, i.e., the Elders, the professional judges, and the priests.³ Whatever the similarity and the dissimilarity among these three kinds of judges might be, the most appropriate judge in front of whom the priestly language

¹W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 344.

²R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel : Its Life and Institutions, (ET. by John McHugh), second edition, London, 1965, pp. 153ff.

³Ibid., pp. 152-155.

of Ezek. 16:2 is used seems to be the priests. Now, according to Deut. 17:8-13 this priestly court is the place in which the most difficult legal cases are brought in and resolved; and the judgement issued from there is without appeal.¹ Whether this means that the priestly court is only meant to deal with the most difficult cases, or that this is only one of its functions, is not clear. Nevertheless, the fact that in Ezek. 16:3-43b α Ezekiel does not refer to any appeal either from the part of the people (cf. Ezek. 18:2, 19, 25) or from himself (cf. Ezek. 9:8; 11:13) seems to indicate that the legal case presented there can be regarded as one of the most difficult. In other words, the legal case presented in Ezek. 16:3-43b α is not an ordinary one which can be resolved in the court held in the gate, but it is one of the top level which must have its Sitz im Leben in the priestly court in the sanctuary.

Verses 3-34.

It is in this part of the chapter that Ezekiel's treatment of Israel's past history is to be found. The uniqueness of this treatment lies in that Israel is referred to in the name of Jerusalem, which is in its turn personified as a woman. With this personification, Ezekiel's treatment of Israel's history in this section takes its form in a metaphorical language. To that extent it is similar to his presentation in Ezek. 23 but different from that in Ezek. 20. However, despite the similarity between the present

¹Ibid., p. 153.

section and chapter 23, the former is different from the latter in that it deals only with one woman, whereas the latter with two women. The significance of this difference will be shown later in the detailed examination of this section and that of chapter 23.

In the context of the priestly court, it must be said that what is presented in vv. 3-34 is an accusation against Israel, and that which is presented in vv. 35-43^{bx} is the announcement of her judgement. In other words, in the present section the woman Jerusalem is addressed as the accused, and the accusation is told in a form of metaphor.¹ It is in this accusation or in this metaphor that Ezekiel's treatment of Israel's past history is contained.

In this connection it is interesting to find that Ezekiel begins his metaphor by unveiling the curriculum vitae of the woman Jerusalem. Coupled with the fact that to the eastern mind the mentioning of one's parents in its bad sense is almost a taboo (cf. Ezek. 20:5ff.), the beginning of the present metaphor with the unveiling of that curriculum vitae shows how strong is the tension of the accusation. Besides, the fact that this metaphor is dominated by direct addresses, in which Yahweh, the accuser, is

¹Some other scholars call it allegory (Davidson, Cooke, Fohrer). This designation is perhaps applicable only to part of the story, and not to its whole. Moreover, it is very difficult to accept W. Zimmerli's remark that 'Ez gilt unter den at.lichen Propheten als der eigentliche Vater der Allegorie' (the italics are mine). Despite all of this, and despite the fact that some other stories of this kind are found in the Book of Ezekiel, e.g., Ezek. 15; 29:2ff.; 38f.; etc., such a remark is quite an exaggeration. However, as far as Ezek. 16 (and 23) and the meaning of the term 'allegory' are concerned, it is a great relief to find Zimmerli's further remark, in which he says: 'Es ist nun aber bei Ez 16 and 23 noch zu sehen, wie die Form gesteigerter Bildrede ganz unmittelbar aus einer Israel (und seiner Umwelt) ganz geläufigen Anschauungsform, die mit der Allegorie zunächst nichts zu tun hat, herauswächst' (op. cit., p. 343).

referred to in the first pers. sing. and the woman Jerusalem, the accused, in the second pers. fem. sing., has unmistakably shown that the accusation is really presented with full of tension.

This strong tension has in its turn unmistakably given a strong impression that Jerusalem has occupied a very, if not the most, important place in the speech of Ezekiel. In this connection, however, it is worth while to remember that this section is by no means the first or the only place in which Jerusalem has occupied the mind of Ezekiel. This is clear from the fact that the great prophetic symbolic actions in Ezek. 4, especially vv. 6ff.,¹ have pictured Jerusalem being menaced in such a way that she will not be able to escape the punishment of Yahweh. The picture is shown again in Ezek. 5 (cf. Ezek. 12:19) with a more dreadful symbolic action, i.e., the population of Jerusalem will be destroyed by fire and sword, and will be scattered 'to all the winds' with but a few of them left behind. Further, the great vision of the prophet which is reported in Ezek. 8-11 puts Jerusalem and the Temple right at the centre of the scene, and the happenings which took place in these two places are reported with a full tension similar to that of the report of the symbolic actions in Ezek. 4. The abominable deeds of the Temple officials have caused Yahweh's anger and wrath, that he will inevitably punish his people, 'my eye will not spare, and I will have no pity' (8:18), and those who are in the city of

¹The 'Jerusalem' of 4:1 is generally regarded as a later addition (Zimmerli, Eichrodt, Cooke).

Jerusalem will be smitten, except those who have been marked.

All these descriptions of and judgements on Jerusalem, which are full of negative tension, acquire fresh emphasis in other passages in which the name Jerusalem is mentioned. This is so, since out of the twenty six occurrences of the word 'Jerusalem' in the Book of Ezekiel,¹ it is only in two passages that this word, or this name, is mentioned with approbation, i.e., in 26:2 and 36:38. Besides, it must be said that with the exception of 'Jerusalem' in Ezek. 33:21, the other twenty three explicit mentioning of that name are found within the confinement of Ezek. 1-24, i.e., in the part of the Book which is generally agreed to contain Ezekiel's oracles of Judgement. With all of this it can be inferred that Ezekiel's view of Jerusalem is from the outset very negative.²

This negative view is of course not without traditio-historical background. And in this context a traditio-historical examination is very appropriate. In the part of the Book of Ezekiel dealt with here, i.e., Ezek. 16:3-34, the name 'Jerusalem' occurs only twice, i.e., in v. 2 and v. 3. However, the fact that Jerusalem is personified as a woman, who is addressed constantly in the 2nd pers. sing. throughout this section, means that this section is really speaking solely about Jerusalem. It is true that

¹For the number of these occurrences, see, Nelson's Complete Concordance of The Revised Standard Version Bible, Edinburgh, 1957, under 'Jerusalem'.

²For more information on this, see, W. Zimmerli, Grundriss der alttestamentlichen Theologie, (T.W. 3), Stuttgart, 1972, pp. 181ff.

'Jerusalem' here is used only metaphorically, which means that she represents something else; but, the fact that Jerusalem predominates the whole speech, suggests that Ezekiel is here standing within the traditions about Jerusalem rather than otherwise. It is therefore desirable to carry out the traditio-historical examination of the section within the confinement of this particular tradition.

The use of the metaphorical language is not a strange thing in the Old Testament, and, particularly, in the prophetic traditions. It is interesting to find that in most cases in the prophetic traditions the metaphorical language is used in addressing Israel as the people of Yahweh. In this connection Israel herself is very frequently addressed, or described, either as a woman (Hos. 1-3 et al.) or as a vineyard (Isa. 5; Jer. 12:10), or even as a lioness (Ezek. 19), or something else.

Among these metaphorical, or figurative, descriptions of Israel, the woman figure is the most significant for the present study. This is so since throughout Ezek. 16:3-34 Jerusalem is personified, and addressed, as a woman.¹ The personification of Israel as a woman in the prophetic traditions can be regarded as outstanding in that Israel is not only personified as a grown up woman, but also as a baby-girl (Ezek. 16:3ff.), or as a 'daughter of Zion' (Jer. 4: 31), or as a 'virgin of Israel' (בתולה ישראל, Amos 5:2), or as a bride (Jer. 2:2), or as a married woman or a

¹Cf. Ezek. 23.

mother (Hos. 1-3). In other words, the use of the woman figure as the personification of Israel does not confine itself to a grown up woman, but comprises almost all the steps of the whole life of the woman, right from her birthday until her marriage. The common practice in the prophetic traditions is, however, to deal only with either one or two steps of the life of the woman figure. In that sense Ezekiel is unique because in this particular section, i.e., Ezek. 16:3-34, he deals with almost the whole life time of the woman figure.

His personification of Jerusalem begins with her birthday and continues right through until her marriage. Moreover he describes every step of the growth of the woman figure in a very characteristic way.

But, in reference to the Sitz im Leben of the speech in this section, it seems clear that Ezekiel's descriptions of this woman figure at the same time constitute ~~an~~ both part of Yahweh's accusation against Israel and Ezekiel's interpretation of Jerusalem's past history. In this sense, it can be said that Ezek. 16:3-34 is similar to both Ezek. 20:1-31 and Ezek. 23:1-20, in which Yahweh's accusations against Israel are also constituting ~~an~~ Ezekiel's interpretations of Israel's past history.¹

¹For Ezek. 20:1-31, see, supra, pp. 86ff. ; and for Ezek. 23:1-20, see, infra, pp. 308ff..

Now, before this interpretation is examined further, it seems necessary to have a look at the significance of Jerusalem in connection with the history of the whole Israelite people. This is so since as is shown above, Jerusalem is the sole subject in the speech of the prophet in this chapter. For this purpose we will confine ourselves to have a look at Jerusalem from two points of view.

First, from the point of view of political history, it seems right to say that the significance of Jerusalem begins only after she was taken over by David. This is so since before that event Jerusalem does not seem to have anything at all to do with the political history of Israel as a people of Yahweh. In other words, the inclusion of Jerusalem in the political history of Israel begins only after she was taken over by David (2 Sam. 5:6-10). The occupation of Jerusalem by David has at least two important meanings.

a). Jerusalem then became the centre of David's government, whence David, as a king, reigned both Judah and all Israel (2 Sam. 5:5). As a matter of fact it is beginning with David that Judah and all Israel were politically united into one kingdom for the first time.¹

b). Despite the fact that David made the stronghold of the city his own personal abode, from which the name 'city of David' arose (2 Sam. 5:9), it is in and from Jerusalem that a new political

¹G. W. Anderson, op. cit., pp. 54f.; J. Bright, op. cit., pp. 193ff..

identity of the people Israel as a nation has arisen. It is this event which has made Jerusalem so meaningful to the political history of Israel as a people of Yahweh, in spite of the fact that the presence of the non-Israelite elements are still to be noticed (2 Sam. 24:18-25).¹

However, the problem which is to be discerned concerning the political significance of Jerusalem in relation to Ezekiel is to be examined further. This is so, since the political significance of Jerusalem had, in the course of Israel's history, undergone some developments in both for the worse and for the better. And one of the results of these developments is that what was true during the time of David or of Solomon might have no longer been true at the time of Ezekiel and vice versa.

However, before discussing this problem further, it seems wise at this stage to have a look at the significance of Jerusalem from the second point of view. This time from the religious point of view. In speaking about the religious significance of Jerusalem, one is soon reminded of the building of the Temple at Zion. The building of the Temple had, in fact, been intended by David himself (2 Sam. 7:1ff.). But, due to Yahweh's own will, only later his intention was carried out by his son Solomon (1 Kings 6:1-9:1). A close examination of the religious significance of the Temple, however, seems to show that without the Ark the Temple alone would

¹Cf. J. Bright, op. cit., p. 195.

certainly be less significant. In other words, from the religious point of view, the existence of the Temple would not be understandable and meaningful without the presence of the Ark in it. This is so since from the beginning, the Ark is inseparable from either the tent of meeting, or the shrine, or the sanctuary.¹ Therefore, if the Temple is to be significant at all it must be related to the Ark. And this is exactly what Solomon did. After he finished building the Temple, he then brought the Ark of God, or the Ark of the Covenant, into it (1 Kings 8:1-9, 21). With this event the Temple can now be regarded as really the religious centre of the whole people.² But, to return to the beginning of Jerusalem's religious significance, what Solomon did seems to be only a later development of what was previously done by David. This is so, since despite the fact that the Temple was built by Solomon, the initiative had in fact been taken by David years before (2 Sam. 7:1-3). Moreover, the Ark of God or the Ark of the Covenant is most certainly neither Solomon's own invention nor of David. Even when David took over Jerusalem, he was faced with the fact that the

¹R. E. Clements, God and Temple, Oxford, 1965, pp. 40f.; G. W. Anderson, op. cit., pp. 39f., 44, 55; idem, 'Israel: Amphictyony : 'AM, KAHAL, 'EDAH', in Translating and Understanding the Old Testament: Essays in Honour of H. G. May, Ed. by H. T. Frank and W. L. Reed, Nashville - New York, 1970, pp. 144ff.; R. de Vaux, op. cit., pp. 299ff..

²J. Bright, op. cit., p. 214; G. W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, London, 1966 (reprinted 1969, 1971), pp. 54f.; R. de Vaux, op. cit., pp. 320f..

Ark of God had already been playing its important role for a long time in the religious thinking of the people.¹ And it is perhaps mainly for this reason that soon after his victory David felt it absolutely necessary for him to bring the Ark into Jerusalem (2 Sam. 6:1ff.).² With this action, not only did David enhance the honour of his own name in the sight of the people, but he also enhanced the meaning and the function of the newly converted Jerusalem.

The significance of Jerusalem was, then, increased to its utmost : As the capital of the newly united kingdoms, she is both the centre of David's government and the centre of the religious identity of the whole people of Israel.³ In other words, the supreme significance of Jerusalem is now established, and therefore she can fully be called the centre of the Israelite people. In the light of this it is clear that despite the fact that the Temple

¹See p. 239 note 1.

²The exact name of the place from where this Ark was taken is rather difficult to identify, owing to the vagueness of the name בְּלֵי יְהוּדָה. The Chronicler identifies it as Kir'iath-je'arim (1 Chron. 13:6); but according to Josh. 15:9, 60; 18:14 Kir'iath-je'arim is called קִרְיַת-בֵּל or בֵּל.

³Cf. J. Gray, A History of Jerusalem, London, 1969, pp. 86f. and the notes there. There is no clear information, however, about the place where David put this Ark in 2 Sam. 7:17. For the discussion on it, see, R. E. Clement, op. cit., p. 42, and the references there; H. H. Rowley, op. cit., pp. 71ff.

is Solomonic rather than Davidic, what Solomon did is only the continuation of what David did. In other words, the birth of the religious significance of Jerusalem for the people Israel must be looked for in what both David and Solomon did.¹

Having said all this, the problem of the development of Jerusalem's significance through the course of Israel's history raised earlier can now be examined. In dealing with this problem, however, it is very important to distinguish between the question of Jerusalem as the central identity of the people of Israel and that of Jerusalem as a city. Although the investigation carried out earlier has shown that both of these significances have been established by both David and Solomon, the course of Israel's history later on shows that both had developed differently. This is true in relation to the severe schism which had divided the united kingdom into two sister-kingdoms, i.e., North Israel and Judah, which took place soon after Solomon's death. Despite the fact that there were some intervals in which both sister-kingdoms were re-united, or at least were on good terms (1 Kings 22:2-38; 2 Kings 3:4-27; 28:26; 9:16ff.),² the significance of Jerusalem had, in

¹For all this, see also, M. Noth, 'Jerusalem and Israelite Tradition' in his The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays, (ET. by D. R. Ap-Thomas), Edinburgh and London, 1966 (reprinted 1967), pp. 132ff..

²Cf. M. Noth, The History of Israel, second edition, (ET. revised by P. R. Ackroyd), London, 1960, pp. 234f. and the notes there.

fact, been considerably changed or reduced. Names such as Samaria (1 Kings 16:24; Hos. 8:5-6), Dan and Bethel (1 Kings 12:25-33; Amos. 7:10-15), to mention but three of them, remind one of the fact that the significance of Jerusalem was, to a very large extent, denied by the leaders of the bigger group of the people. Although the significance of these three cities seemed to have ended in the catastrophe of the year 721 B. C., i.e., the year which is generally regarded as the terminus ad quem of the existence of Northern Israel (2 Kings 17:1-6),¹ and although the so called Israelite traditions do not elaborate their significances as they do Jerusalem's, it would be a mistake to ignore their effects on the latter's significance.²

Anyway, despite the political and the religious achievements of Northern Israel, two things which are more decisive for the religious identification of the whole people of Israel are still left in Jerusalem. These are the Temple and the Ark of God. Due to the difficulty of separating the religious significance of Jerusalem from her political one,³ and this is perhaps one of the

¹ See, e.g., ibid., p. 262; J. Bright, op. cit., p. 274; G. W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, London, 1966 (reprinted 1971), pp. 103, 187.

² However, some scholars are of the opinion that the religious activities carried out in both Dan and Bethel (and Samaria?) were not of Baalism, but Yahwism. See, e.g., H. H. Rowley, Worship in Ancient Israel, London, 1967, pp. 78, 82, and the references there.

³ See the worries of Jeroboam concerning the religious habits of his subjects in 2 Kings 12:26ff..

reasons for Jehu's rebellion against the house of Omri (2 Kings 10:15ff.),¹ in the final analysis all the religious efforts of the kings of Northern Israel seemed to be 'unable to compete with the Ark in Jerusalem and its unique traditions'.² Therefore Jerusalem remained the sole identification of and for the whole Israelite people.

However, the superiority of Jerusalem over the cities of Northern Israel does not seem to mean that she was free from any threat and defilement which came, directly or indirectly, from the part of the kings and/or the people of Judah. Indeed, the reformations of Hesekiah, Josiah, and the threats of the prophets, especially that of Ezekiel, would mean nothing if this did not happen.³ Although it is sometimes very difficult to discern whether or not the defilement of Judah had anything to do with the whole Israelite people since Judah's sovereignty was often confined only to her territory, nevertheless the effects of the defilement

¹Jehu was perhaps strongly influenced by, or at least in the same belief as, the Rechabites; cf. 2 Kings 10:15; Jer. 35:1-19.

²M. Noth, op. cit., p. 231; cf. H. H. Rowley, op. cit., pp. 78f.

³In this context, however, it is very interesting to find that both the cult centralization programme of Deuteronomy and the programme of the restoration of the city and the Temple in Ezek. 40-48 do not specifically identify the place for their purposes as Jerusalem. Cf. H. H. Rowley, op. cit., p. 106; see also his From Moses to Qumran, Lutterworth Press, London, 1963, pp. 198f.; G. A. Cooke, op. cit., p. 427.

on the significance of Jerusalem are hardly possible to be confined to the territory of Judah. Putting it the other way, despite the fact that the non-Yahwistic religious activities within and without Judah were to some extent the result of the foreign influence, their having been so ^{prosperous} ~~flourish~~ shows that the significance of Jerusalem was clearly less than it used to be.

Yet, the fact that there is no evidence which could show the effort of the Samaritans to revive the political and the religious life of Northern Israel to the level of rivalling Jerusalem, at any rate until as late as 587 B.C. when Jerusalem was plundered by the Babylonians, seems to show that the survival of Judah, especially that of Jerusalem and the Temple and the Ark, until about two centuries after the fall of Samaria, must have meant more positively rather than negatively to all the Israelite people. This can be seen chiefly during the reign of King Josiah. On the one hand, King Josiah was considerably successful in restoring the political unity of Judah and Northern Israel, and on the other, his religious reformation was not confined only to Judah, but was extended to Northern Israel as well (2 Kings 22f.; 2 Chron. 34f.).¹

¹H. H. Rowley, Worship in Ancient Israel, p. 107; G. W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, pp. 124ff.; M. Noth, op. cit., pp. 273ff.; J. Bright, A History of Israel, second edition, London, 1972, pp. 316ff..

In other words, although Jerusalem's significance has been reduced by, during, and after, the schism to such an extent, her survival after 721 B.C. has given her a great chance to regain and develop it for all of the people Israel, both in Judah and abroad.

So far the investigation presented here has only dealt with the historical development of the significance of Jerusalem in terms of both politics and religion. It is now time to have a look at the relation of this development to the history of the tradition of Jerusalem in connection with Ezek. 16:3. The amazing thing which one finds in this endeavour is that, to begin with, the birth of Jerusalem can only be understood in connection with David.¹ Of course it would be a mistake to ignore the tradition of Jerusalem in its connection with the tradition about the blessing of Abraham by the king of Salem as it is recorded in Gen. 14:17-24.² And R. E. Clements has clearly shown that there is a close connection between the traditions of the Davidic covenant and that of the Abrahamic covenant.³ But, as far as Ezek. 16:3 is concerned, it is not the latter traditions which ~~has presupposed~~ ^{have determined} its text, rather it

¹ See, M. Noth, op. cit., loc. cit..

² Clements argues that the story in this passage has come from a time after David conquered Jerusalem, 'when the worship of Yahweh was introduced there'. However, he goes on and says: 'It is in fact in every way probable that the story itself is an adaptation of traditional material used to explain and legitimize certain developments in David's reign' (op. cit., p. 43 and see his note there).

³ R. E. Clements, Abraham and David, (S.B.T. Second Series 5), London, 1967, pp. 55f..

is the former. This is so, because in their early traditio-- historical developments and amalgamations, the traditions of the Davidic covenant turn out to be predominant compared with that of the Abrahamic covenant.¹ R. E. Clements demonstrates that the Davidic covenant is also different from the Sinaitic covenant in that the former is promisory whereas the latter is not.² This means that, although 'the Davidic covenant was simply an extension and adaption of the earlier covenant of Horeb-Sinai', the former will remain forever, whereas the latter will not.³ With all this it can be concluded that in this passage Ezekiel is standing in the line of David-Jerusalem traditions which is different from both the Abrahamic traditions and that of the Sinaitic covenant. This also means that in this passage Ezekiel is not standing in the line of the exodus-wilderness-conquest tradition. This does not mean, however, that Ezekiel did not know the exodus-wilderness-- conquest tradition. The investigation of chapter 20 carried out earlier has shown very clearly that in that chapter he is almost completely standing in this tradition. If now in chapter 16 Ezekiel employs the David-Jerusalem tradition, or more popularly

¹Ibid.; M. Noth, op. cit., loc. cit...

²Ibid., pp. 52ff..

³Ibid...

the David-Zion traditions,¹ to accuse the people Israel, then, it is imperative to find out what this tradition is.

According to both G. von Rad² and R. E. Clements the David-Zion tradition consists of two traditions, i.e., the tradition about Yahweh's election of David and the tradition about Yahweh's election of Zion. When were these two traditions joined together is not clear. On the one hand, G. von Rad, on the basis of Ps. 78:68ff., says that 'the choice of Zion and the election of David are clearly differentiated as two separate acts', and that they represent two separate traditions,³ and on the other, he does not seem to deny that later on these two separate traditions were amalgamated.⁴ In contrast to von Rad, R. E. Clements is of the opinion that the Zion tradition is 'indissolubly connected with the (tradition of the) divine election of David and his dynasty to be the ruler of Israel', and that the dates of their amalgamation might

¹It must be noted, however, that Ezekiel does not use the word 'Zion' at all in the book which bears his name.

²Cf. G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, (ET. by D. M. G. Stalker), Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1970, p. 46; R. E. Clements, op. cit., pp. 48ff..

³Ibid., p. 46.

⁴Cf. ibid., p. 47.

go back to the Davidic-Solomonic age.¹ As far as the kernels of these twofold traditions are concerned, most scholars seem to be in agreement that the election of David refers to the establishment of David's dynasty to be the ruler of Israel and that the election of Zion refers to the doctrine of Yahweh's having chosen Zion, or the Temple in Jerusalem, as his dwelling place.² Whatever the origins of these two electional traditions might be, it is in any case true that the David-Zion tradition was 'fostered in Jerusalem and Judah'.³

To that extent it is different from the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions which lived on predominantly in Northern Kingdom.⁴

In addition it must be said that the David-Zion tradition does not only show and preserve the significance of Jerusalem, but also becomes the vehicle of it.⁵ The investigation presented above has

¹R. E. Clements, op. cit., p. 49 and note 2. In other place R. E. Clements points out that the assertions of the divine election of mount Zion as Yahweh's dwelling place, and of David's house to provide Israel's kings, became central features of the religious traditions of Jerusalem (Abraham and David, ((S.B.T. Second Series 5)), S.C.M. Press, London, 1967, p. 52.

²G. von Rad, op. cit., pp. 46f.; R. E. Clements, God and Temple, pp. 49f.; idem, Abraham and David, p. 52; M. Noth, The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays, pp. 139ff.; R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel : Its Life and Institutions, pp. 325ff..

³G. von Rad, op. cit., p. 47, cf. R. E. Clements, God and Temple, p. 58.

⁴G. von Rad, op. cit., p. 47.

⁵This tradition can be regarded as one of the common sources of the similarity of some passages within or without the prophetic traditions in which Israel is figuratively addressed as the woman Jerusalem, or as the woman Zion; see, e.g., Isa. 1:8. 21; Mic. 1:13; Hos. 2; Jer. 2:2ff.; Lam. 1-2; etc..

shown that in the time of Ezekiel Jerusalem was still the significant symbolic identification of the whole people Israel. And it is against this background that now the prophet launches his accusation against the whole Israelite people.

Verses 3-7.

It is shown above that in dealing with the personified Israel or Jerusalem in this chapter Ezekiel is unique in that his metaphor comprises the whole life of the woman, beginning with her birthday until her getting married. The way Ezekiel presents the metaphor is also interesting in that he begins with unveiling the curriculum vitae of the woman Jerusalem. In this connection it is worth noting that the first three or four names which one should write in filling in a curriculum vitae form in modern time, especially in eastern countries, are his/her own name, the name of the place and the date of birth, and the forenames of each of the parents. Whether Ezekiel and his contemporaries knew this kind of thing is not clear. Yet, it is remarkable that he begins his accusation against Jerusalem by reciting this kind of record. It is not clear whether this kind of recital was always made before someone was accused in the court of ancient Israel or on other formal occasions such as marriage or divorce, nevertheless the record recited by Ezekiel here can be regarded as unique. This is so since this kind of recital finds no parallelism at all in the Old Testament.

With this recital Ezekiel reveals concisely both the

identification and the origin of Jerusalem.

(Your name is Jerusalem, your sex is female),
'your origin and your birth are of the land of the Canaanites,
your father (was) an Amorite,
and your mother (was) a Hittite'.

In this recital it is clear how Ezekiel looks at the origin of Jerusalem. The mentioning of both יְרִיחוֹ¹ and יְרוּשָׁלַיִם have rightly reminded most scholars of the pre-history of the city of Jerusalem in the land of the Canaanites.² It is well known that before Jerusalem was taken over by David she was a city of the Canaanites.

These Canaanites people were not in themselves a homogeneous people. They consisted of both Semitic and non-Semitic elements, which had been intermingling for quite some time (cf. Gen. 15:16, 18f.; 26:34; 48:22; Deut. 7:1; Josh. 3:10; 24:11; etc.).³

¹For the article י here, see, Zimmerli's note, *op. cit.*, p. 334.

²For the discussions of this, see the Commentaries of Eichrodt, Cooke, Weavers, and Zimmerli, and their bibliographies. See also J. Van Seeters, 'The Terms "Amorite" and "Hittite" in the Old Testament', *V.T.* 22, 1972, who argues that the references to the land of Canaan, Amorite, and Hittite in Ezek. 16:3 are 'all rhetorical and pejorative' rather than 'to give a quaint historical footnote on Jerusalem's great antiquity' (pp. 72ff., especially pp. 78, 80).

³A. Haldar, 'Amorite', *I.D.B.*, Vol. I, pp. 115f.; I. J. Gelb, 'Hittites', *I.D.B.*, Vol. II, pp. 612ff.; M. Noth, *The History of Israel*, (ET. revised by P. R. Ackroyd), second edition, London, 1960, p. 141 note 1; J. Bright, *A History of Israel*, second edition, London, 1972, pp. 114f.; G. W. Anderson, *The History and Religion of Israel*, London, 1966, p. 44. To all this, contrast, J. van Seeters, *op. cit.*, pp. 64-81.

If this recital is compared with what was commonly known as the significances of Jerusalem as they are contained in the David--Zion tradition, it is clear how Ezekiel challenges the people of Israel. It is shown earlier that the birth of the significances of Jerusalem as the central identity of the people was both the glorious political and religious acts of David and Solomon. In that sense not only does Ezekiel reveal the non-Yahwistic background and origin of Jerusalem, but also reverse what is gloriously stated in the David-Zion tradition.

What is interesting in this challenge of Ezekiel is that Ezekiel firmly stands on an historical basis. In other words, no one will fail to see that what Ezekiel recites in the curriculum vitae of Jerusalem is historically right. In this connection it is certainly probable to argue that the part of Jerusalem's history referred to by Ezekiel here does not belong to the history of Jerusalem in her connection with Israel as a people of God. But it is precisely with the background of this glorious history of Jerusalem that Ezekiel is here presenting his accusation against the people.

In other words, instead of telling the history of Jerusalem beginning with her glorious birth by referring to David's conquest and empire, Ezekiel looks at that history by referring to the birth of Jerusalem from a non-Israelite people.

In what follows Ezekiel elaborates his metaphor in a more detailed description in which he shows how different is his interpretation of Jerusalem's history from that which is contained in the

David-Zion tradition. He looks at the beginning of Jerusalem's fate and describes it as the fate of an unwanted baby-girl. The birth of Jerusalem is like the birth of an unwanted baby-girl, to whom no maternity customs or ceremonies were performed. Her navel string was not cut, nor was she washed with water. She was not rubbed with salt, nor was she swathed with binds. The meaning of all these customs is clear in that in ancient Israel, these four things must be performed if the newly born baby was wanted to be alive.¹

The description of this unwanted baby-girl (vv. 4-6) is characteristically Ezekielian. As it now stands, the word וַאֲנִי לְדָוִד אֶתֶּן is in a casus pendens.² This word is followed by some short sentences which are paratactically arranged until the end of v. 5. Coupled with the fact that these short sentences are in themselves self-contained, it seems possible to understand the word וַאֲנִי לְדָוִד אֶתֶּן as if it is implicitly followed by a colon. In other words, the function of the short sentences in vv. 4-5 is to describe what is meant by וַאֲנִי לְדָוִד אֶתֶּן.

The description begins with the words בְּיוֹם הַוֹּלְדוֹתָ אֶתֶּן in v. 4a,

¹For this see, W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, (B.K. XIII/1), Neukirchen--Vluyn, 1969, p. 349 and the references there; R. de Vaux, op. cit., p. 43.

²W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 348.

and ends with the words ביום הולדת אהרן in v. 5b. Despite the fact that the latter words are defective, this verbatim repetition is not a strange thing in connection with Ezekiel's characteristics. As a matter of fact, this verbatim repetition enhances the emphasis of what is described there, i.e., the newly born baby-girl Jerusalem was really an unwanted baby-girl.

In dealing with the detailed description of the fate of the newly born-baby, W. Zimmerli is right in pointing out that the phrase עלֹיךְ עֵינַי in v. 5a is uniquely Ezekielian.¹ Although the significance of this phrase is similar to that of the individual short sentences in the rest of vv. 4-5, it is worth noting that this phrase occurs again in Ezek. 5:11; 7:4, 9; 8:18; 9:5, 10. In all of these passages the phrase means that Yahweh will not protect or spare Israel from his wrath or judgement. In this sense it might be possible to understand the use of this phrase in Ezek. 16:5a as meaning that the newly born baby girl is really without protection or charitable acts. This meaning is strengthened by the following description in Ezek. 16:5b in that the baby was disposed of, or cast out on the open field and left there.²

¹W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 349.

²According to W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 348, the style of the narrative in vv. 4-5 is to be connected with that of the priestly narratives in Gen. 2:4; 5:1; 6:9; 10:1; etc.; and due to the fact that the introductory וַיִּשְׂרַח in Gen. 1:1 is, so W. Zimmerli, the substitute of וַיִּבְרָא in all of these passages, so Ezek. 16:4-5 must also have a connection with the creation story in Genesis.

This is really a very dreadful condition for a newly born baby, even more dreadful than the condition befallen to Ishmael when he, still in his mother's womb, was expelled from the household of Abraham (Gen. 16).

