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PREFACE.

The study of Ezekiel has, hitherto, rested on the postulate that the prophet, living in the neighbourhood of Babylon, addressed the exiles resident there and through them the priests and people in Jerusalem and Judah. Upon this basis scholars have been faced by an Ezekiel-enigma that has up to the present defied solution and has led the latest commentator, Hölscher, in his endeavour to formulate a theory that would give a plausible explanation of the book, to reduce the message of the prophet to the smallest dimensions and to resort to wholesale and unwarranted excisions from the text.

The result of Hölscher's investigations seemed to the writer disastrous and led him to believe that the critical superstructure must have been erected upon an insecure foundation and that the true solution could only be arrived at by divesting the mind of all preconceptions or assumptions. Struck by the homogeneity of the work, its sincerity, its vivid imagery culminating in the theophany and the intense fervour and wide range of its prophecy, the writer felt that he could not accept without dismay the view that before him lay the ingenious compilation of an unscrupulous redactor, scheming to uphold the pretensions of a faction. To him the book seemed the outpouring of a soul riven and tormented with the impulse to speak, and of one, too, that was a well-known influential personality whose voice could not fail to carry conviction to his hearers.

With this in his mind the writer was driven to the conclusion, after a close examination of the text, that the oracles in Ch. I-XXXVII bear the stamp of one mind. He feels
that the redactor, though unwilling to tamper with the oracles themselves, wished to give the impression, for a reason which cannot be fathomed, that the prophecies were delivered in Babylonia, and sought to achieve his purpose by giving a bias to the glosses by which he linked the various oracles together. It is noteworthy that if the first three verses of Ch. I, verses 3, 4 of Ch. X and verse 24 of Ch. XI be rejected, all the oracles except three could have been delivered in Palestine, and a large number of them could, in the writer’s opinion, have been delivered nowhere else.

The writer owes a deep debt of gratitude to the Minister of the Church and Parish of Bellie, the Rev. Robert Venters, his lifelong guide, counsellor and friend, who gave him in boyhood his first lessons in Hebrew, thus enabling him to take Hebrew in his Arts curriculum, to Professor Gilroy under whose guidance in the Advanced Arts Class of 1911 he studied the Book of Ezekiel, to Professor A.R.S. Kennedy for answering his many enquiries, for supplying him with books, and for directing his work upon the last eight chapters of Ezekiel during the post-graduate class of 1927, and to his supervisor Professor A.C. Welch without whose laborious co-operation this thesis could not have been produced. He acknowledges also the unfailing courtesy and kindness of the Very Rev. Dr. Philip, custodian of the Longforgan Free Church Ministers’ Library, of the librarians of the Universities of St. Andrews, Edinburgh and Aberdeen, of Dr. Williams’ Library, London, of the Central and the University College Libraries, Dundee, and of the President of the Jewish Synagogue, Dundee, Mr. Nathan Cree, who granted him access to the Talmud.
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Chapter I.
A Summary of Modern Criticism.

No portion of the O.T. has suffered more neglect than the book of Ezekiel. Preachers seldom turn to it for texts; and, for all the use made of it by the laity, it might never have been written. The Jews, while accepting it as part of the Canon, have always regarded it with suspicion. They forbade unrestricted discussion of the Vision of the Chariot because of its obscurity and, on account of the discrepancies between the ritual scheme of Chapters XL-XLVIII and the Law, would have withdrawn the book from public use had not Hananiah with his 300 measures of oil elucidated its difficulties. According to Jerome the opening and closing sections might not be read by Jewish youth under the age of 30. Even from scholars the book has not received the attention that it merits, because, although "the most influential of the prophets, Ezekiel is also the most elusive". Jerome looked upon the book as "a labyrinth of divine mysteries", and A.B. Davidson acknowledges that he leaves it"with
In the opinion of all but a minority the book is the work of one hand; and scholars like Zunz\(^3\) and Geiger\(^9\) and Seinecke who questioned its authenticity have raised no doubts as to its unity. "The Book of Ezekiel", writes Skinner, "exists in the form in which it left the hands of its author. Not only does it bear the stamp of a single mind in its phraseology, its imagery, and its mode of thought, but it is arranged on a plan so perspicuous and so comprehensive that the evidence of literary design in the composition becomes almost irresistible." "If anywhere a book of the O.T. bears the stamp of authenticity", says Cornill, "and lies before us in the form in which it came from the hand of its author, that book is Ezekiel." Smend maintains that one can take no piece out of it without destroying the whole ensemble." Similar views are expressed by others.\(^{13}\)

Cornill, however, remarked on the disparity of both the form and content of Chapter VII,\(^15\) and Bertholet\(^16\) and Toy\(^17\) directed attention to other sections in which are apparent
inconsistencies. Since then scholars have been faced with an "Ezekiel-enigma." Kraetzschmar advanced the hypothesis that the book has been pieced together by a redactor from two recensions of the text. He lays emphasis on the Talmudic tradition that Ezekiel was placed between Jeremiah and Isaiah and was written by the men of the Great Synagogue. Kuenen has shown that there are good grounds for considering the Talmudic tradition to be a fiction of the Jews. Whether this be so or not, the tradition may imply only that Isaiah as a book is of later date than Jeremiah or Ezekiel.

Jahn exposes the weakness of Kraetzschmar's hypothesis. He attempts a reconstruction of the M.T. from G. and argues that the M.T. is a product of the who "have drawn Ezekiel's poison-fangs". He directs attention to the problem presented by the differences between the M.T. and G. but his work is marred by serious defects. Precedence is almost invariably given to the text G. over the M.T. and too frequent recourse is had to purely conjectural emendations.
Herrmann, according to Hölscher, devised the first methodical analysis of the book in his "Ezechiel-Studien" upon which he built up his Commentary. "The Book of Ezekiel", Herrmann concludes, "is not a literary product but a collection of small independent oracles as are Isaiah and Jeremiah". He asserts that the book shows signs of a deliberate arrangement that emanates from Ezekiel himself and has been developed by other hands.

Herrmann is followed by Hölscher who, complaining that the book has escaped the knife of criticism, makes up for the timidity of his predecessors. Starting with the assumption that Ezekiel is a poet who used only the πρωτούμενη measure he cuts out whatever runs counter to his theory and restricts the book to the smallest dimensions. Of the 1273 verses that compose the book he "assigns some 170 to the prophet himself". That Ezekiel contains some of the finest poetry in the Bible is not in doubt, and Hölscher has rightly directed attention to this; but, remembering that Ezekiel shares with Samuel the distinction of
having the most corrupt text of the O.T. and in view of our
defective knowledge of Hebrew metre, his argument from poetic
structure is far from reliable. Holscher is ruthless in excising
expressions and passages that appear to betray dependence upon
later writings; but to delete expressions and to separate pass-
ages from their context on the ground of literary relationship
alone is not scientific criticism. A critical method such as
this would make havoc with the work of any writer. 36

Analogies to the Book of Ezekiel may be found in
Sir Philip Sidney's "Arcadia", the "De Consolatione Philosophiae"
of Boethius, and the mediaeval "Chante-Fable", "Aucassin et Nicole-
ete" 37 These are works in alternating prose and verse and it is
open to anyone applying Holscher's method to dispute the authen-
ticity of the prose sections. "Aucassin et Nicolete", modelled on
the Moorish romances, makes use like Ezekiel of stereotyped
formulae and recurrent epithets; yet no one would venture to doubt
its unity. The one certain criterion of dependence and without
it no reliance can be placed on the argument from language and
style. Although in the Book of Ezekiel many passages occur
reminiscent of other portions of Holy Scripture there are only two instances of direct quotation. Holscher's argument that the unity of the book is superficial and that the present arrangement of the oracles is the work of a skilful redactor may be correct and yet afford little justification for his extensive deletions. Although accretions, glosses and alterations may be discovered, there are no grounds for the erasure of any phrase or passage that might have come from Ezekiel, that fits in with the period in which he lived, and that harmonises with the actual conditions of his time.
Chapter II.

THE PROBLEM OF THE BOOK.

No satisfactory solution of the Ezekiel-Enigma has been given by any scholar mentioned in the preceding chapter. Although the main theme of the first thirty-seven chapters is the fate of the people in Palestine, the Babylonian origin so far has not been called in question. The explanation offered is that "Ezekiel had two audiences, one real and present, and the other ideal; and for the most part they are identified to such a degree that in addressing the exiles or their elders, he fancies himself speaking to the idealised nation, whose members were then scattered far and wide over the world. It is an extension of the same tendency when he delivers imaginary discourses to those left in the land." "Ezekiel felt sent to 'the House of Israel', and, while addressing his fellow-exiles, he fancies before him the people of Canaan or the nation scattered abroad throughout the world." "The peculiarity of Ezekiel's prophecy of judgment lies in the fact that he predicts the catastrophe of Jerusalem-Judah to the Gola at Tel-Abib." "The prophecy of the real
Ezekiel", says Hölscher, and one is surprised that he does not foresee the implications of his statement, "does not concern the exiles but the people of Jerusalem in the Home-land". 4

Josephus apparently found a solution of the problem by assuming the transmission of Ezekiel's prophecies to Jerusalem. 5

The belief that Ezekiel's activities were confined to Babylonia has given rise to the idea that prophecy with him was more or less of a literary occupation. "After all that has just been said, it is superfluous to add that there is not, in the whole book, a single page which we ought to regard as having been publicly read or spoken. Ezekiel was not an orator; he is a writer. What he gives us is this: literary lucubrations, the product of work in the study, the fruit of retirement and contemplation. No one, not blind to the evidence, would maintain that he ever had an opportunity of taking part in public life, or of leaving his seclusion in order to play a part on (life's) stage, amid the turmoil of passions and the panorama of events." 6 "In his (Ezekiel's) hands prophecy became far more of a literary occupation than it had hitherto been. A
perusal of the book shows that it has been carefully planned with an eye to literary effect: and if the prophet had simply worked out his conceptions in the solitude of his chamber, the result would hardly have differed much from what we actually find. More than any of his predecessors he lives in a world of abstract ideas, which are more vividly real to his imagination than the circumstances of his everyday life."

On the other hand, literary analysis detects in the structure of the book a structure similar to that of Isaiah and Jeremiah, whose oracles in the first instance, it is generally admitted, were spoken. Although critics are divided as to the best principle of classification, there is common agreement that the book falls into certain large sections; four according to Skinner and Herrmann: viz. 1. Ch. I-XXIV; 2. Ch. XXV-XXII; 3. Ch. XXIII-XXIX; 4. Ch. XL-XLVIII. According to Davidson and Lofthouse there are two main sections with three subdivisions in the second section: viz. 1. Ch. I-XXIV; 2. Ch. XXV-XLVIII; (a) Ch. XXV-XXXII; (b) Ch. XXXIII-XXXIX; (c) Ch. XL-XLVIII.
the book

Driver divides into three large sections with two subdivisions: viz. 1. Ch. I-XXIV; 2. Ch. XXV-XXXII; 3. Ch. XXXIII- XLVIII

(a) Ch. XXXIII-XXXIX; (b) Ch. XL-XLVIII.

None of these schemes go far below the surface. Within Ch. I-XXXVII there are collections of oracles, independent in time and content, some of them comparatively short, strung together loosely like pearls on a thread. Their limits are frequently marked by a superscription and a subscription. "It is noticeable that the several sections of the book, just as in the Book of Jeremiah, are provided with inscriptions-formulas of the same kind". The favourite introductory formulas are:

(1) הלא ידָה יֵשָׁנִי הָכָה in the following passages: - II:4; III:11,27; V:5,7,8; VI:3,11; VII:2,5; XI:7,16,17; XII:10,19,23,28; XIII:3,8,13,18,20; XIV:4,6,21; XV:6; XVI:3,36,59; XVII:3,9,19,22; XX:3,5,27,30,39; XXI:3,29,31,33; XXII:3,19,28; XXIII:22,28,32,35,46; XXIV:3,6,9,21; XXV:3,6,8,12,13,15,16; XXVI:3,7,15,19; XXVII:3; XXVIII:2,6,12,22,25; XXIX:3,8,13,19 XXX:2,10,13,22; XXXI:10,15; XXXII:3,11; XXXIII:25,27; XXXIV:2,10,11,17,20; XXXV:3,14; XXXVI:2,3,4,5,6,7,13,22,33,37; XXXVII:5,9,
The favourable closing formulas are:

(1) נא וְזַעַ֖ר in the following passages: - VI:7; VII:4; XI:10, 12; XII:20; XIII:9, 14, 21 (וגם), 23 (וגם); XIV:8; XX:38; XXV:5; XXXV:9; XXXVI:11; XXXVII:6; Read also in VII:9; XIII:9. (The phrase occurs in XV:7; XXII:22; but not as closing formula; in XX:42, 44, and XXXVII:13, as an introductory

(2) וַיַּקְרֹ֥ב תָּהֳלַ֖ל אֶלָּאָ֑ו in the following passages: - VI:1; VII:1; XII:1, 17, 21, 26; XIII:1; XIV:2, 12; XV:1; XVI:1; XVII:1, 11; XVIII:1; XX:2; XXI:1, 6, 13, 23; XXII:1, 17, 23; XXIII:1; XXIV:1, 15; XXV:1; XXVII:1; XCVIII:1, 11, 20; XXX:1; XCVIIII:1, 23; XXXV:1; XXXVI:16; XCVIIII:15; נָא וְזַעַ֖ר in XXIII:36; נָא וְזַעַ֖ר in XXVI:1; XXIX:1; XXX:20; XXXI:1; XXXII:1, 17.

(3) נָא וְזַעַ֖ר in XIII:2; XVI:35; XXI:3; XXXIV:7, 9; XXXVI:1; XXXVII:4. Occasionally two of these formulas are found together, e.g. in XIII:2; XXI:3.

The favourite closing formulas are:
formula; ידוע כ"צ חזותה ונכון in XX:20; ידוע כ"צ חזותה ונכון in XVI:62; XIX:16; XXV:7; XXXV:4, as closing, and in
XXXV:12 as introductory formulas).

(2) ידוע כ"צ חזותה in the following passages: - VI:10, 14;
VII:27; XII:15, 16; XXIV:27; XXV:11, 17; XXVI:6; XXVIII:22, 23;
XXIX:9, 21; XXX:8, 19, 26; XXXII:15; XXXV:9, 15; XXXVII:13; XXXVI:
38; (also in XXIV:27, XXX:25, in the middle of a sentence in
XXXIII:29, XXXIV:30, as introductory formula; ידוע כ"צ חזות
והנה in XXVIII:26).

(3) ידוע כ"צ חזותה in the following passages: - V:15, 17;
XXI:22, 37; XXIV:14; XXX:12; (in XVII:21, 24; XXVI:14; XXXVII:14,
in combination with other phrases; ידוע כ"צ חזותה in XXII:14;
(4) ידוע כ"צ חזותה in the following passages: - XI:8, 21; XII:
25, 28; XIII:8, 16; XIV:11, 14, 23; XV:8; XVI:14, 19, 43, 63; XVIII:
9, 30, 32; XX:36, 44; XXI:12, 18; XXII:12, 31; XXIII:34; XXIV:14;
XXV:14; XXVI:5, 14, 21; XXVIII:10; XXX:6; XXXI:18; XXXII:8, 14, 16,
31, 32; XXXIV:49, 30, 31; XXXV:14, 15; Read also in XVI:58, XXXVII:
14; (The phrase occurs but not as closing formula in V:11; XIV:
16, 18, 20; XVI:8, 23, 30, 48; XVII:16; XVIII:3, 23; XIX:3, 31, 33, 40;
Not only is the book cast in the form of other prophetic writings but it is clear that from first to last Ezekiel regards himself as a נבון, impelled by the הנחיה ווד to proclaim the divine will (Ch. II: 8-III: 3).

I. He lays claim to the prophetic title.

Ch. II: 5(g).

II. He has all the prophetic characteristics.

(a) He states that the הנחיה ווד is upon him (cf. Is. VIII: 11).

Ch. I: 3(g) הנחיה ווד יתבכש, צד יתבכש Ch. III: 14.

Ch. III: 22 הנחיה ווד יתבכש, צד יתבכש Ch. VIII: 1(g) הנחיה ווד יתבכש, צד יתבכש Ch. XxxxIII: 22(g).

(b) He states that the הכר enters into him. (Cf. Num. XXIV: 2; Jugd. III: 10; VI: 34; XI: 29; XIII: 25; XIV: 6, 19; XV: 14; ISam. X: 10; XI: 6; XVI: 13; XIX: 20, 23; II Sam. XXIII: 2; II Chron. XV: 1; XX: 14; XXIV: 20; Is. LXI: 14; Mic. III: 8).

II: 2. צד יתבכש, צד Ch. III: 12. צד יתבכש, צד.
(A number of these are probably connecting links of the redactor)<

He claims a prophetic vision and denies that claim to the false prophets.