Having said all this, one wonders whether there is any historical reference(s) at all of what Ezekiel here is presenting. In connection with the dreadful fate of the newly born baby in the field, it is easy to see the analogy of the baby's condition to that of Israel in the wilderness. Or even to say, as A. B. Davidson does, that the baby's condition refers to 'the history of the family (of Israel) in Canaan, in its descent to Egypt, when it was feeble, unprotected, and in danger of perishing'.¹ But, since it has been pointed out earlier that Ezekiel is here standing in the David--Zion tradition, it is difficult to adapt this view. This is so since this view refers to the patriarchal traditions and the locality outside Canaan. Instead, and as far as Jerusalem is concerned, it seems better to look at the condition of the newly born baby by analogy with the geographical situation of the city of Jerusalem. Compared with the great cities known to Ezekiel, e.g., Tyre, Babylon, Tel-Abib, which were situated near river(s), or were surrounded by

¹A. B. Davidson, op. cit., p. 110.

water, Jerusalem means absolutely nothing.¹ This is so because she is always threatened by drought and death! And such was the fate of the newly born baby.²

In this connection one wonders whether Ezekiel was the first to interpret the beginning of Israel's history by using the metaphor of a baby which is exposed in the field and threatened to death. As far as prophetic traditions are concerned this metaphor is found again very briefly in Hos. 2:5 (RSV. 2:3), in which the birth of baby girl Israel³ is associated with both wilderness (רָבִיב), a parched land (אֶרֶץ צָרָה) and thirst (צָמָה). Yet, there are at least two things which make it difficult to see the relationship between Hosea and Ezekiel in this particular case. First, it is generally agreed that Hosea is standing entirely in the exodus--wilderness-conquest traditions. This does not mean, however, that Ezekiel does not know these traditions, but in the case of Ezek. 16

¹The references to the river and water which are positively connected with Jerusalem are only found in chapters 40-48 in the Book of Ezekiel. And in the context found in these chapters, it is better to understand them in their ideal sense rather than in their real ones. Cf. R. E. Clements, God and Temple, p. 107.

²It is perhaps possible to see Ezekiel's usage of רָבִיב here in contrast to the glorious title given to Jerusalem, יְרוּשָׁלַיִם , the city, in Ezek. 4:3, 7; 5:2 et al., which was then well known. Cf. W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 349.

³In Hos. 11:1 Israel is called 'son', which refers to a baby-boy rather than a baby-girl.

it is difficult to see how Ezekiel devises those particular traditions. Second, vocabulary in Hos. 2:5 (RSV.2:3) is different from Ezek. 16:5, in that the former uses מַרְבֵּב and the latter הַרְשָׁה. As a matter of fact the word מַרְבֵּב is more at home in the exodus--wilderness-conquest traditions rather than the word הַרְשָׁה.¹ So, if the similarity of Ezekiel and Hosea in this particular case must be understood in terms of traditio-history, the best that can be said seems to be that Ezekiel applies the metaphor of a baby-girl, which he receives from Hoseanic traditions, to Jerusalem in the land of the Canaanites. By doing so Ezekiel is, on the one hand, similar to Hosea in that he interprets the beginning of Israel's history as a newly born baby-girl, and on the other, different from the latter in that he is standing in the David-Zion tradition.

To return to Ezekiel's usage of the metaphor, it must be said that the dreadful fate of the unwanted baby was soon afterward completely changed, as is told in vv. 6-7. From the context of the metaphor, it is clear that this change did not take place long after the baby was exposed in the dreadful condition. The baby was still weltering in her blood when Yahweh passed by, saw, and said to her: 'Live, grow up like a plant in the field'.² In

¹See also, below.

²There is a dittography in y. 6b.

connection with the expression used in this speech, W. Zimmerli has rightly pointed out that the combination of the words הָיָה and רָבָה has its counterpart in the combination of the words הָפְרָה and רָבָה as is used by P in the story of creation (Gen. 1:22, 28; 9:1, 7; cf. Gen. 17:20; 28:3; 35:11).¹ The use of the emphatic meaning of the combination of the words הָיָה and רָבָה in this metaphor shows quite clearly how contrast will be the fate of the baby before and after Yahweh's passing her. Instead of facing death in the field she is now commanded emphatically by Yahweh to live and grow. In view of the contrast, the command of Yahweh can perhaps be understood as referring to a new creation of the fate of the baby.² In other words, by this command it is shown that Israel's life or death depends entirely on Yahweh's intervention in her life right from the day when she was born.

In this metaphor the intervention of Yahweh is told as a very unexpected act. Yahweh was just passing by the baby ($\text{וַיַּעֲבֹר עָלֶיהָ}$) when he saw and commanded her to live and grow. So, it is not the intention of Yahweh to find and help the exposed newly born baby--girl. Or, in other words, the finding of the baby by Yahweh is only a fortuitous event. Yet, in spite of all this, Yahweh's willingness to look at the baby in compassion must be regarded as the

¹W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 350.

²Cf. the creation story in Gen. 1 in which the chaotic situation is changed by Yahweh into an orderly, and live, one.

beginning of the change of the baby's fate. With this willingness of Yahweh, the salvation history of Israel begins.

The interesting thing about this salvation history as is told here is that it began precisely in the land of the Canaanites, on the open field (אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן - v. 5b),¹ where the baby was cast out and left dying. This is also clear in that if compared with the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions, Ezek. 16 does not say anything about a possible movement of the baby from one place to another, which could be regarded as a possible parallelism to that of the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions.² Everything pictured in this chapter is located at the same place. And according to v. 3, the name of the place is the land of the Canaanites (cf. Ezek. 5:5).

The change of the baby's fate is described in v. 7aβb. Nevertheless, apart from the fact that Ezekiel seems to be the first to put in writing the detailed description of the physical growth of female body,³ the picture he describes in v. 7aβb gives an impression that he is referring to a country girl rather than to a city girl. This does not mean, however, that the girl is less

¹ Notice that in the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions the frequent word is אֶרֶץ and not אֶרֶץ.

² Contrast, however, W. Zimmerli, The Law and The Prophets, (ET. by R. E. Clements), Oxford, 1965, who says that 'Yahweh took her up from the field ...' (p. 81).

³ For this, see, W. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, (B.K. XIII/1), Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969, p. 350. Cf. 1 Sam. 2:21b, 26.

civilized than the city girl, but, rather, to the eastern mind, being a country girl or a country people means being a simple people, and not sophisticated. Besides, the picture given here could perhaps remind one of the picture of Eve and Adam described by J in Gen. 3:1-7, although the differences between them are obvious.¹

Verses 8-14.

The metaphor goes on in describing the curriculum vitae of the girl. This time it begins with a phrase similar to that of v. 6, which again shows that the meeting of Yahweh and the girl Israel is a coincident happening. But, clearer than the first, the coincidental character of the present meeting is soon overshadowed by the intentional act of Yahweh, in which he proposed ^{to} the girl, betrothed her, and married her, so that she became his (v. 8).² As far as the metaphor is concerned, it does not seem appropriate to ask questions like for example : what has taken place in the time between these two meetings?³ although Ezekiel did refer to the growing up of the baby to becoming a girl in v. 7a β b. To that extent, therefore, it is out of the proportion to mention or discuss the childhood of the girl, since Ezekiel himself did not mention ~~about what and how was~~ the relationships between Yahweh and the

¹For the form-critical relationship between Ezek. 16:6-7 and the P narratives in the Book of Genesis, see, W. Zimmerli, op. cit., in loc..

²For the textual problem of this verse, see, G. A. Cooke, op. cit., in loc.; W. Zimmerli, op. cit., in loc..

³W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 349.

adolescent girl.¹ The obvious thing in both of the meetings, which coincidentally took place at the decisive periods of the girl's life, is that Yahweh saved the girl from a probable death, and then married her. Nobody will fail to understand these acts of Yahweh as his saving and gracious acts. Therefore it is a great mistake to hold that Ezekiel is here occupied by the darker side of Israel's past history, as he probably is in chapter 20.² This saving act of Yahweh is told in detail in vv. 8-14, in which Ezekiel quite remarkably and almost exclusively uses the language of betrothal and matrimony. However, W. Zimmerli has rightly demonstrated that, although Ezekiel here tends to be unique, his uses of these matrimonial and betrothal phraseologies is not without parallel.³

¹It is true that the childhood ($\gamma\psi$) of Israel is mentioned in both Hos. 11:2 and Jer. 2:2, but both of these passages refer to the Exodus event and therefore belong to the exodus-wilderness--conquest traditions. However, the similarity of Hosea and Jeremiah, namely that both of them say that this period of the childhood of Israel was full of positive attitude from the part of the child, could perhaps illuminate the silence of Ezekiel here.

²It is again to be remembered that in chapter 20 the saving acts of God always go side by side with, or even presuppose, Ezekiel's accusation against Israel.

³W. Zimmerli, op. cit., in. loc., and the references there; see also, R. de Vaux, op. cit., pp. 26ff., whose questionable interpretation of Ezek. 16:8 is followed by John B. Taylor, Ezekiel, (Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries), London, 1969, in loc..

The spreading of the end of the skirt in v. 8 is again found with a similar context in Ruth 3:9. The entering into the matrimonial covenant (v. 8) is also found in Prov. 2:17 and Mal. 2:14; while the crucial $\text{בָּחַרְתִּי$ in v. 8b could perhaps be compared with the statement of Raguel to Tobias his son in Tobit 7:12.¹ However, despite the fact that Israelite people also allowed their young people to choose their bride-to-be (Judg. 14:2; Gen. 26:34f.) or vice versa (1 Sam. 18:20),² it seems better not to talk about the idea of choice in the context of the passage dealt with here,³ because the idea in this metaphor is the absolute kindness of God to Israel and her absolute dependence on him, beginning from her birth onwards, and that she is now belonging to him alone. This is also clear from the fact that the idea of choice does not lie primarily in Yahweh's having taken care of Israel, but in his having been compassionate to her. In other words, seen from the side of Israel this event cannot be regarded as her being chosen by Yahweh, whereas seen from the side of Yahweh his having done all the saving acts only means that he has chosen to be compassionate to Israel, and not that he has chosen Israel herself.⁴

¹Cf. R. de Vaux, op. cit., p. 33. See also the discussion of Ezek. 23:4, infra, pp. 326ff..

²R. de Vaux, op. cit., p. 30.

³Contrast, however, W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 351.

⁴It might well be possible to see the relationship of this act of Yahweh with the idea of Yahweh's having chosen Israel to be his own people or Jerusalem to be the place of his dwelling. However, there are at least two difficulties which might well prevent seeing this relationship. First, in this passage the word $\text{בָּחַר$ (to choose) is not used. Second, despite the fact that the idea of Israel's being chosen by Yahweh does not always mean her having glorious privilege (see, e.g., H. H. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, London, 1950), it seems right to say that it is precisely in challenging the idea of Israel's being chosen by Yahweh that here Ezekiel chose the metaphor of the foundling girl.

So, with v. 8, in fact the curriculum vitae of the girl seems to have ended. She is now no longer alone. She is married, and therefore she becomes the possession of her husband.¹

The picturing of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel as that of the husband and wife is by no means peculiar to Ezekiel. Already Hosea used it (Hos. 1-3), and so did Jeremiah (Jer. 3:1, 20). For this, we maintain that Ezekiel and Jeremiah were contemporaries,² therefore it seems more acceptable to understand both of them as depending on Hosea.³ In any case, it is clear that the idea of the husband-wife relationship used for the relationship between Yahweh and Israel was one of the current ideas at the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. And as far as Ezek. 16 is concerned, it is at this point that Ezekiel clearly shows his acquaintance with the tradition from Northern Israel, i.e., Hos. 1-3.⁴

Beginning with v. 9 the scene of the metaphor is changed. The phraseologies used here⁵ remind one of the phraseology of Ruth

¹For wife's being possessed by her husband, see, R. de Vaux, op. cit., p. 26, and some of the passages referred to there.

²Infra, pp. 383, 395f..

³See also, J. W. Miller, Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels : sprachlich und theologisch untersucht, Neukirchen-Kreis, Moers, 1955, especially p. 107.

⁴For the origin of this idea in the Book of Hosea, see, J. L. Mays, Hosea, (O.T.L.), London, 1969, pp. 8f.; cf. G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, (ET. by D. M. G. Stalker), Vol. II, Edinburgh, 1970, pp. 141f..

⁵For the possible omission of v. 9a β , see, W. Zimmerli, op. cit., in loc..

3:3a. Despite the possibility of understanding this phraseology as part of the ritual ceremony for a bride,¹ the use of the verb $\zeta\pi\gamma$, which also occurs in 2 Sam. 11:2a β in a more customary sense, seems to refer the meaning of this verse, i.e., v. 9, to other point. In Ruth 3:3a the context is hardly of ritual ceremony at all. It is, rather, referring to one of the current customs (cf. Exod. 2:5), namely, it is customary for the woman to take a bath, anoint herself, and put on clean clothes. The purpose of this custom, therefore, is not always to prepare oneself for a ceremonial occasion. How and when did this custom become an essential part of certain ritual ceremonies, is very difficult to trace. In any case, the mentioning of this custom as part of the care given by Yahweh to his filthy wife is, first of all, to be understood as referring to the custom rather than to a ritual ceremony. Besides, one must remember that the story here is a metaphor, and is not an historical or a ceremonial record. The comparison to the language of Ruth 3:3a and Exod. 2:5 has shown that here Ezekiel is using the popular, secular language in order to be able to move his addressees or to make them vulnerable. This popular, secular language is still used by Ezekiel in his description about how Yahweh clothed, ornamented, and looked after his wife in vv. 10-13. The comparison of v. 9 to Ruth 3:3a also

¹W. Zimmerli, ibid..

shows that the clothing is missing in the former. But in these verses, i.e., Ezek. 16:10-13, the clothing of Jerusalem is described almost to every detail. It is of course difficult and probably unnecessary to ask what does the 'best clothes' in Ruth 3:3a mean. However, the context found there will be sufficient to be used as the basis for perceiving that what is described in Ezek. 16:10-13a is undoubtedly referring to the best of the best.¹ This 'the best of the best' does not mean only that both the clothes and the ornamentations given by Yahweh to Israel are complete, i.e., he provides her with everything the woman might need, but also that the materials of those things are of the best quality. Even the stuff with which Yahweh feeds Israel (v. 13aβ) is not ordinary.²

If one looks again at the language and the phraseologies used in these verses, one is impressed by the details which Ezekiel seems to be keen on. However, since the inclusion of detailed and lengthy descriptions is one of Ezekiel's characteristics, it is unnecessary to raise any question about it. But, the contrast between detailed and lengthy description in Ezek. 16:9-13a and the sketchy description in Ezek. 16:3-8, which are juxtaposed as such, certainly cannot be ignored. Apart from their difference in style, these

¹For the detailed explanations of each of the things mentioned here see, W. Zimmerli, G. A. Cooke.

²Cf. the domestic life of the woman at Zarephath, 1 Kings 17:8ff.; see also the quality of the food which Ezekiel has to eat in his symbolic actions, Ezek. 4:9ff..

two passages have in fact presented two different scenes as well. Ezek. 16:3-8 tells the story of a very simple, and perhaps poor country girl, while Ezek. 16:9-13a tells the story of the same girl, now she is married woman, who is superbly dressed, and perhaps even sophisticated.¹ Moreover, in vv. 13b-14 it is said that this woman now achieves the highest rank in the society, and even becomes well known among the nations. From the point of view of social psychology, this contrast could mean at least two things. First, the sudden change of the woman's life from her birth day until the present stage means nothing else but that she is indeed a very lucky woman. Second, seeing that this change happens presumably only in a very short time and without her active participation, it is no wonder that she will not be able to be responsible in using all the things she now has. However valid such a point of view is, it seems justified to say that the primary concern of Ezekiel in this metaphor is not this. Rather, he is concerned with the fact that all the glories of Israel, as both political entity and religious community, are neither the result of her own efforts nor that of the efforts of other deities. All of them are the gifts of Yahweh. Even the very existence of Israel itself is not and will not be understandable apart from this loving Yahweh. In

¹However, W. Zimmerli, sees this contrast differently. He says : 'Dabei scheint das Tun Jahwes bei dem Armutsstand des Mädchens, wie er im Vorgehenden geschildert war, anzuknüpfen' (op. cit., p. 351).

this context it is certainly not a coincidence that in Ezek. 16: 3-14 the metaphor is dominated by verbs in which Yahweh, who is speaking in the 1st. person singular, is the subject of the sentences. It is he who is actively acting. While Israel, addressed in the 2nd. person, feminine, singular, acts only as the dative object, which has no participation at all. In other words, from her birth, i.e., from the beginning of her life, until she is now at the top of the world, it is Yahweh alone who cares for and looks after her. So, as far as Ezek. 16:8-14 is concerned, it is this saving history of Yahweh alone which has dominated Ezekiel's mind and his metaphor.

Verses 15-34.

The first fact to be found in vv. 15-34 is that the structure of the sentences here is different from that of vv. 3-14.¹ Although the speaker here is still Yahweh, the subject of most of the sentences is now Israel. It is now Israel who is told to be acting. And Yahweh, who is pictured as her loving husband in vv. 3-14, is now more clearly acting as her accuser. The accusing

¹For the form-critical analysis of vv. 15-34, see, W. Zimmerli, op. cit., in loc.; he says that vv. 30-34 is the 'weitere Ausführungen' of vv. 26-29; while vv. 26-29 is, in turn, the 'Nachinterpretation' of vv. 16-23. The theme of vv. 26-29 is in fact the basic theme of chapter 23, and therefore this passage cannot be authentic. Since vv. 16-23 is in itself in the same line as is Hos. 2, 4, it cannot be regarded as authentic either. So, W. Zimmerli concludes, 'Der Grundbestand der Sündschilderung ist danach in den knappen Ausführungen 15.24f. zu finden' (op. cit., pp. 353f.).

status of Yahweh is in fact already clear from the scene set forth at the beginning of the metaphor. But it is not until v. 15 that he exposes the guilt or the abominations of Israel his wife.¹

What are the abominations of Israel? Before answering this question one must realize that here he is again faced with a lengthy and detailed description of the guilt. And in some cases he will find that there are some descriptions which are only repetitions of what is said before. Like for example, the taking^{of} garments in v. 16a is repeated in v. 18a; the building up of the vaulted chamber etc. in v. 24 is again found in v. 31a; v. 31b is repeated in v. 34a. Nevertheless, the most remarkable thing in this passage which one will never fail to realize is also found in the style of repetition, namely the word ׀׀׀ dominates the whole description.² So, despite the lengthy and detailed description found here, it is justified to say that the guilt and abominations of Israel are mainly connected with the connotations of the word ׀׀׀ , i.e., idolatry, abomination, fornication, and harlotry. Yet, in the context of Ezek. 16:15-34 the meaning of ׀׀׀ is very ambiguous. It is used not only in describing the practice of a prostitute with

¹About the possibility of a husband accusing his wife, see, Deut. 22:13-22; cf. R. de Vaux, op. cit., p. 35.

²According to W. Zimmerli's counting, the word ׀׀׀ occurs twenty-eight times in chapter 16, and twenty times in chapter 23 (op. cit., p. 354).

any passer-by (vv. 15f., 24f.), but also in describing the worshipping of deities other than Yahweh, the worshipping of לִבְיָטָן - whatever these words might mean¹ (v. 17ff.), in describing the foreign policies of Israel, which ~~are~~^{is} in itself ambiguous (vv. 26, 28f.),² and in describing the practice of a real prostitute (vv. 32ff.). So, apart from this ambiguity, a close look at the descriptions which in some cases refer directly to the current and actual happenings, will indicate whether or not Ezekiel here is still speaking metaphorically.³ The problem of the ambiguity of לִבְיָטָן and the question of the abomination of Israel posed above are actually one thing. This thing is in fact also found in Ezek. 16:3-14,

¹A. B. Davidson translates this word to 'image of man'; and W. Zimmerli leaves it open, although he relates it to the cult objects made of costly jewels or ornamentations as is mentioned in Exod. 32:2-4, 24; 33:4-6; 35:22; Judg. 8:24-27. However, he also mentions the names of Ehrlich, Herrmann, and Fohrer, who think of a phallic image (op. cit., in loc.). To these names, however, the name of Eichrodt is to be added. Unlike all of them, G. A. Cooke thinks only of the image of Baal.

²The ambiguity of the meaning of 'adultery' in connection with Israel's foreign affairs in this passage is dealt with by O. Bissfeldt, 'Hesekiel Kap. 16 Als Geschichtsquelle', in Kleine Schriften II, Tübingen, 1963, pp. 101-106, who argued that this word means both political and religious submission to any stronger foreign nation. He says: 'Denn politische Verbindungen brachten in der Antike auch immer kultische Beziehungen mit sich ...' (p. 103). See also J. B. Taylor, op. cit., pp. 138f.; G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, (ET. by D. M. G. Stalker), Vol. II, Edinburgh, 1970, p. 229 note 16.

³W. Eichrodt, notices that Ezekiel here is abandoning his parable and 'continued in a different way' (op. cit., p. 206.)

especially in vv. 9-14. The description found in these verses is, indeed, ambiguous. It can refer directly to the real, current customs of a newly married woman, or even woman in general; yet, it is still part of the metaphor. This ambiguous explanation is without doubt also applicable to vv. 15-34. So, despite the fact that some parts of the descriptions of $\overline{\text{]]}}\overline{\text{]]}}$ here directly refer to the current realities, that passage of Ezek. 16:15-34 is, therefore, still to be regarded as part of the metaphor. And it is in this metaphorical sense that the meaning of $\overline{\text{]]}}\overline{\text{]]}}$ here is to be understood.

Now, a close look at the various, and ambiguous, descriptions of $\overline{\text{]]}}\overline{\text{]]}}$ in vv. 15-34 will reveal that behind all of them there is only one idea, namely, the unfaithfulness of a wife to her husband. And this is exactly the idea which Ezekiel wants to present here : Israel is, indeed, unfaithful to Yahweh. And if the metaphorical descriptions of this unfaithfulness could directly refer to the actual, but not necessary current, happenings, this would be a great help to understanding that the case presented by Ezekiel is not without basis.¹ In other words, the prophet knows exactly

¹For the historical references of each of the descriptions of the adultery here, see, O. Bissfeldt, op. cit.; W. Zimmerli, op. cit., in loc.; W. Eichrodt, op. cit., G. A. Cooke, op. cit., in loc.; J. B. Taylor, op. cit., in loc..

what he is saying.

The picturing of unfaithful Israel as an adulterous wife is by no means Ezekiel's invention. Already Jeremiah (Jer. 3:1, 20; 4:30) and Hosea have used it (Hos. 2).¹ But the difference is that Ezekiel has elaborated and elevated, or even exaggerated, the picture to such an extent that the adulterous character of Israel becomes unique. This uniqueness can be seen not only in the clarity of the reason why Israel becomes so adulterous (v. 15a), but also in her lewdness to accept any passer-by (vv. 15b, 25), and in her insatiability with the foreign lovers (vv. 26, 28f.), and, moreover, in her being prepared to pay rather than to be paid (vv. 31b-34).² Besides, and unlike in chapter 20, here Ezekiel regards the adulterous deeds of Israel as not taking place at the beginning of her history when she was a child or a baby, but at the time when Israel has achieved the peak of her glory.

¹For this, see, e.g., J. W. Miller, op. cit., especially pp. 111f..

²It is true that in Isa. 1:21 Jerusalem is also personified as an adulteress or harlot (זִנְיָוָה). But the fact that (a) Isaiah does not relate this personification with the idea of Jerusalem's being a wife, and (b) the word זִנְיָוָה is used as an opposite of the word אִשָּׁה, makes it clear that the degree of Isaiah's personification is milder than that of Ezekiel. It would of course be a mistake to deny the traditio-historical relationship between Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel in this particular case, but it would also be a mistake not to recognize that Ezekiel has elaborated the metaphor of the woman Jerusalem to its climax.

For Isa. 1:21, see, e.g., H. Wildberger, Jesaja, (B.K. X/1), Neukirchen, 1972, pp. 59f..

Verses 35-43.

In this passage, the judgement for the adulterous Israel is announced. First of all, it is interesting to find that this passage can, in itself, be regarded as a self-contained unit of a prophetic speech. There is a messenger formula (v. 36a α i), followed by diatribe or indication of the situation (v. 36a α ib), which is in turn followed successively by the announcement of judgement (vv. 37-41a), the concluding motive (vv. 41b-43a), and finally by $\pi(\pi^{\circ} \cup \times]$.¹ But, as has been pointed out earlier, this passage actually belongs to the preceding ones, i.e., vv. 3-14 and vv. 15-34, and in itself announces the judgement suitable for the accusations launched there. This is confirmed by the fact that the diatribe found here is in fact more than just catching words which could easily be regarded as connecting this unit with the previous ones; it is, in fact, the repetition of the accusation in vv. 15-34.² And as far as a repetition of this kind is concerned, it has also been pointed out earlier that it is one of the reasons which have made the metaphor lengthy and detailed.³ Therefore, despite the possibility of regarding vv. 35-43a as a

¹See, supra, p.226 and note 1 .

²Compare v. 36 with vv. 15-18, 20-22, 25.

³See, supra, pp.226f. The repetitions, either only of the style or of phraseology, is also found in chapter 20, which are generally regarded as one of Ezekiel's characteristics.

separate unit, it is better to look upon it as the concluding part of the whole metaphor. And in this context it is interesting to find that the picture of the adulterous woman presented in vv. 15-34 is clearly continued here.

Now, a close look at the judgement announced in this passage will reveal that, like the descriptions of guilt in vv. 15-34, its description here is lengthy and very detailed. Repetitions also occur, e.g., the gathering of the woman's lovers is found in v. 37a and in v. 37b, the uncovering of the woman's nakedness is found in v. 37b and in v. 39b. It is perhaps partly because of these repetitions that W. Zimmerli argues that there are actually two phrases of punishment here. The first is the punishment carried out by the individual lover (v. 39), and the second is that which is carried out by the host (לְהַק, v. 40). The first punishment will be so executed that the woman will be left alive but 'naked and bare' (v. 39) as she was before (vv. 3-8), while the second will be carried out according to the punishment of adulterous woman, which ends with the woman's death (v. 40a; cf. Deut. 22:21-24; Gen. 38:15ff.; Ezek. 23:47). Although the executors of both punishments are different one from the other, i.e., the first by the individual lovers and the second by the לְהַק, these two punishments, so W. Zimmerli goes on, are described, or rather, interpreted theologically in vv. 36-38 as the punishments of Yahweh himself.¹

¹W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 360, and the reference there; cf. R. de Vaux, op. cit., pp. 36f..

Whatever the details of the punishments might be, there are at least two things which can be noted of them. First, like in chapter 20, it is clear that the punishment is inevitable. Israel will be punished. On the basis of the date of this passage, which is generally agreed to be the years before the fall of the city of Jerusalem in 587/6 B.C.,¹ it seems obvious that the main objective of this punishment is the fall of Jerusalem itself. In the light of this objective, the two kinds of punishments above can be explained easily. The first punishment will be so carried out that Jerusalem, as a city in the literal sense of the word, will be stripped so that all her beauty and glories will be finished. She will be left 'naked and bare' at the place where she is and was, i.e., on the open field, $\pi\tau\omega\tau$ בְּיָד (cf. 5b). While the second punishment will be so carried out that Jerusalem's significance as both the political and religious identity and the centre of the people Israel will be finished too. The kingdom of Israel and the religious community of its people will be destroyed, so that from then on there will be no identification for their existence (cf. Ezek. 7 and the situation of Israel pictured with dry bones in Ezek. 37:lff.). So, both of the punishments actually mean one thing, i.e., the total punishment of the people

¹See, e.g., G. Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament, (ET. by David E. Green), Nashville - New York, 1968, p. 408; G. A. Cooke, op. cit., p. 159.

Israel. Second, this interpretation of the punishment is strengthened by the fact that in this chapter Ezekiel does not give any hint at all at the idea of exile or of remnant.

The ^{absence}~~mission~~ of these two ideas in the whole chapter 16 is very astonishing. In the whole Book of Ezekiel one will not fail to find that both of these ideas are outstanding. In fact the chapters which contain the details of punishment appropriate for the accusations in chapter 16 clearly announce either one or both of these ideas. The punishment announced in 6:1-7 is followed by the statement that Yahweh will 'leave some of you (i.e., Israel) alive', which is immediately related to the idea of exile (v.8f.). And the punishment announced in chapter 7, which announces the absolute 'end' to the land of Israel, which is parallel to the capital punishment in 16:35-43, is also coupled with a hint at a possible idea of remnant, although it is not related to the idea of exile (Ezek. 7:16). ofh

Whatever may be the differences of 16:35-43 from other passages of similar concern, it is clear that this passage is unique in that it contains a metaphor which speaks only about a woman, who is the personification of the whole people Israel. It is due to this uniqueness, and nothing else, that the punishment of the personified Israel cannot be analysed into

detail. If the woman is dead, then, everything about her is finished.¹

¹It is possible, however, to use the argumentum e silentio to suppose that here the ideas of both the remnant and the exile were in the mind of Ezekiel. And the fact that vv. 41b-43a can be looked upon as part of an embryonic salvation oracle (Heilsaussage), perhaps justifies this hypothesis. For the accusation, 'Because you have not remembered the days of your youth' (v. 43a; cf. v. 22a), see, S. J. de Vries, 'Remembrance in Ezekeil', in Interpretation 16, 1952, pp. 58f.; B. S. Childs, Memory and Tradition in Israel, (Studies in Biblical Theology 37), London, 1962, pp. 46ff..

Conclusion.

1. Despite the fact that it is impossible to isolate Ezek. 16: 1-43 from the rest of the chapter, the present examination of Ezekiel's treatment of Israel's past history confines itself to this particular section. The examination carried out above shows that this section deals with Israel's past history in a unique way. Form-critically the section reminds one of the procedure of the judgement in the priestly court, in which the guilt of the whole Israelite people is revealed (vv. 3-34) after which the judgement or the punishment is announced (vv. 35-43). All of this is told in a metaphor in which Israel is addressed as a woman, represented by the personification of Jerusalem. The metaphor itself is unique in that it is not confined to a part of the woman's life, but looks like a curriculum vitae which described the whole life of the woman beginning with her birth day until well after she got married.

The uniqueness of Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history can also be seen in that in this metaphor he does not begin his description about Israel by referring to her being Yahweh's chosen people. Instead, and in a humiliating way, he begins by describing Israel as an unwanted baby-girl of non-Israelite parents, who soon afterward becomes Yahweh's foundling child.

2. Historico-critical examination shows that the significance of Jerusalem for the people of Israel did not emerge until she was taken over from the Canaanites by David. Since that event, and

with the building of the Temple and the installation of the Ark of God in it, Jerusalem can be called the identification of the people Israel. It is due to this fact that in this passage Ezekiel is, traditio-historically, to be regarded as standing in the David-Jerusalem, or the David-Zion, tradition, which was fostered primarily in Jerusalem/Judah. And this is also the reason why his recital of Israel's past history is different from the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions. According to this passage Israel was born, grew up, and became the people of God in the land of the Canaanites. Besides, and apart from her dark pre-history, beginning with her birth onwards, Israel's past history is in fact inseparable from the saving history of Yahweh. In this case, there is presumably a significant parallelism between the David-Zion tradition and the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions.

3. Apart from the exclusive use of the David-Zion tradition, however, the picturing of Israel as an unfaithful wife by Ezekiel is by no means unique. Jeremiah and Hosea have already employed this picture. But due to the fact that Jeremiah was Ezekiel's contemporary, it is better to hold the view that, traditio--historically, both Ezekiel and Jeremiah are deriving the picture from Hosea. Consequently, it is at this point that in this passage Ezekiel shows his acquaintance with the tradition from Northern Israel. Returning to Ezekiel's treatment of Israel's past history, it is very interesting to find that in the course of Israel's curriculum vitae this passage shows quite clearly that Israel does not begin her abominable deeds until she is at the peak

of her glory. One will not fail to see that this view is, indeed, in an absolute contrast to the view in chapter 20.

4. The announcement of the judgement for this adulterous woman is also presented in a metaphorical way. Apart from the ambiguity of the meaning of the word ירושלם , the woman will be punished according to Israelite law of adulterous woman. However, vv. 35-43 seems to present two kinds of punishment, i.e., one in v. 39 and another in vv. 40-41a. The study presented above has shown that these two punishments are actually one thing. Their different appearances are in fact due to the possibility to interpret 'Jerusalem' both literally, i.e., the city, and metaphorically, i.e., the woman Israel. And it is due to the metaphorical character of the passage that the woman will be punished with a capital punishment, which means that Israel's identification will be finished.

Despite the fact that the question of the detailed historical references of what is metaphorically said here cannot be pressed too far, yet it seems acceptable to say that this punishment means nothing else but that Jerusalem is to fall. And with it is also Israel.

CHAPTER V

EZEKIEL 23

By a quick and general look at the chapter as it now stands, one will find that, as in Ezek. 16 and 20, the redactional unity of Ezek. 23 is undeniable. In a very systematic way the chapter deals with both kingdoms of Israel, which are metaphorically personified as two sisters of one mother. This systematic way can easily, and clearly, be seen in the facts that : vv. 2-4 deal very concisely with both sisters together; vv. 5-35 deal with them individually, i.e., first the elder sister (vv. 5-10), then the younger (vv. 11-35); and finally in vv. 36-49 both sisters are once again dealt with together. This general impression of the systematic structure of the chapter is so strong that it would certainly be a mistake to regard it as a false or misleading impression. However, a close and careful look at the chapter will show that that systematic structure is not without problems. These problems can be seen not only in the facts that some parts of the text of the chapter, especially in vv. 42ff., are very cryptic, and that vv. 13, 18 with their 1st. pers. sing. inflexions seem to have disturbed the evenness of the speech in the chapter, but also from the facts that (a) v. 21, being direct address, does not seem to have belonged to what precedes, and (b) the introductory formula in v. 36 (וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי) is different from the characteristic introductory formula of Ezekiel (וַיְהִי דְבַר יְהוָה אֵלַי e.g., in v. 1; 22:1; etc.).

These unevennesses have actually been dealt with by scholars in their analyses of the chapter; and, naturally, their opinions are varied. Some prefer to leave the disturbing verses out while others prefer to regard them as secondary, or additional, or extensional, or even authentic. Indeed, their opinions vary so much, ranging from the most radical to the most modest, that one must be very careful in trying to look at the chapter afresh. In this connection, and whatever the most acceptable opinion regarding the above mentioned facts of the chapter might be, it is necessary to have a look briefly at what scholars have said about the structure of the chapter.

Hölscher,¹ whose thesis of 'der "Dichter" Ez' is well known,² has radically scrutinized this chapter. As a result, he left some 16 verses, all within vv. 1-27, as the original part of the chapter. He believes that these 16 original verses are originally in a poetic form.³ He is also of the opinion that vv. 28-30 are

¹G. Hölscher, Hesekiel. Der Dichter und das Buch, (B.Z.A.W. 39), 1924, pp. 120ff..

²W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, (B.K. XIII/1), Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969, p. 342.

³Hölscher says : 'In Kap 23 folgt wieder ein hesekielisches Gedicht, auch diese, wie gewöhnlich, stark überarbeitet. Die Ausscheidung des ursprünglichen Bestandes ist natürlich nur mit relativer Sicherheit möglich. Aber die rhythmische Struktur des ursprünglichen Textes ist unverkennbar' (op. cit., p. 120). See also his reconstruction of what he regards as the original poem, op. cit., pp. 120-122.

a 'Nachtrag' added to the original part of the chapter; and that the poem in vv. 32-34 has nothing at all to do with the original poem of Ezekiel; and that vv. 36-49 are 'eine weitere Anhang'.¹ Going along a line more or less similar to that of Hölischer, Fohrer believes that apart from a few parts of the verses in it the authentic part of the chapter is also to be found in vv. 1-27;² and that this authentic part, which is introduced by a prose formula in v. 1, is a poem consisting of 15 strophes with 7 short lines each.³ Fohrer also believes that, following this authentic part, there are three 'Nachträge Hesekiels', i.e., vv. 28-30, 31-34, and 35, which 'zeitlich nach dem vorangehenden Stück entstanden sind';⁴ and that these 'Nachträge Hesekiels' are also in poetic form.⁵ Following Hölischer again, Fohrer regards vv. 36-49 as unauthentic.⁶ He is of

¹G. Hölischer, op. cit., pp. 123ff.

²G. Fohrer, Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel, (B.Z.A.W. 72), 1952, p. 85 and note 86 there. Fohrer regards vv. 4b, 9b, and 20-21 as 'Zusätze'.

³G. Fohrer - K. Gallig, Ezechiel, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 13), Tübingen, 1955, p. 130.

⁴G. Fohrer, Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel, (B.Z.A.W. 72), Berlin, 1952, p. 85. He regarded v. 28 and part of v. 35 as prosaic introductions, Cf., G. Fohrer - K. Gallig, op. cit., p. 130.

⁵G. Fohrer - K. Gallig, op. cit., p. 130.

⁶G. Fohrer, Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel, pp. 75f., 99. He says that vv. 36-49 'dürfte mit grosser Wahrscheinlichkeit als unecht zu bezeichnen sein' (p. 75). In other place he continues: 'Das Wort (cf. vv. 36-49) stammt nicht von Ez, aber sein Verfasser hat sich eng an 16:1ff.; 23:1ff. angelehnt' (G. Fohrer - K. Gallig, op. cit., p. 136). See, also, G. Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament, (ET. by David Green), London, 1970, p. 410, in which he includes vv. 36-49 in his list of the later passages in the Book of Ezekiel.

the opinion that these verses, i.e., vv. 36-39, are a poem consisting of 6 strophes with 7 short lines each.¹

In distinction from both Hölscher and Fohrer, Hermann, concerning Ezek. 23, says that 'die literarische Einheit reicht zunächst von (vv.) 2-35' and that 'eine Weiterführung des Themas ist (vv.) 36ff. angeschlossen'.² However, although the problem of authenticity and unauthenticity does not seem to have come into Hermann's concern, what is interesting in view of Ezek. 23 is his opinion that vv. 28-30 'scheint eine Art Variante zu (vv.) 22-27 zu sein', and that 'bereits mit (v.) 27 war sachlich der Abschluss erreicht, dem Anfang des Stückes (i.e., vv. 11ff.) entsprechen';³ and that vv. 36-49 came from a later time than the previous verses.⁴ Slightly in distinction from Hermann, Bertholet is of the opinion that vv. 36-49 is a 'Nachtrag' which has come from the hand of a redactor.⁵ In this respect it seems obvious that for Bertholet these verses are later than the preceding ones, similarly v. 35, which he regards as 'ein sekundärer Nachtrag'.⁶ Further, Bertholet

¹G. Fohrer - K. Galling, op. cit., p. 130.

²J. Hermann, Ezechiel, (K.A.T. XI), Leipzig, Erlangen, 1924, p. 144.

³J. Hermann, ibid., p. 146; in the brackets are mine.

⁴Cf., ibid., pp. 146f..

⁵A. Bertholet - K. Galling, Ezechiel (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 13), Tübingen, 1936, p. 85.

⁶Ibid., p. 81.

says that vv. 31-34 is 'in sich geschlossen' and that vv. 1-30 'nicht aus einem Gussen sind'.¹ It is on vv. 1-30 that Bertholet's opinion is very close to that of Hermann. Rejecting Hölischer's attempt to reconstruct the original poem out of this section Bertholet says that 'vielleicht aber vermag gerade hier die Beobachtung tatsächlicher Dubletten und Parallelen (cf. besonders 22ff. mit 28f.) etwas weiter zu führen bis zur Erkenntnis, dass es sich hier im ganzen um eine Zusammenarbeit zweier in sich geschlossener Relationen handeln dürfte'.² Despite the fact that Bertholet does not seem to have developed what he says here, his translation of Ezek. 23 shows which verses are the doublets and which are the parallels.³

At this stage, however, there is one thing concerning Ezek. 23 which seems to have gained acceptance by the scholars. This is the fact that vv. 36-49 has been regarded by all of them as a section which is in some sense distinct from the rest of the chapter. Of course this acceptance does not mean that the section has not problems of its own. The fact that the delimitation in this chapter could not, and may not, always mean a literary separation, makes this section still deserve great attention in the context of chapter 23. G. A. Cooke, for instance, regards this section

¹Ibid...

²Ibid.., pp. 82f..

³These doublets and parallels can be seen within vv. 3-10, 11-20, and 22-30. See, A. Bertholet - K. Calling, Ezechiel, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 13), Tübingen, 1936, pp. 80, 82.

as 'a new address' which 'was added as an appendix to vv. 1-35, (and) perhaps by Ezekiel himself'.¹ While Eichrodt regards it as the result of some Ezekiel's disciples' work, who 'den Meister nur sehr unvollkommen nachahmt'.² To these two opinions should be added that of Wevers who says that this section is 'a later expansion to verses 1-35' and that its secondary character can clearly be seen 'from the fact that the two sisters are described, judged, and sentenced together in contrast to verses 1-27'.³ In distinction from all that has been noted above, and it is the only opinion of its kind which has come into notice in the present study, is the opinion of Davidson. Concerning this section Davidson says that 'the passage is not a continuation of vv. 1-35, but an independent description' which is parallel to it.⁴ Indeed, this remark of Davidson is very surprising, not only because it has gone further

¹G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1936 (reprinted 1967), p. 256. Cooke also warns that 'we need not be so positive as Hölischer that Ez. has nothing to do with the section vv. 28-35, or accept the view that vv. 36-49 were dictated by the criminal procedure of later Judaism' (p. 248).

²W. Eichrodt, Der Prophet Ezechiel, (A.T.D. 22), Göttingen, 1959-1966, p. 222. (ET. by Cosslett Quin, London, 1970, p. 332).

³J. Wevers, Ezekiel, (The Century Bible - New Series), London, 1969, p. 186.

⁴A. B. Davidson, Ezekiel, (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges), revised by A. W. Streane, Cambridge, 1916, p. 186.

than just showing the delimitation of the section, but also reminds one of the theory of Kraetzschmar. Since Kraetzschmar's theory of two recensions has long been challenged, and finally discarded, by many scholars for one reason or another,¹ it is also difficult to follow what Davidson means by his remark. Besides, it is a pity that neither Davidson himself nor the reviser of his book makes any attempt to explain what is, or are, the implications of the remark.

From all that has been said above, it is clear that on the one hand the scholars are in agreement on regarding vv. 36-49 as a section within chapter 23, while on the other their opinions on the relationship of the section with the rest of the chapter are varied. However, there is another attempt to explain this relationship which, due to its method, deserves special attention. This is the attempt of Zimmerli. According to Zimmerli there are at least two facts within this section itself, which 'weisen 36-49 als sekundäres, stark von Zitaten lebendes Sonderstück aus'.² First, there is the fact that this section is introduced by

וְלֵאמֹר אֵלֶּיךָ יְהוָה וְאָמַרְתָּ אֵלֶּיךָ יְהוָה, i.e., by words and a form of expression which are unusual in the Book of Ezekiel.³ Second, from the point

¹See supra, p. 5.

²W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, (B.K. XIII/1), Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969, p. 537.

³In the Book of Ezekiel these words and form of expression occur again only in 9:4 with וְלֵאמֹר instead of וְאָמַרְתָּ אֵלֶּיךָ יְהוָה; while וְאָמַרְתָּ אֵלֶּיךָ יְהוָה occurs twice, i.e., in 44:2, 5; and וְלֵאמֹר אֵלֶּיךָ יְהוָה occurs only once, i.e. in 4:13. For the explanation of the unusual form of וְלֵאמֹר אֵלֶּיךָ יְהוָה, see, W. Zimmerli, ibid., ad loc..

of view of the content and the linguistic usage of the section, it is clear that this section depends on Ezek. 16 rather than on the rest of chapter 23.¹ About these two facts, it must be said that the second has long been noticed by scholars,² although they did not come to the conclusion that the relation between 23:36-49 and chapter 16 can be understood as the dependence of the former on the latter, or that the dependency could overrule the relationship of the former to the rest of chapter 23. Besides, it has been said earlier that in chapter 16 itself the problem of the secondary and/or primary part(s) of the chapter cannot easily be solved. Therefore it is also difficult to hold the view which says that any dependency of part(s) of chapter 23 on chapter 16 could mean that within the context of chapter 23 this part is secondary. And if one looks back at the variations of the opinions of scholars recorded earlier, one might say that the main reason for that variation is the lack of the definition of what is primary and what is secondary. Nevertheless, it seems clear that in drawing his conclusion Zimmerli does not stand solely on this lack of definition. The first fact within the chapter under consideration which he pointed out above is really strong and decisive for the solution of the problem. Further, despite the similarity of the form (and

¹W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, (B.K. XIII/1), Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969, pp. 537, 552ff..

²See the explanations of the individual verses of this section, in, e.g., G. A. Cooke, op. cit., pp. 256ff.; G. Hölscher, op. cit., p. 124 and notes 2ff.; G. Fohrer - K. Galling, op. cit., pp. 136ff.; R. Smend, Der Prophet Ezechiel, (Kurz. H.A.T. 8. Lief.), Leipzig, 1880, pp. 165ff..

content?) of the words in v. 36 and those of 20:4 and 22:2, there is another fact which also strengthens Zimmerli's conclusion. This is the fact that the 3rd. pers. fem. pl. pronoun seems to have dominated the whole speech which follows the word of command in v. 36.¹ As a matter of fact, this pronoun of 3rd. pers. fem. pl. does not at all dominate the speech in 20:5ff. or in 22:3ff.; and nor does it in the rest of ch. 23.

Having said all this, there are still two other things about this section which are worth noting. First, from the point of view of the prophetic traditions,² it is actually difficult to regard this section as either secondary or primary. As far as Ezekiel's characteristics are concerned, this difficulty comes into view not only because the metaphor of the previous part of the chapter is still continued in this section,³ but also because (a) this section is concluded with an 'Erkenntnispruchsformel' $\overline{\text{וְיָדַעְתֶּם (אֲנִי) יְיָ כִּי אֲנִי יְיָ}}$ which is characteristic in the Book of Ezekiel,⁴ and (b) the vocabulary of this section strongly reminds one of the priestly language, which Ezekiel must have been

¹Cf., W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 553.

²See, supra, pp. 38ff.

³The names Oholah and Oholibah in vv. 36, 44 could not have come from other source except that which precedes this section. Cooke says that in vv. 36-49 the allegory (sic!) of vv. 1-35 is still kept up (op. cit., p. 248).

⁴See, W. Zimmerli, op. cit., pp. 55*ff.; also his 'Erkenntnis Gottes nach dem Buche Ezechiel', in his Gottes Offenbarung, (T.B. 19), München, 1965, especially pp. 42-54.

quite familiar with.¹ The latter can be seen from the fact that the list of the sins of Oholah and Oholibah in this section points heavily to religious sins (e.g., vv. 37-39) rather than to political ones. Although this fact does not mean that the priestly language should be regarded as exclusively containing religious matters, but it means that in this section the dominating point of view is religious rather than other things. And in this religious context it is now clear why these two women are dealt with together. Granting that Oholah and Oholibah are the metaphorical names of Northern Israel and Southern Israel respectively,² in religious problems there was only one Israel in the mind of Ezekiel.³ The second thing about this section is the fact that the list of the sins of both Oholah and Oholibah does not only present the reason why they should be punished (vv. 45ff.),⁴ but also refers to the history of their lives. Although it is not clear when and where that history began, it is clear that it is full of religious sins. This sinful history is expressed by using words which, as is pointed out by Zimmerli,⁵ mostly resemble the words used in

¹See, supra, pp. 39, 70ff..

²See, infra, pp. 334ff..

³Cf., W. Zimmerli, 'Israel im Buche Ezechiel', V.T. 8, 1958, pp. 75-90. See also the discussion on Ezek. 16 presented earlier.

⁴Reading $\{\eta\pi\alpha\lambda\}$ instead of $\square\eta\pi\alpha\lambda$ in v. 45a α , with Cooke and Zimmerli.

⁵See, supra, pp. 285f..

chapter 16. The word ׀X1, which is found again elsewhere in the Book of Ezekiel only in 16:32 (Pi'ēl, ptc. fem. sing.) and 16:38 (Qal, ptc. fem. plur.), is found in this section in v. 37 (twice, Pi'ēl, pf. 3 fem. plur.), v. 43 (as subst. m. plur.) and v. 45 (twice, Qal, ptc. fem. plur.).¹ And the ideas of worshipping idols and of child sacrifice (vv. 37, 39), the decking of oneself to please other men than the lawful husband (v. 40), the preparing of the table for gods other than Yahweh (v. 41), and the punishing of these adulterous women with 'the punishment of adulteresses and the punishment of bloodshedders' (v. 45) are ideas similar to that found in chapter 16, especially vv. 15-21, 38. The similarities between this section and chapter 16 are actually more than what has been noted above. But, as far as the past history of Israel is concerned, there is one important thing which is found in Ezek. 23:36-49 but not in Ezek. 16, i.e., the mentioning of the defilement of Yahweh's sanctuary and the profanation of his sabbaths (23:38, 39aβ).

Now, as far as the mentioning of the profanation of Yahweh's sabbaths is concerned, it is unlikely that anything new can be said here, because its phraseology has already been dealt with earlier, i.e., in connection with its occurrence in the stereotyped speech in Ezek. 20. However, what is seemingly special in the section under consideration is the mentioning of the defilement of

¹See, S. Mandelkern, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae, Akademische Druck-u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, 1955.

Yahweh's sanctuary : $\text{בְּשַׁדְּרַיִם אֱלֹהִים}$ in y. 38b α . And, what is interesting in this expression is the fact that the verb אָנַח with שַׁדְּרַיִם as its accusative object is only found twice in the Book of Ezekiel, i.e., in 5:11 and in the verse under consideration here (23:38). Of course the verb אָנַח could have some connotations and synonyms, and perhaps this is proved by the fact that, e.g., in y. 39a the verb שָׁנַן is used instead of the verb אָנַח .¹

But, in the context of the problems of the whole section, what is involved in this unusual phrase is the question of whether or not it bears any basic significance at all so that the whole section could be regarded as offering something other than that offered by chapter 16 and 20.

This question can be answered in two ways. First, by comparing the phrase in 23:38b α with that in 5:11. Disregarding the differences in the order of the words and the person of the verb אָנַח in both passages, there is another difference which is decisive in determining the significance of the phrase. In Ezek. 5:11 the phrase clearly constitutes a very important part in the form of the prophetic speech found there. It is the diatribe without which the speech could not have been completed. The

¹ Similar case can be seen in Lev. 20:3 in which שַׁדְּרַיִם is used as the accusative object of the verb אָנַח , while in Lev. 21:12, 23 the verb שָׁנַן is used instead of the verb אָנַח . The connection between the Book of Ezekiel and Leviticus has been noted by scholars, e.g., Cooke, Zimmerli.

diatribe is preceded by $\{ \text{ש} \}$ and, more significantly, a 'Schwurrede' $\text{היה}^{\text{ש}} (\text{ש} \text{ה} \text{א}) \text{א} \text{ה}^{\text{ש}}$, which are in turn preceded by $\{ \text{ב} \}$. The use of $\{ \text{ב} \} - \{ \text{ש} \}$ is very frequent in the prophetic speech,¹ especially in the prophecy of disaster. Therefore, as far as $\{ \text{ב} \} - \{ \text{ש} \}$ is concerned, it is impossible to include it in the characteristics of Ezekiel. However, the position is different with the 'Schwurrede' $\text{היה}^{\text{ש}} (\text{ש} \text{ה} \text{א}) \text{א} \text{ה}^{\text{ש}}$. This form of speech is one of the characteristics of Ezekiel and occurs not less than 16 times in the Book which bears his name.² Now, the question which immediately arises in this connection is whether or not the appearance of $\text{א} \text{ה}^{\text{ש}} \text{ש} \text{ה} \text{א} - \text{ה} \text{ה}^{\text{ש}}$ in 5:11 can be regarded as basically from Ezekiel himself. It is surprising to find that Zimmerli's answer to this question is negative. He regards Ezek. 5:11-13 as one of the interpretational additions which were given by Ezekiel's disciples.³

As far as the characteristics of Ezekiel are concerned, it is clear that the $\text{א} \text{ה}^{\text{ש}} \text{ש} \text{ה} \text{א} - \text{ה} \text{ה}^{\text{ש}}$ in 23:38b α is not used in such form as that of 5:11, although its role as part of the diatribe in the speech cannot be denied. So, if this phrase $\text{א} \text{ה}^{\text{ש}} \text{ש} \text{ה} \text{א} - \text{ה} \text{ה}^{\text{ש}}$, which is used with a form of speech

¹K. Koch, The Growth of the Biblical Tradition, (ET. by S. M. Cupitt), London, 1969, pp. 210ff. and note 8 on p. 212.

²W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, (B.K. XIII/1), p. 135.

³Ibid., pp. 100f., 135.

characteristic of Ezekiel, could not basically be from Ezekiel himself, how much more is this true of the similar phrase found in 23:38b which is used otherwise! Second, this suspicion that the phrase $\text{ׁוּתְקַן־בַּיָּדָיִם}$ in 23:38b α could not have had a basic significance in the context of whole chapter is strengthened by the fact that the word ׁוּתְקַן is not frequently used in Ezek. 1-24. In the Book of Ezekiel this word occurs not less than 30 times, which is the biggest number compared with those found in other books of the Old Testament.¹ This number is distributed as follows: 8 times in Ezek. 1-24, 4 times in Ezek. 25-39, and 18 times in Ezek. 40-48.² By looking at this distribution, it seems possible to say that the word ׁוּתְקַן must have its significant role in chapters 40-48 rather than in other parts of the Book of Ezekiel.³

With these two answers it seems now clear that the phrase

$\text{ׁוּתְקַן־בַּיָּדָיִם}$ in 23:38b α , which is unique in the sense that it only occurs again in 5:11 in this whole book, cannot be regarded as bearing a basic role in the context of chapter 23. So

¹In the Old Testament this word occurs not less than 75 times. The greatest distribution is found in the Books of Ezekiel and Leviticus. See, S. Mandelkern, op. cit., p. 1016.

²They are 5:11; 8:6; 9:6; 11:16; 21:7; 23:38, 39; 24:21; 25:3; 28:18 (of Tyre); 37:26, 28; 43:21; 44:1, 5, 7-9, 11, 15f.; 45:3, 4, 4, 18; 47:12 and 48:8, 10, 21.

³It is unlikely that the meaning of this word can be interpreted as Temple per se as is implied in the use of the word ׁוּתְקַן in v. 39b. The word ׁוּתְקַן in 48:21 is in the absolute state, therefore it is different from that in 23:39b. While in 9:6 the word ׁוּתְקַן seems to have been only part of the meaning of the word ׁוּתְקַן .

despite the fact that this phrase and the whole section do give hints about the past history of Israel, i.e., of Oholah and Oholibah together, it is unlikely that the basic treatment of this history in chapter 23 can be found in this section. Therefore, it is now time to turn to the other parts of the chapter, i.e., to vv. 1-35.

From the opinions of the scholars briefly recorded earlier,¹ it can also be gathered that the majority of them seem to have agreed on dividing Ezek. 23:1-35 into sections. The division which is so far alleged by most of those scholars is as follows: first section vv. 1-27, second section vv. 28-30, third section vv. 31--34, and finally fourth section v. 35. Although this division cannot be regarded as absolute in the sense that it might lead into a conclusion that one section can be isolated from the other, nevertheless it seems acceptable. Indeed, the reasons and the explanations of this division have been varied as ranging from the

¹See, supra, pp. 280ff..

most radical to the most modest.¹ The radical reason and explanation prefers to regard some verses as original and retain them, and leave out those which are not original, while the most modest prefers either not to involve itself with this problem or to be silent about it. Whichever attitude is better, it is interesting to find that each of those sections is introduced by a form of prophetic speech familiar in Ezekiel. The first section is introduced by וַיְהִי דְבַר-יְהוָה אֵלַי לֵאמֹר, a form of prophetic speech characteristic of Ezekiel, while the other three are

¹Hölscher would like to accept only some verses of the first section, i.e., within vv. 1-27, as original and to leave out the rest of it, and the rest of the chapter. According to him the non--original parts of the chapter are either the result of the working over of the original verses or later additions. Cf. Hölscher, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-123. Slightly different from Hölscher, Fohrer_x says that '23:1-27 ist unumstritten echt'. But Fohrer continues, saying that 'in 23:28-30, 31-34, 35 schliessen sich drei Nachträge Ezechiels an ... die zeitlich nach dem vorangehenden Stück entstanden sind' (G. Fohrer, *Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel*, B.Z.A.W. 72, Berlin, 1952, p. 85).

Bertholet's opinion is modest. Despite his saying that 'wiederum ist das Bild des Bechers 31-34 in sich geschlossen, während 35 für sich steht, ein sekundär Nachtrag', he is of the opinion that in vv. 1-30 'vielleicht aber vermag gerade hier die Beobachtung tatsächlicher Dubletten und Parallelen (cf. besonders 22ff. mit 28ff.) etwas weiter zu führen bis zur Erkenntnis, dass es sich im ganzen um eine Zusammenarbeit zweier in sich geschlossen Relationen dürfte' (A. Bertholet - K. Galling, *op. cit.*, pp. 81, 83). Cooke's opinion is also modest. He says that vv. 28-31, 32-34, and 35, are three paragraphs which give further description of the punishment contained in vv. 24b, 25, 27 (G. A. Cooke, *op. cit.*, p. 248). To these two last names can probably be added the names of Eichrodt, Zimmerli, and Wevers.

Further, the most modest opinion is represented by scholars, e.g., A. B. Davidson, who seems not to have seen any problem at all in accepting the whole chapter. He divides the chapter into four divisions, i.e., vv. 1-10; vv. 11-21; vv. 22-35; and vv. 39--49 (A. B. Davidson, *op. cit.*, p. 180). Equally very modest is the opinion of J. B. Taylor. See J. B. Taylor, *Ezekiel*, (The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries), London, 1969 (reprinted 1971), pp. 170f..

introduced by a similar form of prophetic speech, but slightly different from that of the first, i.e., כִּי־כֹה אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה. The only major difference in the use of this introductory speech is found in the third section in that it does not seem to have really introduced the section. Besides, the third section is different from the others in that it ends with a concluding formula אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲדָמָה in v. 34.

With these two facts, indeed, the identity of vv. 31-34 as a section inherent in the whole chapter is shaken. This is mainly because the existence of these forms of prophetic speech could set vv. 32-34 as an independent unit apart from what precedes and what follows,¹ and that by this fact the weight of v. 31 could easily be reduced to a mere connecting verse which connects the unit with what precedes it. This, however, does not mean that it is now possible to leave this section or to attribute some pejorative labels to it. This is so, despite the fact that the text of this section, i.e., vv. 32-34, is very difficult to render. However, as far as the treatment of Israel's past history in the passage under consideration, i.e. 23:1-35, is concerned, there is one important reason which could lead either to the leaving of this section out of the present consideration or to the retaining of it. The reason is that this section speaks about the figurative

¹Cf. K. Koch, *op. cit.*, pp. 205, 208; W. Zimmerli, *op. cit.*, pp. 537, 551f.. It is also interesting to find that BHS puts vv. 32-34 between two \mathfrak{D} 's.

cup, which, on the one hand, will be drunk by one of the sisters, while on the other, ~~it~~ belongs to the other sister. Now, in order to be able to clarify this reason, it seems helpful to have a look at the grammatical structure of the word כּוּפ 'cup' in the passage. In the passage as it now stands the word כּוּפ occurs three times : vv. 32a α , 33b α , and 34a β ; all are in the same grammatical structure, i.e., in the construct state. As far as כּוּפ in the construct state is concerned, its figurative meaning is also found in Pss. 11:6; 16:5; and 23:5.¹ In all of these three passages of psalms it seems clear that the figurative meaning of the word כּוּפ denotes or refers to the life, or the fate, or the destiny of the person who owns the 'cup'.² In Ps. 11:6 the lives of the wicked men ($\text{כּוּפֵי הַרְשָׁעִים}$) will be threatened by wrath,³ in Ps. 23:5 the life of psalmist is overflowing full of blessing,⁴ while in Ps. 16:5 it is God himself who is the life or the destiny of the psalmist.⁵ So, from these three passages

¹In Ps. 23:5 כּוּפ could also be understood literally; see, C. A. Briggs, The Book of Psalms, Vol. I, (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1906, p. 94. For the figurative meaning of כּוּפ here, see, e.g., W. O. E. Oesterley, The Psalms, Vol. I, London, 1939, who says that the expression is 'a figurative expression ... meaning that he (i.e., the psalmist) is fully supplied with his needs' (p. 184).

²A. Weiser, The Psalms, (ET. by Herbert Hartwell), (O.T.L.), London, 1962, pp. 157, 175; W. O. E. Oesterley, op. cit., pp. 148, 156f., 184.

³Cf. A. F. Kirkpatrick, The Book of Psalms, (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges), Cambridge, 1933, p. 60.

⁴Cf. J. H. Eaton, Psalms, (The Torch Bible Commentaries), London, 1967, p. 78.

⁵W. O. E. Oesterley, op. cit., pp. 156f.; cf. J. H. Eaton, op. cit., p. 59. For the mentioning of the 'cup' in Jer. 25:15f., see, e.g., H. Cunliffe-Jones, Jeremiah, (The Torch Bible Commentaries), London, 1960, p. 170.

it can be inferred that כוס ('cup') in its figurative meaning could refer to man's life as either full of blessing or full of wrath. Between these two references, the one which denotes the life full of wrath is relevant to Ezek. 23:32-34. This is clear from the apposition of the word כוס with the nouns שמה ושמחה in y. 33b^a,¹ which means that the content of the 'cup'² is something (i.e., שמה ושמחה) closer to the idea of wrath rather than to the idea of blessing.³ In the sequel, the idea of wrath brings the question of whether or not the figurative meaning of

כוס could be related to the idea of God's judgement. The answer to this question is positive. The explanation of this positive answer is as follows: If the Sitz im Leben of the figurative cup is one of the cultic feasts in which the cultic meal was served, and in which the "'festival cup" of Yahweh' was passed around,⁴ it is not difficult to understand why in Ps. 75:9 the psalmist could talk about the cup which is in the hand of the Lord. Moreover, in Ps. 75:7-9 it is clear that the judgement of God, which he will execute, is spoken of by using the figurative

¹ Despite the opinions of some scholars that the word שמה in y. 33b is later addition; cf. Zimmerli, Cook, BHS (crit. app.).

² For the meaning of such an apposition, cf. G-K para. 132 c-e.

³ See, e.g., Jer. 25:17f.; 49:12f..

⁴ Cf. A. Weiser, *op. cit.*, p. 157; W. O. E. Oesterley, *op. cit.*, pp. 148, 156f., 184. This perhaps will answer Zimmerli's remark when he tries to find the traditio-historical origin of the use of the figurative cup. He says: 'Das Bild von dem mit Rauschtrank gefüllten Becher, an dem, wer davon trinkt, zu Schwanken und Fall kommt, ist vor Ez schon bei Jeremia und Habakuk nachzuweisen. ... Jer. 25:15, 17, 28 zeigt das Bild in einem Wort aus der Zeit Jojakims in der Ausweitung auf das göttliche Völkergewicht. Nach Hab 2:16 soll כוס dem geheimnisvollen Gewaltherrscher dargereicht werden, der "seinen Nächsten" trunken gemacht hat. Keine von diesen beiden Stellen dürfte die Erstverwendung des Bildes, das in Beiden schon ganz spezifisch abgewandelt ist, belegen' (W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, ((B.K. XIII/1)), pp. 551f.).

cup which he holds on his hand :

- (7) 'For not from the west and (neither) from the east,
and not from the wilderness (comes) lifting up,
(8) But it is Yahweh (who) judges,
making one low and lifting up another,
(9) For a cup (is) in the hand of Yahweh,
full of foaming wine, (well) mixed,
and he will pour out from it a draught,
and all the wicked of earth shall drain and drink'.¹

So, reverting to the figurative D^{D} in Ezek. 23:32-34, there are two things which can be said now. First, from the text itself it is clear that the 'cup' is associated with 'horror and desolation'. In the light of Pss. 11:6; 16:5; and 23:5, it cannot be doubted that the 'cup' denotes the fate of one of the sisters, and that this fate is full of wrath and destruction. Second, in the light of Ps. 75:7-9 it is also clear that the horrible fate of that sister² is nothing else but the judgement of God. Besides, it is very interesting to find that outside the Book of Ezekiel the idea of judgement is often related to the drinking of the figurative cup. The content of this cup is more or less similar to that of the figurative cup in Ezek. 23:32-34. This can be

¹Cf., e.g., Briggs, Barnes, Kissane, who would like to regard the word D^{D} as a gloss.

²Most of the scholars are in agreement on regarding the word D^{D} here as a later addition.

found, e.g., in Jer. 25:15ff.; 49:12; Isa. 51:17; etc.. Indeed, this idea is common in the Old Testament,¹ that the appearance of the drinking of the figurative cup in Ezek. 23:32-34 could not have any other meaning : the other sister will have to receive the judgement of God too.