Like Isaiah (VI:1) and Jeremiah (I:20) he has a vision of Yahweh. The הוהי venez appears to him in a thunderstorm (I:4–28). The word which he uses is והנה (I:1, 27, 28). He sees a hand stretched forth with a roll of a book (II:9). He has another vision of the והנה venez (III:23). He has a vision of the והנה venez (VIII:4). He has a vision of the idolatries committed by the יכרצות ב in the הוהי venez (VIII:10f), of the destroying angels and the scribe (IX:2ff), and of the slaughter of the idolaters (IX:8). He accuses the false prophets of following what they have not seen (והנה XIII:3); the word which he uses for his own prophetic vision is והנה which he denies to them; the word which he applies to them is והנה (XIII:6, 7); he will allow to them only a certain power of beholding with the eyes.
The יְהֹוָה used this word of Ezekiel himself (XII:27); evidently they refused to accept him as a seer.

(d) He has the prophetic characteristic of rhythmic movement accompanied by prophetic speech.

VI:11. (Read as in XXV:3, XXVI:2, XXXVI:2). יָדַע הָבֶל רָדֵּק
XXI:17. (Read): יָדַע וְיָדַע אֶפְשָׁר גֶּק
XXI:19. (Read): יָדַע וְיָדַע כָּל עַל כָּל

(e) He indulges in rhythmic speech accompanied probably by rhythmic movement.

Ch. VII is composed of a series of oracles in a lyrical-dithyrambic measure almost peculiar to Ezekiel.

(f) Ezekiel, if the words are his, expressly states that some of his prophecies were addressed to an audience who had come to hear.
Herrmann says: "It is clear that the elders were not altogether without purpose in coming to Ezekiel; we can readily read between the lines that they came to hear his prophecies". 20

Even if these references are interpolations they imply that the redactor regarded Ezekiel as a prophet whose message was delivered through the medium of the spoken word. The allusions in the following three passages suggest that some of Ezekiel's prophecies were spoken in the first instance.

(g) Other references imply speech to a listening audience.

There is a suggestion of hesitancy to accept the call owing to
the hostile attitude of the *qim* (II:3-7). Yahweh urges the prophet to face his tremendous task by taking up a fearless attitude, for Yahweh will make his forehead harder than flint.

Why the hint of reluctance and fear, why such counsel from Yahweh, unless Ezekiel were to address the *qim* in person?

II:4. "And say to the rebelliousness of the house of Israel..."

II:5. "As I am watching over my sheaf..."

II:7. "I will make the forehead of your head like flint..."

III:11. "Therefore, say to the rebelliousness of the house of Israel..."

III:17. "And thus..."

XII:2. "...and my eyes shall see them..."

XX:1ff. "And I will make you a ransom for the house of Israel..."

XX:27. "...and the house of Israel..."

XXIV:18 (K.H.B.) "And you also shall know that I am the Lord..."

XXXIII:7. "...and they shall see that I am the Lord..."

XXXIII:20 (Read). "And when I saw you spurn the Lord..."

XXXIII:25. "...and I said: 'O house of Israel..."
Ezekiel is prophetic not only in word but in deed. One of his most striking modes of appeal is the performance of symbolic actions. They are just such actions as would appeal to his countrymen and attract an audience. Apart from the senselessness of making mention of them unless they had been actually carried out, there seems proof of their performance. (1) They are occasionally introduced by formulas which imply their performance.

No enquiry would be made by the people about the significance of an act unless they had witnessed its performance.

(2) They are performed (IV:12; XII:3, 4, 5, 6, 7; XXI:11; XXXVII:18).
Ezekiel's Symbolic Actions.

Ch. IV. Ez. symbolically takes part in the siege of the city.

Ch. V: 1-4. Ez. takes a sharp sword (symbolical of the judgment of Yahweh) & uses it on his hair like a razor, the hair symbolising the community. The division of the hair into three parts is symbolical of the accuracy of Yahweh's justice. Ez. then performs acts symbolical of the fate of those who perish within the city & its environment, those who flee the country, & those left in the land.

Ch. XII: 3-7. Ez. symbolises the fate of the נֵבֶל in Jerusalem & all the members of the נֵבֶל who are in the midst of her, & explains that he is a sign to his audience predicting what will happen to the נֵבֶל & the others referred to. He is to take the scant equipment for the exiles' journey & to remove by day in their sight from one place to another (possibly from his house to a spot nearby) (v. 3); in vv. 4-6 further details are given, but these vv. appear to have been edited. Smend interprets these actions as symbols of Zedekiah's attempted escape, & Hölscher argues that the passage has been brought into connection with Zedekiah's flight & blinding through vv. 12 ff. which he regards as secondary.

Ch. XII: 18-19. Ez. carries out an act symbolical of the scarcity in the land as a result of the Babylonian invasion.

Ch. XXI: 8. Ez. probably draws a sword.

Ch. XXI: 11 f. Ez. sighs "with the breaking of his loins", symbolising the effect which the news of the approach of the armies will have upon the community.
Ch. XXI:13-16. Ez. sharpens and polishes the sword. Vv. 17-19, he cries and howls and smites upon his thigh as a symbol of grief (cf. Jer. XXXI:19); he smites his hands together as a sign of wrath (cf. v. 17; XXII:13; Num. XXIV:10). In VI:11 and XXV:6 this action is an expression not of wrath but of exultation over a fallen enemy.

Ch. XXI:19bff. Ez. seizes the sword which he had dropped and brandishes it.

Ch. XXI:24. Ez. draws a map (cf. IV:1) with two lines to symbolise the roads to Jerusalem and to Ammon (v. 33); as his excitement rises he seizes the sword again.

Ch. XXXVII:16ff. Ez. takes two sticks, which he joins into one, to symbolise the reunion of the northern and southern kingdoms.

Such symbolical actions are by no means peculiar to Ezekiel. Moses during a battle with Amalek held up his rod towards the sky (Ex. XVII:11). Samuel poured oil on the head of Saul (I Sam. X:1). Ahijah rent his garment in 12 pieces and gave 10 to Jeroboam (I Kings XI:30ff). A son of the prophets asked one of his fellows to strike him (I Kings XX:35ff). Zedekiah made for himself horns of iron (I Kings XXII:11). Amos smote the lintel of the door (Amos IX:1). Hosea married a wife of whoredom and gave his children symbolical names (Hos. I). He bought her out of slavery and tried to redeem her (III). Isaiah walked naked and barefoot for three years (Is. XX:2-4).

The performance of such symbolical actions seems to have been a characteristic prophetic feature of Ezekiel's age. Jeremiah, his contemporary, hid a girdle in a rock to symbolise the corruption of Judah (Jer. XIII:1-5). He...
broke in pieces a potter's vessel as a symbol of Yahweh's complete rejection of Jerusalem (XIX:1-13). He wore a yoke to symbolise the coming subjection of the nation (XXVIII:10). He bought a field to symbolise his confidence of the future restoration (XXXII:7).

(i) Ezekiel has the prophetic temper. The nature and drift of his message mark him out as a prophet. While not stating a speculative monotheism, he insists upon the supremacy of Yahweh (XII: 16; XVII:24; XX:9). Against the contention of a section of the community that "Yahweh hath forsaken the land", Ezekiel's constant refrain is: "Ye shall know that I am Yahweh". Even the nations shall learn the same truth that "I am Yahweh", the only real God. Like Jeremiah, Ezekiel proclaims the destruction of Jerusalem for her sins. He is at one with the prophets in his denunciation of the idolatry of Israel and of the false worship in the Temple courts (VI, VIII, XVI, XXIII). No prophet is more outspoken in his criticism of the existing religious condition of society, embracing all classes in its sweep (XXII:23-31). There is at the same time the equally firm prophetic conviction that Yahweh cannot for ever repudiate Israel (XVII:22ff; XXXIV:23ff; XXXVII:24ff).

It must be admitted that the references in (f) and (g) are of doubtful value in establishing the conclusion that Ezekiel's prophecies were spoken, because they may be the connecting links supplied by the redactor. It must also be admitted that, while Ezekiel had the temper and characteristics of a prophet, he may have discharged the prophetic office in the solitude of his chamber. On the other hand, although some of the oracles may be literary productions, it is clear that there are numbers of them which convey the impression of the spoken word.
CHAPTER III.
THE SCENE OF EZEKIEL'S PROPHETIC ACTIVITY.

Ezekiel according to the received view was a priest of Jerusalem carried into exile with Jehoiachim in 597 B.C., a view based on II K.XXIV:14-16, Jer.LII:28, and Ez.I:2,3.

A study of his book confirms the view that he was a priest, but there is nothing in it to show that he was one of the captives of 597. No reference is made to Ezekiel in Jeremiah and Kings or to priests who went into exile at this time, whereas there is mention of captive priests in the exile of 586 (II K.XXXV:18).

"Since we do not know the causes which led to Jehoiachim's rebellion, and have no reason to conclude that religion was concerned in it, it is likely that the Babylonian had selected men who had been identified with the rising or were likely to foment new troubles". 

Nor does our prophet in his opening chapter indicate that he was a captive. He says no more than that he was ḳiḥa ḫa. At the outset we are confronted with a double introduction. In v.1 the date and place of his vision are given. Verse 1b is probably interpolation. The phrase אַחַת אֶלֶם אֶלֶם is unique in the O.T., elsewhere found only in later apocalyptic literature (cf. III Macc.VI:18; Apoc.Bar.XXII:1; Test.LeviIII), and although Ezekiel may have been the first to use the expression, we are inclined to regard it as an interpolation and to consider 1a and 3b as the original text. (Read in 3b 'ע with G). Verses 2 and 3a are inserted in order to explain the puzzling 30th year, to identify the anonymous speaker of verse 1 (מונע) with the Ezekiel who exercised the
function of a prophet, and the with the canal of that name in Babylonia.

A characteristic feature of the book is a scrupulous exactness in dating events unparalleled in any earlier prophet; but, while the chronological scheme is accepted by Hölscher, the dating may be the work of a redactor. In any case, as Kraetzschmar points out, even if the authenticity of the dates is accepted, it does not follow that all the oracles standing between two dates belong to the same intervening period. Our hands cannot be tied by the redactor's arrangement of the material. Unless we take it for granted that Ezekiel edited his own oracles, the period to which an oracle should be assigned must be determined rather by internal evidence than by chronological arrangement. The chronological scheme, as in Haggai, is the framework of the oracles.

Due weight ought to be given to the tradition that Ezekiel was the lonely prophet of the Exile, but it does not follow that his prophetic work was confined altogether or in the main to the exile. The possibility is not excluded that his prophetic activity may have been cut in two, and that he discharged the prophetic office first in Palestine and then in Babylonia. The reader can with difficulty escape the conviction that most of the oracles suggest not a Babylonian but a Palestinian background to the prophet's work; and surprise has been expressed by students of the book that so little light is shed on the conditions of the community amongst whom, it is presumed, his lot was cast. A.B. Davidson, for example, says: "The picture, if it can be called so, which the prophet gives of the
life of the exiles and their circumstances is singularly colourless.... His work lay among the captives in the midst of whom he lived. It is remarkable, however, how little reference is made in his prophecies to the circumstances of the exiles. 

To the question: "Why should Ezekiel in imagination place himself in Palestine when speaking to an exiled community?", it can hardly be said that a satisfactory answer has been given. Josephus was alive to the nature of the problem and cut the gordian knot by assuming the transmission of Ezekiel's prophecies to headquarters at Jerusalem. Although there was free communication between the exiles and the homeland (Jer. XXIX), such transmission would take time, and it is difficult to grasp the purpose of it and to gauge the effect of the recorded oracles upon the Jerusalem community.

On the other hand, it may be argued that Ezekiel's denunciations and forecasts of doom were designed to shatter the exiles' false conception of Yahweh as a local deity and that belief in the inviolability of the Temple which was responsible for their hope of a speedy return and for a spirit of unrest and rebellion (Jer. XXIX). "We may wonder that the first terrific blow struck by Babylon in 597 should have left the Jews unconvinced of the probability of their impending political extinction—a probability which to Ezekiel was a certainty as clear as noonday. But the people had reasons for their incredulity. Their destruction meant to an ancient mind the destruction of their own God's/power and prestige as well; and Yahweh could not and would not allow himself to stand discredited before the world. Jerusalem as His own city, the Temple as His peculiar home, the
monarchy as established by Himself, were believed to be inviolable; it was their very faith in these things, and in the God who was supposed to guarantee them, that rendered the message of Ezekiel as incredible as it was intolerable. Again, Ezekiel was not the only prophet. There were others who preached a more welcome and probable message; and, between the two, a people with no very sensitive conscience to moral issues might well be really confused, and only too ready to give themselves the benefit of the doubt.  

The above possible and plausible explanation fails to account for the absence of detail concerning the conditions of the people and for the terms in which Ezekiel speaks of the homeland. Ezekiel betrays an intimate knowledge of the moral and spiritual condition of the people in Palestine such as we could expect only of a man on the spot. To escape from their embarrassment scholars have been driven to postulate "second-sight". Lofthouse, in speaking of the idolatries practised in the Temple, says that "Ezekiel whether in a trance or not must have watched these scenes", and in a note to chapter XXIV:2 remarks that "either Ezekiel was a deliberate deceiver, or he was possessed of some kind of second-sight."  

Against the view that Ezekiel was psychically abnormal it must be urged that his prophecies give the impression of being the work of the most practical of men; and, on psychological grounds, it is difficult to accept the theory of second-sight as there is no other instance of anyone with the gift of second-sight going into such detail.

A still more serious difficulty faces us. One complaint, that of idolatry, apostacy from Yahweh, stands out in
Ezekiel's arraignment of his people; so pronounced is it that, whereas to Hosea (XI:1-3) and Jeremiah (II:2ff) the period of the wilderness wanderings was a time of harmony between Yahweh and His people, to Ezekiel Yahweh would have been justified in destroying at the very beginning an Israel whom He had chosen and to whom He "had lifted up His hand in covenant" (XX). It is an inference unsupported by proof, but reasonable none the less, that this attitude is the result of Ezekiel's reflections upon the sins of his contemporaries. Not only does he condemn the worship with their false worship (VI:3, 6; XVI:16), but he denounces in the strongest terms child-sacrifice (XX:26; XXIII:37), Temple-prostitution, sun-worship, phallic-worship (VIII) and sorcery (XIII:18, 20, 21). The picture that he paints of the moral life of the nation is appalling. Jerusalem is a sink of iniquity and has infected the whole country. "The land is full of bloody crimes and the city is full of violence" (VII:23; cf. XI:6). Father and mother are despised, the are oppressed, widows and orphans are wronged, the Sabbath is desecrated, and there is a complete absence of any moral code (XXII:7-13; cf. XXXII:25ff). The most disquieting symptom is the alliance of the prophets and the priests for selfish ends (XXII:26). Always is there a glancing towards alien ways. The religion of the people is illicit intercourse with false gods who have seduced Israel from her allegiance to her true husband (XVI & XXIII). The Jerusalem priesthood favour religious syncretism. No longer does the at the entrance to the Temple, even though they know that Yahweh cannot tolerate it. The ritualism of Yahweh has lost interest for them; an eclecticism and fanatical syncretism have taken
The usual explanation given of this picture of corruption is that with the death of Josiah in 608 (II K. XXIII:29; II Chrons. XXXV:24) a severe blow was inflicted on the Yahweh party and a religious reaction set in. "The people believed the king's death was a divine punishment for changing the forms of worship in their religion" and, with the hopes of temporal prosperity blighted, the old heathenism returned and moral degradation with it (II K. XXIII:32). If the reformation of Josiah was as sudden and drastic as is described, says Gates, it must have had a reaction, whether we look for it in the changed policy of a succeeding king, or in the logic of the situation. Men would have forms of worship and if Yahweh-worship was centralised in Jerusalem, the other gods would steal away the people's hearts. But Welch has shown how little foundation there is for the view that corruption of the cultus set in after the death of Josiah. "Jehoiachim... had continued the policy of his father in religious matters, so that the reform was beginning to make its way into the habits of the people. Now the undoubted aim and the inevitable result of the movement were to give the temple a new sacredness in the minds of all Israel. It had also given the sacrifices which were offered there a new value as a means of access to Yahweh". Jeremiah's Temple-address "is directed not against a desecration, but against a false valuation of the temple and its worship". No evidence can be produced that the Babylonian Empire, like Assyria, demanded recognition of its gods. The gods of Nebuchadrezzar-Bel, Nebo, Marduk- are not mentioned; and the silence of the prophetic voices is not due to considerations of prudence. Nebuchadrezzar was a
different type from the Assyrian overlords. "He was, in truth, a son of Babylonia, not of Assyria, a man of peace, not of war, a devotee of religion and culture, not of organisation and administration. . . . . . His inscriptions reveal a loftiness of sentiment unequalled in the royal literature of the Oriental world. With his accession the Yahweh party must have looked forward to a new era of political and religious freedom. The retention of Yahweh in the new name יִשְׂרָאֵל given by the king to יִשְׂרָאֵל may be accepted as an indication of his recognition of Yahwism if not of his desire for its establishment in Palestine.