The text in Ezek. 23:32-34 as it now stands could give an impression that the giving of the cup from one sister to the other could mean freedom for the former and judgement for the latter. Yet if the cultic Sitz im Leben of the figurative cup is correct there is no evidence at all to support this idea. In other words, the passing around of the "'festival cup" of Yahweh' means that all who are partaking in the feast do drink from the same cup. And in the passage under consideration it is clear that there is only one cup which seems to have already been passed on to one of the sisters but will be passed on to the other. So, because it is one cup only that is passed around, the idea that the judgements on both sisters are the same is unavoidable. And it is because of this idea that v. 31 has come into existence. In other words, since the judgements conceived in the use of the figurative cup expression are the same, so the reason for that must be the same too. And this is what is said in v. 31 :

¹ See the remarks of Briggs, Barnes, Kissane, Kirkpatrick concerning Ps. 75:7-9.

'In the way of your sister you have walked,
so I will give her cup to your hand'.

Now, what is interesting here is the fact that y. 31a is the same as y. 13b :

'(There is) one way for (or, which belongs to) both of them'. Since it is said earlier that y. 13 seems to have disturbed the evenness of the speech by its being a comment on what precedes,¹ and that for this reason it can be excluded from its context, therefore it can be said that y. 31 is also liable to the same treatment. Moreover, it has been shown earlier that the idea of the sisters' similar judgement is found in vv. 36-49,² in a passage dominated by religious issues, therefore it seems justified to say that all these passages, i.e., vv. 13, 31-34, and 36-49, show themselves to have belonged to the same traditionist(s) who stressed the similarities of both wicked, abominable ways and horrible, disastrous judgements on the two sisters. With all these arguments, it is now possible to differentiate all the passages examined above from the remainder of chapter 23. Their main differences can be seen from the fact that (a) in the remainder of the chapter there are elements which show that the two sisters are not the same (e.g., in vv. 11, 14, 19), (b) the

¹ See, supra, pp. 279f.; Zimmerli even says that vv. 12-14a 'einen ausmalenden Nachtrag darstellt' (Ezechiel, ((B.K. XIII/1)), p. 545). See also, J. Wevers, op. cit., p. 181.

² See, supra, pp. 282f..

remainder of the chapter is dominated by political issues and political vocabulary, and (c) the treatment of Israel's past history is found mostly and very distinctively in the remainder of the chapter. So, it seems possible now to exclude these three passages, i.e., vv. 13, 31-34, 36-49, and some other passages which will be shown later, from the present consideration.

Looking at the remainder of the chapter, one will find that vv. 22-30 raises the first problem. It has been said earlier that this passage has two introductory formulas, i.e., at the beginning of vv. 22, 28, and two concluding sentences, i.e., vv. 27, 30.¹ Although neither of these concluding sentences is followed or accomplished by the usual concluding formula וְכֵן אָמַר as at the end of v. 34, it seems certain though that their function is to sum up what is said after their respective introductory formulas. However, before the examination of the passage is pursued, it seems wise to have a look briefly at what the scholars say about it.

It is interesting to find that Davidson does not seem to have noticed that there is a problem in the passage. So, he has no relevant comment to make. In distinction from Davidson, Cooke remarks that vv. 28-31 is 'a second threat of punishment' which is 'not quite so harsh as vv. 22-27'. Although Cooke does not

¹ Reading וְכֵן אָמַר וְכֵן אָמַר in v. 29b β as the beginning of v. 30, and וְכֵן אָמַר instead of וְכֵן אָמַר in v. 30a α . See, the crit. apps. in BH3 and BHS. in loc.

give any further explanation of his remark, it is clear that he notices that there are two threats of punishment in the passages. The mentioning of the two threats, however, has actually been noticed by commentators long before Cooke. Kraetzschmar, whose theory of two recensions is well known, says that vv. 28-30 'wiederholen nur die Gedanken von vv. 22-27' and that 'vv. 28ff. sind wohl nur eine Dubl. davon, von R(edaktor) aus der kürzen Textgestalt des Ez.-buches entnommen'.¹ Next, Fohrer regards vv. 28-30 as the first of the three 'Nachträge' in which Ezekiel 'wiederholt ... noch einmal zusammenfassend und knapp die vorher ausgesprochene Drohung',² i.e., vv. 22-27. Of course this list can still be enriched by adding to it the varied opinions of the other scholars.³ But, as far as the reason and the explanation

¹R. Kraetzschmar, Das Buch Ezechiel, (H.A.T. III. 3), Göttingen, 1900, p. 192.

²G. Fohrer - K. Gallig, op. cit., pp. 130, 136.

³Like for example, (a) R. Smend, Der Prophet Ezechiel, (Kurz. H.A.T. 8. Lief.), Leipzig, 1880, says that 'vv. 28ff. sind eine Wiederholung von vv. 22ff., wobei nur noch stärker als dort betont wird, dass das Unglück Jerusalems die Strafe für seine Unzucht, d.h., vor allem den Götzendienst ist' (p. 163); (b) J. Herrmann, Ezechiel, (K.A.T. XI), Leipzig, 1924, says that '(vv. 28-30 scheint eine Art Variante zu (vv.) 22-27 zu sein' (p. 146). With this remark Herrman seems to have modified a little what he said before, i.e., following Jahn he regarded vv. 28-30 as an 'abschwächende Dublette zu 25-27' (J. Herrmann, Ezechielstudien, Leipzig, 1908, p. 23); (c) A. Bertholet - K. Gallig say that vv. 22ff. and vv. 28ff. are two of the 'tatsächlicher Dubletten und Parallelen' in vv. 1-30, and that the case might be concerned with 'eine Zusammenarbeit zweier in sich geschlossener Relationen' (op. cit., pp. 81, 83); (c) W. F. Lofthouse, slightly in distinction from all the scholars mentioned above, says that vv. 28-30 'are in the main a repetition of the thoughts already expressed in vv. 22-27, but the expression (in vv. 28-30) is too independent to warrant us in putting them down as a gloss or a "doublet"' (W. F. Lofthouse, Ezekiel, ((The Century Bible)), Edinburgh, 1907, p. 198). The opinion of Lofthouse is somewhat modified and clarified by J. Wevers in the new series of The Century Bible. Wevers says that in vv. 28-30 'a second judgement has been added ... which is parallel to the first (i.e., in vv. 22-27) but takes verse 17b as its point of departure' (Ezekiel, p. 178). Further, he remarks that vv. 28-30 'is an expansion on verses 1-27' (ibid., p. 184).

which have led the scholars to their respective conclusions are concerned, it seems better to have a look at what the later commentators have to offer. However, it is a great pity that among the later commentators it is only Zimmerli who, so far, seems to have elaborated his arguments for his conclusion.¹ Therefore, there is no other comparison for it.

To begin with, Zimmerli points out that vv. 28-30, which is introduced by a 'Botenspruchformel', shows itself as 'eine blässere, in allgemeineren Worten gehaltene Zusammenfassung von vorher Gesagten'.² Looking more closely at this passage, Zimmerli

¹If compared with Zimmerli's explanation and reason, those of the others are only remarks. This can be seen in the following facts: J. Muilenburg remarks that 'the original threat ... ends appropriately by an allusion to Egypt (27; cf. 3 and 19-21). In sharp contrast to the concrete detail, 28-31 are general, though the motif of harlotry is pronounced' (J. Muilenburg, 'Ezekiel', in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, ed. by M. Black, and H. H. Rowley, London, etc., 1962, para. 507i, p. 581). Muilenburg's remark is quoted by Stalker, who in his turn remarks that vv. 28-30 'are a doublet or later expansion of vv. 22-27' (D. M. G. Stalker, Ezekiel, (The Torch Bible Commentaries), London, 1968, pp. 192f.). While on Eichrodt's commentary on the Book of Ezekiel, one could only ask whether or not the number '23:23-30' should be read '23:28-30' (W. Eichrodt, Der Prophet Hesekiel, ((A.T.D. 22)), Göttingen, 1959-1966, p. 221; ET., p. 330). If it should, it is very interesting to find that Eichrodt regards the passage, i.e., vv. 28-30, as a postscript, with non-allegorical language, and that it is a simplification of the case according to the Deuteronomistic points of view (cf. ibid.).

²W. Zimmerli, Ezekiel, (B.K. XIII/1), p. 537.

says further : 'Die Erweiterung 28-30 bringt die Gedanken der Gerichtsansage 22-27 ... nochmals mit leichten Varianten des Ausdrucks und der Durchführung vor'.¹ Zimmerli shows these 'leichten Varianten' in the fact that the words $\text{ׁקׁ} \text{---} \text{ׁקׁ}$ in vv. 17, 22 are interpreted by the word ׁקׁ in v. 28; and that the second ׁקׁ -sentence in v. 28b 'macht den Eindruck einer nachholende Bezugnahme auf 17, 22';² and that the word ׁקׁ in v. 25 is replaced by the word ׁקׁ in v. 29a α i; that v. 29a α ii modifies v. 26; that the expression of 'naked and bare' ($\text{ׁקׁ} \text{ } \text{ׁקׁ}$) in v. 29a β is taken from 16:7, 22, 39; that v. 29b stems from v. 10; and that the defilement of the sister in v. 30 is derived from v. 7. Based on all this Zimmerli concludes that vv. 28-30 'ist ... als Formulierung der Schule Ez's zu beurteilen, die, wohl schon unter dem Eindruck der Plünderung Jerusalems (29), das Strafgeschehen in enger Anlehnung an 23:1-27 ... nochmals zusammenfasst und in der nachgestellten Begründung (30) auf die Buhlerei und Verunreinigung mit den Volkern und ihren Götzen als die Ursache des Gerichtes weist'.³

With all this, it can now be said that most of the scholars

¹Ibid., pp. 551. For these 'leichten Varianten', cf. R. Smend, op. cit., in loc.; R. Kraetzschmar, op. cit., in loc.; G. A. Cooke, op. cit., in loc..

²W. Zimmerli, op. cit., loc. cit..

³Ibid..

are in agreement on differentiating vv. 28-30 from vv. 22-27. Along the line of differentiating these two passages, there are two other things which can be pointed out here. First, as far as vv. 28-30 is concerned, its concise form reminds one of the concise form of vv. 9-10, i.e., the passage which recalls the judgement of Oholah. Besides, there is a similarity between them in the fact that the two ַן־ -sentences in v. 28 with the preceding verb ַן־ are found in v. 9. Second, the religious sin referred to in v. 30 is not only without parallel in vv. 22-27, but also reminds one of vv. 36ff. in which the religious issues are dominant.¹ Now, one must be very careful in drawing a conclusion concerning vv. 28-30, especially if he remembers the nature of the prophetic traditions and the characteristics of Ezekiel. However, on the basis of what is said above, it seems acceptable now to exclude vv. 28-30 from the examination of the treatment of Israel's past history in chapter 23.

Now, an examination on v. 35 must also be made. This is a self-contained passage, whose introductory formula is basically the same as that of vv. 28ff., 32ff., and 46ff.. Indeed, its concise form reminds one of that of vv. 9-10, 28-30, which is rather unusual in view of Ezekiel's characteristics. The phrase ַן־ ַן־ is only found again in 22:12 in the Book of Ezekiel; this time in reverse order.² The word ַן־ 'to forget'

¹Concerning this passage, see, supra, pp. 280ff..

²On Ezek. 22:12, see especially Sinnerli, op. cit., p. 511.

be confined to vv. 1-27 in which the past history of Israel is uniquely presented. To begin with, it is very interesting to find that this passage, i.e., vv. 1-27 is a metaphor. But as the metaphor goes into detail, one is struck by the use of vocabulary which is almost entirely non-metaphorical. This vocabulary is so dominant and its content is so clear, that one could not fail to recognize that the whole passage contains only one issue, i.e., political harlotry. In the sequel, it is very interesting to find that the division of the passage into some sections is in itself so clear, that if there is anything at all about the passage which should immediately be agreed upon, it must be its division. The division is as follows : first section : vv. 1-4; second section : vv. 5-10; and third section : vv. 11-27.

The passage is introduced by an introductory formula which is quite characteristic in the Book of Ezekiel : 'The word of Yahweh came to me, saying'.¹ In most cases this introductory formula is immediately followed by words of command ('Botenspruchformel') from Yahweh to the prophet to do or to say something, e.g., 17:1f.; 16:1f.; 13:1f.; etc.. However, in 23:1f. the introductory formula is not followed by anything but a long reporting speech in which Yahweh is the speaker and the 'son of man' is

¹For this see, supra, pp. 71f.

the only hearer. The reporting speech goes through to v. 21, in which it breaks up into a direct address which in turn dominates the rest of the passage. As far as the reporting speech is concerned, it is indeed unusual that the speech should last so long. Elsewhere in the Book of Ezekiel, the reporting speech with the introductory formula similar to that of 23:1 is found in 11:14f.; 22:17f.; 33:23f.; 36:16-21. However, despite the fact that the reporting speech in 36:16-21 is the longest among these other passages, nevertheless that of 23:1ff. remains the longest of all. Besides, these other passages of reporting speech are different from 23:1ff. in that they are followed by words of command from Yahweh to the prophet to do or to say something: 11:16(--- לכן אמר);¹ 22:19(--- לכן אמר);² 33:25(--- לכן אמר); 36:22(לכן אמר לבית-ישראל).

The ^{absence} ~~lack~~ of the 'Botenspruchformel' at the end of reporting speech in 23:1-20 has made the changing of the speech into the direct address (vy. 22ff.) rather uneven. This unevenness is even worsened by the fact that v. 21 is, according to MT,³ in

¹For MT. אמר see notes of W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 200; BHS. crit. app., in loc..

²For the insertion of אמר, see, W. Zimmerli, op. cit., pp. 514, 519; BHS. crit. app. in loc..

³In LXX the direct address even begins in v. 19.

itself a direct address.

So, with or without y. 21 the case seems to be just the same.¹ With the change of the reporting speech into the direct address the scene is now also changed. In the direct address (yy. 22-27) it is no longer Yahweh, but the prophet who speaks. In other words, the addressee of the speech is no longer the 'son of man', but is Oholibah; and the speaker is the prophet who does so on behalf of Yahweh. Further, the direct address no longer talks about what Oholibah did or does; instead, it talks about what her lovers (לְיָדָיו) will do to her. This is clear from the fact that the subject of most of the sentences in the reporting speech is Oholah and/or Oholibah (i.e., 3rd per. fem. plur./sing.), while in the direct address it is Oholibah's lovers (i.e., 3rd. pers. masc. plur.). Like most of the judgement sentences (Gerichtsaussagen) in the Book of Ezekiel, the direct address is dominated by verbs of imperfect mode, i.e., the form of both way-consec. perf. and impf. tense (G-K paras. 112x, 107), which

¹ Most of the scholars regard this verse as an addition, secondary, or the like. Cf. W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 548; W. Eichrodt, Der Prophet Hesekiel, (A.T.B. 22), p. 211 note 4 (SP. p. 319 note k.); A. Bertholet - K. Galling, op. cit., p. 82. Fohrer even wants to delete yy. 20-21 because they are 'wiederholende Glosse' (G. Fohrer - K. Galling, op. cit., p. 133). However, there are two other things which can be said about y. 21, namely, first, the words לְיָדָיו do not actually refer to לְיָדָיו (y. 19) or to לְיָדָיו (y. 3); second, it is not necessary to change the preposition לְ into בְּ in the word לְיָדָיו, since both prepositions are interchangeable. For the interchangeability of these two prepositions, see, N. M. Sarna, 'The Interchange of Prepositions BETH and MIN in Biblical Hebrew', J.B.L. 78, 1959, pp. 310-316.

means that the happening is not yet or will be accomplished. Having noted all this, one is still faced with the fact that in the direct address there is a pronoun, which, theologically speaking, is very important. This is 1st. pers. pronoun, the 'I', i.e., Yahweh himself. Although the 3rd. pers. masc. plur. predominates the speech, it is, after all, Yahweh himself who is the master of the judgement announced there. So, since the direct address is mainly concerned with the judgement which will come to Cholibah, therefore it seems justified to say that the question of how Ezekiel interprets the past history of Israel should not primarily be looked for in the direct address. Instead, it must be looked at primarily in the reporting speech, i.e., vv. 1-20.

As was said earlier, Ezek. 23:1-20 is unique in that after the introductory formula וְהָיָה דְבַר יְהוָה אֵלַי לֵאמֹר there is no word of command or another kind of prophetic speech formula, e.g., כֹּה אָמַר (אֲדַבֵּר) יְהוָה or the like. In the text as it now stands, one could not fail to recognize immediately that it is Yahweh himself who is speaking and the prophet is his sole hearer. In the speech Yahweh is acting like a reporter who is reporting about something to the prophet. It is from this scene that the term 'reporting speech' has come into use throughout this study. As far as the term is concerned, it is of course possible to ask questions about its appropriateness or its suitability, or even to reject it completely. However, what strongly impresses one in looking at the passage under consideration

is the fact that it presents a kind of scene in which there are three parties, and that the first party tells the second about the third. The first party does so so intensely that the whole speech has become monologue without the interruption from either the second or the third party. It is from this that the 'reporting speech' is derived.

Further, it is very interesting to find that the report is so systematically arranged. Its sentences and its clauses are so beautifully composed that the whole piece presents a work of high quality. It is partly because of this beautiful composition and systematization that the attempts by some scholars, e.g., Hölischer, to reduce the passage into a concise poem do not gain much acceptance. However, it is also rather difficult to regard the passage as plain prose, since the rhythmical and the metrical structures in it are too obvious to be ignored.¹ It is true that the sentences in the passage are sometimes very long, with clauses and sub-clauses or repetitions. It is also true that for the sake of straightforwardness of expression these clauses, sub-clauses, and repetitions, can be left out without too much reducing the message of the passage. But, if one remembers that it is one of Ezekiel's characteristics to go into detailed

¹For this problem, see, W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 538.

and lengthy descriptions in presenting his message, as for example in Ezek. 16; 18, it seems there is no reason why these elements should be cut off or left out. So, as in Ezek. 16, here one is not dealing with either prose or poetry, but with what Zimmerli calls 'eine gehobene Prosa'¹ or 'eine gehobene Erzählstil'.²

Verses 1-4.

This section constitutes the beginning of the passage and is entirely in a metaphorical form. As far as the metaphor itself is concerned, it must be said that the mentioning of the two women (אִשׁוֹת) simultaneously is very interesting. This is so not only because it has presupposed the existence of the two sister-kingdoms of Israel, but also because it is the word אִשׁוֹת and no other words, e.g., בתולות, which is used here. The word אִשׁוֹת is the plural of אִשָּׁה which according to BHS means 'woman, wife', i.e., a grown up woman. In this sense it is clear that the section deals with two grown up women. If the metaphor is to refer to the people of Israel at all, the question which arises is this : does the mentioning of the two

¹Zimmerli points out that 'Kennzeichen dieser gehobene Prosa ist vor allem der knappe, mit zwei oder drei Akzenten zu lesende Kurzsatz, der ... in meist parataktischer Reihung herrscht' (op. cit., p. 343). This is the kind of composition which one actually finds in Ezek. 23:1-20.

²Zimmerli remarks : 'So wird man auch hier mit einem gehobenen Erzählstil, der sich gelegentlich streng metrischer Rhythmisierung annähern kann, aber dann wieder zu freierer Bewegung zurückkehrt ... zu rechnen haben' (op. cit., p. 536).

grown up women make any sense at all? If it does, in what way? Before answering this question one must have a look at the clause in y. 2b, i.e., בנות אִם-אַחֻזָה הֵינִי, which gives a short description of the two women. According to this clause, the two women are the daughters of one mother, therefore they are sisters. The metaphorical use of sister-relationship for the two kingdoms of Israel, i.e., Northern Israel and Southern Israel, outside Ezek. 23:1-20 is only found again in Ezek. 16:45f.; 23:31, 33; and Jer. 3:7f., 10. However, the question which immediately arises in connection with the clause in Ezek. 23:2b is : who is the 'one mother'? Or, putting the question in another way : how is the בנות אִם-אַחֻזָה הֵינִי to be understood? The only passage in the Book of Ezekiel which explicitly mentions who is the mother of one of the sisters is Ezek. 16:3, 'your mother was a Hittite'. But, from the study on Ezek. 16:1-43 presented earlier, it has been shown that what is meant in Ezek. 16:3 is applicable only to Jerusalem. At best the meaning of Ezek. 16:3 can be applied only to Judah or the Southern Kingdom, but not to both kingdoms of Israel. Moreover, neither Ezek. 23:31, 33, nor Jer. 3:7f., 10 could give a clear clue to answer the question of who is the 'one mother'. So the meaning of the sister-relationship and the idea of 'one mother' must be sought from other sources, i.e., the issues which Ezekiel might have been familiar with. First, the religious issue, which raises the question : does Ezekiel think that there were two religious groups within the people of Israel? In the study presented earlier, especially that of Ezek.

16:1-43, it has been shown that Ezekiel has never thought of such religious division within the people of God.

For him there is only one God, Yahweh, and one people of God, Israel. There has never been any idea of two people of God for Ezekiel. Therefore, if he uses the idea of division within the people of Israel, he must refer it to something other than religion.

With this negative result, the second issue must be examined.

This is the political issue, which raises the question: does Ezekiel think that there were, or there are, two political groups within the people of Israel? In answering this question one is faced with at least two difficulties. (a) It is not true that Ezekiel thinks entirely politically, or that the political issue was his main concern. (b) If there is any passage in the Book of Ezekiel which most outstandingly speaks about Israel politically, it must only be Ezek. 23:1-20 (or 23:1-27). Even so, the issue here is not only politics. Even the political issue itself is presumably not the invention of Ezekiel himself either. With these two difficulties it seems clear that the political issue found in 23:1-20 cannot be regarded as genuinely Ezekielian. It is, rather, something which has come to him and which he simply accepts. Indeed, the sentence שְׁתֵּים וְשֵׁים בְּנוֹת אִם-אֶדוּת הֵן does not sound derogatory or controversial; and throughout chapter 23 there is no hint at all at either rebuking or criticising the existence of the two political groups of the people Israel, or interpreting it as a breach of Israel's unity.

So, if one is to answer the question of political issue posed above, it seems acceptable to say that Ezekiel himself does not

particularly think of the people of Israel in terms of politics, but he is confronted with the fact that there were already two political groups within the people themselves. This is the existence of Northern Israel and Southern Israel.

The political interpretation of the metaphor of two sisters in Ezek. 23:2 seems to be applicable also to the similar metaphor in Jer. 3:7f., 10. These two prophets were contemporaries which means that the historical issue around them was more or less the same. Yet Ezekiel talked only about 'two women', i.e., purely in a metaphorical way, while Jeremiah showed the political identification of them : 'faithless Israel' and 'false Judah'. The comparison between these two prophets' metaphors will be elaborated later. For the moment it is suffice to notice that these two prophets are using similar metaphorical language to express their understanding of the two sister-kingdoms of Israel. In connection with this interesting fact the question of the traditio-historical relationship between these two prophets certainly cannot be ignored. However, reverting to the interpretation of Ezek. 23:2, it must be said that the political application of the metaphor of the 'two women' seems to be in difficulty if it is to be related to the last clause in the passage : בנות אִם-אֶחָת הֵינּוּ. How is this phrase to be understood? Does it mean that initially there was a powerful kingdom whose political expansion had resulted in the existence of the two sister-kingdoms of Israel? Or, does it only presuppose that initially there was one political unity of Israel which eventually split up into two political entities, i.e., Northern

Israel and Southern Israel? About the last two questions it can be said that, theoretically, the former could be the right case; while historically, it is the latter which could be the right one. However, these two possibilities do not solve or answer the first question. Instead, they create a dilemma. In this situation the only way out is to go back to the nature of the metaphorical language itself. In going back to the metaphor in Ezek. 23:2, it seems provisionally sufficient to say that there was only one political unity of the people Israel, but later there were two; and it is due to the metaphorical language employed by Ezekiel that these two political entities, i.e., Northern Israel and Southern Israel, are called 'two women', and that the one previous to them is called 'one mother'.

This much may be said about religious and the political issues which can be examined in connection with the metaphor in Ezek. 23:2. As far as the result of the examination is concerned, it must be said that those two issues have been helpful only in providing general illumination for the metaphor, since to some extent they are external factors rather than internal ones. Therefore, a closer examination of the passage itself must now be made.

In carrying out the examination, it is very interesting to find that there is an important fact in the metaphor itself. This fact is the phrase שתי נשים , which can be understood in two ways: First, grammatically, it can be understood as an ordinary numerical expression, namely that there are two women, each stands

independently, without any relationship between them. Second, due to the facts that (a) the word אִשׁוֹת can be regarded as a dual noun,¹ (b) the phrase refers to the two-sister kingdoms of Israel, and (c) the two sisters are the daughters of one mother, it might well be that the phrase $\text{אִשׁוֹת} \text{אִשׁוֹת}$ refers to the wholeness of the two-sister kingdoms rather than to their being two separate kingdoms. In other words, beside the fact that the phrase $\text{אִשׁוֹת} \text{אִשׁוֹת}$ can mean that there are 'two women', it retains the connotation that the 'two' are actually one.²

Elsewhere in the Old Testament the phrase $\text{אִשׁוֹת} \text{אִשׁוֹת}$, with both words in the absolute state, is found again only in 1 Kings 3:6 and Zech. 5:9; while in 2 Chron. 24:3 it occurs in reverse order. Of these three or four occurrences, it is only in Ezek. 23:2 that the phrase is used as a metaphorical expression. Moreover, whereas in the other three passages the ordinary numerical idea is strong, the case is slightly different in Ezek. 23:2. This is clear from the fact that, on the one hand, it is not impossible to conceive more than two women to be the wives of Jehoiada (2 Chron. 24:3), more than two women to prove Solomon's wisdom (1 Kings 3:16ff.), and more than two women in the vision of Zechariah (Zech. 5:9; cf. 5:7); while on the other, it is impossible to conceive

¹See, B.D.B.

²The case might be compared with that of the dual noun. Cf., G-K para. 88, 97a-b; James Kennedy, Introduction to Biblical Hebrew, London, 1898, para. 140d, p. 100.

more than two women to express metaphorically the existence of the two sister-kingdoms of Israel (Ezek. 23:2; Jer. 3:6-10).

So, it is clear that although Ezekiel is referring to the existence of the two sister-kingdoms of Israel, i.e., Northern Israel and Southern Israel, the problems of separation, of contradiction, of hatred, of enmity, and of the like between these two kingdoms are out of his mind.¹ Instead, the ideas of harmony and wholeness behind the division are very strong. This can be seen once again, in the use of the dual noun $\square^{\prime}\eta\psi$ and from the phrase $\eta\eta\chi-\square\chi$. It is these ideas of harmony and wholeness which have enabled Ezekiel to speak about the deeds of the two women's youth (v. 3) without pointing out or giving hints of any difference between their deeds; he speaks about their deeds as if there was only one woman:

$\eta\eta\chi$ $\eta\eta\chi$ $\eta\eta\chi$ $\eta\eta\chi$ $\eta\eta\chi$ (v. 3a).²

In referring to v. 3 it is very interesting to find that there are three things mentioned together in it: harlotry of the two women ($\eta\eta\chi$), Egypt ($\square^{\prime}\eta\psi$), and the youth of the two women ($\eta\eta\chi$). These three things are in themselves inter-related, namely the name of Egypt is related to the youth of the women, and both are related to the time when the women, or rather

¹W. Zimmerli, 'Israel im Buche Ezechiel', V.T. 8, 1958, pp. 75-90.

²The use of the 3rd. per. fem. plur. in v. 3 is to be understood as referring to the dual idea and not otherwise. Cf. G-K paras. 88a, 145n.

the young women, began to play the harlot. Elsewhere in the Book of Ezekiel the interrelation, or the association, of the name of Egypt with the time when Israel began to play the harlot is at best only found again in Ezek. 20:5-8a. Even so, the difference between Ezek. 20:5-8a and 23:3 cannot easily be ignored. Ezek. 20:5-8a does not speak in metaphorical language, and its issue is religion rather than politics; while Ezek. 23:3 speaks in metaphorical language, and therefore its issue is rather vague. However, it seems acceptable to say that the clue to understand what is involved in the association of the name of Egypt with the harlotry of young Israel in Ezek. 23:3 lies in the verb הָיָה . In the passage under consideration, i.e., Ezek. 23:1-20, the word הָיָה occurs 13 times, both as verb and as substantive. This number is not only extra-ordinarily big for a passage of 20 verses such as Ezek. 23:1-20, but also clearly gives the indication that the whole passage must be dominated by the word concerned. About the word הָיָה it is generally accepted that its metaphorical use with Israel as its subject and foreign nation(s) as its object could mean both religious and political harlotry,¹ and that these two meanings are to a great extent inseparable. Consequently, it is due to this double meaning of the word that its metaphorical use in Ezek. 23:1-20 is also liable to a double interpretation. Nevertheless, Ezek. 23:1-20 is different from both Ezek. 16 and Ezek. 20 in that its metaphorical use of the word הָיָה is coupled with the real

¹O. Bissfeldt, 'Hesekiel Kap. 16 Als Geschichtsquelle', in his Kleine Schriften II, Tübingen, 1963, pp. 101-106.

description of the military or political power of the foreign nations involved. This can be seen in vv. 5f., 7a, 11f., 14f.. From this fact it is also clear that the whole passage is dominated by the issue of the political harlotry more than by the religious one. However, concerning v. 3 there is a question of whether the word הַיָּמִין is also to be understood as being dominated by political issues or not. The answer to this question is likely to be negative. It is so, because of at least two reasons: First, as far as Israel's political history is concerned,¹ the passages which could support the indication that Israel had political alliance with Egypt in the early years of her existence are 1 Kings 3:1; 7:8; 9:16, 24.² All of these references have one similarity in that either directly or indirectly they speak about Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter. It is true that Solomon's marriages to foreign women (1 Kings 11:1) could have both political and religious implications. It is equally true that the Deuteronomistic historian always connects the presence of foreign women in the royal household with the presence of

¹It is actually difficult to say whether there was any political history of Israel as such. But this term is used here in an attempt to describe the foreign political affairs of Israel. For the problem of how one should see the history of Israel as comprehensive as possible, see, J. Bright, Early Israel in Recent History Writing, London, 1956. For the inseparableness of Israel's political and religious histories, see especially, G. W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, London, 1966 (reprinted 1971).

²1 Kings 11:1 is not included here because most scholars agree on regarding the word וְאֵת־בְּנוֹת־פְּרָצִי there as a gloss or an addition.

foreign idols.¹ But, as far as Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter is concerned, it seems that all of the references above, particularly 1 Kings 3:1 and 9:16, stress the political implication more than otherwise.²

However, it is difficult to regard Solomon's political affairs with Egypt as Israel's political harlotry. This is so, because Solomon's foreign political affairs happened primarily due to his mighty empire rather than to his political weakness. This means that, on the one hand, Israel is superior than her foreign counterparts, and that Egypt is less powerful,³ and on the other, it is impossible to make this particular foreign political affairs correspond with Ezekiel's explanation of political harlotry in

¹ M. Noth, The History of Israel, (ET. revised by P. R. Ackroyd), second edition, London, 1960, p. 216.

² J. Gray, 1 - 2 Kings, (O.T.L.), London, 1964, in loci; J. A. Montgomery and H. S. Gehman, The Book of Kings, (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1951 (latest impression 1960), in loci; A. Alt, Israel und Ägypten, (B.W.A.T. 6), Leipzig, 1909, especially pp. 16ff..

³ See, on the one hand, M. Noth, op. cit., who identifies the Egyptian woman as 'a daughter from the harem of one of the unimportant Pharaohs of the 21st Egyptian Dynasty' (p. 216, italics are mine), and on the other, J. Bright, A History of Israel, second edition, London, 1972, who remarks that the event recorded in 1 Kings 9:16 'illustrates both the relative importance of Israel and the low estate to which Egypt had sunk : Pharaohs of the Empire did not give their daughters even to kings of Babylon or Mitanni!' (p. 208). Cf. G. W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, p. 61.

y. 3b which suggests that Egypt is superior and that Israel is weak. Second, as on Ezek. 20:5-8, some scholars say that Ezekiel might be referring to the time when the tribes of Israel were sojourning in Egypt,¹ or even to the time when they were in slavery service there.² However, although these two events are historically well warranted (cf. Gen. 45:10; 46:2-5; 47:1ff.; Exod. 1:8ff.; 5:5ff.; etc.), it is again very difficult to understand them as a political harlotry. Furthermore, according to Ezekiel the harlotry was initiated by Israel!