It seems clear that many of Ezekiel's oracles do not fall within the period between the first and second captivities of Judah; some fit in with the conditions known to have existed prior to the reformation of Josiah, some might even belong to the chaotic period after the fall of the city, but of these none suit a Babylonian environment. The reign of Manasseh, as a result of the new political conditions, was marked by a religious reaction. All the superstitious cults and practices of the time of Ahaz were revived and established by royal sanction (II K. XXI:3). Sun-worship, a characteristic Assyrian cult, was introduced. There was a revival of the Baal and Asherah cults accompanied by dealings with wizards and familiar spirits. "The breach between the court and the religious leaders appears to have gone so far as to result in religious persecution. At least it is said that Manasseh shed innocent blood very much (II K. XXI:16). . . . . . How far, again, the king's action was prompted by opposition to the religious ideals of these men, and how far it could justify itself as directed against public acts to which their view of religion drove them,
it is impossible to say.... A further effect of this policy was to bring a temper of indifference in the minds of ordinary men. Many began to lose their sense of national pride and national dignity. They were tempted to follow the customs and ape the habits of the great Empire.... All the elements in Judah which had felt the restraint of their religious distinctiveness only to resent it felt themselves free to do as they pleased. They did not confine themselves to a compelled recognition of the Eastern cult of their conquerors, but gave way to baser and lower superstitions which had been repressed by the official religion". 19

Not only does internal evidence point to a pre-Josianic date for many of Ezekiel's oracles, but in the Talmud there is the significant statement that prior to the Vision of Yahweh in Chaldea, Ezekiel had exercised the prophetic office in Palestine. It may be plausibly argued that the Jews could not conceive of the call of Yahweh coming to a prophet for the first time outside the Holy Land; but the natural interpretation of the following passage is that the writer recognised the Palestinian background of many of the oracles or may have known by a tradition lost to us that Ezekiel's ministry had begun much earlier than 593 B.C.
בשנים שלפני רבבות, שבנו
ובבר "חמישה 맺ים" בבר אחיו ואת בנג'י
חיו ב" userEmail "וזה הוא התחלת הספר, אז נשלק
חדרה" ו"ו שהוא התחלת הספר, ואומר אגיד".
שאלה בבר זה עם תחילתו אתה ראה
בצומת אלו בערכו祖先 והיוו באזנו, ואומר אגיד
כנדתי התחלתיشفות אסכולה, ובוותך את בו כל
תירם, והזה הווה עתמה各式התקדמת יוזה מקדרים יוזה
ומאמץ בר בוזו começa עברא די שארד, 
תנינא וואטשזים עם בזירות אורת כדריא
ויתקנת עי הרשיא והستحق טבלת עם דרויין
(ד, ע, ש')
It has been shown in the preceding chapter that, although the 
was upon Ezekiel (I:1), it does not follow that his work as a prophet began at that point or that his mission was confined to a captive community. As the exclusive concern of many of the oracles is Palestine and its people and the religious situation portrayed is apparently that prior to the reformation of Josiah rather than of the period between the first captivity of Judah and the fall of the city, it is a justifiable inference that these oracles were delivered by the prophet in Palestine. What is the significance of the initial \( Vm \) with which the book opens? It does not follow from Holscher's argument that only late books—e.g.,Ruth (I:1), Esther (I:1), Jonah (I:1)—begin with \( Vm \) that the opening words are spurious, but the \( Vm \) does suggest, as Spinoza recognised, that it was preceded by something else and that a previous manifestation of \( nm \) had been vouchsafed to Ezekiel. "Quod autem Ezechielis liber fragmentum etiam tantum sit, id primi ejus versus clarissime indicat; quis enim non videt conjunctionem, quae liber incipit, ad alia jam dicta referri, et cum iis dicenda connectere? at non tantum conjunctio, sed totus etiam orationis contextus alia scripta supponit; annus enim trigesimus, a quo hic liber incipit, ostendit Prophetam in narrando pergere; non autem incipere, quod etiam Scriptor ipse per parenthesin vers.3 sic notat; "fuerat saepe verbum Dei Ezechelis filio Buzi sacerdoti in terra Chaldaeorum" &c quasi diceret, verba Ezechelis, quae hoc usque descripsaret, ad alia referri, quae ipsi, ante hunc annum trigesimum revelata erant". It is the contention of the writer that the
call first came to the prophet in Palestine, and he proposes in this chapter with oracles which appear to him to be Palestinian in origin and to have been delivered in the homeland to a community to whom they were of vital importance.

Ch. IV & V. present symbols of the siege of Jerusalem, the scarcity of food and the sufferings of the inhabitants. There is general agreement that in IV there is an admixture of siege and exile symbolism. Herrmann remarks on the possibility of the original text containing no reference to exile, and Hölscher appears to have hit the mark in fastening upon IV: 1, 2, 9a, 10, 11, V:1ff. as the original and in regarding the remainder as secondary, that, as Ezekiel is symbolising the fate of Jerusalem, there was to begin with no exile symbolism. The chapter has to all appearance been edited in the direction of introducing exile symbolism, reference being made in the first instance to the duration of the exile of Israel (190 years) and of Judah (40 years), and in the second place to the unsanctified life of the Jew on foreign soil in an alien land. Could the symbolical action—lying on his side for 190 days—have been literally carried out? It has been advocated, e.g. by Kraetzschmar, that Ezekiel was a cataleptic or in a trance, but on psychological grounds such an explanation is credible only after the elimination of all other possibilities. McPadyen argues that Ezekiel need not have lain on his side for the whole period but only for a short time each day. But that is not the obvious interpretation of the statement in IV: 4. "No appeal to the prophet's alleged tendency to catalepsy will suffice to make a literal fulfilment of this command conceivable; for this reason, apart from any other, that such a prolonging of the sym-
symbolical transaction over nearly eight months would have tended to rob it of effect, or at least would have been quite unnecessary for the purpose in view."

We are faced with a further difficulty: if the period of bearing iniquity refers "to the time of being punished for sin"—national calamities being due to religious declension—what are we to make of the figures? If 190 & 40 represent the duration of the exile of Israel and Judah respectively, then, as Hölscher has pointed out, the 150 years of the exile of the Northern Kingdom must be reckoned from 586 B.C. and that brings us to 734 B.C., the year of Tiglath-Pileser's deportation of the populations of Naphtali and Dan (II K.XV:29; I Chrons:V:26). But that is not the natural date at which a North Israelite would have set the calamity of his people.

The reference to the baking of cakes with human faeces (IV:12) is designed to lay emphasis on the fact that food eaten in exile was unclean. It is difficult to conceive that the literal fulfilment of such an act as is referred to here could even have been contemplated. Human faeces could not have been used for fuel, and, as Hitzig remarked, 'וּיְחיָזָּה was not available in beleaguered cities owing to the slaughter of cattle.'

Ch. V:1-4 presents symbols of the fate of the people of Jerusalem.

A third will perish by pestilence and famine within the city.
A third will fall by the sword in the neighbourhood of the city.
A third will be scattered among the nations. Herrmann omits vv.3±4 and Hölscher regards 3-4a as addition, אֱלֹהִים cannot refer, as Ehr. & Er. hold, to אֶלּוֹעַ, as that portion had been already scattered to the wind. If the verses are retained
we must assume that prior to the performance of the symbolical acts Ezekiel made a selection of a few hairs. A few (v.3), not of the third part which is scattered to the wind but of the hair (v.1), will be saved, and of these (4a) some will be destroyed. It is easier to suggest emendations than to explain the text. One is tempted to retain the text and to translate: "from them (the saved remnant) shall go forth a fire unto all the house of Israel", implying ultimate purification through destruction of what cannot endure its presence. If this interpretation is correct Ezekiel symbolises the salvation of a remnant, not of the exiles, but of the people in Palestine.  

V:5-17 are interpretation, and interpretation of siege symbolism "Die Deutung bezieht sich...auf die Belagerungssymbolic." The number of fresh starts, e.g. the double "in vv.7,8, and again in vv.10,11, and the change of person, suggest that the passage is not homogeneous.

To sum up: in IV we have an oracle which, we are convinced, has been edited. Originally it dealt with the siege of Jerusalem and only at a later period was added the exile symbolism. To this exile state are due the absurd idea of Ezekiel lying for 190 days on one side, the dubious idea of Israel's captivity dating from a 190 year, and the extravagant notion of human faeces being used for fuel. That is to say, all the fantastic elements are secondary. Is it likely that the same man, working among the same people in Babylon, first delivered an oracle on the siege of Jerusalem, and then carefully inserted these features about exile? Why should he supplement his first oracle in this way? Is it not
more probable that his oracle about the siege of Jerusalem was spoken in Palestine and was expanded at a later period by the Redactor?

Ch. VI is a collection of oracles directed against the אֵלֶּה הָעָם, a phrase peculiar to Ezekiel (cf. XIX:9; XXXIII:28; XXXIV:13, 14; XXXV:12; XXXVII:22). The אֵלֶּה הָעָם probably signify the mountain-land of Palestine as a whole, on which the גֶּפֶן were situated. The chapter is not homogeneous. It falls into 3 distinct sections, 2-7, 8-10, 11-14. Verse 5a is probably a marginal gloss to explain that the בֵּית of 4b were not those of the exiles but those of the Israelites and is omitted by G. Holscher regards the chapter as secondary because of its style and because the prophet's range of vision and censure are not confined to Jerusalem but are extended to cover the whole land of Judah. "Es handelt sich nicht mehr, wie bei Hesekiel, um die Weissagung der Belagerung und Eroberung Jerusalems, sondern um die Verwüstung des ganzen Landes." Why should an oracle against Judah be added to the Book of Ezekiel? Have we any justification for saying that Ezekiel spoke only against Jerusalem? There are no grounds for regarding the chapter as secondary.

These oracles appear to have been delivered orally. They are short; and the prophet uses the 2nd person throughout. (In v. 13 read the 2nd person with G.). And they are spoken to a Palestinian community. Their whole tone implies the presence of the prophet in the land. In the coming catastrophe the גֶּפֶן shall fall by the sword. The exiles are excluded. Although the possibility of information about the internal affairs of Palestine reaching the captives by letter must not be ruled out,
Ezekiel

/ betrays an eyewitness’s knowledge of the spiritual condition of
his countrymen. His knowledge of the idolatries practised on the 'רָע שֶׁיַבָּא וַיְהָעָרַב (v. 3) & his references to the בְּאִירָיָה and the בָּנָי (v. 4) are those of a man on the spot. His attitude towards Judah points to a pre-exilic date. A prophet after the fall of Jerusalem would scarcely tell the exiles in Babylonia that Judah, all Judah, was thus condemned. The oracle appears to have been delivered to Judah as a reason for the exile.

That there may have been a certain amount of religious syncretism in Palestine between 597-586 cannot be denied; but it is questionable whether the description given in this chapter agrees with any period we know in the life-work of Ezekiel. Josiah not only destroyed the emblems of the Assyrian cult in Jerusalem, but also the Yahweh altar at Bethel (II K. XXIII:15). In the account of his Passover (II K. XXIII:21-23; II Chron. XX.-XXXI:1) we read that "the סְדָרָי (i.e. North Israel) that were present kept the Passover at that time" (II Chron. XXXV:17). Josephus says: "After these things Josiah went also to all the Israelites who had escaped captivity & slavery under the Assyrians & persuaded them to desist from their impious practices". Although "the enforcement of the law of the one sanctuary was a powerful incentive to the delusion of its inherent sanctity", there is no evidence that "die kultischen Zustände, die Ez. in den folgenden Versen voraussetzt, zeigen, dass die Früchte der deuteronomischen Reform... im Lande niedrigst weithin geschwunden". Under Manasseh, on the other hand, there was religious reaction on a large scale, due probably to political factors. "Resistance to Assyria was hopeless; the cost which must be paid for Judah’s continued existence was some form of
religious syncretism. And the leading men at the capital,
reluctantly or willingly, bowed their necks and paid the price.
Sun-worship introduced by Manasseh retained its popularity until
the destruction of the sun-images by Josiah. References in Ch. VI
point towards the time of Manasseh as the period to which these
oracles should be assigned.
Ch. VII is made up of a series of oracles obviously spoken at or
near Jerusalem. Several of them are primarily eschatological
in character and, although addressed to the אֵלֶּהַ הָאֵשֶׁת and
having in view the downfall of the city and people; the expression
ץַחַנְיָה points to a universal calamity. (cf. Is. XI:
12; XXIV: 16; Job XXXVII: 3; XXXVIII: 13). The following valuable
collection of references to other similar oracles is given by
Hölscher. 26 ייָה יָבָע (Am. VIII: 2; cf. Hab. II: 3); יִתְנָה בָּעָן
Ez. XIII: 6; Ez. XX: 3; Jo. I: 15; Jer. XIX: 5; IV: 14; Ob. I: 15; Zeph. I: 7);
ָהָה הָגָה (Ez. XXI: 12; XXX: 9; XXXII: 33; XXXIX: 8; Jer. X: 22);
ץָרָה בֶּשֶׁ (Is. XXIV: 17); or vv. 10 cf. Jer. XXXI: 10, Ez. XVIII: 18,
IV: 5, VI: 1); יִתְנָה בֶּשֶׁ יִניָּו (cf. Ez. V: 2, 12, VI: 12, XIV: 12ff.);
ץָרָה שֶׁבֶּדֶּשֶׁ (cf. Jer. XIV: 18); יִתְנָה שֶׁבֶּדֶּשֶׁ (cf. Ez. XXI: 12; Jer. XIII: 7);
ץָרָה שֶׁבֶּדֶּשֶׁ (cf. Ez. XXVII: 31);
ץָרָה בֶּשֶׁ יִניָּו (cf. Ez. XXI: 3, Is. XXV: 8, Jo. II: 6);
"ץָרָה בֶּשֶׁ יִניָּו (cf. Is. XX: 22) גֵּלֶאְה בֶּשֶׁ יִּבְדַּלְכֶּ (cf. Zeph.
I: 18); יִנָּו יִנָּו נִנָּו (cf. Ez. XI: 9, XXVIII: 7, 10,
XXX: 12, XXXI: 12); יִנָּו יִנָּו (cf. Ez. XXIV: 21, 25); הֵאֹל יִנָּו
ץָרָה הָבָה (cf. Ez. IX: 9); (K-H:8) יִנָּו (cf. Ez. XXIV: 21, XX: 6,
18, XXXII: 28, Lev. XXVI: 19); יִנָּו יִנָּו (cf. Jer. IV: 10);
ץָרָה בֶּשֶׁ יִניָּו (cf. Jer. XLVII: 11); יִנָּו יִנָּו (cf. Ez. XXI: 12, Jer.
IV: 20); יִנָּו יִנָּו יִנָּו (cf. Jer. XVIII: 18);
Hölscher concludes that Ch. VII is a collection of eschatological phrases and ideas gathered together by a later hand than the redactor of the book. "Im Ganzen unterscheidet sich das Kapitel in Ton und Ausdrucksweise von der sonstigen Art der ersten Redaction des Buches, so dass ich es lieber als ein jüngeres Erzeugnis betrachten möchte." The presence of parallels (e.g. vv.3,4 is a parallel to vv.8,9, and 5-7 is a parallel to 10-12a), while lending support to the idea that the chapter is a collection of eschatological material, indicates that it is a collection of early material, as later men working on the book would not duplicate in this way. Again, on Hölscher's own showing, these oracles have as good a claim to be accepted as original as any part of the book. Whereas the secondary material is "glatt", "die alten hesekielischen Texte fast durchweg textlich am stärksten ladiert sind, während die jüngeren sekundären Stücke des Buches in der Regel einen ziemlich guterhaltenen Text aufweisen." The text of VII ist leider sehr verderbt und vielfach unverständlich", and, on that ground alone, we may conclude that the oracles are early. They give the impression of having been spoken in the first instance and are in a lyrical-dithyrambic measure almost peculiar to Ezekiel. "Diese Weissagung hebt sich zu lyrischer Höhe, ja dithyrambischem Schwunge empor, wie sie nicht allzu oft in Ezechiel's Schrift anzutreffen ist... Konkrete packende Detailmalerei löst hier die Gemeinplätze ab... Kühne Wortspiele von überraschender Wirkung und wie kecke Streiflichter sind dem Gemälde aufgesetzt und bringen Leben und Farbe in dasselbe... Der Gebrauch von so unbestimmten Ausdrücken wie 'das Ende, die Zeit, der Tag, der Zorn' in doch
wieder bestimmtem Sinne, das Fehlen jeglicher Namensnennung 10ff, 21 ff, 27 rückt das Ganze in ein Helldunkel, das seine Wirkung auf die Zuhörer schwerlich verfehlt hat.  

If we assume that all the oracles belong to the same period, can we fix a date? They are obviously prior to the destruction of the city in 586, as vv. 22-27 show a Jerusalem existing with its civil and religious organisation and all this coming to confusion. Yahweh gives over the Temple to foreigners (v. 21). Herrmann 31 is of the opinion that the phrases יָשָׁפ (v. 21) & דָּרוֹל הַיְּיָ (v. 24) refer to the Babylonians. This is doubtful. While Ezekiel pronounces the judgment of Yahweh upon Ammon, Moab, Edom, Philistia, Tyre, Sidon & Egypt, he has nothing to say against Babylon. He exhibits the same friendly attitude to Babylon that Jeremiah does. He speaks no word of blame against Nebuchadrezzar even when Jerusalem falls. He denounces the idolatry of Israel and Judah and the cults of Egypt and Phoenicia, but there is no judgment uttered against the religion of Babylonia. It may be that this pro-Babylonian attitude was due to considerations of fear or prudence, and that in VII:2 (cf XXI:37) we have veiled references to the Chaldean power. "To Jeremiah and Ezekiel", says Toy, 32 Babylon was the supreme political power of the world, victorious over all enemies, firmly established, and therefore the safest guardian of Israel. They saw that it would be madness in a petty kingdom in Palestine to set itself up against this overwhelming force.... This prophetic point of view is not ethical or religious but national.... In the days of Ezekiel Israel's hope lay in keeping quiet and maintaining friendly relations with Babylon; and the prophet has no word to
say against its moral or religious character". Considerations of prudence carried no weight with the prophets, who had no hesitation in denouncing tyranny in high places; and it is our contention that in the absence of oracles against Babylon, these references cannot be applicable to that world power.

We take שִׁילָה (v.23) to mean the צִבּוּי and interpret פִּתי as the golden network before the צִבּוּי (cf. I K. VI: 21 הבטוק). Read פִּתי וְאָנָה (they will destroy the chain) or פִּתי וְהָיִית (they will remove the chain), but the latter reading is arbitrary. The meaning is clear. The heathen will enter the Holy of Holies. They will not be deterred by the "chain". That the צִבּוּי was still in the Temple after 597 is improbable.

While the oracles belong to an earlier period than that which is generally accepted, it is difficult to fix a date. Being eschatological, they may have been uttered without any historical crisis or political event in the view of the prophet. "What all the prophets had to proclaim was a day of the Lord in which Yahweh was about to manifest Himself and His purpose in judgment. At first the sphere of His self-manifestation in judgment was Israel." In this chapter the world-catastrophe is to manifest itself at Jerusalem (vv.3,4) because of the false worship which the Jerusalemites had introduced into the Temple. The last 40 years of the 7th Century was a period of almost universal unsettlement, disruption, and distress of nations, and these oracles might conceivably fall within that period.

Ch. VIII. "Kap. VIII-XI", says Herrmann, "enthält eine größere literarische Einheit, die aber durch mehrere Einsätze erweitert und gesprengt ist". Ch. VIII is an account obviously by an
eyewitness of the various idolatries practised in the Temple. It gives a vivid description of what a man has seen in Palestine. Lofthouse says: "Ezekiel, whether in a trance or not, must have watched these scenes." If he witnessed these scenes in Babylonia he could have done so only by some kind of "second-sight" and a second-sight unlike any kind of second-sight of which we have any knowledge. Therefore we are driven to the conclusion that the account of the idolatries given in this chapter was delivered in Palestine. At what time it is difficult to say. We have no grounds for believing that there was any such revival of idolatrous practices between 597-586 as is described here. The chapter may belong to the period prior to the reformation of Josiah or it may have been after the Exile.

Chap. XI:1-13 forms a separate unity and has no connection in date or idea with the preceding chapters. It owes its setting to the weird idea of Ezekiel's transportation to Jerusalem. Kr. places it in the period immediately preceding the city's final struggle; but the expression and the reference to the suggest a post-Josianic date. After the appointment of Gedaliah as governor there was unceasing intrigue, which led ultimately to his assassination at a communal meal (Jer. XLI:1), an act which was responsible for the downfall of the new community.

It seems apparent that the section belongs to Palestine. Not only does it not contrast the men of Jerusalem with the exiles, but it has nothing to say about the exiles. If we hold that vv. 1-13 are the work of an exile we are placed in an absurd position. Kr. thinks that all that is described here took
place in vision. Hence Pelatiah's death did not happen as the result of Ezekiel's prophecy, since the prophecy was not delivered in Jerusalem but in Babylon. Did Ezekiel see the death in vision or did he receive news of it afterwards in Babylon? No satisfactory explanation can be given except on the hypothesis that the section is Palestinian, not Babylonian.

Chap. XII: 17-20. These verses, it seems clear, are not addressed to Jerusalem. They present a symbol, performed in the presence of the מְצֹחַ בֵּית, of the terror and anxiety of the מַעָּרָשׁ. There is general agreement that the מַעָּרָשׁ are in Palestine. Read: נַעַמְתָּם שָׁם וּעֲשָׂנָה.

Chap. XII: 21-25 are addressed to a Palestinian community. Verse 22 can mean only that Ezekiel is in the מַעָּרָשׁ. Lofthouse recognises this and postulates that the prophet is in Palestine in phantasy. "Ezekiel speaks as if he were in Jerusalem at the side of Jeremiah." Verses 26-28 form no parallel text but are independent oracles which are more suitable if uttered in Jerusalem than elsewhere.

Chap. XIV contains a series of oracles against the idolaters who came to enquire of Yahweh. The first group (vv. 3-5) appear to have been transferred to the נחית by the insertion of verse 1. In VIII: 1 the men who sit before the prophet are the נחית. Here the enquirers are מַעָּרָשׁ. "Die Darstellung ist schlecht; dass die genannten Ältesten Israels Götzendieiner sind und ein Jahwewort vom Propheten begehren, hätte gleich zu Anfang gesagt werden sollen". But we cannot accept Holscher's conclusion that the whole section 1-11, which he regards as a unity, is not authentic. Our contention is that these oracles were delivered in Palestine and bodily transferred to the נחית.
Although there is evidence of the worship of heathen deities amongst the exiles in Babylonia, the Jews who turned to these foreign gods definitely broke with their own religion and would not come to make enquiry of a Yahweh prophet. The men referred to in verse 3 are not so much worshippers of idols as men who in their minds had gone astray. It is improbable that there were such men in an exile community where men were definitely either for Yahweh or the heathen. The passage may conceivably be late, the meaning being that those who in their hearts are away from Yahweh are as bad as those who are actually idol worshippers; or it may refer, as the writer contends, to Jerusalem with its syncretistic worship, that of Yahweh in combination with that of heathen gods.

Verses 6-8 are not appropriate in the mouth of a prophet in exile, but seem to be addressed to the people at Jerusalem, as the reference to the נַעַרה indicates. Bertholet's contention that the נַעַרה were resident aliens carried into exile does not commend itself. Verses 6-8 may be late exposition of vv. 4f, using נַעַרה as proselyte, or they may belong to the pre-reformation period. All one can definitely say is that they do not suit Babylonia.

Chap. XVI is an oracle meant for Jerusalem. There is no reference to exile or exiles. The writer of this chapter draws out to weary and grotesque detail the figure of Hosea. The unique feature of the chapter is the writer's violent and radical hatred of Jerusalem. Employing a North country tradition he traces her origin to the Amorite. Her inborn nature persists throughout her whole history. She has been persistently unfaithful to Yahweh and has shown an amazing lack of gratitude for his kindness. She has
outbidden Sodom and Samaria in wickedness. It is difficult to explain such an indictment of Jerusalem by an exiled Jerusalem priest between 597-586. There was nothing in the conduct of the Jerusalemites to warrant it. There is no evidence, for example, of a revival of child-sacrifice during the last years of the Judean monarchy. Holscher makes vv.44-58 a separate unity. Whether he is correct or not it is difficult to say. We agree with him that vv.59ff. form a separate unity and constitute a later addition, but we cannot accept his conclusions. Verse 61 states that Sodom and Samaria are to be restored, but they are to be mere daughters to Jerusalem, not quite in the same covenant relation to Yahweh. They are relegated to an inferior position. This is not in harmony with the spirit of dislike to Jerusalem which breathes through the rest of the chapter.

Chap. XXI. falls into 7 sections: - 1-5, 6-10, 11-12, 13-22, 23-28, 29-32, 33-37. The first section appears to be Palestinian in origin. The words used (v.1) הַלַּי, יְדֵד, and בָּאָל all refer to the south of Palestine. Lofthouse says "Ezekiel is now in imagination inside Jerusalem". It is more probable that he is actually in the city or neighbourhood. The next oracle, in contrast to the former which was directed against the בָּאָל הַיִּ דָּע, the nex is far more general and is directed against Jerusalem and the הַשְׁתֵּה הַמְּדָה not הַזָּה. It appears to be Palestinian. If the next oracle (11-12) has any connection with the preceding, the symbolical act (v.12) suggests the presence of the prophet in Jerusalem. The tidings of the siege or fall of the city would not, so far as the exiles were concerned, cause every heart to melt, and all hands to be feeble and all knees to be weak as water, but would have precisely that effect upon the inhabitants of the
beleaguered city. On the other hand, יָנָל signifies the coming of something far greater, and this oracle is probably unconnected with the others in time. In Vv. 13-22 we have the 'Song of the Sword' which is whetted and furbished against Jerusalem, a song which might have come from the lips of one in exile or in the homeland, but it has more force if uttered in Palestine. It probably dates between 593-86. "Jerusalem ist jetzt unmittelbar bedroht. Ezech scheint, dass der Abfall Zedekias inzwischen Tatsache geworden ist. Hesekiel erwartet jetzt die blutige Rache des Babyloniers. Dass der Feldzug Nebukadnezars gegen Syrien oder gar die Belagerung Jerusalems bereits im Gange sei, braucht man vielleicht noch nicht anzunehmen; was Hesekiel hier aus spricht, kann schon im Jahre 591 seine Meinung über die sichere Folge des syrischen Aufstandes gewesen sein". 51 Vv. 23-28 present us with a symbolical action and its explanation. Holscher says: "Von 21-26 ab vergisst der Verfasser ganz und gar, dass er eine Handlung des Propheten beschreiben wollte, und erzählt statt dessen einfach, was der König von Babel tut. Übrigens auch kurios genug!" 52 Not at all! Vv. 26-27 may be regarded as parenthesis by which Ezekiel explains the significance of the symbols of which he makes use. Verse 23 seems to show that this symbolical act was carried out in presence of a Palestinian community. Most commentators omit "as an unintelligible gloss."

Read: יָנָל לֹּֽאַנְאָישׁ שְׁבֵּעֶנֶּא "And it (Ezekiel's symbolical act) shall be unto them as a vain divination; but he (Nebuchadrezzar) bringeth iniquity to remembrance that they may be taken". The meaning seems clear. Those who had broken the oath of allegiance which they had sworn to Nebuchadrezzar in the name of Yahweh, may think to escape, but the king of
Babylon's presence is a reminder that they have broken their oath. Their approaching fate is to Ezekiel the natural result of their infringement of the covenant. Hölscher rejects the next section (vv. 29-32) because of the reference to the Judean king as נַעֲשֵׂה נַעֲשִׂית. But the reference to נַעֲשֵׂה suggests that this oracle is directed against the high-priest. If he were the instigator of revolt, it is intelligible that Ezekiel, a partisan of Babylon, should select him as the chief object of his fury. There is nothing to indicate the locale of this utterance, but there is nothing to connect it with the exile. It probably belongs to the same period as the preceding.

The closing section (vv. 33-37) is probably, as Hölscher holds, a later addition. "Das Stück ist eine stilistisch unglückliche Nachbildung des hes. Schwertliedes, setzt aber bereits das ganze Kap. XXI voraus. Der Ergänzer, der XXI:23ff. las, vermisste neben der Bedrohung Jerusalems diejenige der Ammoniter, deren Höhnern ein stereotypes Thema der nachexilischen Literaten ist." Herr. takes the same view. "Man möchte am ehesten meinen, dass es sich um eine Nachahmung handelt, die, wenigstens so wie der Text vorliegt, das vorliegende Kapitel und frühere Weissagungen des Ez. benutzt, um dafür zu sorgen, dass die Ammoniter, die ja nach XXIII-XXXII zunächst verschont werden, nicht ungestraft bleiben."

Chap. XXII is an indictment of Jerusalem with a full catalogue of her sins— idolatry, bloodshed and other offences (vv. 1-12). It is difficult to account for such an indictment on the part of an exiled priest of 597. That there may have been a return to lower moral standards between 597-586 is not impossible, but such moral laxity as is described here is usually associated with
lower forms of religion. But so far from there being a recrud­
esence of idolatry between 597-586, those of Jerusalem insisted on the sole legitimacy of the priesthood there in order that the Yahweh rites might be preserved from heathen contamination.

The chapter appears to be Palestinian. There is nothing to connect with the exile or exiles.

The section commencing at verse 17(17-22) appears to be independent. The הָתוֹ השוֹ לְיַ נִּי are altogether corrupt, and Yahweh will gather the corrupt elements into Jerusalem as into a smelting furnace. Why are they become לְשֵׁא unto Yahweh? If it is because they are meditating rebellion and the breaking of the oath taken in Yahweh's name, one would place the oracle prior to the fall of the city, and think of the people from the surrounding districts, with the certainty of imminent invasion, flocking into Jerusalem.

The language of v. 19 has meaning only if spoken to people in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, and the use of the 2nd person in v. 20ff. suggests the presence of the prophet in the land.

Vv. 23-31 are a renewal of the indictment of vv. 1-12, embracing all the ruling classes in their sweep, לְאֶשֶׁר, לְאֵיתָנ, נִּשְׁפָּם and נַעַר נָבָי. The knowledge of such degeneracy is not likely to be that of one in exile; and, making all allowance for prophetic rhetoric, the situation was not so desperate between 597-586 that Yahweh could say (v. 30) that He sought for a man to stand in the gap before Him for the land but found none.
Nor could it be said of the priesthood of that period that they did not cause men to discern between the clean and the unclean (v. 26). Verse 31 seems to imply the fall of Jerusalem, but, if that verse be omitted as an addition, the section might be dated pre-reformation. Hölshcher calls attention to the numerous parallels with Zephaniah and draws the inference that this section "besteht aus lauter bekannten oder von anderswoher entlehnten Wendungen und Sätzen". The obvious and natural explanation is that, like Zephaniah, it deals with the social and religious condition of Palestine prior to Josiah's reformation. With regard to Hölshcher's statement that this section is the work of an interpolator on the ground that "die literarische Abhängigkeit von fremden stücken ist hier stärker als sonst je beim Redaktor", it is to be remarked that the interpolator, who had to work warily, would not betray himself in this way.

Chap. XXIII, reminiscent of XVI, gives the final indictment of Jerusalem. Whereas in XVI emphasis is laid on the religious side, in this chapter emphasises the sin of political alliances. In the ancient world there was no divorce between religion and politics any more than between religion and morality. Foreign alliances meant foreign worship. Judah's whoredom began in Egypt (v. 3) and throughout the chapter stress is laid upon political relations with Egypt. Connection with Egypt is more severely blamed than connection with Babylon. This suggests a date when the relationship between Judah and Egypt was particularly close. There is nothing to connect the chapter with the exile. Although there are fresh starts at vv. 28, 31, and 36, we see no reason for making these oracles late. Hölshcher asks:
"Was soll aber eine Bedrohung Samarias in Hesekiel's Munde?.... 
Was sollte es wohl bedeuten die Samarier den Tempel in Jerusalem verunreinigt hätten!" There was every reason! The reforms of Hezekiah (I K.XVIII:4; II Chron.XXIX:3—XXXI:1; of Is.XXXVI:7) gave prestige to the Temple at Jerusalem, and we have the beginning of the movement towards centralisation of worship. Whether or not Hezekiah was Sargon's deputy, it is evident that Israel and Judah were in close touch with one another from the summons of Hezekiah to all Israel to take part in a Passover in the 6th or 7th year of his reign, a Passover which was postponed to the 2nd month, probably for the convenience of North Israel (II Chron. XXX). During the reign of Manasseh there was probably a union of "the two provinces of Palestine with Manasseh as their Pasha", and Israel would have every opportunity of indulging in the idolatries and immoralities of the sister kingdom.

Chap. XXIV falls into the following sections:—1-5, 6-8, 9-14, 15-17, 18-27. According to v.2 Ezekiel received the tidings of the commencement of the siege on the day on which it began. Neither of Lofthouse's alternative explanations is acceptable—"either Ezekiel was a deliberate deceiver or he was possessed of some kind of second-sight". Hölscher rejects both of these explanations and regards vv.1-2 as interpolation. "Von Babylonien aus konnte Hesekiel dies Datum anjenem Tagennicht wissen; denn an 'Fernsehen' im Stile Swedenborgs, dem Kronzeugen solcher okkultistischer Fähigkeiten, auf den sich auch die Ausleger gelegentlich berufen haben, glaube ich nicht. Das Datum stammt also, da Hesekiel kein Betrüger ist, vom Redaktor, der die folgenden Hesekielstücke auf diese Weise richtig zu datieren glaubte." The first two verses have come from the redactor for the purpose of placing
the following oracles in Babylonia, or Ezekiel received the news of the siege of the city on the "self-same" day because he was in the immediate neighbourhood. There is no reason why the prophet should not have carried out the symbolical act referred to in 3b-5. We cannot agree with Holscher that "es ist alles nur Bildersprachf." 70 In vv. 6-8 Jerusalem is the bloody city. She has set her blood upon a rock and it cries for vengeance. Verse 6b is probably a later addition as it breaks the connection. "Die Anknüpfung von XXIV:7 ist freilich so schlecht, dass XXIV:6 wohl als Zusatz anzusehen ist". 71 Verse 9 commences a fresh oracle. Yahweh will do in reality what Ezekiel has performed symbolically. In vv. 15 ff. Ezekiel carries out another symbolical act. He binds his turban on his head, puts shoes upon his feet, and abstains from the customary signs of mourning when "the desire of his eyes"—Jerusalem—is taken away. Jahn correctly interprets יִהְיֶה יָדָיו (v. 16) of Jerusalem, not of Ezekiel's wife. Omit יָדוֹ יִנָּשַׁב (v. 18), and transpose 18a to the end of the verse. 73 In v. 21 omit יִנַּשֵּׁב יִנָּשַׁב with Jahn as a "prosaic gloss." 74 Holscher also remarks on the improbability of their sons and daughters being left behind. The expression has probably been introduced to connect the section with the exile. Verses 25-27 appear to be a later addition. They anticipate XXXIII:21-22, and לֹא רֹקֵחַ, which in v. 24 refers to Ezekiel's abstention from manifestations of grief, refers in v. 27 to his recovery of speech. We suggest that these verses form part of the framework of the redactor, inserted for the purpose of linking up the oracles with an exiled Ezekiel.