So, if the word זנות in y. 3 does not refer to political harlotry, then does it refer to religious harlotry? As far as the problem of Israel's religious harlotry in Egypt is concerned, it is only in Ezek. 20:5-8 that the indication of it is alluded to. Yet, the study of Ezek. 20:5-8 presented above has shown that the historical evidence for such an allusion is very meagre. However, if the comparison of Ezek. 23:3 with 20:5-8 is to be meaningful at all, the best that can be said here is that in Ezek. 23:3 Ezekiel is also reading the harlotry of the people Israel in Palestine into Israel's earlier history. And to that extent the reading back must be regarded as unique. This is so, because of two reasons: First, there is no evidence that Ezekiel is

¹G. Fohrer - K.alling remark: 'Er (i.e., Ezekiel) musste sich naturgemäss der ihm zugänglichen Überlieferung von Aufenthalt ganz Israel in Ägypten anschliessen' (op. cit., p. 132); cf. G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), p. 249; J. Wevers, op. cit., p. 179.

²J. Herrmann, op. cit., p. 144.

copying or elaborating any thread of a similar tradition. In other words, the interpretation of Israel's pre-exodus relation with Egypt as a harlotry on the part of Israel is entirely his own invention. Second, Ezekiel could only do so by employing a metaphorical language which presumably could give him some kind of flexibility to express what he had in mind. It is due to this metaphorical usage that the word $\eta\eta\eta$ in y. 3 cannot be analysed into a specific meaning or a specific detail. The only elaboration of its meaning is found in y. 3b.¹ Here one is again faced with a metaphorical explanation which could give an idea of how lewd the deeds of the young Israel are, although it is still very difficult to specify what the deeds were. It is hinted above that the explanation in y. 3b might refer to the exploitation of Israel by Egypt during the time of Israel's slavery; but it is also said above that the slavery exploitation was the desire of Egypt and not of Israel.

So far, what has been discussed here is only the association of the name of Egypt with the time when the young Israel began to play the harlot. Now the association of the two things with the youth of the two women ($\eta\eta\eta$) must be examined. First of all it is very interesting to find that the metaphorical use of the

¹This elaboration is unique in that it is not found in any other prophetic book or in any other book of the Old Testament. Even in the Book of Ezekiel itself such an elaboration is found only twice or three times, i.e., in Ezek. 23:3b, 8 (incomplete), and 21.

construct לְרִיבָה in the Book of Ezekiel is only found in 16:22, 43, 60 (with 2nd. pers. fem. sing. suffix) and in 23:3, 8, 19, 21 (twice) (Lisowsky). Although the meanings which are conceived in the use of this word in all of those passages are the same, there is a big difference between chapter 16 and 23. In 16:22, 43, 60, the word is used to denote the early life of Jerusalem in Palestine, while in 23:3, 8, 19, 21, it is associated with the name of Egypt. Moreover, it has been shown earlier that tradition--historically there is no sign whatsoever which could indicate that chapter 16 has any influence from the exodus-wilderness-conquest tradition. Instead, it is based on the Zion-Jerusalem tradition which is quite different from the exodus-wilderness-conquest tradition. Since the influence of the latter is strongly felt in chapter 23, therefore, it seems justified to say that the use of the word לְרִיבָה (ס) here is not to be confused with that of chapter 16. In other words, the tradition which is followed by Ezekiel in chapter 23 is different from that of chapter 16, which means that although the same word is used, yet its application is different.

Further, it is very interesting to find that the word לְרִיבָה (ס) is metaphorically used in the same connection as in Ezek. 23 by two other prophets, i.e., by Hosea and Jeremiah, whose tradition--historical influence(s) on Ezekiel has often been noted by scholars. By the former it is found in Hos. 2:17, while by the latter in Jer. 2:2.¹ The surprising thing found in these two

¹ For Jer. 3:24f.; 22:21; 31:19; see, B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia*, (K.H.C. XI), Tübingen and Leipzig, 1901, pp. 441., 178, 249f.; P. Volz, *Der Prophet Jeremia*, (K.A.T. X), Leipzig, 1928, p. 288; cf. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25*, (W.M.A.N.T. 41), Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1973, pp. 86f., 165.

passages is that both of the prophets are talking about the same thing : the youth of Israel is associated with the wilderness wandering and the faithfulness of Israel to Yahweh (cf. Hos. 11:1 Jer. 3:4). In this particular connection there are at least two differences between the two prophets and Ezekiel. First, Ezekiel associates the metaphorical use of the word **נְצוּרִים** with the period when Israel was in Egypt, while Hosea and Jeremiah associate it with the period when Israel was wandering in the wilderness.¹ Second, Ezekiel associates the youth of Israel with the time when Israel began to play the harlot, i.e., disobedience to Yahweh, while Hosea and Jeremiah associate it with the time when Israel was obedient to Yahweh.² Even in the passage in which Ezekiel clearly refers to the wilderness wandering, i.e., Ezek. 20:10ff., the wilderness period is also associated with Israel's disobedience to Yahweh. Despite the two differences, there is a similarity among these three prophets in their metaphorical use of the word **נְצוּרִים** in that in the passages referred to above

¹ However, Hos. 11:1 could be understood as referring to the time when Israel was still in Egypt, see, W. Rudolph, Hosea, (K.A.T. XIII/1), Güterloh, 1966, p. 214. Even so, there is no indication that here Hosea associates this period with Israel's disobedience.

² On Hos. 2:7, see especially H. W. Wolff, Dodekapropheten 1 : Hosea, (B.K. XIV/1), Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1961, pp. 51-53; W. Rudolph, op. cit., pp. 16f.; B. Dahm, op. cit., pp. 16f.; W. Rudolph, Jeremia, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 12), Tübingen, 1947, p. 11.

the word is associated with the beginning of Israel's history. In this similarity it is again very interesting to find that for Hosea and Jeremiah the beginning of the history of Israel is full of obedience,¹ while for Ezekiel it is the beginning of Israel's harlotry.²

Having said that, there is now a question of how should Ezekiel's dark view of Israel's early history be related to the bright views of both Hosea and Jeremiah. Before answering this question one must be reminded that the passage under consideration, i.e., Ezek. 23:2-4 is concise and, unfortunately, does not provide any clear clue for its possible detailed examination. Here Ezekiel does not make any hint whatsoever at the wilderness wandering and the conquest of Palestine, i.e., the events or the periods of Israel's history which are usually regarded as the bright periods in Israel's credo (e.g., Josh. 24:2-13).³ Instead,

¹For Hosea's interpretation of Israel's harlotry, see further, e.g., G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, (ET. by D. M. G. Stalker), Vol. II, Edinburgh, 1965 (reprinted 1970), p. 140; cf. J. Vollmer, Geschichtliche Rückblicke und Motive in der Prophetie des Amos, Hosea, und Jeremia, Berlin, 1971, pp. 55ff..

²It is possible to infer that for Hosea and Jeremiah the beginning of Israel's harlotry is associated with the settlement in Palestine. See, e.g., J. L. Mays, Hosea, (O.T.L.), London, 1969, pp. 135f., 152ff.; G. von Rad, op. cit., pp. 142, 193ff.; W. Rudolph, Hosea, (K.A.T. XIII/1), pp. 65f.; W. Zimmerli, 'The Word of God in the Book of Ezekiel' (ET. by James F. Ross), in History and Hermeneutic, (J.T.Ch. 4), New York, 1967, pp. 1-13.

³For the lacking of mentioning of Sinai in the credo, see, H.B. Huffmon, 'The Exodus, Sinai and Credo', C.B.Q. 27, 1965, pp. 101-113, who, following Weiser, argues that the Sinai event was not a salvation-event as were the Exodus and the Conquest; therefore the Sinai event cannot be included into the Credo, which in itself is historical prologue of the covenant.

after mentioning the early history of Israel with its three dimensions (y. 3) Ezekiel goes back to the mentioning of the two sisters with their respective names and their relationship with Yahweh, and their children (y. 4a). If vv. 2 and 4a are read through without y. 3 they will give the impression that Ezekiel's historical starting point is the situation when Israel had already been divided into two sister-kingdoms. In this connection, it is again very interesting to find that no hint at David or Solomon or other bright periods of Israel is found. What does this mean? It means that, on the one hand the ~~looking~~^{omission} could remind one of the similar case in Ezek. 20:1-31, while on the other it could make one ask how could Ezekiel do that.

In answering the question of 'how could Ezekiel do that' it would be a mistake to argue that Ezekiel did not know the important, and bright, events in the history of Israel. The phrase

לְבָנֵי וּבָנוֹת

in y. 4a β could give the evidence that

Ezekiel at any rate knew what was involved in the important, and bright, events;¹ he even goes further in his mentioning of the women's having sons and daughters (y. 4a γ). Although the phrase

וּבָנוֹת

plus preposition לְ occurs very frequently

in the Old Testament, it is interesting to find that it is also used metaphorically to denote Israel's becoming the possession of

¹See also the hints at the salvation acts of Yahweh beside the remarks on Israel's rebellious deeds in 20:1ff.; cf. supra, pp. 259ff..

Yahweh in connection with the Sinai Covenant (Exod. 19:5f. :

והייתם לי סגל (וזהו לי אמלכת כהנים and וזהו לי סגל).

It is of course difficult to argue that when Ezekiel used the phrase וזהו לי in 23:4a γ he was referring to the Sinai

event. But the idea of Israel's being possessed by Yahweh is unmistakably contained in the phrase there. This is supported

by the fact that in many passages in the Old Testament the phrase

וזהו לי is mostly used to denote similar idea of possessing,

e.g., Gen. 20:12; 24:67; Lev. 27:15; Num. 3:12f. etc.. Moreover,

with 3rd. pers. fem. as the subject of the verb וזהו the

phrase is used to denote the women's, or the woman's, becoming

the wives, or the wife, of man, as is shown, e.g., in Gen. 20:12

(וזהו לי לאשה) and 24:67 (וזהו לי לאשה).

So, back to Ezek. 23:4a β , it is not surprising that many scholars have been puzzled by the question involved, namely, how is the two women's becoming Yahweh's wives to be understood?

Before looking at the question further, it seems better to examine v. 4 according to the sequence of what are said there. In v. 4a α the names of the two sisters are told : Oholah the elder and Oholibah her sister. In the Old Testament these two names are only mentioned in Ezek. 23, and this is a sign and an evidence that here Ezekiel is unique. Although there are similarities in the naming of Northern and Southern Kingdoms of Israel by Ezekiel and Jeremiah (Jer. 3:6-11), the differences between them are also obvious. The similarities can be seen, e.g., in the following facts : first, the two kingdoms are metaphorically

called two sisters who belong to Yahweh (Jer. 3:6-12; Ezek. 23:2, 4); second, the two sisters play the harlot (הַנְּיָוָה , Jer. 3:6b, 8b, 9a; Ezek. 23:3); third, Judah's harlotry is greater than Israel's (Jer. 3:8b, 9, 11), the idea which is found in an elaborated length in Ezek. 23:5ff.. While their differences are clear from the following facts : first, in Jer. 3:6-12 the names of the two sisters are not really metaphorical, since they are still coupled with the real names of the kingdoms :

לְשֵׁנֵי שָׂרָא (Jer. 3:6, 8, 11) and בְּגֵדֵי הַחַיִּים (---) הַחַיִּים (Jer. 3:7, 8, 10f.);¹ second, while neither שָׂרָא nor בְּגֵדֵי הַחַיִּים / בְּגֵדֵי הַחַיִּים occurs in the Book of Ezekiel,² the names שָׂרָא and הַחַיִּים in the passage of Jeremiah concerned denote political identity rather than otherwise; third, while the harlotry הַנְּיָוָה in Jer. 3:6-11 is associated with religious affairs rather than with politics,³ the case is on the other way round with Ezek. 23:1-20.

These similarities and differences can of course be added by other

¹For this Zimmerli says : 'Jer 3 hatte die beiden Frauen je mit einem qualifizierenden Beinamen als שָׂרָא and בְּגֵדֵי הַחַיִּים (הַחַיִּים) bezeichnet, dazu aber bei beiden ganz unbefangenen die in politischen Bereich geläufigen Namen Israel und Juda gefügt' (Ezechiel, ((B.K. XIII/1)), p. 541). For further discussion on Jer. 3:6-12, see, J. Bright, 'The Date of the Prose Sermons of Jeremiah', J.B.L. 70, 1951, p. 35; W. Thiel, *op. cit.*, pp. 83--91 and the notes there; J. W. Miller, Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels : sprachlich und theologisch untersucht, Neukirchen-Kreis, Moers, 1955, pp. 35f..

²See, J. Bright, *ibid.*.

³This can be seen as for example in the use of the verb נָאָץ and the phrase נָאָץ אֶת-הָאֱלֹהִים וְאֶת-הַבְּרִית in Jer. 3:8f., which are lacking in Ezek. 23:1-20, but are found in Ezek. 23:45. For the religious concern of Ezek. 23:45, see, *supra*, pp. 288ff..

evidences,¹ but as far as the metaphorical naming of both Northern and Southern Kingdoms of Israel is concerned, it seems that those facts noted above are sufficient. On the basis of those facts it is now possible to draw a conclusion on this particular case that traditio-historically there is a close relation between Jeremiah and Ezekiel. However the traditio-historical aspect of this relation is to be explained, there is one thing about the two prophets which is certain, namely, that in their respective historical review examined here neither of them made any mention of David or Solomon. As in Ezekiel's case, the missing of the two names from the account of Jer. 3:6-11 does not mean that Jeremiah did not know what their significances for the history of Israel were. Passages like Jer. 33:15, 17, 21f.; 26, could at least prove that Jeremiah did know. So, as far as the metaphorical and semi-metaphorical account of Israel's past history in that particular passages of Jeremiah and Ezekiel is concerned, there is now another interesting fact, i.e., that both Jeremiah and Ezekiel are subject to the question of why did they not give any hint at all at the significances of David or of Solomon although they knew it perfectly well. With this question one is led further to a traditio-historical question involved there, namely, whether or not there is any record in the Old Testament in which Israel's history is metaphorically reviewed in the same way as that in both

¹See, e.g., J. W. Miller, op. cit., pp. 67ff..

Jeremiah and Ezekiel, i.e., by using husband-wife relationship for Yahweh's relationship with Israel, which was transmitted by Israel's traditionists earlier than the contemporary Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The answer of this traditio-historical question is positive in the fact that Hosea (in the second half of the 8th. century B.C.) had been dealing with Northern Israel in symbolic actions which to a certain extent can be regarded as metaphor, the kind of which is relevant here.¹ In the most disputed passage of Hosea, i.e., Hos. 1-3, especially Hos. 1:2-9; 2:4 (RSV 2:2) and 3:1-5, it is stated clearly that the woman of harlotry, whom Hosea was to marry, symbolizes the people of Israel.²

¹It is very interesting to find that there are at least two other kinds of metaphor which are also very frequently used for reviewing the history of Israel, particularly her relationship with Yahweh. They are the metaphor of the father and son, e.g., Hos. 11; Isa. 1:2f.; 30:9; Jer. 3:19, 22; 4:22; 31:9, 20; and the metaphor of the vine and/or the vineyard, e.g., Hos. 10:1; 14:7 (sic.); Isa. 5:1-7; 16:8f.; 27:2-11; Jer. 2:21; 6:9 (sic); 8:13; 12:10f.; 48:32; Ezek. 15; 17:1-10 (sic); 19:10-14; Ps. 80:1-19 (sic).

²See, G. W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, London, 1971, pp. 116f.; in other place Anderson remarks: 'Hosea's marriage to Gomer, her infidelity, and his enduring love for her, were counterparts of the bond between God and Israel, Israel's lapses into Baal worship, and God's loving purpose to win her back to Himself' (A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, London, 1959 ((reprinted with new bibliography 1972)), p. 144).

In addition to Anderson's remark, it is interesting to find Fohrer's which reads as follows: 'Hosea heiratet eine Dirne ... um das Verhältnis Israels zu Jahwe zu symbolisieren: Es steht vor ihm wie eine Dirne statt als treues Eheweib da' (Die Symbolischen Handlungen der Propheten, ((A.T.A.N.T. 54)), Zürich/Stuttgart, 1965, p. 25).

In Hos. 2:4 (RSV 2:2) the case is the same, i.e., Israel is called Yahweh's wife. It is not clear, however, whether or not Hosea was the first to employ the marriage relationship as the metaphor or symbol of the relationship of Yahweh and his people.¹ But in either case it is very interesting to find that a similar kind of metaphor or a similar symbol is found in both the Book of Jeremiah and the Book of Ezekiel. This at any rate means that the metaphor or the symbol is not the invention of either Jeremiah or Ezekiel. Further, from the fact that Hosea employed the metaphor in connection with his polemics against the people because the people had adopted the Canaanite fertility cult practices, and that it is in the Canaanite religion that the symbolism of marriage and love was preeminent,² it seems justified to say that the metaphor or the symbol itself, to a large extent, cannot be derived from the traditions of the salvation-history (Heilsgeschichte).³ In other words, the metaphorical use of marriage relationship by Hosea was originally developed, or perhaps invented, in Palestine; and as such, it is perhaps one of the results of the settlement. Therefore, so long as the marriage relationship is used metaphorically

¹See, e.g., W. Brueggemann, Tradition of Crisis : A Study in Hosea, Richmond, Virginia, 1968, pp. 51ff.; O. J. Baab, 'Marriage', in I.D.B. Vol. III, pp. 285f..

²Cf. G. W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, London, 1971, p. 117; W. Brueggemann, ibid..

³It must be emphasized that the metaphor of husband-wife which is used for the relationship between Yahweh and Israel has at least two inseparable elements, i.e., the marriage and the unfaithfulness of the wife.

or symbolically for the relationship of Yahweh and his people Israel, in most cases it refers to the dark side of Israel's history and not to the bright side. So, in this case Hosea, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel are the same. And from the point of view of the traditio-historical criticism it is possible now to say that the later prophets must have inherited the metaphor from the earlier one. Besides, from the fact that there are similarities and differences between Jeremiah's and Ezekiel's handling of the metaphor, it is clear that the transmission of the metaphor had not gone under way without any dynamical development. As a matter of fact, the metaphor which was used only in Northern Israel for her situation following the settlement is now used by both Jeremiah and Ezekiel to denote the relationship of Yahweh with the two sister-kingdoms of Israel. Instead of one woman there are now two women.¹ While in Hosea and Jeremiah the issue connected with the harlotry is religious rather than political, in Ezekiel it is the other way round.²

Perhaps the most characteristic development of the metaphor is found in the Book of Ezekiel, i.e., in the naming of the two sisters : Oholah and Oholibah. As is said earlier, no other

¹The verb 717 and 981 are perhaps characteristic of the metaphor. They are playing significant role in those particular passages of Hosea, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel referred to above. In the rest of Ezekiel's passage they are strengthened by another verb i.e., 127 ; see, infra, p. 346.

²For the comparison of Jeremiah's and Ezekiel's handling of the metaphor, see, supra, pp. 328ff..

prophets or any other Israelite traditionist had ever mentioned the names; even in the Book of Ezekiel itself they are only found in chapter 23.

The attempts to explain the meaning of the names can be outlined as follows: Most of the scholars agree on analysing the names as if they are derived from the word אהל. While most of them agree on associating the meaning of the word אהל to the tent(s) of religious purpose in Palestine,¹ it is only Zimmerli who prefers to associate it with the tents in which the Israelites lived when they were wandering in the wilderness. There are at least two main arguments of Zimmerli in rejecting the traditional explanation of the names.² First, although the two names seem to be in analogy with the name אהל־ב in 2 Kings 21:1 (cf. Isa. 62:4), it is impossible to read them אהל instead of אהל and אהל־ב instead of אהל־ב, because the consonant ה in the name אהל־ב is clearly preserved in the MT. Second, although both names are derived from the word

¹J. Hermann, maintaining the older 'inhaltliche und philologische' explanation of the names Oholah and Oholibah, says that אהל is similar to אהל meaning "ihr Zelt" d.h. "die ihr eigenes Zelt d.h. Heiligtum hat" and that אהל־ב is similar to אהל־ב meaning "mein Zelt in ihr" = "die, in welcher mein Zelt d.h. Heiligtum ist" (op. cit., p. 144). Cf. C. F. Keil, Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Ezekiel, (ET. by J. Martin), Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1876, p. 322.

Slightly in distinction from the opinions of Hermann and Keil, Fohrer - Galling say: 'Auch Juda ist von Anfang an sündig, so dass die Namen dieselbe Verschuldung bezeichnen, die verhassten Höhenheiligümer. Oholah bedeutet demnach "die Zelt hat", Oholiba "Zelte in ihr"' (op. cit., p. 132). See also, Bertholet - Galling, op. cit., p. 83.

²W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, (B.K.XIII/1), pp. 541f..

אהל , it is impossible to relate them to either the Temple in Jerusalem or the sanctuaries in the high places, because (a) apart from Ezek. 41:1 in which the word אהל is a 'Textfehler', the Temple in Jerusalem is never called אהל at all in the Book of Ezekiel; therefore any connection of names אהלה and אהליבה with P's אהל מועד is out of the question; (b) in Ezek. 16:16 where the worship in the high places is spoken of, the word used is not אהל but במות שלמות.

Besides, Zimmerli, following Noth, points out that the meanings of other names derived from the word אהל are in fact not always related to either אהל מועד or 'Höhenzelte'. Therefore, concludes Zimmerli, 'wird man bei der Deutung der Namen von Ez. 23 vorsichtigerweise bei der Normalbedeutung von אהל bleiben'. Then Zimmerli continues: 'Die beiden Frauennamen dürften bei Ez... sagen wollen, dass die beiden Mädchen mit den gleichklingenden Namen ... zu den von der Wüste herkommenden in Zelten wohnenden, Herden weidenden (Gen. 4:20) Leuten gehören'.¹

The opinion of Zimmerli, however, does not stand without question or rejection. Accepting the fact that the word behind the two names is אהל , Eichrodt asks: 'Soll es die Nomadenzeit Israels erinnern, wie es bei ähnlich gebildeten Namen der Fall sein mag ...?' On his question, and at the same time on Zimmerli's opinion, Eichrodt on the one hand comments that 'eine solche archäologische Reminiszenz liegt jedoch hier ganz fern', and on the

¹Ibid., p. 542.

other points out that 'es findet sich nirgends eine Spur davon, dass das Zelt im Alten Testament als Charakteristikum des Höhenkults empfunden wäre'. Therefore, continues Eichrodt, 'wird die alte Erklärung sich immer noch als die befriedigendste anbieten, dass hier an das Jahweheiligtum gedacht sei, das ja im Pentateuch, und dort mit Vorliebe in der Priesterschaft gerne als Zelt bezeichnet wird'. So, according to Eichrodt, the name Oholah means '(die) ihr eigenes Zelt (hat)' and Oholibah means "'mein Zelt in ihr"'.¹ With Eichrodt the interpretation of the names Oholah and Oholibah goes back to the old one, namely that they refer to the religious tent(s) : the one belongs to Yahweh and the other does not.²

Now, it seems clear that generally speaking the discussion on the meaning of the two names rises out of the question of how is the word זֶלֶת to be understood. On the one hand it is possible to relate the meaning of the word to the nomadic life of the wandering Israel before the settlement, while on the other it is equally possible to relate it to the cultic tent(s). About the second possibility Taylor says :

'The names, Oholah and Oholibah, derived from Hebrew 'ohel, meaning a 'tent'. It could be a reference to a

¹W. Eichrodt, Der Prophet Hesekiel, (A.T.D. 22), Göttingen, 1959--1966, p. 214 (ET. pp. 321f.).

²To a certain extent Cooke also refers to this interpretation when he says that both names 'means tent, the second with a slight increase of emphasis, in allusion, probably, to the tents set up on the high places for religious prostitution'. However, he continues : 'The point is that the sisters were alike, as in name so in guilt' (G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, (I.C.C.)), Edinburgh, 1936, reprinted 1967, p. 249); cf. J. T. Bunn, Ezekiel, (The Boadman Bible Commentary, Vol. VI), London, 1972, who says : 'They were both alike in name (i.e., "tent") with slightly different emphasis, as well as in character and disposition. Each was depraved and wayward' (p. 301).

tented place of worship, but it is not clear whether this is Israel's tabernacle in the wilderness or a pagan shrine.

... On the other hand, Oholah could mean "her tent" and Oholibah almost certainly means "my tent (is) in her", which suggests Yahweh's sponsorship of Jerusalem'.

However, Taylor does not want to go any further than what he says. Instead, he says that '... the details must not be pressed too far. It is enough that the names had a cultic flavour'.¹ The hesitation of Taylor to go any further is shared with ^{by} Wevers. Although basically Wevers rejects the second possibility,² in fact he does not go any further in following up the first either. He says :

'The allegorical names given the sisters remain obscure. They were probably names intentionally sounding alike ... (And, although) the basic element of 'ohel occurs occasionally in Phoenician names, in the Hebrew name, Oholiab (Exod. 31:6), and in the Edomite feminine name, Oholibamah, in Gen. 36:2, 5, but these are no help. Nor is reference to the tent of meeting at all alike'.³

With all this, it is now clear that a new way out must be sought in order to understand what actually Ezekiel had in mind with

¹J. B. Taylor, Ezekiel, (The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries), London, 1969 (reprinted 1971), p. 171.

²Wevers says that 'the traditional explanation of the names Oholah as "her tent" and Oholibah as "my tent is in her" cannot be based on MT, and are not over lucid' (Ezekiel), ((The Century Bible - New Series)), London, 1969, p. 180).

³J. Wevers, ibid... For quite a different attempt, see, T. K. Cheyne, Critica Biblica, Part II, London, 1903, who argues that these two names are 'corruptions of (the name) שֶׁחֶלְבָּה' (p. 99).

these two names. For this, it must be emphasized that the names are used in a metaphorical context. In that sense it must be distinguished from other personal names, despite the fact that the latter very frequently have special meanings too (cf. Isa. 7:3; 8:3; Hos. 1:4, 6; etc.). In other words, the metaphorical context of the names Oholah and Oholibah has its own uniqueness. This is so, not only because traditio-historically the naming marks the climax of the metaphor's development in the prophetic traditions, but also because both names are derived from the word סִיח which is one way or the other very important in the course of Israel's history.

From the traditio-historical examination carried out earlier, it has been made clear that the metaphor was developed, or perhaps invented, in Palestine. This means that, as far as the course of Israel's history is concerned, the Sitz in Leben of the metaphor is the Palestinian soil rather than the wilderness or the Egyptian soil. In this sense it is probably right to say that originally the metaphor was used only to denote the relationship of Yahweh with Israel in Palestine (Hos. 1-3).¹ It is in this connection that the relevancy of the meaning(s) of the word סִיח is to be sought. Zimmerli is perhaps right in referring the meaning of the word to the tent dwellers in the wilderness, i.e., the nomadic ancestors of Israel. But from the fact that in

¹In Jer. 2:2, however, the metaphor is applied to the relationship of Yahweh and Israel in the wilderness. Whether the bride-bridgroom relationship there can be regarded as equal to the husband-wife relationship, is still a question. Besides, the word used in Jer. 2:2, i.e., סִיבָּב , is not found elsewhere.

Ezekiel 23 the metaphor presupposes the existence of the two sister-kingdoms of Israel, it is unlikely that his interpretation is relevant here. Further, it is true that in the Palestinian context the word בִּיָּהוָה could refer to either the tent of Yahweh or the tent(s) of deities other than Yahweh, and that this fact seems to be the reason why Oholah is often associated with the tent(s) of deities other than Yahweh and Oholibah with that of Yahweh. But, as Zimmerli has rightly argued, it is unlikely that that is really the meaning of the two names, since in the Book of Ezekiel the two sister-kingdoms are never contrasted one against the other.¹ So, the probable solution of the problem is to look for the meaning of the word בִּיָּהוָה which will keep the harmonious relationship of the two sisters and with Palestinian locality.

For this, first, one is to realize that the short sentences in 23:2, 4a, which are arranged paratactically, cannot be regarded as representing the chronological sequence of what ^{was} were historically taking place. Rather, they are the metaphorical presentation of what the situation really is, namely, that the names of the two sisters are Oholah and Oholibah, and that they belong to Yahweh, and that they have sons and daughters. In other words, they are the dimensions of what is metaphorically stated. Second, it should

¹W. Zimmerli, 'Israel im Buche Ezekiel', V.T. 8, 1958, pp. 75-90.

be emphasized that as is shown earlier, the aspects of harmony and unity of the two sisters are more outstanding than their being two independent, separate women. This is actually also the case with their two, and almost similar, names. The root word אהל behind the names refers to their being one rather than to their being two. In this sense it is unlikely that the word אהל refers to anything other than the tent of Yahweh in Jerusalem.¹ Despite the fact that there were attempts by Northern Kingdom to set up her own tent of Yahweh, in Israel's history until at least the time of Ezekiel it has been proved that the tent of Yahweh in Jerusalem remained superior.² Even so, it seems unlikely that

¹K. Koch, in his extensive explanation of the word אהל has shown that the name of the Temple in Jerusalem which was built by David is different from that of the Temple built by Solomon. David's Temple is called אהל יהוה , while Solomon's is called אהל מועד . Yet, as far as the word אהל is concerned, he says: 'Einerlei, ob das davidische Zelt YHWHs in den solomonischen Temple eingebracht und einer Kammer (zusammengefaltet) aufbewahrt wurde oder nicht, die Zeltterminologie geht jedenfalls in die Templesprache ein' (T.W.A.T. col. 138). It is also impossible to refer the meaning of the word אהל to the tent(s) in the high places, because, apart from the fact that these tents can be found in both Northern Israel and Southern Israel, and that their number was so big, it is difficult to see the harmonious relationship between the two sister-kingdoms and Yahweh through them. Besides, in the Book of Ezekiel they are not called אהל but במות של אהל (especially Ezek. 16:16).

²See, supra, pp. 241ff..

the use of the word אהל for the metaphorical names of the two kingdoms arose from this superiority, since in the time of Ezekiel the Northern Kingdom had long ceased to exist.

Rather, it must refer to the fact that from the beginning the word אהל had played a very important role in the history of Israel as the people of God. This fact is not only evident in the erection of the tent of meeting (אהל מועד) in the wilderness, but, most of all, in the building up of the Temple or the tabernacle (אהל יהוה/מועד) in Jerusalem by David and Solomon.¹ It is with these two tabernacles, i.e., the tabernacle in the wilderness and the tabernacle of David and Solomon, that the unique history of Israel as the people of God must^{be} understood. And if one is to choose which אהל best suits the Palestinian flavour of the metaphor, it must be said that the choice should fall on the tabernacle or the Temple in Jerusalem.

Now, it is true that the relation between אהל מועד in the wilderness and the tabernacle/Temple in Jerusalem is rather difficult to explain, nevertheless their significances in relation to Israel's becoming and being the people of God are undeniable.²

¹For the terminology related with the word אהל, see especially G. H. Davies, 'Tabernacle', in *I.D.B.* Vol. IV, pp. 498ff.; K. Koch, *op. cit.*, under 'אהל'.

²Cf. R. E. Clements, *God and Temple*, Oxford, 1965, pp. 35-62.

Moreover, with the אלה, be it the אלה in the wilderness or the tabernacle/Temple in Jerusalem, the idea of Israel's being possessed by Yahweh was never associated with her being divided into two or more groups, but always with her wholeness. In other words, with the word אלה there is no divided Israel; instead, there is only one people of God, i.e., the whole Israel. It is precisely with this idea of the whole Israel's being one people of God that the second dimension, i.e., ונתה"ן ל must be examined. The first thing about this expression of ונתה"ן ל which immediately attracts one's attention is the fact that the verb נתה"ן is in the 3rd. pers. fem. plur. form. Due to this fact it is not surprising that, in dealing with this particular passage of Ezekiel, many scholars have been led to the conclusion that metaphorically Yahweh has married two women. The idea of deity's bigamy was of course familiar in Canaanite mythology and other non-Israelite religions. But it was certainly alien to the religion of Israel. It is due to this fact that the explanations so far given by scholars concerning Oholah and Oholibah's becoming Yahweh's are almost always based on non-Israelite religion.¹

However, it has been hinted above that the problems concerning the

¹For this, see the discussion in Zimmerli's Ezekiel, (B.K. XIII/1), pp. 538f. and the references there; Zimmerli himself does not seem to have solved the problem involved in the metaphor of Yahweh's bigamy. See supra, pp. 332ff..

'two women' and the two names Oholah and Oholibah are genuinely Hebraic and not non-Israelite, namely that although there are 'two women' (23:2), or two-sister kingdoms, they are actually only one unity or one wholeness. In terms of their relationship with Yahweh, their being 'two' does not at all exclude their being one people of God. This contradiction can perhaps be compared with the Hebrew understanding of dual noun,¹ in which it is implied that instead of looking at the dual noun as referring to two separate things, it is preferred to look at it as referring to one unity or one wholeness.