Chap. XXXVII falls into three sections: 1-10, 11-14, 15 ff.
While under the influence of the "fill Ezekiel goes out to the ֶנֶרֶב which is probably to be located in Palestine. ֶנֶרֶב is the correlative of ֶנֶר (cf. Deut. VIII:7; XI:11). It is a cleft between hills and is a characteristic feature of the Holy Land. There is the ֶנֶר of Jericho (Deut. XXXIV:3), of Mizpeh (Jos. XI:8), of Lebanon (Jos. XI:17), of Megiddon (Zech. XII:11), of Ono (Neh. VI:2). Sir G.A. Smith says: "A surrounding of hills seems necessary to the name ֶנֶר as if land laid open in the midst of hills". The word used in conjunction with ֶנֶר is ֵנִמֵ' to which we give the natural and literal interpretation. Herrmann says: "Hier wird er 'im Geiste Jahwes' an den Ort geführt. Dass kann dem Wortlaut von v.1 nach durchaus corporaliter verstanden werden". "Here", says Lofthouse, "all reference to external signs of ecstasy or trance is absent". The הָרֹץ הָיוֹל are in despair. The bones are very many and they are very dry. Ezekiel prophesies unto them and speaks unto them. The הָרֹץ הָיוֹל touches them and they are a new people (v.10).

In vv. 15 ff. Ezekiel announces the reunion of Israel and Judah. The two nations are to be one on the הָרֹץ הָיוֹל (v.22). The language of vv. 21 ff. suggests that the speaker is in Palestine. No exile would be likely to speak in that way. "I will take the הָרֹץ הָיוֹל from among the nations whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side and bring them into their own land". To the writer of this thesis there seems no doubt that these two sections, in which Ezekiel anticipates the rebirth of the nation and pictures a future of glorious prosperity, were addressed to a Palestinian community by one who was animated not only by a passionate desire to unite Israel and Judah but by an equally passionate desire to have them work together. Such
a desire argues for a date before the breach with Samaria. That there was no return from exile prior to Ezra and Nehemiah and no permission given for a return by Cyrus is untenable. Without the permission of Cyrus the rebuilding could not have taken place, but the Babylonian exiles did not have the part in the restoration with which they are customarily credited. A careful study of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah shows that prior to the days of Ezra and Nehemiah there was no return of the Jews on a large scale. The restoration was in the main the work of those left in Palestine; but they suffered from inertia, lack of sympathy and of means. Babylon was a land of plenty and the conditions of life for the Jews so pleasant that few availed themselves of the opportunity to return. In the 5th Century the Jews in Babylonia "owned land and possessed capital, and took a full share in the commercial activity of the community". They "seem to have been next in importance to the Babylonians and Persians. They were perhaps even more important than the Persians, ....... They were free citizens in a free land". Those in the home-land were for the most part peasants, not wealthy, and in need of every encouragement to bring about a resurrection of the national life. In the address of the Deutero-Isaiah - if this prophet's activities were carried on in Babylonia- the exiles not are bidden to take comfort at the prospect of return but to give comfort to the Palestinian community. If Deutero-Isaiah is the work of a writer in Palestine - for which evidence is not wanting the prophets or leaders are urged to comfort and encourage the community. Ezekiel in Palestine is working for the restoration of the nation. He is trying to breathe new life into Israel's
Although we incline to place these sections after the fall of the city, it is possible that they may be pre-exilic as there are no references which rule out a pre-exilic date. Welch has shown that from the time of Josiah’s reform, strenuous attempts were made to bring Israel and Judah together not only through the centralisation of the cult but through the union of the literatures of North and South. "Josiah proceeded to gather all Israel together from north and south to the first united Passover celebration at Jerusalem. At the restored and purified temple, where Yahweh again reigned in His lonely majesty, and according to the peculiar rite of their national faith, a united people found its centre and sought to renew the kingdom of David."
CHAPTER V

ORACLES OF DOUBTFUL ORIGIN.

In the preceding chapter the writer has made a collection of the oracles in the Book of Ezekiel which appear to him to be of Palestinian origin. In addition to these there are many oracles about which it is difficult to come to a decision, to say with any degree of certainty whether they derive from Palestine or from Babylonia. In the absence of proof one's interpretation depends upon one's point of view.

The first group of oracles about which there is doubt is to be found in Chapter IX, which could have been spoken in Babylonia although the writer favours a Palestinian source.¹

Chap. X. One of the most difficult problems which the scholar has to face is that of the relationship which exists between I & X. Except on the hypothesis that the two accounts of the theophany were given to different communities it is difficult, if not impossible, to justify a second description of the.²

It is probable that originally Ch.X had no connection with Ch.I, but has been brought into relationship with it through the confusion of the.³ The and the (X:7) are not those of the throne-car but of Solomon's Temple. Ch.X:1 seems doubly out of place, says Toy.² It is remote from its own context (vv.9-22), it is a repetition of Ch.I:26 save that it represents an empty throne, and its connection with the context is so loose as to be unintelligible as a part of the narration.³

Verse 2a should be omitted as an insertion which was added after
v. 1. Verse 2b gives an excellent connection with IX:11. The
made his report and received fresh orders which he (not Ezekiel) fulfilled. Vv. 3-6 appear to be interpolated, as do vv. 8-17 as well as the remainder of the chapter. At the close of v. 7 we expect some account of the scattering of fire over the city. The original text probably read:

"And He said, 'Go and fill both thine hands with coals of fire from between the cherubim and scatter them over the city', and he went in in my sight. And he stretched forth his hand unto the fire that was between the cherubim and took thereof and went out". This makes excellent sense. The natural sequel to the slaughter of the guilty is the destruction of the city.

The took of the altar-fire, according to Yahweh's instructions, for the purpose of reducing the city to ashes. The other additions are probably the work of the redactor who annotated the chapter with Ch. I in view. Not only did he repeat without making any essential addition, but, taking Ch. I as implying that Yahweh had taken up His residence in Chaldea, he gave an account of His departure from the Temple. Hölsher would delete the whole of Ch. X on the ground that Ezekiel did not at that time have in view the complete destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple but only judgment upon the ungodly. The writer regards the original of Ch. X as a continuation of Ch. IX.

Chap. XI: 15-21. This section is fitted with a special introduction and appears to be directed against the insolent bearing of the towards the exiles of 597 and those of the
Northern Kingdom who, because they were far from the Temple, were in the opinion of the Jerusalem people far from Yahweh. The section contrasts strongly with vv. 1-13 which deal with an entirely different theme. Vv. 1-13 not only do not set themselves over against the מֵסָיְל, but they say nothing about the מֵסָיְל. The people of Jerusalem "were secure, because they sat under the shadow of the temple. In leaving them there, Yahweh had proved anew His favour. They were the elect of the nation, since they were suffered to continue in the Holy Land and in the Holy City. They could by their sacrifices maintain their relation to Yahweh, and He would maintain them and their city. As for the exiles, their fate had been decided by the same divine act which had declared in favour of the men of Jerusalem. Through being driven out from the Holy Land they were cut off from the sure mercies of God." 7

The section (15-21) appears to the writer to have been addressed to a Palestinian community. Had Ezekiel been speaking to exiles he would have used the 2nd person in vv. 16 ff. Read יָדָנ in v. 17 (G.י "as the connection requires", 8 and יָפָל for יָפָל. In v. 19 read (G.) יָזְרִי "as the connection requires". 9

Chap. XII: 1-16. Ezekiel gives a dramatic representation of flight from a beleaguered city and an exposition of the meaning of the symbol. Vv. 12-14 appear to be secondary and inserted in order to bring the original oracle into connection with the sortie and attempted escape of Zedekiah. Vv. 5 and 7b (זֵלמ...יִבְרָי) have been interpolated for the same purpose, to fit the condition of Zedekiah. V. 10 refers the action to the people as a whole, not to an individual. "Wie überall in diesem Abschnitte, hat der Interpolator das Schicksal Zedekias, seine Flucht und seine Blendung
im Auge gehabt, und was er beschreibt ist natürlich vaticinium post eventum". Were vv. 1-15, 15-16 addressed to an exiled community? The question is difficult to answer. From the use of the 2nd and 3rd person in v. 11 - "I am a sign to you that they shall go into captivity" - it seems clear that Ezekiel is not in Jerusalem. Does it follow that he is ἐν τῇ ἀγῳ? The symbolical act may have been performed to assure the exiles of the certainty of the fall of Jerusalem; but it is equally possible that Ezekiel's audience was composed of people in Palestine outside of Jerusalem, and the act would have a very deep significance for a Palestinian community who had thrown - or were on the point of throwing - in their lot with the ἀσώι. There is a similar ambiguity about vv. 17-20. They might have been addressed to the ἐν τῇ ἀγῳ to assure them that Jerusalem was doomed, but on account of the use of the peculiar expression γενώμενος, the writer is in no doubt that they were addressed to men in Palestine. Chap. XIII is made up of a collection of oracles against false prophets similar to the smaller collection in Jeremiah XXIII:9ff. The first oracle (vv. 1-8) is closed by ἄνωθεν ἀνασκόμα. Again it is impossible to say whether these oracle is Babylonian or Palestinian. We know from Jeremiah (XXVII:14; XXIX) that false prophets were at work both in Jerusalem and among the exiles. Jeremiah "is found to characterize as false prophets certain men in Jerusalem who were advising Zedekiah to rebel against Nebuchadrezzar. He would naturally find the same falsity in similar prophets among the exiles, if these were teaching in Yahweh's name that their co-religionists must expect a speedy deliverance at the hands of their God and must take every means to ensure
their deliverance from exile". Verse 9 appears to be an exilic addition, because if Ezekiel expected the exile to be of long duration, it would have been foolish to say that these prophets would not see the land of Israel.

Verses 10-12 may belong to vv. 1-8 with v. 9 inserted, or they may constitute an independent oracle with vv. 13-16 as a doublet. If we interpret נֵבֶט (v. 10) of Jerusalem with whose collapse the fortunes of the false prophets are bound up, it is possible that the oracle was delivered to a Palestinian community. If Herrmann is correct in detecting in v. 14 a reference to Jerusalem, the doublet refers the whole section to the Jerusalem prophets and gives a certain support to the idea that these oracles are not exilic.

Verses 17-21 constitute an oracle against false prophetesses, and vv. 22ff. appear to be an addition which contains a restatement of vv. 20f. The false prophetesses promise success either to the anti-Babylonian or to the anti-Yahweh party. So far from the passage being "ein rein literarisches Produkt," it has to all appearance come from a man who was dealing with a real situation. Whether he was at work in Palestine or Babylonia it is difficult to decide. Although women acted as diviners and prophetesses amongst the Hebrews, e.g. Deborah (Jud. IV), Huldah (II K. XXII:14), and Noadiah (Neh. VI:14), there is no mention of a class who practised divining as a trade. It may be that in these verses we are given an account of the methods and stock-in-trade of the fortune-tellers among the exiles. On the other hand, the various methods of divination employed by the Assyrians and the Babylonians would be familiar to, and might well be practised by, the
Israelites during the long reign of Manasseh and in the years prior to Josiah's reformation—by Israelites who were satisfied that "Yahweh had forsaken the land". Ezekiel's reference is to some form of exorcism or sympathetic magic. In the religion of Babylonia and Assyria incantation rituals and divination practices played an important role. "Certain individuals were supposed to have the power over the demons to superinduce them to lay hold of their victims.... Curiously enough, women were more commonly singled out than men.... An image is frequently made of the demon or of the sorceress... In addition to burning the images... or throwing them into the water, a large variety of other symbolical actions are introduced in the incantation series, all falling within the category of sympathetic magic. Lastly, we have amulets of various kinds prescribed as a protection against the demon... Threads spun from virgin kids and knotted, were looked upon as protection against the demons and... were attached to the head, neck, hands or limbs of the patient".

Chap. XV falls into two parts; the similitude of the vine (vv. 1-5), and the application to the הַשָּׁם 'בָּשֵׁן (v. 6). The vine-tree when whole is worthless for certain purposes. How much less when its ends have been consumed and its heart charred! According to Holscher the burning has no reference to the destruction of Jerusalem but to the deplorable state of affairs in the city after 597. To what "klaglichen Zustande" at that time can the passage refer? Vv. 1-5 appear to have been written after 586 and to refer to the troublous times following the murder of Gedaliah. There is nothing to indicate its place of origin. Whether the concluding section is Palestinian or Babylonian would appear to depend upon the reading in v. 7, and as M. T. reads הַשָּׁם and
Gr. reads יַעֲנֵי, it is impossible to come to any definite conclusion. 

Chap. XVII falls into four sections: - 1-8, 9-10, 11-21, 22-24. 

The allegory in vv. 1-21 though clumsy may be by one hand, but there is considerable force in Hölscher's contention that the passage is not homogeneous, and that the interpretation of the riddle does not fit the allegory. "Während das Gedicht XVII: 3f. יֶרֶם נַעֲנֵי als den Adel Judas und יִתְנָה שָׁנָה als den König Judas zu unterscheiden scheint, hält der Ausdeuter XVII: 12 beides für gleichbedeutend, König und Oberste in eins fassend". The interpretation appears to have the siege and fall of Jerusalem in view. It speaks of the oath which Zedekiah took to Nebuchadrezzar in the name of Yahweh (v. 13), the breaking of the oath and the intrigue with Pharaoh in 583 (v. 15), Pharaoh's attempt to raise the siege (v. 17), Zedekiah's captivity (v. 20), and the collapse of his leading men (v. 21).

It is difficult to suppose that Chapters XVI and XVII came from the same hand. If they have one and the same author they must have been written at different periods, as they give different reasons, one religious, the other political, for the same thing viz. the rejection of Jerusalem. In XVI the author deals with the apostasy of Israel from the beginning. Throughout her whole history the nation has sinned against Yahweh, adopting the gods and the religious rites of the nations with whom she came in contact, and on these grounds the author predicts the inevitableness of the destruction of Jerusalem. The reason advanced in XVII is altogether different. Judah's fall is due to want of political sense and in particular to disloyalty on the part of Zedekiah. There can be only one end to such perfidy, viz. destruction. The author is a partisan of Babylon. "Sein Gedicht
ist ja auch ein uneingeschränktes Lob der Milde Babylons". Just as in the Book of Judges historical and moral or theological explanations are adduced for the explanation of the incompleteness of the conquest of Canaan, explanations which, in the words of Driver, "are naturally not all from a single hand", so in Ezekiel XVI and XVII we have two explanations of the same event which probably come from different hands.

XVII:22-24 are independent of the rest of the chapter in time and content. These vv. imply the destruction of the Temple and present us with a picture of the restoration of the monarchy; whether Davidic or not it is impossible to say. There is nothing to indicate whether the oracle is Palestinian or Babylonian. Chap. XVIII may be interpreted from different points of view.

(1) After the reformation of Josiah there was a clear-cut distinction between the righteous and the wicked, i.e. between the true Yahwists and the others, and Nebuchadrezzar could not have been in ignorance of the distinction. Then as now insurrectionists were all marked men, and the punishment of oath-breaking was severe in the extreme. But all were not treated alike. In the deportation of 597 only the leaders were removed, and after the fall of Jerusalem when Jeremiah was liberated, considerable discrimination was shown in the treatment of the survivors. One of the first acts of the commanding officers on the fall of the city, was to hand Jeremiah over to the care of Gedaliah (Jer. XXXIX: 14; XLI: 10). Some of the people were left in the home-land and a native governor was appointed who "may have been one of those who went over to the Chaldeans before or during the siege". The appointment of Gedaliah as governor was an experiment in
local autonomy which exhibits in a favourable light the pacific tendency of Babylonian imperialism". Nebuchadrezzar spared Zedekiah's daughters because he knew that the king was but a puppet in the hands of others, whilst the priests who were responsible for the defection were severely dealt with.