In the light of this comparison it seems possible now to understand the word אֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה as a predicate of a sentence whose subject is a dual noun (cf. G-K. paras. 88a, 145n).² With the dual noun as the subject of the word אֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה the metaphor now clearly refers to the idea of Yahweh's possessing Israel as a whole and not as two separate kingdoms. In other words, due to the fact that the 3rd per. fem. plur. suffix in the word אֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה refers to Oholah and Oholibah, i.e., the two sisters-kingdoms which are actually one unity, the problem of Yahweh's bigamy can be regarded as non-existence. This is so, since the metaphor clearly refers to the marriage of Yahweh with Israel as a whole, and not as two

¹G-K. para. 88.

²This is actually also the case with the words אֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה and אֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה in Ezek. 23:3.

separate parts.

Now, as far as the idea of monogamy contained in the metaphor is concerned, it is easy to see the connection of the metaphor of Ezekiel with those of Hosea and Jeremiah. On the one hand Ezekiel goes in the line of Hosea in the fact that the ideas of monogamy and of the bearing sons and daughters are followed; while on the other he is like Jeremiah in that the two sister--kingdoms are included in the metaphor. In the first case it could clearly mean that Ezekiel's metaphor is derived from and the development of that of Hosea, and that Ezekiel was acquainted with the tradition of Northern Kingdom; while in the second case it cannot be understood as if Ezekiel was depending entirely on Jeremiah.¹ The truth probably was that the division of the kingdom into two separate kingdoms, i.e., two separate political identities, no longer allowed any Israelite traditionalist to talk about one political identity for the whole Israel. This can be seen chiefly in the work of the Deuteronomistic historian,² which

¹It has been argued earlier that the case might well be that both Ezekiel and Jeremiah depend on Hosea, but not Ezekiel on Jeremiah. This means that each of these contemporaries has his own version of the metaphor. See, *supra*, pp. 327 ff.. Contrast, however, J. W. Miller, who, seeing the connection of Jer. 3: 6-11 with Ezek. 23:1-35 (and Ezek. 16:44-52), says that 'Jer. 3:6ff. das Original bietet und nicht die Stellen in Hesekiel' (*op. cit.*, p. 91); cf. Zimmerli's remark that 'Ez steht auf den Schultern Jeremias, wenn er dieses Bild (i.e., the picture of the two unfaithful wives of Yahweh) aufgreift und in der ihm eigenen Gründlichkeit (analog Ezek. 16:34) es im einzelnen ausmalt' (*Ezechiel*, ((B.K. XIII/1)), p. 539).

²Cf. G. W. Anderson, *The History and Religion of Israel*, pp. 104, 167; his *A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 93ff..

clearly shows the distinction between Northern Israel and Southern Israel. So, it can now be said that by the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel there was already a common knowledge that in terms of politics there were two kingdoms of Israel, i.e., Northern Israel and Southern Israel. It is from this common knowledge, or this common source, that both Jeremiah and Ezekiel seem to have derived their knowledge of the divided kingdoms to which they applied the metaphor of the husband-wife relation of Yahweh and Israel.

While Jeremiah in his treatment of the two sister-kingdoms in this particular passage, i.e., Jer. 3:3-11, still preserved the names 'Israel' and 'Judah', Ezekiel, in his metaphor dealt with here, left them out altogether.¹ Instead, Ezekiel used other names, i.e., Oholah and Oholibah. In other words, while Jeremiah's treatment is only semi-metaphorical, that of Ezekiel is entirely metaphorical. Based on all the arguments above, it can now be said that the sentence in Ezek. 23:4b cannot be regarded as an original part of the metaphor. This is so not only because the mentioning of the names 'Samaria' and 'Judah' has weakened the metaphor, but also because these two names do not fit well with the meaning of the word בִּתּוֹן which underlies both names 'Oholah' and 'Oholibah'.

¹For the use of the names 'Israel' and 'Judah' in the Old Testament, particularly in the Book of Jeremiah and the Book of Ezekiel, see, G. A. Danell, Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament, Uppsala, 1957, pp. 206-261. Despite the fact that the name 'Israel' can be understood in several ways, Danell admits that in Jer. 3:6-10 it refers to the Northern Kingdom as contrast to 'Judah' which refers to the Southern Kingdom (ibid., pp. 211f..)

Verses 5-10 : The deeds of Oholah.

It is very interesting to find that this section begins with the verb חָלַל with Oholah as its subject. In this section alone the word חָלַל occurs four times, i.e., once as a verb (v. 5a), and three times as substantive (vv. 7a, 8a, 8b); once connected with person other than Oholah (v. 8b), and three times connected with Oholah alone (vv. 5a, 7a, 8a). From this statistics it can be inferred that the history of Oholah is one way or the other connected with the word חָלַל . This inference is strengthened by the use of the verb רָצָה which in this section alone occurs three times, and each time with Oholah as its subject (vv. 5b, 7b, 9b).¹ It is true that these two dominating words are used metaphorically. But it is interesting to find that the partner, i.e., the Assyrians (v. 5b), with whom Oholah played the harlot (חָלַל) and doted on (רָצָה) is not spoken of metaphorically. Instead, the Assyrians are described as what they really were, i.e., they were the military and the administrative personnel.² From the description it is

¹In the Old Testament the word רָצָה meaning 'desire', 'dote on', occurs not more than ten times, i.e., once in Jer. 4:30 and nine times in the Book of Ezekiel. The distribution of those in the Book of Ezekiel is as follows : Ezek. 33:31, 32, and Ezek. 23:5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 20 (Lisowsky). For Ezek. 16:37, see Zimmerli, *op. cit.*, *in loc.*; BHS. crit. app., *in loc.*.

²For the details of the description, i.e., the last word of v. 5 plus v. 6, see, e.g., Cooke, Zimmerli (and the references there), and Wevers.

clear that the reference is now the foreign political affairs rather than the religious ones. To this extent Ezekiel is different from both Hosea and Jeremiah,¹ whose references are the Canaanite religious influences.² Although it is still a question of whether there was any particular reference in the mind of Ezekiel in his mentioning of Oholah's harlotry and desire with Assyria, and if there was whether it could be regarded as representative of the whole period of Northern Israel's existence, there is one thing which is certain, namely, that in that whole period Assyria was becoming the world empire.³

If the historical reference is pressed further, one would see that there are at least two facts which could be regarded as important. First, as far as the history of Northern Israel is concerned, it was only King Jehu (841-815 B.C.),⁴ King Menahem

¹ Although with a slightly different reason, Zimmerli says: 'Dabei steht hier nicht mehr wie in Hos 2, Jer 3 ... die Buhlerei mit den kanaänischen Landesbaalen vor Augen, sondern die politische Fremdländerei ...' (*op. cit.*, p. 539).

² With the exception of Hos. 8:9. For this passage, see, e.g., W. R. Harper, Amos and Hosea, (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1905, pp. 317f.; W. Rudolph, Hosea, (K.A.T. XIII/1), says that 'die Bündnispolitik ist für Hosea genauso eine Verletzung des ersten Gebotes wie der Fremdkult' (p. 166).

³ For this, see, G. W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, London, 1971, pp. 101ff..

⁴ In the so called Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III it is clearly pictured that Jehu was prostrating and paid tribute to Shalmaneser III the King of Assyria. For this see, e.g., M. Noth, The History of Israel, 2nd edition, (ET. by Stanley Gordon, revised by P. R. Ackroyd), London, 1960 (reprinted 1972), p. 247 and note 2; J. Bright, A History of Israel, 2nd edition, London, 1972, pp. 250f. note 68; G. W. Anderson, ibid., pp. 98f., and the references there.

(745-738 B.C.), and King Hosea (732-724 B.C.) who had become Assyria's vassals (2 Kings 15:19f.; 17:3ff.), while their respective predecessors and successors showed either defensive or offensive attitudes against Assyria's expansion.¹ Second, despite the resistance from the part of small countries like Syria, Damascus, and Northern Israel, Assyria's successful expansion to the west had certainly made her the overlord of those small countries. In other words, as far as Northern Israel is concerned, it seems there was no time at all in which her relationship with Assyria can be regarded as enjoyable. The situation of Northern Israel had always been either surrendering to or fighting against Assyria. In either situation there was no point at all at which Northern Israel can be regarded as benefiting from her encounter with Assyria.

However, there are some evidences in the Book of Hosea which show that the relationship of Northern Israel with Assyria had become one of the major prophetic criticisms. They are Hos. 5:13; 7:11; 8:9; 12:1. In all of these passages Northern Israel's seeking for help or her submission to Assyria is regarded as her distrusting and denial of Yahweh, her only God.² It is interesting too to find that it is only Hos. 7:11 and 8:9 which to some extent are metaphors, while Hos. 5:13 and 12:1 are not. Nevertheless,

¹For all this, see, M. Noth, *ibid.*, pp. 245f., 253ff.; J. Bright, *ibid.*, pp. 237-240, 268ff..
G. W. Anderson, *ibid.*, pp. 92, 101ff..

²On these passages, see, e.g., J. L. Mays, *Hosea*, (O.T.L.), London, 1969, *in loci*.

these evidences show that it is impossible to deny that one way or another this prophetic criticism of Hosea must have come to Ezekiel's knowledge. So, it can now be said that there are at least two sources which had given rise to Ezekiel's metaphor of Oholah's harlotry with the Assyrians : first, the historical source or the historical evidence, e.g., the seeking for help and/or the submission of King Jehu, King Menahem, and King Hosea, to Assyria (cf. 2 Kings 15:14f.; 17:3ff.)¹ which, neagre though they might be in the traditions of the people Israel, Ezekiel must have known by himself; second, the traditio-historical source or evidence, i.e., those derived from the passages of Hosea referred to above. Turning to Ezek. 23:8 it can be said that the solution of its problem is more or less similar to the one presented above. Although to a great extent 23:8 only repeats 23:3,² it is clear that the mentioning of the name of Egypt could refer to two historical references : first, it refers to the historical reference of y. 3, and second, it refers to the historical reference of Hos. 7:11; 12:1. As far as the second

¹The issue here seems to be politically centred rather than religiously centred, although in the whole context both politics and religion were inseparable. With this view in mind, it looks like that Ezek. 23:7b does not fit well to the main issue of Ezek. 23:5-10; cf. W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 544; J. Wevers, op. cit., p. 180.

²Repetition is a literary phenomenon characteristic of Ezekiel. For the problem of repetition, see, C. Kuhl, 'Die "Wiederaufnahme" - ein literarisches Prinzip?', Z.A.W. 64, 1952, pp. 1-11.

historical reference is concerned, its explanation is entirely the same as that of the reference to Assyria in Ezek. 23:5, 7a.¹ But as far as the first historical reference is concerned, it is interesting to find that here Ezekiel does not relate Northern Israel's seeking for help to Egypt with Israel's harlotry with the latter in her early history; but he also sees that the later harlotry with Egypt is based on and the continuation of the former one. In this sense it is unique that Ezekiel sees the whole history of Northern Israel, as the history of harlotry (הַיָּזְנָה and הַזְנָה).² For this reason, it is therefore understandable that the punishment which befell upon her is the punishment which a harlot deserves (vv. 9f.).³ And it is not difficult to find the historical reference of the punishment, since the metaphor refers to the fall of Samaria (722 B.C.) and the deportation of Northern Israel's population by the Assyrians.⁴

¹For Northern Israel's seeking for help to Egypt, see, 2 Kings 17:4.

²It has been shown earlier that the lacking of the reference to the positive, and bright, periods in the history is due to the nature and the Sitz im Leben of the metaphor itself. See, supra, pp. 337ff..

³Except in Deut. 22:20f., there is no other evidence in the Old Testament which shows that the punishment of a harlot (הַזְנָה) is death sentence. Cf. O. J. Baab, 'Prostitution', I.D.B. Vol. III, pp. 931-934. Although the phrase וַיִּזְנֶה בְּחַרְבַּת הַגֵּר in 23:10a β does not seem to belong to the original metaphor, it shows clearly that the issue in the metaphor is political rather than religious.

⁴The relevant passage for this is 2 Kings 17:5f., 23; for the passage, see, J. Bright, A History of Israel, 2nd edition, London, 1972, pp. 273ff.; J. Gray, 1 & 2 Kings, pp. 583f.. For the explanation of the punishment, cf. Ezek. 16:39ff., and supra, p. 349 note 2.

Verses 11-20 : The deeds of Oholibah.

Like that of Oholah Oholibah's deeds are described by using two dominating verbs, i.e., הָיָה and בָּרָא . Out of the seven occurrences of the word הָיָה in this section there are only two which are not related to Oholibah. While the rest, and the whole occurrences of the word בָּרָא (four times), are directly related to her.¹ The frequent occurrences of these two words is not only keeping the unit in the line and the continuation of the preceding metaphor, but can also be regarded as maintaining the dual character of the two sisters. This is to say that the deeds of the two sisters are basically the same, i.e., metaphorically called by the uses of the words הָיָה and בָּרָא . The other similarity between the sisters is that their partners are not described in metaphorical language but, instead, in plain language. The description of the Assyrians in vv. 12 is just the same as that of the Assyrians in v. 5f.; the description of the Babylonians 'pictured on the wall' is just clear and real as well (vv. 14b-15).² From the descriptions of Oholibah's two partners it is clear that the issue in the unit is once again foreign political affairs. However, there is one outstanding thing here which distinguishes Oholibah from Oholah, namely, that

¹ הָיָה : vv. 11b, 14a, 18a, 19a, and 19b; בָּרָא : vv. 11a, 12a, 16a, and 20a.

² For the detailed description of the Babylonians' picture, see, e.g., G. A. Cooke, op. cit., pp. 251f.; Zimmerli, op. cit., pp. 546f..

Testament which can be considered, i.e., Jer. 3:6-11.¹

¹It seems impossible to take 2 Kings 17:7-20 into consideration here, because it does not say anything about the excessive sins of Judah compared with that of Northern Israel. Instead, it says that their sins are the same.

It seems equally impossible to refer to Ezek. 16:44ff., since it deals with three sisters, i.e., Jerusalem, Samaria, and Sodom. For this, see, Eichrodt, Ezekiel, (ET. by Cosslett Quin), (O.T.L.), London, 1970, pp. 214ff..

As far as Jer. 3:6-11 itself is concerned, most scholars are in agreement on regarding the passage as a self-contained one, which to some extent is separated from the rest of the chapter (Cornill, Volz, Rudolph, Weiser, Cunliffe-Jones). The text of the passage is not entirely good. The corrections of Cornill, Rudolph, Volz, and BH3 crit. app. are very suggestive. However, as far as the comparison between Northern Israel and Southern Israel is concerned, there is one thing in the passage which is rather difficult to explain, i.e., the \aleph (or \aleph ?) which is prefixed to the word \aleph in v. 9a. For this one could only ask whether or not the \aleph (or \aleph) is meant to be a preposition \aleph -comparative.

For the allusion to the sending away of a wife with a decree of divorce in Jer. 3:8b, see, Deut. 24:1-4. The use of the legal prescription in Jer. 3:1 to show how Judah's legal fate would be is very interesting. It is true that to some extent Jer. 3:1 concerns with a kind of comparison between Judah's increasing harlotry (v. 16) and that of the woman in the legal prescription (v. 1a). However, to understand the case of that legal prescription as the case of Northern Israel's divorce from Yahweh (Jer. 3:8b) would be reading too much into the text of Jer. 3:1. As far as Jer. 3:1 is concerned, see, e.g., the illuminating article by J. D. Martin, 'The Forensic Background to Jer. III:1', in V.T. 19, 1969, pp. 82-92.

In spite of what has been said about Jer. 3:6-11 above, there are at least three things which can be said concerning its comparison with Ezek. 23:5-20. First, in both passages it is clear that Yahweh is the speaker and the prophet the sole hearer.¹ Second, both passages describe Southern Israel, which is metaphorically called אהליבה by Ezekiel and semi--metaphorically called יהודה בגודה by Jeremiah, as having seen the deeds and the punishment of Northern Israel, which in its turn metaphorically called אהלה by Ezekiel and semi--metaphorically called ישראל משבה by Jeremiah. The phrase which these two prophets uses for the description are the same, i.e., ותראה בגודה אחותה יהודה (Jer. 3:7b) and ותראה אחותה אהליבה (Ezek. 23:11). Third, both passages contain the idea of comparison between Northern Israel and Southern Israel. This can be seen in the use of the preposition ׀-comparative in both passages, i.e., Jer. 3:11 : מדקה נפשה משבה ישראל מבגודה יהודה and Ezek. 23:11 : ותשחת עגבתה מפנה ואת תזנותיה מידונן אחותה, which shows that Northern Israel's harlotry is less than that of the Southern Israel. Despite the fact that the issue in Jer. 3:6-11 is religious rather than political, it can be said that both passages have similar theme or idea, i.e., Judah's

¹For this type of speech, see, supra, pp. 310f..

harlotry (זנות) is greater than that of Israel.¹ Now, since these are the only passages in the Old Testament in which the idea or the theme of comparison is found, it is therefore very difficult to trace back the history of the idea or the theme concerned. The most that one can say here is that there is a relationship between the two passages. But the question such as how and what the relationship was is very difficult to answer.²

¹For the idea as it is found in Jer. 3:6-11, see, e.g., A. Weiser, Das Buch des Propheten Jeremia, (A.T.D. 20), Göttingen, 1952, pp. 33f.; H. Cunliffe-Jones, The Book of Jeremiah, (The Torch Bible Commentaries), London, 1960, p. 60; Volz, and Rudolph.

²It seems that Miller has gone too far in saying that the passage of Jeremiah is the original, which means that Ezekiel copied or developed it. More modest opinion is expressed by Zimmerli, who says that here Ezekiel was standing on the shoulders of Jeremiah although Ezekiel had his own interpretation (cf. Ezekiel, ((B.K. XIII/1)), p. 539); cf. Eichrodt's remark on Ezekiel's employment of the symbol of marriage for the relationship of Yahweh and Israel, in his Ezekiel, (ET. by Cosslett Quin), p. 210.

For all this, however, one must be reminded that similarities of phraseology and idea in two or more passages does not necessarily always mean that one passage is dependent on the other. Especially with Jeremiah and Ezekiel, who were themselves contemporaries, the case might well be that their similarities have derived from a common source or a common knowledge.

In other words, both Jeremiah and Ezekiel might well have derived their similarities from a common source or a common knowledge, which was presumably so common and/or so popular that no other Israelite traditionist felt necessary to put it into record. Cf. C. A. Briggs, 'The Argument E Silentio', J.B.L., June-December 1883, pp. 3-21.

Going back to Ezek. 23:11-20, it is very interesting to find that here Ezekiel understood the history of Judah as the history of harlotry ($\eta\eta\tau$ and $\eta\eta\psi$) with foreign nations or foreign powers. He described the history very systematically in metaphorical language similar to that of Oholah's or Northern Israel's history. Once again one may be surprised by the lack of any hint at the bright periods of Judah's history. And for this it must be said that the lack is primarily due to the nature of the metaphor itself. This, however, does not mean that Ezekiel did not know the bright periods of Judah's history such as those detected in the David-Zion tradition,¹ and the reforms and resistances of Hezekiah and Josiah. Besides, the lack shows that the issue in this passage is entirely different from that of Ezek. 16:1-43. With this in mind, one is also surprised by the fact that Ezek. 23:11-20 only mentions the Assyrians and the Babylonians² as Oholibah's partners in her harlotry, and is silent about the other foreign engagements. For this fact there are at least two things which can be said. First, although the Assyrians and the Babylonians are described in a very plain language, their being mentioned here is primarily to be understood in the context of the metaphor and not otherwise. Second, it is true that there are many other foreign engagements of Judah, in terms of both alliance and submission. But the reason for the mentioning of only these two foreign powers is

¹See, supra, pp. 259ff., 277, 326ff., 341ff..

²For the mentioning of the name Egypt in vv. 19f., see, infra, pp. 364ff..

presumably because they were the two world empires whose influences were most decisive for the political life of Judah. In other words, as far as Judah is concerned, it is chiefly with these two world powers that her whole political affairs were determined. With all this it seems clear that Ezek. 23:11-20 does not have any concern at all with detailed historical references.

The systematic structure of the passage is shown by the following facts : First, in v. 11, and in a fairly concise statement, it is verbally reported that Oholibah's deeds are worse than that of her sister. Second, this statement is not immediately followed up by the description of the difference between the two sisters. Instead, their similarity is shown first (v. 12), and it is only after that that their difference, or rather Oholibah's excess, is mentioned (vv. 24ff.). The systematic structure is so clear that with or without the comment in v. 15¹ it will easily be noticed. Finally, it is very interesting to find that the excess of Oholibah's harlotry is regarded as the result and the continuation of her harlotry with Egypt in the days of her Youth (vv. 19f.).

Having said all this, there are now two problems which must be examined. First, the problem about the mentioning of

¹Some scholars would like to leave this verse out for one or two reasons; see, e.g., Wevers, op. cit., p. 179; Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 545.

the Assyrians (אֲשּׁוּרִי) in v. 12. It is said above that Ezek. 23:11-20 does not actually concern with detailed historical references. Therefore the examination on the problem of the mentioning of the Assyrians in this section will be confined only to what is mentioned there. In v. 12 it is stated that Oholibah 'doted upon' (אֲהוּלִיבָה) the Assyrians. As far as its historical reference is concerned, this verse could probably be referring only to the reigns of King Ahaz (735-715 B.C.; 2 Kings 16:17f.; cf. Isa. 7:1-8:3), King Manasseh (687-642 B.C.; 2 Kings 21:1-18), and King Amon (642-640 B.C.; 2 Kings 21:19-26), i.e., the times when either willingly or by force Judah became one of Assyria's vassals. These references do not mean, however, that it is only during those special periods that Judah's life was determined by the Assyrian power. The whole period beginning from Assyria's first military campaign in the mid-9th century B.C. until the fall of Nineveh in 612 B.C. had turned out to be the period in which the political lives of the Syrian and the Palestinian countries were measured by the Assyrian power.¹ However, these references of Judah's history do show that during that particular time Judah's political life was completely

¹ M. Noth, The History of Israel, pp. 243ff., 253-269; J. Bright, A History of Israel, 2nd. edition, pp. 283ff.; A. L. Oppenheim, 'Assyria and Babylonia', I.D.B., Vol. I, especially pp. 271-274.

dependent on Assyria. In other words, Assyria was then Judah's overlord. Yet it is surprising that in v. 12 Ezekiel does not call the Assyrians the 'lover' of Oholibah as he does in the case of Oholah (v. 5b).¹ Whether this silence of Ezekiel signifies anything is not clear.

Second, the problem about the mentioning of the Babylonians (לְבָבֵי בָבֶל) in vv. 14-17. The striking thing here is that the harlotry of Oholibah with the Babylonians is described in such a way that one cannot fail to appreciate Ezekiel's characteristics. The description begins with a concise introduction (v. 14a) which, on the one hand, is connecting what precedes with what follows it, while on the other, raises curious tension in the reader about what will follow. In what follows, i.e., vv. 14b-15a, it is not the Babylonians themselves who are described in detail, but only their picture which is presumably painted on a wall.² Here it is again very surprising that Ezekiel describes the picture twice. First, he identifies the 'men painted on the wall' (אֲנָשֵׁי מַחֲקָה עַל-הַקִּיר , v. 14b) as the 'images of (the) Chaldeans' (צַלְמֵי כַשְׁדִּיִּם , v. 14b) who, according to the clothes or the uniform they were wearing,

¹ Zimmerli notices that the sequence of the detailed descriptions of the Assyrians here is different from that found in vv. 5f.. The sequence in vv. 5f. is : 1-2-3-4, but in v. 12 is : 2-1-4-3, with the variation of מַכְלֵל instead of תַּכְלֵת (Ezekiel, ((B.K. XIII/1)), p. 548).

² Some scholars would like to change אֲנָשֵׁי מַחֲקָה in v. 14 into אֲנָשֵׁי מַחֲקָה (Cornill, Toy, Bertholet, Cooke), while others, referring to 8:10, prefer to retain it (Zimmerli, Eichrodt).

'appear like third-ranked-men' (מראה שלשים כלם , v. 15a); second, he identifies them as the 'likeness of (the) Babylonians (whose) native land was Chaldea' (דמות בני-בבל --- , v. 15b).

These two descriptions could mean at least two things : (a) Ezekiel realizes the difference between the Chaldeans and the Babylonians (cf. v. 23).¹ As a matter of fact it was not the Babylonians who set up the neo-Babylonian empire in 625 B.C., but it was the Chaldeans.² This was so, partly because most of the Babylonians themselves were deported to Northern Israel by Assyria soon after the fall of Samaria in 722-721 B.C. (2 Kings 17:24).³ (b) Due to this fact the Babylonians referred to by Ezekiel in v. 15b must then mean the neo-Babylonians, i.e., the neo-Babylonian officers, and not the old Babylonians. This is so not only due to Ezekiel's characteristics in arranging detailed

¹W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, (B.K. XIII/1), says : 'In (v.) 23 werden sogar die Babylonier (בבל) von den Chaldäern (אַרְמֵי) unterscheiden. Darin könnte sich ein Wissen um die Fremdherkunft der aramäischen Chaldäern ... verraten'. Moreover, it is interesting to find his suggestive conclusion, in which he says : 'Man wird solche Unterscheidung einem in der bab. Verbannung wohnenden Propheten eher zutrauen als einem in Jerusalem redenden' (pp. 546f.).

²Cf., e.g., M. Noth, op. cit., p. 270; W. Eichrodt, Der Prophet Hesekiel, (A.T.D. 22), p. 217 (EP., p. 325); W. Zimmerli, ibid..

³Cf. M. Noth, op. cit., p. 262.

descriptions like this one (vv. 14b-15) paratactically,¹ but also due to the historical fact, namely that it was this neo-Babylonian empire and not the old one which determined Judah's political life after the fall of the Assyrian empire.² So, with these two things it is better to regard the two descriptions as being one long, and detailed, description which refers only to one thing, i.e., to the picture of the neo-Babylonian officers.

The question of historical reference of the picture, i.e., whether the picture was seen in Jerusalem or outside, is very difficult to answer. It is true that some of the materials of the painting were found in Jerusalem (Jer. 22:14 : וְקָקִים בַּשָּׁטָר) Π and that Ezek. 8:10 could perhaps give the idea of what sort of

¹ On this detailed description, Cooke remarks that כְּלָמֵי כְּשָׁרִיִּים is 'perhaps a note from the margin; the mentioning of the Chaldeans comes too soon, anticipating v. 15', and that מִלְרֵחַם כְּשָׁרִיִּים אֶרֶץ is an annotation to v. 15 (*op. cit.*, p. 251). However, since detailed, and sometimes repetitious, descriptions are found very often, and since it is one of Ezekiel's characteristics, this remarks of Cooke are actually unnecessary.

² The first phase of Chaldean history was marked by King Merodachbaladan, during whose reign the Chaldean Kingdom was still fairly small. Although he had seized Babylon in 720 B.C. and had taken part in the fights against Assyria, it was Nabopolassar (626-605 B.C.) who had brought the kingdom into world power. Nabopolassar set up the so called neo-Babylonian Kingdom, which later, under the powerful reign of Nebuchadnessar II (605-562 B.C.) became a world empire (2 Kings 24:7). 'In fact "Chaldea" then began to replace the term "Babylonian"'. Nebuchadnessar was succeeded by his son, Evil-Merodach, under whose reign the empire began to weaken. Under the reign of Babonidus the empire eventually fell into Cyrus' hand in 539 B.C. See, A. L. Oppenheim, 'Chaldea', *I.D.B.* Vol. I., pp. 551f.; cf. G. W. Anderson, *op. cit.*, pp. 105, 148.

painting it was. But, it seems to be too pedantic to press this question further. Wherever the picture was, it is upon those who were painted there that Oholibah doted. Further, the expression which is used to describe the reaction of Oholibah in seeing the picture is indeed quite emphatic :

וּתְעַגְבֵּה אֲלֵיהֶם לִמְרָאָה עֵינֶיהָ (v. 16a).¹ This is immediately followed by Oholibah's real action, i.e., sending them messengers to Chaldea (v. 16b). Oholibah's invitation was presumably gladly accepted, so the harlotry went under way (v. 17a). With all this, one cannot fail to be impressed by the systematic and detailed description of the process of Oholibah's harlotry with the Babylonians, from its very beginning until its accomplishment. By looking back at the introductions in vv. 11a,β, 14a, it must be said that here one is dealing with a piece of literary work which is indeed difficult to find its comparison. However, it has been said above that here too one is dealing primarily with a metaphor, for which reason the historical reference(s) of what is described cannot be examined in detail. So, here too, its historical reference(s) will be examined in the confinement of what is said by the passage itself.

As far as one can see, the political involvement of Judah with Babylon can be noted clearly when Merodach-baladan 'sent envoys to Jerusalem (i.e., to the King Hesekiah) to encourage

¹ Reading the text with Q^e rē, (Zimmerli, Cooke, and others). Notice the emphatic expression : לִמְרָאָה עֵינֶיהָ.

resistance to Assyria'¹ (Isa. 39:1-4) some-time in 703 B.C. (2 Kings 20:12-15). But the dependence of Judah on Babylon itself does not seem to have begun until 605 B.C. when King Jehoiakim became Babylon's vassal (2 Kings 24:1);² in addition, Judah's complete submission to Babylon took place only in 597 B.C. (2 Kings 24:8ff.), after which the first deportation from Judah to Babylon, including Ezekiel himself, took place. With all these references it seems acceptable to say that it is difficult to pinpoint what or which of these events Ezekiel was referring to.

The mentioning of Egypt in vv. 19-20 might give some light on the reference. There are at least two possible ways to understand vv. 19f.. Both of them actually depend on how v. 19a is to be understood. To begin with, it has been said earlier that the expression in v. 19a is one of the statements which is employed by the prophet Ezekiel to show the difference between

¹G. W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, p. 105.

²It is not clear whether Josiah's going to Meggido to attack Necho II when the latter was on his way to Assyria in 609 B.C. (2 Kings 23:29f.; 2 Chron. 35:20-24) had any thing at all to do with Babylon's growing power. However, it is interesting to find that Wevers alludes to the connection when he says: 'Actually Josiah's attempt to stop Egypt at Meggido from going to the help of Assyria was aid to Babylon, and this may be what sending messengers (i.e., v. 16b) (in the brackets is mine) may refer to' (op. cit., p. 182).

For the discussion on this problem, see, e.g., G. W. Anderson, op. cit., p. 129 and the note there; M. Noth, op. cit., p. 277 and the note there.

Oholibah and Oholah. However, it seems that the expression as it now stands has a double function, i.e., to repeat and stress the statement in v. 14a and to introduce a new case of Oholibah's harlotry (vv. 19b-20). In the first function, which leads to the first way to understand vv. 19-20, it is clear that the statement stresses the increase of Oholibah's harlotry described in vv. 14b-17a, and gives reason for it :

'She multiplied her harlotry, remembering the days of her youth when she played the harlot in the land of Egypt' (v. 19);

that is to say, Oholibah multiplied her harlotry with Babylon because she remembered her harlotry in the land of Egypt when she was still young.¹ This implies that the possibility to understand v. 19 as referring to a new harlotry with Egypt is ruled out, and that the harlotry with Babylon, presumably very intensive one, was the current harlotry which Ezekiel saw and described. If it is so, then the two verses, i.e., vv. 19, 20, only constitute a concluding remark which gives more stress to and reason for the

¹In Ezekiel's denunciation on Jerusalem the bloody city (Ezek. 22:6-12), the harlotry is related to Jerusalem's having forgotten Yahweh. In this connection perhaps one could say that Oholibah's remembrance of her harlotry is actually the same as her forgetfulness of Yahweh. For the theological discussion on the problem of remembrance and forgetfulness hinted at here, see, S. J. de Vries, 'Remembrance in Ezekiel', Interpretation 16, 1952, pp. 58ff., although he does not say anything about the connection of Israel's remembrance of her harlotry with the increase of her current one referred to by Ezekiel.

harlotry described in vv. 14-17. While in the second function of the statement in v. 19a, i.e., introducing a new increase of Oholibah's harlotry, the case is different. In this connection some scholars regard vv. 19-20 as referring to Oholibah's new harlotry with Egypt which is different from that described in v. 3.¹ This is justified by the fact that in 609-605 B.C. Judah once again became the vassal of Egypt (2 Kings 23:31ff.; Jer. 22:10ff.).²

¹Eichrodt points out that the new harlotry with Egypt began after the bankruptcy of Judah's pro-Babylonian policy. He, then, continues: 'Man sucht durch Anlehnung an Ägyptern, dessen Expansionspläne nach Norden unter Necho neu belebt wurden, eine selbständigere politische Stellung mit grösseren Freiheiten einzuhandeln. Hesekiel kann darin nur eine gesteigerte Wiedekehr des alten sündlichen Hanges erblicken, den er mit den verletzendsten Worten als widerliche Teilheit brandmarkt' (Der Prophet Hesekiel, ((A.T.D. 22)), p. 218; ET. p. 327).