The lives of the true Yahwists, also marked men, would be spared. Ezekiel knew that. He knew that Nebuchadrezzar was a very different type of man from the Assyrian rulers. He may even have received advices from one of the State Departments — say — the War Office — that no action would be taken against those who were known to be, or were under suspicion of being involved in intrigue, if only they would turn over a new leaf. They would not be punished either for their father's sins or for their own past transgressions, if only they would give proof of repentance by a return to Yahwism, the Covenant-religion. Jeremiah set before the Jerusalemites "the way of life and the way of death" (Jer. XXI:8) by counselling individual desertion to the enemy. Ezekiel delivers a message on similar lines to the יזאע יִבְּש, He too puts before them the way of life and the way of death. The righteous shall live because of his righteousness and the wicked shall die because of his wickedness (vv. 19, 20). יִנָּפ and יִדְר are used by Ezekiel in this and the corresponding chapters of natural life and death. "'Live' and 'die' are used by the prophet of literal life and death, continuance in the world and removal from it".

True Yahwism meant peace in the community and loyalty to the oath given to the ruling power in Yahweh's name. The neglect of the Yahweh cult resulted in the breaking of the oath; therefore the life of the true Yahwist would be spared and the life of the
false Yahwist would be taken. On this interpretation of Ezekiel's doctrine of individual responsibility, which is a possible interpretation, the chapter might have been addressed to the יְהֹוֵי or to the Palestinians prior to 586 or to the People of Palestine after the murder of Gedaliah, when many of the Jews, fearing the vengeance of the Babylonian king, took refuge in Egypt. 29 (2) It is possible, as Hölscher argues, 30 that we have here no doctrine of individual responsibility but exhortation to the יהוה giving them the assurance that they, as a community, would be restored to the home-land (vv. 35-38). It may be that Ezekiel foretells a testing trial of Israel and a sifting of the better elements out of the nation, in the day when God comes to set right His world. Only the remnant, only those who have elected to live by the standards which God's coming makes valid and enduring, shall be carried over into, and find their place in the new order. 31 Only the remnant who have accepted the principles of Yahweh's righteous government shall find their place in the kingdom of God.

Chap. XIX may be Palestinian or Babylonian. It does not profess to be an oracle, makes no mention of Yahweh, but simply professes to be a מִלָּה which came into use.

Chap. XX is composed of two sections (1-31, 32-44) which deal with entirely different situations, 32 and have apparently been brought together because of the contrast between the evil past (1-31) and the glorious future (32-44). The latter section makes an appeal to men on the point of surrendering their national faith and adopting the worship and gods of heathen peoples because they are hopeless of return to a land where they can worship Yahweh.
"Die Verse können nicht gut anders verstanden werden, als dass sich unter den Mitexulanten Ezechiels eine Strömung gebildet hat, die dahin geht, sei es den Jahwekult überhaupt mit den Kulten des Fremdlands zu vertauschen, in dem man nun doch leben muss, sei es Jahwe hier in fremden Kultformen zu dienen". 

The basis of the passage is the promise of return, and there seems little ground for doubt that this section was addressed to the Nisa. The first section, on the other hand, is addressed to a people as idolatrous as their fathers, who pollute themselves after the manner of their fathers by going awhoring after their abominations and making their sons to pass through the fire (vv. 30-31). That this section is exilic is improbable. There is no evidence that child-sacrifice was practised at any time by the Jewish exiles, nor was there such a recrudescence of idolatry amongst them as would have led the prophet to trace the nation's history in such dark colours. We can only draw one inference, that vv. 1-31 derive from Palestine and that they were addressed to a community in which there was such a revival of cruel and immoral cults that Yahweh is represented by Ezekiel as having given their fathers statutes which were not good (v. 25). The references to idolatry (v. 31) and to child-sacrifice suggest that the passage belongs to the pre-reformation period. Child-sacrifice was rare amongst the Hebrews but was practised by Ahaz (2 K. XVI: 3) and revived by Manasseh (2 K. XXI: 6).

Chap. XXIII: 21-29. According to verse 21 Ezekiel received the tidings of the fall of the city a year and a half after the event. "Considering the constant intercourse between the mother country and the exiles this period is very long", and so most
commentators read with S. יְנָוֹי, i.e. six months after the fall of the city. If the יְנָוֹי were one of the deportees of 586 B.C., he would take about six months to reach Babylonia. "The journey was long and the transport troublesome". It appears obvious to the writer that this date was fixed upon by someone, probably the redactor, who thought of the יְנָוֹי as a deportee. It is strange, as Hölscher remarks, that Ezekiel should have no news of the fall of the city for six months. G. reads: καὶ γενόμενον ἐν τῷ ἥσκατῳ ἑτέκ ἐν τῷ ἄδω. There is thus considerable uncertainty about the date. According to vv. 23 ff. Ezekiel knew of the claims of the people in Palestine and the distinctions between them immediately after he received the news of the fall of the city. If he in Babylon knew of the attitude of these men he must have received his information from יְנָוֹי. But יְנָוֹי could not tell the mood of the men who remained behind in Judah. Hence we find it difficult to believe that vv. 23-29 were spoken to the יְנָוֹי. Hölscher holds that they constitute "eine Drohrede gegen den abgöttischen יְנָוֹי in Palästina".

There is a further difficulty. Ezekiel knows that they eat with the blood, and are guilty of idolatry and commit deeds of violence. The reference cannot be to those left with Gedaliah(מֶלֶךְ יְנָוֹי). The picture is inconsistent with that given by Jeremiah(XXXIX). The leaders on tendering their allegiance were sent back by Gedaliah to the villages which they occupied. "In Mizpah itself 'they gathered wine and summer-fruits very much', and the fertile valleys and terraced hill-slopes rang with joyous vintage music which celebrated the return of peace and prosperity to the war-stricken land". Skinner, contrasting the two pictures(Jer. XXXIX:
14, Ez. XXXIII) asks how the difference of judgment is to be accounted for, and concludes that "there are doubtless facts in the situation which would justify either estimate. It is questionable, however, if the two descriptions correspond in point of time". Vv. 21, 22 appear to form part of the redactor's framework, and vv. 23-29 appear to the writer to have been spoken in Palestine, possibly in the period subsequent to the murder of Gedaliah, as Ezekiel appears to speak as one present amongst the inhabitants of the ruins.

Chap. XXXIV falls into the following divisions: - 1-15, 16-22, 23-31. As the figure of the כֵּן occurs for the most part in late writings and as this chapter appears to be an elaboration of Jer. XXIII:9, the inference may be drawn that it dates after 536.

Ezekiel pictures Israel as a flock of scattered sheep and prophesies that they will be searched out and gathered together and brought back to their own land. Yahweh Himself will be the deliverer, the Good Shepherd of His flock. His agents have been false to their trust (v. 3). Who are the כֵּן? The rulers of Israel, the line of kings to whose care Yahweh had entrusted His people? That is possible. But as Ezekiel's interests are religious and as the נְדוֹמ who appears to be a religious, not a civil, head is in the forefront of the picture, it looks as if the כֵּן are the priests. Next to Yahweh the נְדוֹמ is the one person essential to the restoration of Israel's hopes and to their welfare in the restored kingdom (cf. XLV:17 & XLVI:4; the most exalted function of the נְדוֹמ is to make provision for the upkeep of the Temple worship). יַדְתָּא (vv. 23, 24) appears to be an insertion made for the purpose of identifying the נְדוֹמ with the civil head.
The chapter may be Palestinian or Babylonian. The writer favours a Palestinian origin on the grounds that Ezekiel would have used the 2nd person instead of the 3rd in vv. 13, 14, 15, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and would not have made reference to the exiles being drawn from many places, had he been addressing an exiled community. In Chap. XXXVI Ezekiel pronounces the judgment of Yahweh upon Edom because of her perpetual enmity of Israel and her joy over Israel's downfall (v. 5), but principally because of Edom's invasion and seizure of the land (vv. 10 ff.). Chap. XXXVI: 1-15 is of a piece with XXXV. It is a positive oracle prophesying Israel's deliverance from the מחרת צור (v. 3). "In spite of the severity with which he had crushed the rebellion, Nebuchadrezzar had no thought of exterminating the Jewish people. It is clear from many indications that the great majority of the people were left in the land." But they were in the depths of despair and evidently made no attempt to rebuild Jerusalem. The land apparently became a prey to ravenous neighbours.

The descriptions in XXXV-XXXVI: 1-15 are so vivid that the writer feels that the prophet was living amongst the ruined villages, dreaming of their transformation, and trying to infuse new life into the hearts of a people who were without hope, a people appalled by the desolation which had overtaken their land. The exiles in Babylonia were for the most part city people, and it is improbable that a Jerusalem priest speaking to them would have taken such an interest in the ruined little villages. Chap. XXXVI: 33-36, 37-38, are oracles more appropriate in the mouth of a prophet in Palestine than of one in exile. Not only
do they betray an eyewitness's knowledge of the conditions in the home-land but their purpose seems to be to give heartening to a community who were in a minority or in despair because of the dreadful desolation which had followed in the wake of the disastrous campaign of 586.
CONCLUSION.

The more closely Ezekiel is examined the more profound becomes the problem presented by the book. Whatever solution appears most probable, the scholar is never confident that, relying as he must upon uncertain criteria, he has met and unravelled all the difficulties. He is conscious, too, that the paucity of accepted data tempts his mind to range through the realms of speculation, where his judgment is often swayed by subjective influences that play havoc with the critical faculty. Perhaps it is the very absence of uncontested facts, with the consequent freedom to theorize, that is, for the investigator, one of the most enticing features of the book, and one that spurs him to make a fresh effort to penetrate the labyrinth and to find a path out of the intricate maze. The obstacles that lie in his way seem almost insuperable and are so perplexing that, whatever conclusion he may reach, sufficient doubt of its accuracy remains to deprive the most rigid argument of perfect cogency. It is remarkable that from the same premisses such divergent views should be maintained as those of Cornill, who asserts that "if anywhere a book of the O.T. bears the stamp of authenticity and lies before us in the form in which it came from the hand of its author, that book is Ezekiel," and those of Hölscher who restricts the original Ezekiel to 170 verses.

The analysis of the text leads the writer to believe that Ezekiel I-VIII is in the main a compilation of two sets of oracles, the majority of which, he considers, emanated from Palestine. Apart from the theophany (Ch. I), which may have come from the hand of an exile, three oracles alone are with any degree of certainty
addressed to an exile community. Of the others a large number - IV:1,2,9a,1c,11; V:1ff; VI; VII; VIII; XI:1-13; XII:17-20; XIV; XVI; XXI; XXII; XXIII; XXIV; XXXVI-1:1-10, 15 ff; - do not suit a Babylonian environment and can, therefore, be relegated to a Palestinian origin. The remainder give no indication of their source; but because, as the writer contends, the weight of evidence favours the delivery in Palestine of a great number of the prophecies in Chs. I-XXXVII, these also may be considered with some confidence to have proceeded from Palestine. This view becomes stronger if due regard be paid to the interpolations of the Redactor, who, for purposes of his own, has chosen to give a Babylonian complexion to the whole book and to convey the impression that the prophet was resident in Babylonia when he uttered his oracles. If the more obvious of the Redactor's additions be removed, and especially if the doubtful introduction to the book הַגָּזָה יֵעָל הַיָּמִים (I:1-3a) and Ch XI:24 be omitted the major difficulties that confront the scholar disappear, since nothing beyond the three oracles referred to would then suggest a Babylonian origin for the work.

Nor must that striking characteristic of Ezekiel, the extent to which alien words and turns of expression abound, be disregarded. These could have been acquired by an exile after years of captivity; but, if the other evidence supports the contention that the prophecies were delivered in Palestine, they go far to confirm the view that Ezekiel the author was employing an idiom familiar to Palestinian hearers who had so long been accustomed to the presence of a foreign element in their midst that their language had been coloured by it.
The composite character of the book with its oracles derived from both Babylonian and Palestinian sources may be accounted for in three ways:—

1. The Book of Ezekiel is the work of two authors, one Babylonian the other Palestinian, artificially combined by a Redactor whose aim was to convey the impression, by arranging the oracles in such an order, by introducing connecting links and by supplying appropriate dates, that they were all the work of a prophet associated with the Diaspora. To effect this alteration he inserted Ch. I: 1b, 2, 3a, and perhaps נֶאֶר נַתְנֵי (1a), and Ch. XI: 24; and to account for Ezekiel's accurate and intimate knowledge of the conditions prevailing in Jerusalem he boldly invented the absurd idea that the prophet lay for 190 days on one side, was seized by the hair of the head and transported to Jerusalem and was tongue-tied during the first part of his prophetic career until news came to him of the fall of the city. The bias in favour of a Babylonian authorship given by this editor has been the main stumbling-block in the way of a proper appreciation of the contents of the book. "Diese erstmalige Redaktion ist es offenbar, die dem Buche seinen planmäßigen Aufbau gegeben hat. Eine deutliche Disposition gliedert das Buch in zwei Teile, einen drohenden und einen verheissenden Teil. Im ersten Teile erscheint Hesekiel als der Schweigende (III: 26), im zweiten Teile ist ihm der Mund geöffnet (XXXIII: 21-22). Im ersten Teile ist Israel "das Haus der Widerspenstigkeit" (יִרְמָיִב), im zweiten Teile verschwindet, dieser Begriff und die Exulanten erscheinen nunmehr als bejerte Höher des göttlichen Wortes. Auch andere Stücke in beiden Teilen des Buches korrespondieren miteinander, z. B. die Bedrohung der Berge Israels Kap. VI und die
2. Ezekiel was endowed with second-sight. His visions were so intense that he announces them as if he had been an actual eye-witness of what was happening in Jerusalem. It is sufficient to repeat that this explanation labours under a twofold difficulty. In the first place, far from being abnormal Ezekiel possessed a sound, practical mind, was a close observer and took pleasure in detail. No feature of the book is more noticeable than the minute, almost immoderate, precision with which the author represents facts and describes scenes. The vague ramblings of a visionary are poles asunder from his method and would be without parallel in any other O.T. prophet. In the second place, he must have exercised his gift, in exile, between the time of Josiah’s death and the fall of the city; but no evidence has been adduced to prove that Jerusalem had, during that period, reverted to the depth of degradation pictured in the lurid pages of his book.

3. Ezekiel wrote both parts - the first before he went into exile, the other after reaching Babylonia. This is the simplest and most rational interpretation, and, on the whole, if due allowance be made for the interference of the Redactor, removes many of the difficulties that bestrew the critic’s path. The chief question that demands an answer, should assent be given to this explanation, is: "When was the depraved Temple-worship that Ezekiel denounces in Ch. VIII practised?" There are no signs of a pagan reaction under Jehoiachim and Zedekiah, which seems to prove that Josiah’s reform was effective and permanent; and it is a reasonable inference, therefore, that Ezekiel describes a state of affairs that preceded the drastic reformation which took place in Josiah’s reign. That
must have been a period of great popular excitement and prophetic activity. It is not at all unlikely that Ezekiel, with the enthusiasm of youth, took an extensive part in furthering the spiritual upheaval and, through his fervid eloquence, became about the year 620 a prominent figure in Palestine by the delivery of his startling and impressive oracles; that afterwards, in 597, he went into voluntary exile in order to devote his gifts to the comfort and encouragement of his fellow-exiles; and that later still after the fall of the city he continued his prophetic labours alternately in Palestine and Babylonia. This scheme is intelligible and chronologically possible; and it has the merit of resolving most of the difficulties evoked by a critical survey of the book.

This view gains in importance if, for a moment, criticism be laid aside and the book be read as literature. Amid diversities of style not uncommon in the compositions of an author that stretch over a long series of years, there is a marked similarity of language and ideas that can be accounted for only by the presence throughout of the same personality. Every oracle rings with the sincerity of the writer, resounds with the thunder of his message, trembles with the quivering of his soul under the stress of a mighty spiritual impulse. "One must have little feeling for the power of his religious testimony", writes Herrmann, "not to be conscious of the emotion which thrills through many of Ezekiel's speeches that sprang direct out of the needs of the time and the situation". There is behind this book a true prophet, a preacher who makes frenzied appeals, whose voice, that carried such weight and authority in his day, still reaches us in spite of gloss, interpolation and textual corruption, and whose utterances and
actions from beginning to end are so personal to himself that none but the prejudiced can fail to see in them the link that gives unity to the book.

If this hypothesis be correct, if the Book be composed of two sets of oracles delivered by Ezekiel, one set in Palestine and the other in the Diaspora, both artificially united together by a Redactor, it may be that we have remarkable confirmation of it in the tradition preserved by Josephus that Ezekiel wrote two books, and in the Jewish belief that Ezekiel's prophetic activity commenced in Palestine.
APPENDIX.
CHAPTER VII.

EZEKIEL’S THEOPHANY.

To regard the vision in Ch. I as an interpolation is to miss its whole force and meaning, and to consider it as inserted simply to give authority to the prophecy does not explain the elaborate detail, the gorgeous imagery and the insistence on the might and omnipotence of Yahweh. Neither Isaiah nor Jeremiah found these necessary. Whether or not Ezekiel was addressing the  הָלָה, he was addressing a people who had come to believe that their God was unable to defend His own shrine or to protect themselves from the more powerful gods of the north. Naturally they wavered in their allegiance and were inclined therewith to transfer their worship to the victorious gods of Assyria, or to accept the assertion that Yahweh was to be found only in the Temple at Jerusalem, which, though shorn of its splendour, still stood intact on Mount Zion. Ezekiel’s voice rang through the land. The impact of it must have been tremendous. He cried that the people were suffering for their sins, that Yahweh had withdrawn His support to punish them for their delinquencies, but "the arm of Yahweh was not shortened", He was still the greatest of the gods, the protector of the  הָנֹע shinning with undiminished majesty. 3 Yahweh to Ezekiel had remained no mere national god confined to a small country or housed in a separate building however sanctified, but was the Lord of Lords, 4 whose dwelling-place was the heavens above, and the insignia of whose glory surpassed in brilliance and in lustre even the dazzling brightness of Ashur the Magnificent. Once the House of Israel returned to Him in loyal obedience, they would experience the
power of His arm; they would find Him ready to renew His guardianship and to re-establish their independence. Ezekiel's vision would restore confidence to a depressed people, and, thrilled with the thought that they were the favoured subjects of the All-Powerful One, they would listen with alacrity and eager trust to the words of the prophet.

We find Ezekiel opposing with all his force the party of Yahweh-fanatics at Jerusalem who believed in the inherent sanctity of the Temple, to whom the Temple was a fetish, its existence being an assurance of the presence and protection of Yahweh. To them the Jerusalem Temple was the abode, and the only abode of Yahweh. Inasmuch as Ezekiel's "brethren" and were far from the Temple, they were far from Yahweh (XI:14 ff.).

Against the contention that the Temple is the sole abode of Yahweh, Ezekiel utters a protest. Even to the scattered exiles of the North, in the lands in which they are dwelling, Yahweh has been even (XI:16). Omit as an insertion. "It does not harmonise with.

To Ezekiel the worship of Yahweh was not confined either to the Temple or within the boundaries of Palestine.

What is the purpose of the detailed theophany? Not, as Ehrlich believes, to give the assurance that Ezekiel had had a vision of Yahweh on foreign soil. Jeremiah (XXIX) refers to prophets who were operating in Babylonia and who claimed to have received the word of Yahweh there. Nobody questions the possibility of their receiving such a revelation. Still further from the truth are the views—based on I:4 and VIII:12—expressed by Smend that Ezekiel regards the rock of God in the North as the
provisional dwelling place of Yahweh, and by Toy that Ezekiel localises Yahweh.

The purpose of the theophany is to preserve the old familiar idea of Yahweh's self-revelation wherever His people happen to be. The place of His self-manifestation must not be confused with the place of His dwelling. "As in the historical books of Israel, whose antiquity is not disputed, Jahve appears from heaven (Gen.XI:5,//J.), we have no evidence which would warrant the opinion that heaven had not long before the age of David been recognised in Israel as the dwelling-place of Jahve". Just as Yahweh had His seat on Mount Sinai, and came from Mount Seir in Edom (Jud.V:4) - reference being made at the same time to Mount Sinai - so to Ezekiel He comes from the Mountain in the North riding upon a thunder-cloud (I:4) although His dwelling is in heaven.

Ezekiel uses symbols which make clear that His vision is a vision of Yahweh, who is claimed to reside in the Jerusalem Temple, and not the vision of another god. The יְהֹוָה is the יְהֹוָה הר היל. Yahweh appears as Lord of the elements borne by the storm-cloud, bright and gleaming, from which fire darted forth (I:4). In Psalm XXIX Yahweh is conceived as a storm-god rushing onward in furious haste. His voice is the thunder in the storm, the flame of fire is the lightning. "What is set down as a metaphor in this late composition is really the survival in language of the conceptions that once were held as literal". In the Song of Deborah He is described as sweeping down in a thunderstorm. Yahweh's association with the storm-cloud (cf. Ex.XIX:18; I K.XIX:11; Job XXXVII:1ff; XXXVIII:1; XL:2; Is.XXX:27; Neh.I:3; Habak.III;
Ps. XVIII:10 ff; XXIX:1,3; LXVIII:8 f1 and the fire (Gen, XV:17; Ex. III:2; XIX:18; Is. IV:5; XXX:27; LXVI:15), was familiar to the Hebrews.

The נְגֵרָה. In the O.T. frequent references are made to Yahweh riding on a chariot. (cf. Ps. LXVIII:5; Dt. XXXIII:26; Habak. III:8b; Is. LXVI:15; Ps. LXVIII:18; II K. II:11, VI:17).

The נְגֵרָה were familiar to the Hebrews as נְגֵרָא in connection with Yahweh long before Ezekiel's day. Their abrupt introduction in Gen. III:24 (נְגֵרָא נֶא), without any intimation of their shape or nature, signifies that they were too well-known to require comment. The נְגֵרָא is a personification of the storm-wind upon which Yahweh rides (Ps. XVIII:11). P. gives an account of the figures of נְגֵרָא enwoven on the curtains of the Tabernacle and the veils (Ex. XXVI:1,31; XXXVI:8,35) and of two נְגֵרָא of solid gold upon the slab of the נְגֵרָא constituting a throne on which the נְגֵרָא appeared (Ex. XXV:18,22; XXXVII:7,9; Num. VII:89). Kings and Chrons. describe the נְגֵרָא of Solomon's Temple, the two colossal נְגֵרָא of olive wood, overlaid with gold (I K. VI:23-28; VIII:6-7; II Chrons. III:10-13; V: 7-8) and the images of נְגֵרָא introduced into the carved woodwork of the inner walls of the Temple and the olive wood doors (I K. VI:29-35; II Chrons. III:7) and on the bases of the portable lavers (I K. VII:29-36).

The נְגֵרָא exercised a threefold function. They were (1) the attendants of Yahweh and the guardians of the נְגֵרָא (Gen. III:24; Ez. XXVIII:14 ff); (2) symbols of Yahweh's presence in the Temple and in relation to sacred things (Ex. XXV: 18-20; 27; XXXVII:8-9; Num. VII:89; I K. VI:23-28; VIII:6 f; I Chr.
XXVIII: 18; II Chrons. III: 10-13; V: 7 f; Cf. Ex. XXVI: 1, 31; XXXVI: 8, 35; I K. VI: 29, 32, 35; VII: 29, 36; II Chrons. III: 7, 14; Ez. XLII: 18, 20-25; (3) the bearers and upholders of Yahweh's throne (Ps. XVIII: 11 = II Sam. XXII: 11; I Sam. IV: 4; II Sam. VI: 2; II K. XIX: 35 = Is. XXXVII: 16; I Chrons. XIII: 6; Dan. III: 55(?) ; Ps. LXXX: 2; XCIX: 1).

The נֵיִו. In the migration of the ark from station to station, a chariot drawn by oxen was used as a means of transport (Ex. XXV: 13; II Sam. VI: 13, XV: 24; II Chrons. XXXV: 3). In the Temple of Solomon the brazen sea was supported by 12 oxen, and in the ornamentation were figures of oxen (I K. VII: 25, 29). The prophets inveighed against the cult of the ox (Ex. XXXII: 4; I K. XII: 28; Amos IV: 4; V: 5, VII: 9 ff, VIII: 14; Hosea VIII: 5, XIII: 2).

The נַיָּה. Amongst the Hebrews Yahweh was never worshipped in the form of a lion; but the lion was regarded as a symbol of His power and majesty (Amos I: 2; Joel IV: 16; Hosea V: 14; XI: 10, XIII: 7; Jer. XXV: 38; XLIX: 19; Is. XXXI: 4). Figures of lions were stationed at the throne of Solomon (I K. X: 19 ff; II Chrons. IX: 18 ff) and on the bases of the portable lavers (I K. VII: 29-36).

The נַעַן. In the O.T. the eagle appears as the symbol of Yahweh "As an eagle that stirreth up her nest, that fluttereth over her young, He spread abroad His wings, He took them, He bare them on His pinions" (Dt. XXXII: 11). (cf. Ex. XIX: 4; Ps. XVII: 8; XXXVI: 8; LVII: 2; LXIII: 8; XCI: 4).

The דַּתָּה. In the O.T. man is brought into close connection with Yahweh. He is given dominion over the lower creation (Gen. I; XXVI: 28; IX: 2; Ps. VIII: 7 ff). Yahweh breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (Gen. II: 7), and made him in His own image (Gen. I: 26 ff; V: 1; Ex. 6), but little lower than Yahweh, and crowned him with
glory and honour (Ps. VIII: 5ff; Job XVII: 7f).

Special mention is made of the number four in the Theophany. The throne of Yahweh is supported by four creatures (I: 5), and each has four hands (I: 8), and four wings (I: 6) and four faces (I: 6). The chariot is mounted on four wheels (I: 15). In the O.T. the number four was the symbol of Yahweh's universality. Through having four faces the נְנָחָנָה can move forward on all sides without turning, thus achieving perfect mobility. (cf. Zech. VI: 5; Jer. XLIX: 36; Is. XI: 12; Dan. XI: 4). The wheels symbolise Yahweh's freedom to move freely to all quarters of the earth. The eyes in the wheels represent Yahweh's universal knowledge and sight (cf. Zech. IV: 10b; Dan. VII: 8; II Chrons. XVI: 9).

Ezekiel uses symbols well-known to the Hebrews, associated in their minds with Yahweh. No one can deny that his vision is a vision of the וּלְכָּע, a Yahweh who is not confined to the Temple but who is omniscient and omnipresent. The eyes of Yahweh run to and fro through the whole earth. The wings speak of His speed and ubiquity, and the straight feet tell of the lightning-like flash of His motion. "The living creatures described here...and later called Cherubim are symbols of the essential qualities of the Deity whose manifestation is the subject of this allegorical discourse. They are four in number, placed at the corners of the chariot. Their upper wings are stretched out and joined and enclose the chariot which supports the throne of Yahweh. The four faces represent four attributes; that of man, dominion (Gen. I: 28; Ps. VIII: 7); that of the lion, power; that of the ox, strength; that of the eagle, providence (Dt. XXXII: 11).... The wings are added to symbolise rapidity of
movement and the feet of a calf have been chosen, because those of human form can move only in one direction; the author wishing above all to emphasise the freedom of movement. The four faces are turned to the points of the compass. Each element of the picture has its own significance and it would be wrong to look for harmony in all the details. The chariot represents the Universe rather, and the living creatures the active forces by which the world is governed. The wheels represent by their perfect mobility omnipresence, the eyes omniscience.  

As a result of deportation Yahwism among the exiles received a severe blow. The deity was the Lord of the land and if He failed to protect His people He was without power. If Yahweh had failed them, perchance the gods of other nations might come to their rescue (cf XX:32); Ezekiel is addressing a community familiar with, and under the influence of Assyrian and Babylonian conceptions. His purpose is to show that Yahweh is the greatest of all the gods, to restore the confidence of the exiles in Yahweh by means of familiar symbols which cannot fail to appeal—symbols by which the gods of the nations manifest their power and majesty. He employs whatever serves as a manifestation of divine majesty. His god is Yahweh, a Yahweh in no way inferior to the gods of the nations who have enslaved His people, a Yahweh sensitive to His reputation, a Yahweh who makes His appearance with all the splendour and display of Babylonian monarch or god "that they may know that I am Yahweh". There is no reason for holding with Herthalet, Herrmann, and Hölscher that the symbols did not unfold themselves before the prophet in his vision. Ezekiel was familiar
with the details of Solomon's Temple, with the composite animal figures of Assyria, and with the religious conceptions of Israel and Assyria. Such a combination of symbols is to be expected from a prophet in his circumstances who had been given to reflection on religious questions.

Ezekiel's vision is in the fourth month (I:1), the month of the festival of Tammuz.  

Yahweh comes יְחַנֶּן, from the seat of the "summus deus", the great god Anu. The storm-cloud played an important part in the service of the deity in Assyria and Babylonia, and so, in making use of this symbol, Ezekiel demonstrates the equality of Yahweh with the great gods of the conquering nations known to his hearers. Enlil was the god of the wind and the storm, the name signifying the "lord of the storm". The storm constituted his weapon. "The storm, sweeping over the land, is personified as his "word" or "command", and described as bringing on devastation and ruin. The god is pictured as a rushing deluge that brings woe to mankind". Ningirsu, his son, was the great warrior of the rock of the storm of Enlil. Ninib is portrayed as an onrushing storm. Ramman-Adad was god of the storm which was his weapon, like the shield and spear of the warrior. His power was in evidence when he came riding upon the storm. The storm-cloud is a symbol of the power and majesty of the god. The picture of the יְאֹרֵב יָסֶף seated upon a throne, from the waist upward shining like יְאֹורֵב, from the waist down like fire, has its parallel in Babylonian literature and art. In the bas-relief on the Hammurabi-stone, the sun-god Shamash is portrayed in human form, seated upon a throne with flames or rays of light arising from his shoulders.
The symbol of Ashur was a disc from which rays or wings proceed.
In the Assyrian pantheon he is the God of Gods beside whom all
others pale into insignificance. Marduk in Babylonia is "the
shining one" whose course is across the resplendent heavens. His
appearance is pictured as a flaming fire. He illuminates the
universe and is directly associated with Shamash, the chief sun-
god. In Ezekiel's vision the brightness emanating from Yahweh,
and his picture is purposely based on the image of
a solar deity.

Amongst the Assyrians and Babylonians, the gods were
borne in the festal processions in such chariots as Ezekiel's
A chief feature of the Resurrection of Marduk as
king of the gods was the sacred ship mounted on wheels and
carried along the "via sacra". Yahweh is the victorious king
of the gods carried in triumphal procession.

Assyrian sculpture furnishes numerous representations
of composite animal forms which served as guardians of the
temple entrances, as protecting spirits, or as bearers of the god's
throne. Their identification with the cherubim seems inevitable.
Just as the cherubim in the O.T. are connected with the Tree of
Life (Gen, III:24), with the palm trees and open blossoms carved
on the walls of Solomon's Temple (I K. VI:29, 32, 35; VII:29, 36) and
with the ideal Temple (Ez. XLI:18 ff), so we have representations
in Assyrian sculpture of creatures with four wings, two outspread
and two covering the body (cf. Ez. I:11). Winged bulls and colossal
lions stood at the entrances to the Babylonian and Assyrian
Temples. Winged bulls with human heads carried the throne of
Istar.
Sphinx-forms are represented as seated at the foot of the throne of the god.\textsuperscript{33} The eagle was the symbol of Ningirsu, the lion represented Bau, his consort.\textsuperscript{34} Enlil is described as a mighty bull.\textsuperscript{35} According to Assyrian and Babylonian and Phoenician conceptions man is the child or the son of the god.\textsuperscript{36} Sargon of Agade and his son Naram-Sin and some of the kings of Ur, Isin and Larsa, affixed the sign for deity to their names.\textsuperscript{37} The king was a kind of "alter ego" of the god, his direct representative upon earth. These composite forms served a threefold purpose—they were symbols of the divine presence, bearers of the divine throne, and guardians of the holy places. In the vigour of the ox, the majesty of the lion, the swiftness of the eagle, the intelligence of man, we have symbols of the power and majesty and universal sway of the god. These symbols were known throughout the whole East.

The account of the theophany is essentially a unity. The imagery is magnificent and is of a character one would expect from a prophet gifted with Ezekiel's imagination and exuberant expression. The pictures and words flow from his lips or his pen with the utmost ease. Yahweh for him was the Great God, without superior, without equal. The majestic vision in its stately march glorifies Him, frees Him from the confinement of the Judean Temple and makes of Him in a sense the Universal Deity, the God of Gods. Perhaps Ezekiel did not understand the full implication of his vision; he may have had his doubts, and he must have struggled against age-long prejudices; he could not regard Yahweh with the freedom that we do, but he was on the way to do so, and was one of those who gave an impetus in that direction.
A remarkable feature of the Book of Ezekiel is the "foreign" element. Alien words and turns of expression are numerous, and mythological references are introduced that excite surprise in the work of a Judean priest. To account for these by saying that Ezekiel was "une âme ouverte", "un esprit très réceptif", readily acted upon by his environment, disregards those religious prejudices which would shield a Yahweh priest from heathen contamination and which a few years' residence in Babylonia could not break down. Hölscher meets the difficulty by assuming that Ezekiel employed words and ideas brought into Judea before his time: "The genuine passages of Ezekiel show with regard to foreign ideas the same impartiality which is peculiar to the Jews of the pre-exilic age. The influence of Babylonian mythology is more powerful in Ezekiel than in any one of the older prophets. Ezekiel, naturally, did not for the first time appropriate all these foreign ideas during the few years of his stay in Babylonia. Already before that time they must have been familiar to him, and they show to what an extent Judah had stood for a long time and especially since Manasseh, under the influence of the East, and how Babylonian ideas in spite of all Yahwistic reform-efforts in Judah, made themselves at home in Judah. Even in the forms of expression in Ezekiel Babylonian influence shows itself here and there".

(A) Akkadian words, words of doubtful meaning or origin, and words of peculiar formation found only in Ezekiel (in O.T.).

\[\text{אַֽעְָל} \text{ (XXI:20)} = \text{slaughter; connected by Delitzsch}^{4} \text{ with Akk.} \text{abahu},\]
but the text may be in error; found only here.