Despite the fact that Cooke deals only with v. 20, he points out that 'the allusion here is to Judah's overture to Egypt for help when threatened by the Babylonians'. For this he refers to v. 27; Jer. 2:18; 37:7; and Lam. 4:17. (G. A. Cooke, Ezekiel, ((I.C.C.)), p. 252). However, Ezek. 23:27 does not seem to confirm Cooke's remark, since the 3rd. pers. masc. plur. suffix in the word אֵלֶּיךָ is not clear whether it refers to 'Egypt' or to Oholibah's 'lovers' (v. 22). Besides, in the list of Oholibah's 'lovers' in v. 24 the name of Egypt is not included.

See also A. B. Davidson, The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges), revised by A. W. Streane, Cambridge, 1916, p. 184.

²The name 'Shallum' in Jer. 22:10ff. refers to Jehoahaz. See, e.g., G. W. Anderson, op. cit., p. 129.

However, there are two problems which are raised by these two interpretations of y. 19a. First, if it is true that וּתְרַבָּה אֶת-תַּזְנוּתֶיהָ (y. 19a) introduces a new case of harlotry, the partner of Oholibah cannot be Egypt, but must be פְּלִגְשִׁי(הִם). This is so not only because y. 19b (לִזְכֹּר יִזְנֶתָהּ בְּאַרְצָא מִצְרַיִם) refers to the past harlotry rather than to the current one, but also because y. 20a uses the expression and form similar to that of yy. 5b α , 9b β , and 16a α , i.e., עַבְדָּה, plus עַל, plus object. The object here is פְּלִגְשִׁי(הִם). Second, granted that y. 19a introduces a new case of harlotry, and that Egypt was the partner, then it is rather difficult to refer the historical reference of yy. 19b-20 to Judah's becoming the vassal of Egypt in 609-605 B.C. This is so because, on the one hand Judah's becoming the vassal of Egypt in this period was prior to her submission to Babylon (597 B.C., of yy. 14-17a) which means that the harlotry with Egypt cannot be understood as the increase of the harlotry with Babylon, and on the other the meaning of the word פְּלִגְשִׁי(הִם) is not clear.¹

As far as the word פְּלִגְשִׁי(הִם) is concerned, it might well be that this word is a foreign, or a loan, word as it is suggested

¹See, note 1 following page and infra, p. 368 note 1.

by some scholars.¹ But whether it is foreign or not, its meaning seems to be determined by its explanation in y. 20b. In this connection Oswald's remark is very helpful. He points out that there was a great and complex literary tradition between the expression used in y. 20b and a Sumerian expression of the same kind.² Despite the difficulty to see how this

¹Cooke, Zimmerli.

In distinction from these two scholars, Eichrodt does not say anything about the word's being foreign. Instead he points out that elsewhere this word is used for concubines, and that here it must have a masculine meaning (cf. W. Eichrodt, Ezekiel, ((ET. by Cosslett Quin)), p. 319 note j). Further, rejecting Köhler's suggestion that this word means the Philistines, Eichrodt seems to have taken for granted that אֲשֵׁרֵי refers to Egypt (ibid., pp. 327).

²From the construction of the sentences, it is clear that y. 20b is actually intended to describe what אֲשֵׁרֵי refers to. For this problem Loretz Oswald has drawn attention on an expression from a Sumerian literature which he thinks helpful to understand what Ezek. 23:20 means. Oswald himself acknowledges that he quotes the relevant expression from W. Heimpel's Tierbilder in der sumerischen Literatur, (Studia Pohl. 2. Rom. 1968, pp. 258:27. 1). The relevant expression is: 'Eine dreijährige Frau heiratet man nicht wie Esel (es tun)'. The comment of Heimpel on the expression, which is again quoted by Oswald, reads as follows: 'Der Vergleich berührt nicht etwa auf der "Niedrigkeit" der Esel ... sondern vielmehr auf deren intensive sexuelle Aktivität'.

Confirming Heimpel's comment, Oswald concludes: 'Das sumerische Sprichwort und Ez 23:20 stellen sich uns somit als Zeugnisse einer grossen und komplexen literarischen Tradition dar' (L. Oswald, 'Eine sumerische Parallele zu Ez 23:20,' Biblische Zeitschrift, N. F., 1970, p. 126.

In the Old Testament there are four passages whose ideas are perhaps similar to that of Ezek. 23:20. They are Hos. 8:9; Jer. 2:24; 5:8; 13:27. Apart from the fact that they all refer to Israel or Jerusalem, it is only Jer. 5:8 which uses the word אֲשֵׁרֵי, while Jer. 2:24 and Hos. 8:9 use the word אֲשֵׁרֵי ('wild ass'), and Jer. 13:27 uses the word אֲשֵׁרֵי (neighing of horse?). Despite this difference on terminology, these four passages might throw some light to the 'grosse und komplexe literarische Tradition' of Oswald. To begin with, it might well be that Hosea had applied the Sumerian expression to Israel's harlotry. This application was later on taken over by Jeremiah and Ezekiel, together with the other elements of the Hoseanic tradition. While Jeremiah to some extent remained dependent on Hosea, Ezekiel referred back to the origin of the expression and applied it to the Babylonians. This was possible because he was himself in the Babylonian land. Otherwise, perhaps he would have followed Jeremiah's step.

literary tradition was, it might well be that such expression as is found in y. 20b was really Sumerian, or Babylonian, rather than Egyptian. Moreover, the expression must have been known only by a prophet or a person who had been in Babylon himself. If it is so, the argument will certainly support the thesis that Ezekiel was actually in the land of Babylon, among those deported in 597 B.C..

With all these arguments, it seems now clear that yy. 19-20 refers to Oholibah's multiplying harlotry with Babylon, and not with Egypt.¹ In this connection there are two things which can be noted: First, it is interesting to find that it is not Oholibah's but her partner's sexual capacity which is described here. The description is in itself a metaphor which, on the one hand is different from that of yy. 14-17, while on the other fits well with, and emphasizes, the metaphor of Oholibah's harlotry. Second, since Ezekiel himself was one of those who underwent the result of Babylon's world power, it seems justified to say that here he was talking not only about Judah's past history but also her current one. For Ezekiel the whole history of Judah, i.e., from the beginning in Egypt until his time, was a history of ever increasing harlotry.

¹The word (ה)־שָׁלֵב, somehow or other, refers to Babylon or to the Babylonians more emphatically. The plural form of the word reminds one of that of the word (ה)־בָּבֶל in y. 5a.

Conclusion

1. Having looked at Ezek. 23 with the aim of examining Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history, it is found that not all of the units in the chapter are relevant. From the examination of the form and the content of the units, it appears that the relevant passage is vv. 1-20. This passage is in itself a metaphor of two sisters, i.e., Oholah and Oholibah, and is dominated by two words, i.e., ןןן ('to play the harlot') and ןןן ('to desire', 'to dote upon'). The division of the passage into three sections is in itself already very clear. The division is as follows : the first section : vv. 1-4; the second section : vv. 5-10; and the third section : vv. 11-20.

2. In the first section, the beginning of Israel's history is dealt with. The history is told in a metaphor of two sisters whose names are Oholah and Oholibah. In their youth the two sisters played the harlot in Egypt. However, if the reference of their harlotry in Egypt (y. 3) is left aside for a moment, what are stated in vv. 2, 4b cannot be regarded as a chronological account of who the two sisters were. Rather, what are stated are the three dimensions of what Israel really was. The mentioning of the two sisters refers to the two sister-kingdoms of Israel, i.e., Northern Israel and Southern Israel; Oholah is Northern Israel, Oholibah is Southern Israel, and both are Yahweh's. Besides, the mentioning of the two sisters refers to their dual character rather than to their being two independent, and separate,

women. Therefore what is meant here is not the two separate, and independent, kingdoms of Israel, but one and the whole Israel as the people of God. It is in this sense that their playing the harlot in Egypt and their becoming the possession of Yahweh must be understood.

With the metaphor which is in itself a Palestinian invention, it is also clear that on the one hand Ezekiel stands in the prophetic traditions, especially that of Hosea, while on the other he has his own characteristics.

In the second section, the history of Northern Israel is dealt with. The metaphor is here continued, but Oholah's partner is described in a plain language. From the description of the partner, i.e., of the Assyrians, it is clear that what is meant by harlotry is in fact Northern Israel's foreign political affairs. Oholah's harlotry with the Assyrians is understood by Ezekiel as the result and the continuation of her harlotry with Egypt in the beginning of her history. While the conquest of Northern Israel by Assyria is understood by him as God's own deliverance of the kingdom to Assyria because of her harlotry. So, in the understanding of Ezekiel the whole history of Northern Israel, i.e., from the beginning until the end, is a history of harlotry.

In the third section, Judah's history is dealt with. Again, the metaphor is continued, with an even stronger tension. Oholibah's harlotry is described as greater than that of Oholah. This is shown in various ways, and all these ways are concentrated on Oholibah's current harlotry with Babylon. Like that of

Oholah, what is meant by harlotry here is Judah's foreign political affairs. So, in the understanding of Ezekiel the whole history of Judah, i.e., from the beginning in Egypt until Ezekiel's time, is a history of ever increasing harlotry, which is worse than that of Northern Israel.

3. As far as the idea of comparing Northern Israel and Southern Israel in terms of their sinful deeds is concerned, Ezekiel must have a traditio-historical relationship with Jeremiah. However, like the other traditio-historical relationships between these two contemporary prophets,¹ it is very difficult to decide whether or not the one is dependent on the other. Apart from the fact that each of them has his own characteristics, the most that one can say in this connection is that they must have common sources, e.g., the Hoseanic tradition, the historical traditions, and the historical materials or the historical facts of their time.

4. The lack of any hint at the bright periods of Israel's history in the passage under examination is mainly due to the nature of the metaphor itself. This, however, does not mean that Ezekiel did not know those bright periods at all.

¹ Despite the difficulty in accepting Miller's conclusion on this problem, he has provided a great deal of material on the traditio-historical relationship between the two prophets. See, J. W. Miller, Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels : sprachlich und theologisch untersucht, Neukirchen-Kreis, Moers, 1955.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

There are still many questions which are not dealt with in the examination and study presented above. These questions include, inter alia, Ezekiel's fragmentary references to Israel's past history in his descriptions of the future of Israel, Ezekiel's doctrine of individual responsibility in chapter 18 which is in great measure contradictory to the usual earlier doctrine of hereditary responsibility, his discourse on the bloody city Jerusalem in chapter 22 which is contradictory to the common belief that Jerusalem is the chosen and holy city, etc.. In all of these references and discourses, Ezekiel must have had something from Israel's past which served as his basis. Otherwise his discourses or his accusations would be baseless and irrelevant for his audiences. This is also very clear especially in chapters 40-48 in which Ezekiel describes his design for Israel's future. Almost every topic which he describes there is taken from Israel's past history. Temple, priesthood, people of God, land division, kingship, offering, new Jerusalem, etc., would in fact be unintelligible without referring them to Israel's past in which all of them were found.

However, the concern of the present study is confined mainly to Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history. In that

sense it is different from the study of Ezekiel's references to Israel's past history. The former implies something which is characteristically Ezekielian, whereas the latter does not. By using all critical methods, especially the traditio-historical method, the present study has sought to examine the passages in which Ezekiel's interpretation of that history is found. The study above has shown that the relevant passages for this purpose are the first, and the biggest, sections of chapters 16, 20, and 23, respectively.

Despite the fact that Ezekiel cannot by any means be separated from the whole of Israelite traditions, especially those handed down within the prophetic movement, he has his own uniqueness which distinguishes him from every other Israelite prophet or traditionist. This at least means that, as far as the Israelite traditions are concerned, on the one hand, Ezekiel knew the traditions of Israel's past, and on the other, he has his own interpretation of that past.

1. The question of what were the past traditions of Israel which Ezekiel knew is very important, although it is difficult to answer. This is so, since the examination of the three chapters above shows that on the one hand, by the time of Ezekiel the various past traditions of Israel had been so amalgamated or fused that it is no longer possible to make any absolute separation of them, while on the other, there were still some major themes which are predominant in the amalgamated traditions. Scholars

have also shown that the amalgamation had begun centuries before Ezekiel came to his ministry, and that the process of amalgamation went on until the post-exilic period, and even through to the New Testament era.¹

However, this continual amalgamation cannot by any means be understood as having occurred mechanically. Instead, it must be understood as a long, living, and organic process which involved many factors. The Israelite traditionists, be they prophets, priests, psalmists, or traditionist circle, were not persons whose work was mainly joining together all those traditions mechanically. Instead they were exponents and interpreters of those traditions, by whose works many of the past traditions became relevant for their respective audiences or addressees.

As far as Ezekiel is concerned, he is neither more nor less than the other Israelite traditionists in that, on the one hand, he is one of the heirs of Israel's past traditions, and on the other, he is one of the exponents and interpreters of those traditions.² This means that, in connection with chapters 16, 20,

¹ See, e.g., G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, (ET. by D. M. G. Stalker), Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1962, especially pp. 69ff.; M. Noth, A History of Pentateuchal Traditions, (ET. by B. W. Anderson), Englewood Cliffs, 1972, especially pp. 42-45; W. Beyerlin, Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions, (ET. by S. Rudman), Oxford, 1965; R. E. Clements, Abraham and David, (S.B.T. Second Series 5), London, 1961; E. W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, Oxford, 1967.

² Cf. E. W. Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles, Oxford, 1970, whose argument concerning the prose tradition in the Book of Jeremiah implies that the Deuteronomistic circle was one of the interpreters of the Jeremianic traditions (especially pp. 38-115).

and 23, Ezekiel invented none of their traditional content. This is clear from the fact that, as was shown in the examination above, in chapter 20 Ezekiel stands mostly within the credal traditions, i.e., the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions, and in chapters 16 and 23 within the Jerusalemite or the David-Zion traditions. In other words, the three chapters can be regarded as representing two different streams of traditions which were at Ezekiel's disposal. This does not mean, however, that they are the only streams of tradition which Ezekiel knew, but their having been used separately by him means that to a great measure they were still distinguishable from each other, and that Ezekiel was just to accept them that way.

Recent studies have shown that the exodus-wilderness--conquest traditions and the David-Zion traditions, are the outcome of two independent, long, developments of traditions, in which amalgamations and reinterpretations are the most noticeable aspects.¹ In this connection it is interesting to find that in a great measure the prophetic movement was also responsible for

¹For the history of the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions, see especially N. ROTH, loc. cit.; W. BEYERLIN, loc. cit. For the history of the David-Zion traditions, see especially, R. E. CLEMENTS, loc. cit.; N. W. PORTEOUS, 'Jerusalem-Zion: The Growth of A Symbol', in his Living the Mystery, Oxford, 1967, pp. 93-111.

the preservation, amalgamation, and reinterpretation of the tradition materials of those two streams of traditions.

The facts that most of the transmission of Israel's past traditions was carried out in the cult,¹ and that it is impossible to separate the prophet from the cult, mean that the prophets cannot be regarded as not responsible for the development of the traditions.² This is precisely the situation of Ezekiel, who was both a prophet and a priest. The study presented above has shown that Ezekiel stands in both the cultic circle and the prophetic movement. One of the most important implications of this fact is that, as far as the history of the transmission of Israel's past traditions is concerned, he is really standing within the circles in which the traditions of Israel can chiefly be found. In other words, apart from the fact that his knowledge of the traditions of his people is undoubtedly secured, Ezekiel is really an insider in the development of the traditions.

In view of all this, the problem of the stages of the development of both the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions and the David-Zion traditions in the time of Ezekiel must now be

¹M. Noth, *loc. cit.*; W. Beyerlin, *op. cit.*, especially pp. 145ff.; G. von Rad, *loc. cit.*.

²See, e.g., E. W. Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition*, especially pp. 65ff..

looked at. First, the stages of the development of the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions. The examination above has shown that the amalgamations of all of the elements of these traditions have begun from a very early period, but only its most advanced stage is found in Ezek. 20. This does not mean, however, that Ezek. 20 should be understood as chronologically the last and final stage of that development. After the time of Ezekiel there were still other Israelite traditionists whose concerns with, and whose involvements in, the development of these particular traditions played a more decisive role than that of Ezekiel in the formation of the Old Testament as a whole. This can be seen chiefly in both the Deuteronomistic circle¹ and the Chronicler.² Neither does it mean that these later traditionists were entirely dependent on Ezekiel's advanced amalgamation of those traditions, although a close relationship between them can hardly be denied.

As far as the prophetic movement is concerned, the examination above has shown that most, if not all, of the tradition-elements

¹G. von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, (Ed. by D.M.G. Stalker), (S.B.T. 9), London, 1953 (reprinted 1963); idem, Old Testament Theology, Vol. I, pp. 334ff.; E. W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, pp. 107ff..

²G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. I, pp. 347ff..

of Ezek. 20 are also found in the earlier prophets' books. Although by the time of Ezekiel all of Northern Israel's surviving prophetic traditions had been brought to Judah, and perhaps had even been claimed as the property of all-Israel, nevertheless there are indications that initially the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions were chiefly preserved in Northern Israel. With regard to this, the present study is in favour of the opinion that the responsibility for the custodianship of these traditions, and/or the elements of these traditions, lay with the cultic circle in Northern Israel, and that it is chiefly from this cultic source that Hosea and other Northern Israelite traditionists derived their references to those traditions.¹

In this connection it can be said that in Northern Israel there were at least three circles of traditionists who were responsible for the transmission of these traditions. They are the cultic circle, the prophetic movement, and the Deuteronomic circle.² Although these three circles were to some extent inseparable from each other, and although it is not clear how and when the transference to the South of the exodus-wilderness--conquest traditions, and other Northern Israelite traditions, took

¹Cf. E. W. Nicholson, op. cit., pp. 75f..

²For the Deuteronomic circle, see, especially ibid..

place, the examination of Ezek. 16, 20, and 23 above has shown that it is only the first two circles which had their respective counterparts in the South.¹ It might well be true that the period around 721/720 B.C., or soon after it was the busiest time of the transference, and that by the time of Ezekiel most, if not all, of the traditions preserved in the North had been transferred to the South. However, the process of making them the possession of all-Israel does not seem to have gone very smoothly. The reformation by King Josiah can perhaps be regarded as achieving the greatest successes in the process of the all-Israelization of both the Northern and Southern traditions, although this particular process already had its prototypes during and before the times of David and Solomon.²

Now, whatever the relationship between the all-Israelite traditions of the times of David and Solomon and those of the time of Josiah might be, one thing is certain that by the time of Ezekiel this all-Israelization process had achieved a great deal of success. This is clear from the fact that (a) in chapter 16

¹For the lack of the counterpart of the Deuteronomio circle in Southern Israel, see, ibid., especially pp. 88, 94ff..

²Cf. G. W. Anderson, The History and Religion of Israel, p. 125; H. Roth, op. cit., pp. 42-45.

Ezekiel is speaking about all Israel although this chapter is predominated by the David-Zion traditions which were originally preserved only in the Southern Kingdom; (b) in chapter 20 Ezekiel is addressing all Israel although he is standing mainly in the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions which were predominant in the Northern Kingdom; (c) in chapter 23, despite his knowledge that Israel consisted of two political entities, Ezekiel firmly regards them as one people of Yahweh.¹

What is surprising in spite of all of these successful processes is that to a very large extent, and from the point of view of tradition history, the two streams of traditions used by Ezekiel cannot be understood without relating them to their respective provenances and origins. The David-Zion traditions, or the Jerusalem traditions, which are now used for all-Israel in chapter 16, cannot be understood without referring them back to their original contents; the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions which are used for all-Israel in chapter 20, cannot be understood without referring them back to their original contents; and this is also true of the traditions employed by Ezekiel in chapter 23. It is impossible in the present study to go into details on the provenance of each of these traditions,²

¹ For all this, cf. W. Zimmerli, 'Israel in Buche Ezechiel', V.T. 8, 1958, pp. 75-90.

² For the provenances of some of these traditions, see the references in notes 1 and 2 on p. 381.

but very briefly their respective original contents can perhaps be outlined as follows.

The David-Zion traditions contain the covenant between Yahweh and David, in which the Davidic kingship is secured, and Zion, or Jerusalem, is chosen to be the dwelling place of Yahweh.¹ The exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions contain the saving acts of Yahweh towards some of the tribes of the Israelite people.² And the traditions used in chapter 23 are mainly predominated by the meaning of the word בְּיָד which refers to either the Temple in Jerusalem or the tabernacle in the wilderness, or both. From all this, it can be said that all of the traditions of Israel's past in Ezek. 16, 20, and 23, are originally concerned mainly with the saving acts of Yahweh to those who were later on regarded, or claimed, to be the originators of all Israel. In other words, the all-Israelizing process of those various traditions implies the claim that the special status of Israel as the people of Yahweh has been granted to her from a very early period, i.e., from the times of both their very first forefathers (Abraham,

¹On this, see especially R. E. Clements, Abraham and David, (S.B.T. Second Series 5), London, 1967; G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. I, pp. 46ff..

²See, especially, M. Noth, A History of Pentateuchal Traditions, (ET. by B. W. Anderson), Englewood Cliffs, 1972; W. Beyerlin, Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions, (ET. by S. Rudman), Oxford, 1965.

Isaac, and Jacob), their first king (David), and their first Temple in Zion.

Many scholars rightly relate Israel's special status as the people of Yahweh to her covenantal relationship with Yahweh. In this connection, and with regard to the origins of those various traditions, R. E. Clements has rightly said that there were various covenant ideologies in Israel, and that there was a continuous process of reshaping and/or reinterpreting them.¹ Although Ezek. 16, 20, and 23, do not particularly show how this process of reshaping and reinterpreting occurred, they do show that, as was revealed in the examination above, the concept of a covenantal relationship between Yahweh and Israel is dominant in all of them. As a matter of fact, the cases which Ezekiel presents in all of these three chapters can hardly be understood without it. With regard to all of this, it does not seem to be exaggerating to say that the covenantal relationship between Yahweh and Israel is used by Ezekiel as his framework in presenting his arguments against Israel in those particular three chapters.

In this connection it is interesting to find that, on the one hand, Ezekiel still follows two different sources of covenant traditions, i.e., that of the David-Zion (in chapters 16 and 23) and that of the exodus-wilderness-conquest (in chapter 23), and

¹R. E. Clements, Abraham and David, pp. 86f..

on the other, each of these two traditions is used as referring to the covenantal relationship between Yahweh and all-Israel. In other words, although in each of those three chapters Ezekiel deals with all-Israel, the almost exclusive use of each of the two covenant traditions, i.e., in chapter 20 on the one side and in chapters 16, 23 on the other, means that traditio-historically these two traditions were still independent of each other. This is indeed surprising, since the process of amalgamation, or the process of all-Israelization, of these, and other, traditions of Israel had begun long before Ezekiel's time. Moreover, the examination of these three chapters above has shown that it is only in them that each of these traditions is so extensively used, whereas in other parts of the Book of Ezekiel and in other prophetic books there are only fragments of them. To that extent the three chapters of the Book of Ezekiel are really unique.

Their unique characteristics are also clear in that both chapters 16 and 23, in which the David-Zion traditions are predominant, use metaphors throughout, whereas chapter 20 uses stereotyped formulas and stereotyped structures. It is true that the metaphors used in chapters 16 and 23 are not by any means the invention of Ezekiel himself because they are already used by both his predecessors and his contemporary (Jeremiah), but their being used in so extensive, detailed, and developed a stage is peculiar to these two chapters. All of this shows that, on the one hand, Ezekiel is standing within two very important streams of Israelite traditions, and on the other, he is unique in that he

uses the two covenant traditions so extensively that their organic relationship in his teaching is conspicuous.

2. Ezekiel's conspicuous uniqueness is also clear from the way he treats the contents of those two covenant traditions. It was said above that neither of these two traditions could be understood without referring them to their respective provenances and contents. As far as contents are concerned, these two streams of traditions can be regarded as two important vehicles by which the memories and/or the records of Israel's past history are chiefly preserved. The exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions have been rightly associated with the Credo of Israel in which the glorious past history of the people is recited. It is beyond the scope of the present study to trace back the tradition history of this Credo, but, despite this, it can definitely be said that it is this Credo which has become the background of Ezek. 20.

In the classic examples of Israel's Credo, i.e., Deut. 26:5ff. and Josh. 24:2ff., the past history of Israel is referred to, or is recited, as a piece of history full of Yahweh's saving acts. In other words, according to that Credo, the existence of Israel as a people of God from its very beginning depends entirely on the saving acts of Yahweh. This means that from the outset the history of Israel is a history of the saving acts of Yahweh. Moreover, a closer examination of the two credal passages referred to above shows that the recital of those saving acts of Yahweh constitutes an important part in the whole act of

covenant renewal ceremony which Israel enacted from time to time. All of this means that there is a very close connection between the Credo and the covenantal relationship of Israel and Yahweh.

Now, in Ezek. 20 Ezekiel also recites Israel's past history. However, the stress of his recital does not lie on the bright side of that history at all. Instead, it lies on its darker one. This is clear in that with stereotyped formulas and stereotyped structures Ezekiel's recital features the whole of Israel's past history as being full of Israel's disobedience to Yahweh's commandments. Apart from the fact that the use of both the stereotyped formulas and the stereotyped structures in this recital are very impressive, the recital's stress on the darker side of the whole of Israel's past history shows that the function of this recital is different from that of the recital in the Credo. This is true in that the recital in Ezek. 20 is used by Ezekiel as the basis of his announcement of judgement against Israel. In other words, with the recital of Israel's past history in Ezek. 20, Ezekiel does not only turn Israel's Credo upside down and detach it from the context of the covenant renewal ceremony, but also changes the stress of its content and uses it as the basis of his announcement of Yahweh's judgement. In addition, he does all this by using the form of disputational speech.

In this recital Israel is presented as a rebellious people who did not obey Yahweh's commandments from the very beginning of her history. Although in this particular chapter Ezekiel does

seem to have read the people's situation of his time back to the people's whole past, and some of his references to that past are his own creations and are not entirely accurate, nevertheless it is impossible to deny the relevance of his interpretation of that past history. This is so, because his interpretation is presented within the framework of the people's covenantal status. From the Credo it is clear that the covenantal status of the people is claimed, or is believed, to have begun since the time of Israel's forefathers, or more popularly, since the exodus event. It is precisely this status which is now reviewed by Ezekiel by way of arguing that from that very beginning Israel has been rebellious against Yahweh. In doing this the only measure which he uses is whether or not Israel obeyed Yahweh's commandments. However, in spite of the fact that Israel's disobedience, or Israel's rebellion against Yahweh, is mentioned several times, it is interesting to find that in chapter 20 Ezekiel seems to have specified it only in terms of Israel's worshipping deities other than Yahweh. Due to the fact that Israel's involvement in this practice was advanced only after she entered Palestine, and it is certain that Ezekiel himself witnessed the practice during his lifetime, it is once again clear that to a great measure Ezekiel must have read the people's situation in his time back into that of the people's whole past history.

It is also with this disobedience of Israel that Ezekiel is concerned in the two metaphors in chapters 16 and 23. Although

in chapter 16 Ezekiel stands mostly in the David-Zion traditions and in chapter 23 in both the David-Zion traditions and the exodus--wilderness-conquest traditions, the two metaphors are the same in that they speak about the relationship between Israel and Yahweh as the relationship between wife and husband. However, as far as Israel's past history is concerned, the two metaphors are different from each other in that in chapter 16 it speaks about Israel's disobedience only after Israel has been on the top of her glory, whereas in chapter 23 it speaks about Israel's disobedience since Israel's youth. Nevertheless, chapter 16 does not by any means appear to be less radical than chapter 23 (and chapter 20) in that in a very humiliating way it describes Israel's origin not as coming from Israel's forefathers or as being chosen by Yahweh, but from non-Israelite parents and as being an unwanted baby girl who was poorly left dying in the open field.

There are certainly many important points in the two metaphors in chapters 16 and 23, but in the context and purpose of the present study it seems sufficient to say that Ezekiel's interpretations of Israel's past history in both of these chapters are not less gloomy than that in chapter 20. This is so, since the two metaphors present Israel as an unfaithful and disobedient wife who, instead of obeying her lawful husband, commits adultery with other men throughout her married life. Besides, in spite of the fact that the descriptions of the disobedience in chapter 16 and 23 are different from that of the

disobedience in chapter 20, in that the former descriptions refer to both religious and political adulteries whereas the latter refers only to religious disobedience, nevertheless in terms of religious adultery or religious disobedience all of the three chapters are the same in that they specify it in terms of Israel's worshipping deities other than Yahweh.

Further, the political disobedience of Israel described in chapters 16 and 23 is important. This is so not only because it could give a clue for the determination of the starting point of Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel past history in the two chapters. The two chapters explicitly emphasize that Israel's foreign political affairs, or more precisely, Israel's reliance to foreign political powers, is an essential part of her disobedience to Yahweh. In this connection it is clear that by the time of Ezekiel Israel's political reliance on foreign powers can be understood only in connection with her political establishment in Palestine. Therefore it can be said that the political establishment of Israel in Palestine is used by Ezekiel as both the starting point, and the frame of reference, of his interpretation of Israel's past history in both chapters 16 and 23. In other words, the fact that Israel's foreign political affairs can be understood only in connection with her political life in Palestine, makes it clear why the two metaphors in chapters 16 and 23 deal chiefly with Israel's past history in Palestine after the conquest and not with Israel's past history before that period. The confinement of Israel's past history to the period after the

conquest is clear from the following facts. In chapter 16 Ezekiel deals metaphorically with Israel's past history by reciting the curriculum vitae of the woman Jerusalem whose birth-place and place of residence is Palestine, and in chapter 23 deals metaphorically with it by referring to two sisters of one mother who presuppose the co-existence of the two sister-kingdoms of Israel in Palestine.

Due to the fact that the separation of the religious meaning from the political meaning of the metaphorical adultery is generally unacceptable to scholars, the distinction between both of them at any rate shows that the metaphor must have presupposed the fact that Israel is not only a religious community but also a political community, or political communities. This means that the metaphor is concerned chiefly with Israel's situation in Palestine after she established herself as a political community or communities. This is also the case with the metaphors of husband-wife relationship in Hos. 1-3; Jer. 3:1ff.; Isa. 1:21ff.. It is true that in Jer. 2:2 and Ezek. 23:3, 21 the metaphor refers to Israel's situation outside Palestine. But these two passages do not seem to matter, since in Jer. 2:2 no political disobedience is involved, whereas in Ezek. 23:3, 21 Ezekiel reads the Palestinian situation of Israel back to her pre-Palestinian period.

Having said all this, however, it would be a mistake to assume that in chapters 16 and 23 Ezekiel does not refer to Israel's bright past history. As a matter of fact, and as in

the case of chapter 20, all of Ezekiel's negative interpretations of Israel's past history in chapters 16 and 23 are presented by using Israel's bright past as their background. Therefore it would be more acceptable to say that in all of his interpretations of Israel's past history Ezekiel puts the stress on the darker side of that history rather than on its bright side. This stress is so strong and so predominating that Ezekiel's uniqueness is impressively conspicuous. In addition, Ezekiel is even prepared not to mention any major bright event at all. In chapters 16 and 23 no mention is made of either David or Solomon, or Josiah, and in chapter 20 no mention is made of either Moses, or Sinai, or Joshua. The lack of these great names does not mean that Ezekiel does not know the bright periods of Israel's past which surround them. But it does show that Ezekiel is determined to present what he understands about his people's past history.

The examination presented above has shown that traditionally Ezekiel's negative interpretations of Israel's past history in all of these three chapters are not really new. This is so, since his predecessors, e.g., Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, have already presented their negative interpretations of that past history as well, although theirs are more fragmentary if compared with that of Ezekiel. What seems to be new in Ezekiel's interpretations is the way they are presented, i.e. they are presented in special chapters and in really elaborate, and developed, literary compositions, so that they could give a sharper, and more

radical, impression than that of the other prophets. The origin of this difference, or this newness, must be sought in the characteristics of Ezekiel himself.

It was often said in the examination presented above that one of Ezekiel's characteristics is his fondness for describing one particular thing by using a lengthy, detailed, and sometimes repetitious, description. It is this kind of description, and/or literary composition which one actually finds in all sections of the three chapters of the Book of Ezekiel dealt with in the present study. From the point of view of prophetic traditions it can be said that it would indeed be a mistake to put any pejorative label to any part of the lengthy descriptions found in those sections of the chapters. This is so, partly because in those sections most, if not all, of the short descriptions are arranged paratactically so that it is impossible to regard one of them as being subordinate to the other, and partly because it is impossible to determine whether a description is either primary or secondary, or a later addition, or the like. This paratactical arrangement implies that all of the short descriptions have similar functions, and together make Ezekiel's presentation very clear and extraordinarily impressive. W. Zimmerli is certainly right in regarding the literary composition of each of the three chapters as neither pure poetry nor pure prose, but as 'eine gehobene Prosa'.

Certainly, one might wonder whether in chapters 16 and 23, in particular, Ezekiel has not gone too far in describing the

deeds of his people by elaborating the negative stress of the metaphor which otherwise was very familiar in the prophetic and other Israelite traditions. This question applies also to, e.g., Ezekiel's elaboration and, indeed, his changing, of the metaphor of the vine in chapter 15, and his so called doctrine of individual responsibility in chapter 18. Nevertheless, one must remember that Ezekiel is really an exceptional personality, in whom one could find many uniquenesses which distinguish him from other Israelite traditionists. In this connection, C. W. Anderson is right in pointing out that it is natural to think of a prophet's experience of vocation as the driving force behind his ministry.¹ In the case of Ezekiel, the correctness of this point can be seen in that Ezekiel's uniquenesses are inseparable from his unique experience of vocation as is described, e.g., in Ezek. 1:4ff.; 2:8-3:3; 4:1-17; etc.. Further, the Old Testament itself gives evidence that there are no two similar prophetic experiences of vocation. Each one of the prophets has his own uniquenesses, both in terms of his experience of vocation and in terms of his message. In this connection it must be said that Ezekiel's experience of vocation is unique, not only in that it is different from those of the other prophets,

¹C. W. Anderson, Prophetic Contemporaries : A Study of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, (M. F. Fourth Series 5), London, 1967, p. 20.

but also in that in some cases it shows further, and detailed, elaborations and advancements upon theirs. This can be seen both in his incomparable visionary, and enigmatic super-normal, experiences and in his vivid dramatization of some of his messages. In view of all this, it must be said that the seemingly extravagant elaboration of the descriptions of Israel's adulterous deeds in chapters 16 and 23 is one of Ezekiel's outstanding characteristics.¹

3. To return to the sections of Ezek. 16, 20, and 23, dealt with in the present study, it can be said that all of them only have one theme, i.e., Israel's unfaithfulness, or disobedience, to Yahweh. For Ezekiel this unfaithfulness has existed since the very beginning of Israel's history. The fact that there were some parts of Israelite traditions which told how Israel had originated, particularly the exodus-wilderness-conquest traditions and the David-Zion traditions, made it easy for Ezekiel to present his interpretation of his people's past history. This is so, since it is these traditions which are now used by Ezekiel to present his understanding of his people's unfaithfulness and disobedience. The fact that these two streams of traditions, either in their advanced form or in their

¹For further characteristics of Ezekiel, see, supra, pp. 72ff..

fragmentary form, have been known by Ezekiel's predecessors and contemporaries, means that Ezekiel is not their inventor. In other words, in this particular case Ezekiel to a great measure depends on the tradition materials which were already in existence by his time. Yet, the fact that in the three chapters Ezekiel could, in a unique way, use them for the purpose which is contrary to their original ones, the purpose which Ezekiel so determinedly advocated, shows that he is also transforming them.

This is clear from the following facts. (a) Instead of reciting Israel's salvation history according to the Credo, Ezekiel recites Israel's rebelliousness which begins from the very beginning of her history (chapter 20). (b) Instead of telling of the lovely husband-wife relationship between Yahweh and Israel, Ezekiel tells of the broken husband-wife relationship between them which is full of adulterous deeds from the part of the wife Israel (chapters 16 and 23). In addition, Ezek. 15 shows that instead of telling about the precious, and fruitful, vine Israel, Ezekiel tells of the uselessness of the vine's wood.

The dependency of Ezekiel on the tradition materials can also be seen in the fact that neither the metaphor of the husband--wife relation nor the credal historical recital was Ezekiel's invention. His predecessors and other Israelite traditionists have used either one, or both, of them. Yet, Ezekiel's unique use of these two tradition materials in those particular three chapters shows very clearly that he is different from, and more than, most, if not all, of Israelite traditionists.

All of this means at least two things. First, tradition--historically, by the time of Ezekiel the two streams of traditions, and both the metaphor of the husband-wife relationship and the credal historical recital, had not been settled and/or firmly established as such that they were unchangeable and/or untransformable. In other words, in spite of the fact that Ezekiel's predecessors and contemporaries had known and used both the two streams of traditions and the metaphors and the credal historical recital, nevertheless all of these tradition materials remained as the living common property of Israel from which every Israelite traditionist got the right to use and to develop them. This is so, since essentially every Israelite traditionist is both the heir and the exponent of his people's traditions, which means that the traditions were not transmitted mechanically but organically. Second, as far as Ezekiel is concerned, it has been shown above that he is only one of the interpreters of Israel's past history. In that sense, and with regard to his being both a prophet and a priest, he is not an isolated, and solitary, person. Rather, he is an insider, whose whole ministry has been guided by his critical views of both his own people's situation and his own people's traditions.

In connection with these two things, one is reminded of the ministry of Jeremiah. Although Jeremiah began his ministry several years before Ezekiel, it can be established that to a great measure these two prophets were contemporaries. With regard to this, it seems justified to say that to a very large

extent these two prophets shared a common conviction concerning the people of Israel.

This is so, partly because they were living and carrying out their respective ministries in the same historical period in which external, as well as internal 'momentous changes had taken place' both in Judah and in her neighbouring countries,¹ and partly because they were of priestly origins (Jer. 1:1; Ezek. 1:3). Although these two prophets do not seem to have explicitly mentioned each other in the books which bear their respective names, it is no doubt true that, as far as the Israelite people is concerned, they shared the same crisis. The fact that, on the one hand, Jeremiah's commission is 'to pluck up and to break down, to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant' (Jer. 1:10), and on the other, that of Ezekiel is to announce both complete judgement (e.g., in Ezek. 4ff.; and in the sections of chapters 16, 20, 23 dealt with above), and complete restoration (Ezek. 37; 40-48), does not seem to be a coincidence. In addition, these two prophets must traditio-historically have inherited more or less the same tradition materials or tradition inheritance. All of this gives evidence that the similarities between Jeremiah and Ezekiel cannot by any means be understood as the dependence of either on the other. Apart from all of this,

¹G. W. Anderson, op. cit., loc. cit..

it must be admitted that Jeremiah seems to have borne his concern about the people's crisis within his own personal contention, whereas Ezekiel seems to have expressed it more openly. In other words, compared with Jeremiah, Ezekiel seems to be more versatile in articulating his concern, and his contention, about his people.

To return to Ezekiel's interpretation of Israel's past history, it must be said that what Ezekiel radically says in chapters 16, 20, and 23, is his own responsibility. Nevertheless, in all of the three chapters Ezekiel appears to be dependent on the tradition materials which he inherited. This is, once again, clear partly from the fact that the two streams of traditions which are used by Ezekiel were already known and used by his predecessors, and partly from the fact that the darker side of Israel's past history has also been spoken of by them. In addition, it is impossible to deny that Ezekiel has taken some tradition elements from both the common source, where these elements were to a large extent living orally, and the cultic source.

So, summing up what has been said above, it can be said that, on the one hand, Ezekiel's radical interpretations of Israel's past history as is exemplified in Ezek. 16, 20, and 23 are traditio-historically not without basis in the whole of Israelite traditions, especially those handed down within the prophetic movement, and on the other, they show that Ezekiel, as an insider, is not bound by those traditions. In other words,

due to his being an insider in the Israelite traditions, Ezekiel did not only master the living, and the most central, traditions of his people, but was also capable to use them in an extremely characteristic way to be the vehicle of the radical message which Yahweh commanded him to deliver.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- ALT, A., Israel und Aegypten, (B.W.A.T. 6), Leipzig, 1906.
- _____ . Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts, Leipzig, 1934 = 'The Origins of Israelite Law', in his Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, (ET. by R. A. Wilson), Oxford, 1966, pp. 81-132.
- ANDERSON, G.W., A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, London, 1959 (reprinted with new bibliography 1972).
- _____ . The History and Religion of Israel, Oxford, 1966.
- _____ . Prophetic Contemporaries : A Study of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, (M.F. Fourth Series 5), London, 1967.
- _____ . 'Some Aspects of the Uppsala School of Old Testament Study', H.Th.R. 43, No. 4, October, 1950, pp. 239-256.
- _____ . 'Israel : Amphictyony : 'AM; KAHAL; 'ENAH', in Translating & Understanding the Old Testament : Essays in Honour of H. G. May, ed. by H. T. Frank and W. L. Reed, Nashville, New York, 1970, pp. 135-151.
- ANDREASEN, NIEL-ERIK, A., The Old Testament Sabbath, (S.B.L. Dissertation Series 7), published by The Society of Biblical Literature, no place, 1972.
- BAAB, O. J., 'Marriage', in I.D.B. Vol. III, pp. 278-287.
- _____ . 'Prostitution', in I.D.B. Vol. III, pp. 931-934.
- BARNES, W.E., 'Ezekiel's Denunciation of Tyre (Chapters 26-28)', J.T.S. 35, 1934, pp. 50-54.
- _____ . 'The Scene of Ezekiel's Ministry and His Audience', J.T.S. 35, 1934, pp. 163-170.
- BARTON, G. A., 'Daniel, A Pre-Israelite Hero of Galilee', J.B.L. 60, 1941, pp. 213-225.
- BERRY, G. R., 'The Authorship of Ezekiel 40-48', J.B.L. 34, 1915, pp. 17-40.

- BERRY, G. R., 'The Date of Ezekiel 45:1-8a and 47:13 - 48:35', J.B.L. 40, 1921, pp. 70-75.
- _____. 'The Date of Ezekiel 38:1 - 39:20', J.B.L. 41, 1922, pp. 224-232.
- _____. 'Was Ezekiel in the Exile?', J.B.L. 49, 1930, pp. 83-93.
- _____. 'The Composition of the Book of Ezekiel', J.B.L. 58, 1939, pp. 163-175.
- BERTHOLET, A. and GALLING, K., Hesekiel, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 13), Tübingen, 1936.
- BEYERLIN, W., Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions, (Ed. by S. Rudman), Oxford, 1965.
- BRIGGS, C. A., The Book of Psalms, Vol. I, (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1906.
- _____. 'The Argument E Silentio', J.B.L. June-December, 1883, pp. 3-21.
- BRIGHT, J., Early Israel in Recent History Writing, London, 1956.
- _____. A History of Israel, 2nd edition, London, 1972.
- _____. 'The Date of the Prose Sermons of Jeremiah', J.B.L. 70, 1951, pp. 15-35.
- BROWNE, L. E., Ezekiel and Alexander, London, 1952.
- BRUEGGEMANN, W., Tradition of Crisis : A Study of Hosea, Virginia, 1960.
- BUNN, J. T., Ezekiel, (The Broadman Bible Commentary Vol. VI), London, 1972.
- BURROWS, M., The Literary Relations of Ezekiel, Philadelphia, 1925.
- CARLEY, K. W., Ezekiel's Place in the Prophetic Traditions, (unpublished thesis), University of London, 1968.
- CARROLL, R. P., The Significance of the Election Traditions of Ancient Israel for the Prophets and Their Developments in Jeremiah and the Exilic Prophets, (unpublished thesis), University of Edinburgh, 1967.

- CHEYNE, T. K., Critica Biblica, Part II, London, 1903.
- CHILDS, B. S., Memory and Tradition in Israel, (S.B.T. 37), London, 1962.
- CLEMENTS, R. E., God and Temple, Oxford, 1965.
- _____. Prophecy and Covenant, (S.B.T. 43), London, 1965.
- _____. Abraham and David, (S.B.T. Second Series 5), London, 1967.
- COATS, G.W., Rebellion in the Wilderness, Nashville - New York, 1968.
- 'Concerning the Author of Some Poems Ascribed to Ezekiel' (by an anonymous writer), in The Monthly Magazine and British Register, Vol. V, Part I, 1798, pp. 189-190.
- COOKE, G. A., The Book of Ezekiel, (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1936, (reprinted 1967).
- _____. (Review of G. Hölscher's Hesekiel : Der Dichter und das Buch), in J.T.S. 27, 1926, pp. 201-203.
- _____. 'New Views on Ezekiel', Theology 24, 1932, pp. 63-69.
- CROSS, F. M. Jr., 'The Tabernacle', B.A. 10, 1947, pp. 45-68.
- CUNLIFFE-JONES, H., The Book of Jeremiah, (The Torch Bible Commentaries), 2nd edition, London, 1972.
- DAHL, G., 'Crisis in Ezekiel Research', in Quantulaquaque : Studies presented to K. Lake, ed. by H. P. Casey, et al., London, 1937, pp. 265-284.
- DAHLBERGH, B. T., 'Wrath of God', I.D.B. Vol. IV, pp. 903-908.
- DALMAN, G., The Words of Jesus, (ET. by D. M. Kay), Edinburgh, 1902.
- DANELL, G. A., Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament, Uppsala, 1946.

- DAVIDSON, A. B., The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges), first edition, Cambridge, 1892 (revised by A. W. Streane, 1916).
- DAVIDSON, R., Biblical Criticism, (The Pelican Guide to Modern Theology, Vol. III), no place, 1970.
- DAVIES, G. H., 'Tabernacle', I.D.B. Vol. IV, pp. 498-506.
- DE VAUX, R., Ancient Israel : Its Life and Institutions, (ET. by John McHugh), 2nd edition, London, 1965.
- DE VRIES, S. J., 'Remembrance in Ezekiel', Interpretation 16, 1952, pp. 58-64.
- DRIVER, S. R., An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, Edinburgh, 1891 (reprinted 1913).
- _____. The Book of Exodus, (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges), Cambridge, 1911.
- DUHM, B., Das Buch Jeremia, (K.H.C. XI), Tübingen - Leipzig, 1901.
- EICHRODT, W., Der Prophet Ezechiel, (A.T.D. 22), Göttingen, 1959-1966 = Ezekiel, (ET. by Cosslet Quin), (O.T.L.), London, 1970.
- EISSFELDT, O., The Old Testament : An Introduction, (ET. by P. R. Ackroyd), Oxford, 1966.
- _____. 'Hesekiel Kap. 16 als Geschichtsquelle', J.P.O.S. 16, 1936, pp. 286-292 (now in his Kleine Schriften II, Tübingen, 1963, pp. 101-106).
- _____. 'Modern Criticism', in Record and Revelation, ed. by H. Wheeler Robinson, Oxford, 1938, pp. 74-109.
- _____. 'The Prophetic Literature', O.T.M.S. ed. by H. H. Rowley, Oxford, 1951, pp. 115-161.
- ELLIGER, K., Leviticus, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 4), Tübingen, 1966.
- ELLISON, H. L., Ezekiel : The Man and His Message, London, 1956.

- ENGHELL, I., The Call of Isaiah : An Exegetical and Comparative Study, (U.V.A. 1949 : 4), Uppsala and Leipzig, 1949.
- _____. Critical Essays on the Old Testament, (ET. by J. T. Willis), London, 1970 = A Rigid Scrutiny, Nashville, 1969.
- FOHRER, G., Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel, (B.Z.A.W. 72) Berlin, 1952.
- _____. Die symbolischen Handlungen der Propheten, (A.T.A.N.F. 54), Zürich - Stuttgart, 1965.
- _____. Introduction to the Old Testament, (ET. by D. E. Green), Nashville - New York, 1968.
- _____. 'Die Glossen im Buche Ezechiel', Z.A.W. 63 (N.F. 22), 1951, pp. 33-53.
- FOHRER, G. and GALLING, K., Ezechiel, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 13), Tübingen, 1955.
- FRIEDMAN, D. N., 'The Book of Ezekiel' (Studia Biblica XVII), Interpretation 8, 1954, pp. 446-471.
- GASTER, T. H., 'Sacrifices and Offerings, O.T.', I.D.B. Vol. IV, pp. 147-159.
- GELB, I. J., 'Hittites', I.D.B. Vol. II, pp. 612-615.
- GENSER, D., 'The Importance of the Motive Clause in the Old Testament Law', V.T.Supp. Vol. I, 1953, pp. 50-66.
- _____. 'The RIB- or Controversy-Pattern in Hebrew Mentality', V.T.Supp. Vol. II, 1955, pp. 120-137.
- GORDIS, R., 'The Book of Ezekiel in Contemporary Criticism', Jewish Review 4, 1946, pp. 57-77.
- GRAY, J., 1 & 2 Kings, (O.T.L.), London, 1964.
- _____. A History of Jerusalem, London, 1969.
- GRUNTHANER, M. J., 'Recent Theories about Ezekiel', C.B.Q. 7, 1945, pp. 438-446.

- GUNKEL, H., Die Propheten, Göttingen, 1917.
- _____. 'Einleitung', in H. Schmidt's Die Grossen Propheten, (S.A.T. II. 2), 2nd edition, Göttingen, 1923, pp. IX-LXX.
- HAAG, H., 'אֲזַיִן-יְיָ', T.W.A.T., cols. 682-689.
- HALDAR, A., 'Amorite', I.D.B. Vol. I, pp. 115-116.
- HARPER, W.R., Amos and Hosea, (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1905.
- HARTFORD, J. B., Studies in the Book of Ezekiel, Cambridge, 1935.
- HENPEL, J., 'The Form of Oral Tradition', in Record and Revelation, ed. by H. Wheeler Robinson, Oxford, 1938, pp. 28-44.
- HERENTRICH, V., Ezechielprobleme, (B.Z.A.W. 61), Giessen, 1932.
- HEERMANN, J., Ezechielstudien, Leipzig, 1908.
- _____. Ezechiel übersetzt und erklärt, (K.A.T. XI), Leipzig, 1924.
- HICKS, L., 'Jacob (Israel)', I.D.B. Vol. II, pp. 782-787.
- HOUK, C. B., 'אֲזַיִן-יְיָ Patterns as Literary Criteria in Ezekiel', J.B.L. 88, 1969, pp. 184-190.
- HOWIE, C. G., The Date and Composition of Ezekiel, (J.B.L. Monograph Series Vol. IV), Philadelphia, 1950.
- HÜLSCHER, C., Hesekiel : Der Dichter und das Buch, (B.Z.A.W. 39), Giessen 1924.
- HUFFMON, H. B., 'The Exodus, Sinai and Crede', C.B.Q. 27, 1965, pp. 101-113.
- HUMBERT, P., 'Le substantif to'eba et le verbe t'eb dans l'Ancien Testament', Z.A.W. 72, 1960, pp. 217-237.

- IRWIN, W. A., The Problem of Ezekiel - An Inductive Study, Illinois, 1943.
- _____. 'Ezekiel Research since 1943', V.T. 3, 1953, pp. 54-66.
- JAHN, C., Das Buch Ezechiel auf Grund der LXX hergestellt, übersetzt und textkritisch erklärt, Leipzig, 1905.
- JIRKU, A., Die Älteste Geschichte Israels im Rahmen lehrhafter Darstellungen, Leipzig, 1917.
- JOSEPHUS, F., Antiquities N. v. 1.
- KAPLEBUD, A. S., Central Ideas in Amos, Oslo, 1961.
- KEIL, C. F., Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Ezekiel, (ET. by J. Martin), Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1876.
- KESLER, E., Die innere Einheitlichkeit des Buches Ezechiel, (Berichte des theol. Seminar der Brüdergemeinde), Herrnhut, 1926.
- KIRKPATRICK, A. F., The Book of Psalms, Vols. I-III, (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges), Cambridge, 1902 (latest reprinting 1933).
- KITTEL, R., Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Vol. III, 1st and 2nd editions, Stuttgart, 1927-1929.
- KLATT, W., Herman Gunkel, (F.R.L.A.N.T. 100), Göttingen, 1969.
- KNIGHT, D. A., Rediscovering the Traditions of Israel, (S.B.L. Dissertation Series 9), no place, 1973.
- KOCH, K., The Growth of the Biblical Tradition, (ET. by S. M. Cupitt), London, 1969.
- _____. 'Zur Geschichte der Erwählungsvorstellung in Israel', Z.A.W. 67, 1955/1956, (N.F. 26), pp. 205-226.
- _____. 'אֵלֶּה', in T.W.A.T., cols. 128-141.
- KRAETZSCHMAR, R., Das Buch Ezechiel, (N. . . III. 3. 1), Göttingen, 1900.

- KUHL, C., The Old Testament : Its Origin and Composition, (Ed. by C. T. M. Herriot), Edinburgh, 1961.
- _____. 'Zur Geschichte der Hesekiel-Forschungen', Th.R. (N.F. 5), 1933, pp. 92-118.
- _____. 'Neuere Hesekiel-Literatur', Th.R. (N.F. 20), 1952, pp. 1-26.
- _____. 'Zum Stand der Hesekiel-Forschung', Th.R. (N.F. 24), 1956/1957, pp. 1-53.
- _____. 'Die "Wiederaufnahme" - ein literarkritisches Prinzip?', Z.A.W. 64 (N.F. 23), 1952, pp. 1-11.
- LINDBLUM, J., Prophecy in Ancient Israel, Oxford, 1963.
- LOFTHOUSE, W. P., Ezekiel, (The Century Bible), Edinburgh, 1907.
- MANDELKERN, S., Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae, Graz, 1955.
- MARTIN, J. D., 'The Forensic Background to Jer. III 1', V.T. 19, 1969, pp. 82-92.
- MATTHEWS, J. C., Ezekiel, (An American Commentary on the Old Testament), Philadelphia, 1939.
- MAY, H. G., 'The Book of Ezekiel', in The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. VI, Nashville, New York, 1956.
- MAYS, J. L., Hosea, (O.T.L.), London, 1969.
- MENDENHALL, G. E., 'Election', in I.D.B. Vol. II, pp. 76-82.
- MESSEL, N., Ezechielfragen, Oslc, 1945.
- MILLER, J. W., Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels sprachlich und theologisch untersucht, Neukirchen, Kreis, Moers, 1955.
- MONTGOMERY, J. A. and GEHMAN, H. S., The Book of Kings, (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1951 (latest impression 1960).

- MOWINCKEL, S., Prophecy and Tradition, The Prophetic Books in the Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition, Oslo, 1946.
- _____ . He That Cometh, (ET. by G. W. Anderson), Oxford, 1956.
- _____ . The Psalms in Israel's Worship, (ET. by D. R. Ap-Thomas), Vols. I-II, Oxford, 1962.
- _____ . 'Tradition, Oral', in I.D.B. Vol. IV, pp. 683-685.
- MUILLENBURG, J., 'Ezekiel', in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, ed. by M. Black and H. W. Rowley, London, 1952.
- _____ . 'Form Criticism and Beyond', J.B.L. 68, 1969, pp. 1-18.
- NAPIER, B. D., 'Prophet, Prophetism', in I.D.B. Vol. III, pp. 896-920.
- Nelson's Complete Concordance of the Revised Standard Version Bible, compiled under the supervision of J. W. Ellison, Edinburgh, New York, Toronto, 1957.
- NICHOLSON, E. W., Deuteronomy and Tradition, Oxford, 1967.
- _____ . Preaching to the Exiles : A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah, Oxford, 1970.
- NIELSEN, E., Oral Tradition, (S.B.T. 11), London, 1962.
- NORTH, C. R., The Old Testament Interpretation of History, London, 1946.
- NOTH, M., The History of Israel, (ET. by S. Godman, revised by P. R. Ackroyd), 2nd edition, London, 1960.
- _____ . Exodus, (ET. by J. S. Bowden), (O.T.L.), London, 1962.
- _____ . Leviticus, (ET. by J. E. Anderson), (O.T.L.), London, 1965.
- _____ . The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays, (ET. by D. R. Ap-Thomas), Edinburgh, 1966.
- _____ . Numbers, ET. by J. D. Martin), (O.T.L.), London, 1968.

- NOTH, M., A History of Pentateuchal Traditions, (Ed. by B. W. Anderson), Englewood Cliff, N.J., 1972.
- _____. 'Noah, Daniel und Hiob in Ezechiel xiv', V.T. 1, 1951, pp. 251-260.
- OESTERLEY, W. O. B., The Psalms, Vols. I-II, London, 1934.
- _____. 'The Book of Ezekiel - A Survey of Recent Literatures', C.O.R. 116, 1933, pp. 187-200.
- OESTERLEY, W. O. B. and H. H. ROBINSON, An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament, London, 1934 (reprinted 1941).
- OPPENHEIM, A. L., 'Assyria and Babylonia', in I.D.B. Vol. I, pp. 262-304.
- _____. 'Chaldea', in I.D.B. Vol. I, pp. 549-550.
- OSWALD, L., 'Eine sumerische Parallel zu Ez 23:20', Biblische Zeitschrift, N.F. 14, 1970, p. 126.
- PFEIFFER, R. H., Introduction to the Old Testament, London, 1952 (reprinted 1953).
- PORTERUS, N. W., 'Prophecy', in Record and Revelation, ed. by H. Wheeler Robinson, Oxford, 1938, pp. 216-249.
- _____. 'Jerusalem - Zion : The Growth of A Symbol', in his Living the Mystery, Oxford, 1967, pp. 93-111.
- PREUSS, H. D., 'ג'וֹי', in T.W.A.T. cols. 536-568.
- REDPATH, H. A., The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, (The Westminster Commentary), London, 1907.
- REVENTLOW, H. Graf, Das Heiligkeitgesetz formgeschichtlich untersucht, (W.M.A.N.T. 6), Neukirchen, Kreis Moers, 1961.
- _____. Wächter Über Israel : Ezechiel und seine Tradition, (B.Z.A.W. 82), Berlin, 1962.
- _____. 'Die Völker als Jahwes Zeugen bei Ezechiel', Z.A.W. 71, N.F. 30, 1959, pp. 33-43.

- ROBINSON, TH. H., The Old Testament : A Conspectus, London, 1953.
- ROBINSON, WHEELER, H., 'Prophetic Symbolism', in Old Testament Essays, (S.O.T.S. papers), London, 1927, pp. 1-17.
- ROWLEY, H. H., The Biblical Doctrine of Election, London, 1950.
- _____ . From Moses to Qumran, London, 1963.
- _____ . Men of God : Studies in Old Testament History and Prophecy, London, et al., 1963.
- _____ . Worship in Ancient Israel, London, 1967.
- _____ . 'The Book of Ezekiel in Modern Study', B.J.R.L. 36, 1953/4, pp. 146-190 (now also in his Men of God, pp. 169-210).
- RUDOLPH, W., Jeremia, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 12), Tübingen, 1947.
- _____ . Esra und Nehemia, (H.A.T. 1. Reihe 20), Tübingen, 1949.
- _____ . Hosea, (K.A.T. XIII/1), Gütersloh, 1966.
- SARNA, N. M., 'The Interchange of the Prepositions BMTH and MIN in Biblical Hebrew', J.B.L. 78, 1959, pp. 310-316.
- SCHOENBERG, M. W., (Review of J. Lust's Traditie, Redaktie en Kerysma bij Ezekiel), in C.B.Q. 33, 1971, pp. 126-128.
- SCHOORS, A., I am God Your Saviour. : A Form-critical Study of the Main Genres in Is. XI-LV, (V.T.Supp. Vol. XXIV), Leiden, 1973.
- SEEBASS, H., ' רַבִּי ', in T.W.A.T. cols. 592-608.
- SMEND, R., Der Prophet Ezechiel, (Kurz. H.A.T. 8. Lief.), Leipzig, 1880.
- SMITH, G. A., Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament, London, 1901.
- _____ . The Book of the Twelve Prophets, Vols. I-II, revised edition, New York, London, n. d..

- SMITH, J., The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel : A New Interpretation, London, 1931.
- SMITH, L. P., (Review of W. A. Irwin's The Problem of Ezekiel - An Inductive Study), in J.B.L. 68, 1949, pp. 384-389.
- STALKER, D. M. G., Ezekiel, (The Torch Bible Commentaries), London, 1968.
- SPENDAHL, K., 'Implication of Form-Criticism and Tradition-Criticism for Biblical Interpretation', J.B.L. 77, 1958, pp. 33-38.
- TAYLOR, J. B., Ezekiel, (The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries), London, 1969 (reprinted 1971).
- THIEL, W., Die deuteronomische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25, (W.M.A.N.T. 41), Neukirchen, 1973.
- TORREY, C. C., Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy, New Haven, 1930.
- _____. 'Certainly Pseudo-Ezekiel', J.B.L. 53, 1934, pp. 291-319.
- _____. 'Notes on Ezekiel', J.B.L. 58, 1939, pp. 69-86.
- VAN SEEMER, J., 'The Terms "Amorite" and "Hittite" in the Old Testament', V.T. 22, 1972, pp. 64-81.
- _____. 'Confessional Reformulation in the Exilic Period', V.T. 22, 1972, pp. 448-459.
- VOLLMER, J., Geschichtliche Rückblicke und Motive in der Prophetie des Amos, Hosea und Jesaja, (B.Z.A.W. 119), Berlin, 1971.
- VOLZ, P., Der Prophet Jeremia, (K.A.F. X), Leipzig, 1928.
- VON RAD, G., Old Testament Theology, (ET. by D. M. G. Stalker), Vols. I-II, Edinburgh, 1965 (reprinted 1970).
- _____. The Problem of Hexateuch and Other Essays, (ET. by E. W. Trueman Dicken), Edinburgh, 1966.

- VRIEZEN, TH. C., Die Erwählung Israels nach dem Alten Testament. Zurich, 1953.
- WEVERS, J. W., Ezekiel, (The Century Bible - New Series), London, 1969.
- WEIT, C. J. M., 'Aspects of the Book of Ezekiel', V.T. 2, 1952, pp. 97-112.
- WEISER, A., Das Buch des Propheten Jeremia, (A.T.D. 20), Göttingen, 1952.
- _____. The Psalms, (ET. by H. Hartwell), (O.T.L.), London, 1962.
- WIDENGREN, G., Literary und Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets, (U.U.A. 1948 : 10), Uppsala, 1948.
- WIJNGAARDS, J., ' אִשִּׁיָּהּ and הַעֲלֵה, a Twofold Approach to the Exodus', V.T. 15, 1965, pp. 91-102.
- WILDBERGER, H., Jesaja, (B.K. X/1), Neukirchen, 1972.
- WOLFF, H. W., Dodekapropheten 1 : Hosea, (B.K. XIV/1), Neukirchen Vluyn, 1961.
- _____. Dodekapropheten 2 : Joel und Amos, (B.K. XIV/2), Neukirchen Vluyn, 1969.
- YOUNG, E. J., An Introduction to the Old Testament, London, 1949.
- ZIMMERLI, W., Ezechiel, (B.K. XIII/1-2), Neukirchen Vluyn, 1955-1969.
- _____. Gottes Offenbarung : Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament, (T.B. 19), München, 1963).
- _____. The Law and the Prophet, (ET. by R. E. Clements), Oxford, 1965.
- _____. Ezechiel : Gestalt und Botschaft, (B.S. 62), Neukirchen, 1972.
- _____. Grundriss der alttestamentlichen Theologie, (T.W. 3), Stuttgart, 1972.

ZIMMERLI, W., 'Israel in Buche Ezechiel', V.T. 8, 1958, pp. 75-90.

_____. 'The Special Form- and Traditio-historical Character of Ezechiel's Prophecy', V.T. 15, 1965, pp. 515-527.

_____. 'The Word of God in the Book of Ezechiel', J.Th.C. Vol. IV (= History and Hermeneutic), New York, 1967, pp. 1-13.

_____. 'The Message of the Prophet Ezechiel', Interpretation 23, 1969, pp. 131-157.

_____. (Review of J. Lust's Traditie, Redaktie en Kerygma bij Ezechiel), in T.L.Z. 96, 1971, cols. 258-261.

ZUNZ, L., Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, Frankfurt a. M., 1892.

_____. 'Bibelkritisches II : Ezechiel', Z.D.M.G. 27, 1873, pp. 676-689.