£aX = to mourn; hiphil (in figurative sense) found only in Ez. XXI: 15, Lam. II: 8; perhaps from Ak. abalu, but more probably a verb formed from a substantive = Ak. abullu = a doorway. "When he went down into Sheol, I shut the door upon him".

† נע = bands, armies; a loan-word found only in Ez. XII: 14, XVII: 21, originally meaning wing of an army, connected with Ak. agâppu = wing.

מ = alas! Found only in Ez. VI: 11, XXI: 20.

ט = palaces? Found in Ez. XIX: 7 (cf. Is. XIII: 22); Del. defends the M. T. and compares the Ak. almattu = almantu = a fortress; but the word נים = a widow = Ak. almattu; probably some textual change is necessary.

נ = weak; found in XVI: 30; the part. pass., found only here, is omitted by Co. The formation is difficult and probably the text is corrupt. נ is connected with Ak. ummulu.

ר = to howl, to groan; cf. Aramaic; found as a verb only in Ez. IX: 4, XXIV: 17, XXVI: 15, Jer. LI: 52.

ט = purple thread and cloth; Ak. argamannu; this is found elsewhere but is used by Ez. (XXVII: 7, 16) as indicating the wealth and luxury of Tyre; it is probably a loan word.

ט = found in Ez. XXIII: 44; Del. compares with the Ak. plural formation assâti from assatu.

ק = a flash of lightning; found only in Ez. I: 14; the change to ק is without justification.

נ = a seeking; a peculiar form which is found only in Ez. XXXIV: 12, perhaps connected with Ak. bukkuru.

ט = variegated cloth; found in Ez. XXVII: 24, from Ak. birmu = a kind of cloth.
\( \text{מ} \) = to cut down; found only in Ez.XVI:40; = Ak. bataku.

\( \text{נ} \) = a barber; found only in Ez.V:1; an Ak.loan word galabu; 21

Phoen. \( \text{נ} \).

\( \text{ז} \) = wrapping; cf. Aramaic \( \text{ח} \); found only in Ez.XXVII:24; perhaps a Persian loan word; probably connected with Ak. Gulinu.

\( \text{ז} \) = chests (perhaps) (of variegated cloth); found only in Ez.XXVII:24. "In A.V. and R.V. we find in Ezekiel's inventory (XXVII:24) of the merchandise of Tyre "Chests( \( \text{ז} \) ) of rich apparel, bound with cords and made of cedar". But the sense 'chests' for this word is without sufficient support... and the word rendered "made of cedar" must mean 'strong', 'durable', so that we should probably render 'cloths of cord twined and \( \text{ז} \) durable'".

\( \text{ז} \) = loathing; a peculiar form found only in Ez.XVI:5.

\( \text{ז} \) = millet; found only in Ez. IV:9.

\( \text{ז} \) = to trouble, to make turbid; Ak. dalahu = to disturb; found only in Ez. XXXII:2, 13.

\( \text{ז} \) = one silenced(?) from \( \text{ז} \); found in Ez.XXVII:32; Del. hesitantly connects it with \( \text{ז} \) = Ak. damamu = to wail(cf. Is. XXIII:2 ‘\( \text{ז} \) \( \text{ז} \)’ \( \text{ז} \) - "Wail, ye coast-dwellers"); but "the form is peculiar and the sense dubious".

\( \text{ז} \) = ebony; found only in Ez.XXVII:15; perhaps Egyptian loan word "heben".

\( \text{ז} \) = (joyous) shout on mountains; found only in Ez.VII:7.

\( \text{ז} \) = alas! Found only in Ez.XXX:2.

\( \text{ז} \) = lamentation; found only in Ez.II:10; but the "text is very dubious", and most emend to \( \text{ז} \).

\( \text{ז} \) # the contrary, perversity; found only in Ez.XVI:34 and
Israel XXIX:16; the word may be connected with the Ak. abaku or abiktu.

 משא = a multitude(?); found only in Ez.XXIII:24. The word "is unknown" and the "derivation and meaning are dubious". Del. connects with Ak. esinši = to collect, to gather, but B.D.B. regards this derivation as "very dubious". Many read מָשָׂא. G. reads מָשָׂא.

משה = a melting; found only in Ez.XXII:22; from מַעֲשָׂה connected with Ak. natakû = to flow.

משנה = issue (of semen virile); found only in Ez.XXIII:20; Ak. zaramû = to overwhelm.

משה = a pledge; found only in Ez.XVIII:12, 16, XXIII:15, and מֵשָׂה in XVIII:7; cf. Ak. nabhaly = rope, snare.

משנה = twined, twisted; the pass. part. is found in this sense only in Ez.XXVII:24; from מְשָׂה = Ak. abasû = to confine, to restrict.

משנה = debt; found only in Ez.XVIII:7; the construction, however, is difficult, and Herr. suggests that מְשִׂנָּה is a gloss or repetition from מֵשָׂה. K.H.B. suggests מְשִׁנָּה.

משנה = a party wall; found only in Ez.XIII:10; Del. connects with Ak. isu.

משנה = rust; found only in Ez.XXIV:6, 11, 12; a Sabean word. (הָבֹרֶה) שֹׁמָא (שֹׁמָא) = saddle cloths; found only in Ez.XXVII:20; probably connected with Ak. hibsu, tahabû = a woollen article of clothing.

משנה = a shining substance; found only in Ez.I:4, 27; VIII:12; it is supposed to be a brilliant amalgam of gold and silver. G. translates ἕλεκτρον. Del. connects with Ak. esmarû; van Hoonaker with ḫuṣṣu. Herr. suggests that it may be the same word as the Egyptian ḫuṣṣu.

משנה = terror; found only in Ez.XXXII:23 ff; it may be
connected with Ak. ḫattu = terror.

חִירָה = turbans; found only in Ez. XXIII:15; Del. connects with Ak. tublu = turban.

תִּפְקָה = a coating; found only in Ez. XIII:12;

וְאָבָה = to wander; found only in Ez. XIII:10.

קרָב = a young shoot; found only in Ez. XVII:4; probably connected with Ak. ʾaniku 51 = to suck; Herr. suggests נְפִיַּי (v. 22).

חֵשֶׁה = splendour; found only in Ez. XXVIII:7, 17; Ak. ʾêtupu 53 = to shine.

חַפִּישָׁה = jasper; found only in Ez. XXVIII:13 and Ex. XXVIII:20, XXXIX:13; perhaps a Persian loan word, 54 or it may be connected with Ak. aspū. 55

כֹּב = Chebar; in Ez. I:1, 3; III:15, 23; X:15, 20, 22; cf. Ak. Kabaru = to be great and kabru = great. 56

כֹּה = to paint (the eyes); found only in Ez. XXIII:40; cf. Ak. ʾetupu.

לִיִּסְכָה = band, fillet; found only in Ez. XIII:16, 20; Del. connects with Ak. kasū = to take captive, kasitu, kisittu = a fetter.

כֹּפָה = to desire hungrily; found only in Ez. XVII:7; an Aramaic loan word. 59

כֹּרֵך = cherub; in Ez. IX:3, X:1, 2, etc.; the root is dubious; Del. connects with Ak. karūbu = great; R. H. Pfeiffer 51 quotes from Esarhaddon's account of the restoration of the temple built by Shalmaneser, "A Lahmu and a Kuribi of brilliant sariru I set up side by side (of the gate)" and remarks that the identification of the Kuribi with the כֹּרֵך seems inevitable, the root being the Ak. Karābu = to bless.

כָּבְד found only in Ez. XVI:30; perhaps the text is in error. 62

כָּבָד = a tile; Ak. libittu; 63 H. W. B. 64 derives from Ak. labānu =
to throw down; there are many examples of Babylonian architectural plans scratched upon clay.

גוג = (flight) fugitive; found only in Ez.XVII:21.

תור = open land (about Tyre); the plur.abs. found only in Ez.XVII:28; but there may be textual corruption.

סֹּס = stroke (of battering ram); a peculiar form found only in Ez.XXVI:9; from סֹס probably connected with Ak.mah = to crush.

סָלַט = object of compassion(?); found only in Ez.XXIV:21; Van Hoonaker derives from mah = siru, rabu, tizqaru, and mal = gal; סָלַט signifying "pride".

תָּמָר = origin; found only in Ez.XVI:3, XXI:35, XXIX:14; connected with Ak. kâru = to fell (trees).

שֶׂקֶל = gorgeous raiment; the plur. form found only in Ez.XXVII:24; in XXIII:12 and XXXVIII:4 שֶׂקֶל = perfection (i.e. probably gorgeous attire) from שֶׂקֶל; the word is probably connected with Ak. kalalu = to complete; Van Hoonaker derives from muk (mukku = a kind of dress) and lal (tabu).

סָנָה = cherub of expansion, far-covering cherub; found only in Ez.XXVIII:14; cf. Ak. masahu = measure.

סַמָּה = covering; found only in Ez.XXVIII:13; from סַמָּה; cf. Ak. sukkku.

סָנָה = long veil; found only in Ez.XIII:18, 21; Herr. connects with Ak. sapahu which he interprets as "zunichte machen".

סָנָה = wares; found only in Ez.XXVII:9, 13, 17, 19, 25, 27, 33, 34; from סָנָה = to exchange.

סָנָה = shattering; found only in Ez.IX:2; from סָנָה; cf. Ak. sapahu = to shatter.

סָנָה = divination; found only in Ez.XII:24, XIII:7.

סָנָה = largeness, much; found only in Ez.XXIII:32.
bitterness; found only in Ez. XXI:11; from יַּעַנ; cf. Ak. marâru.

market place; found only in Ez. XXVII:24.

befouled (by trampling); found only in Ez. XXIV:19.

oar; found only in Ez. XXVII:6, 29.

spreading-place; in Ez. XXVI:5, 14; "The הבשׂה was the flat house-top or other suitable spot on which grapes were dried. "The word (cf. Ez. XXVI:5, XLVII:10) corresponds to the Arabic mistah".

silk; found only in Ez. XVI:10, 13; "The etymology is unknown"; Del. connects with Ak. masû = namâru = to shine.

(1) a parable (Ez. XVII:2; XXI:5; XXIV:3); (2) a byword (Ez. XIV:8); (3) a proverbial saying (Ez. XII:22, 23, XVIII:2, 3); Ak. masâ'lu.

cleansing; found only in Ez. XVI:4; the "form is strange, and the word at best dubious".

weight; in Ez. IV:10; יָפּוּ is connected with Ak. yâkalū = to weigh.

what is settled, clarified; found only in Ez. XXXIV:18.

a gift; found only in Ez. XVI:33; Herr. translates "love-payment", and connects with Ak. nidintu = niddtu = a dewy gratuity.

a bribe from a harlot; found only in Ez. XVI:33; it is "probably an Ak. loan-word"; cf. nudnu = dowry, and nudunnu.

eminency; found only in Ez. VII:11; but many commentators delete.

lust, harlotry; found only in Ez. XVI:36; perhaps Phoen.

Del. connects with Ak. nûhsu = an overflow.

to sparkle; found only in Ez. I:7 in this sense; cf. Ak. אָבָה

hole, cavity, socket; found only in Ez. XXVIII:13; probably connected with Ak. nakbu = depth, spring (of water).

rulers; found only in Ez. XXIII:6; loan-word from Ak.
 saknu = prefect of conquered city or province (root sak\textnu = to set, to appoint).\textsuperscript{89}

\textnu s\textnu = cage, prison; found only in Ez. XIX: 9; "possibly" says B.D.B.,\textsuperscript{90} "probably" says G.B.,\textsuperscript{91} "certainly" says Herr.,\textsuperscript{92} "an Ak. loan-word from \textnu s\textnu g\textnu r\textnu = a cage".

\textnu \textnu s\textnu = to scrape; found only in Ez. XXVI: 4.

\textnu \textnu s\textnu = image (masculine); found only in Ez. VIII: 3, 5; Dt. IV: 16; II Chrons. XXIII: 7, 15; \textnu \textnu s\textnu "seems to be a loan-word introduced in the 6th century".\textsuperscript{93}

\textnu s\textnu = a brier; found only in Ez. II: 6; XXVIII: 24; the derivation is unknown; there are 28 words for thorn in Hebrew.

\textnu s\textnu = a brier; found only in Ez. II: 6; "probably an Aramaic loan-word".\textsuperscript{95}

\textnu s\textnu = a bough; found only in Ez. XXXI: 5.

\textnu s\textnu = to lust; found only in Ez. XXIII: 5, 7, 9, 12, 16, 20, & Jer. IV: 30.

\textnu s\textnu = love; found only in Ez. XXXIII: 32; read \textnu \textnu s\textnu in Ez. XXXIII: 31.

\textnu s\textnu = lustfulness; found only in Ez. XXIII: 11.

\textnu s\textnu = distortion; found only in Ez. XXI: 32.

\textnu s\textnu = wares (as left in the purchaser's hands); found only in Ez. XXVII: 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 27, 33; probably connected with Ak. uz\textnu b\textnu = a specific payment.\textsuperscript{96}

\textnu s\textnu = to darken, to dim; found only in Ez. XXVIII: 3, XXXI: 8, and Lam. IV: 1 (in figurative sense).

\textnu s\textnu = uncircumcised (?); "the word can scarcely have that meaning here", says Herr.; "the interpretation is unknown", says Ehr.; probably connected with Ak. ar\textnu l\textnu = underworld.\textsuperscript{99}

\textnu s\textnu = some kind of cake; an unknown word\textsuperscript{100} found only in Ez. XXVII: 17.
found only in Ez.XXIII:23 & Jer.L:21; Ak. Pukudu, a tribe on the border of Elam.

= to fly; found only in Ez.XIII:20.

= fragment or morsel (of bread); found only in Ez.XIII:19.

= opening of mouth (in speech or song); found only in Ez.XVI:63, XXIX:21; from Ak. petu. 102

= shining, bare surface; found only in Ez.XXIV:7, 8, XXVI:4, 14; Del. connects with Ak. susu = a desert.

= (probably) a place name; Herr. suggests Itav; the text is dubious.

= ship; found only in Ez.XXX:9; Is.XXXIII:21; Num.XXIV:24; Dan.XI:30; an Egyptian loan-word; G. reads in Ez.XXX:9 νοῦς, 

= lock of hair on forehead; found only in Ez.VIII:3 in this sense; the root is dubious; Del. connects with Ak. sisu = something twisted, the chain with which captives were bound; G.B. connects with Egyptian sisi = tassel.

= a tree-top; found only in Ez.XVII:3, 22; XXXI:3, 10, 14; from = wool.

= to scorch; found only in Ez.XXI:3; ( = adj. scorching in Prov.XVI:27); Ak. sarabu = to burn.

= a kind of willow; found only in Ez.XVII:5; Ak. sipattu = a reed.

= a gathering; found only in Ez.XXII:20.

= to strip off; found only in Ez.XVII:9; the "verb is otherwise unknown".

is identified with Assyrian Kutu, East of the Tigris, on the border of Elam & Media; only in Ez.XXIII:23.

= very little; found only in Ez.XVI:47; Del. connects
with Ak. kitti; but the text is dubious.

レープ = inkhorn; found only in Ez. IX: 2, 3, 11; perhaps connected with Egyptian gat. 117

レエリア = shuddering; found only in Ez. VII: 25.

レノル = warriors; read レノル for レノル in Ez. XXIII: 5; an Ak. loan-word kurade. 118

レ= a glacier; in Ez. VIII: 22; found elsewhere; レ has the same double interpretation as κρύσταλλος Del. 119 connects with Ak. kirhu, kirhusu = a fortification.

レ= to spread, to cover over; found only in Ez. XXIII: 23, XXXVII: 6, 8.

レ= a looking at; found only in Ez. XXVIII: 17.

レ= a quivering; found only in Ez. XII: 18.

レ= traffic; found only in Ez. XXVIII: 5, 16, 18.

レ= merchandise; found only in Ez. XXVI: 12.

レ= medicine, remedy; in Ez. XXX: 21, from レ=; cf. Jer. XXX: 13, XLVI: 11; connected with Phoen.レ= to heal; cf. riputi.

レ= boiling; a peculiar form, found only in Ez. XXIV: 5.

レ= despite, contempt; in Ez. XXV: 6, 15, XXVI: 5; perhaps connected with Ak. レ= to rebel.

レ= to treat with despite; found only in Ez. XVI: 57, XXVIII: 24, 25.

レ is identified with Assyrian Sut, Suti, nomads of Mesopotamia and (later) East of Tigris. 123

レ is connected with Ak. レ= sakuru. 124

*レ= imperious, domineering; found only in Ez. XVI: 30 in this sense; Ehr. says: "scheint irgendeine obszöne Bedeutung zu haben"; connected with Ak. レ= to have power.
= horror; found only in Ez. IV:16, XII:19.

= satiety (used figuratively) as to carnal desire only in Ez. XVI:28; the word is found also in Ez. XVI:49, XXXIX:19; Is. LV: 2; LVI:11; XXIII:18.

= toil; found only in Ez. XXIV:12; from .

= fornication; found only in Ez. XVI: 15, 20, 22, 25, 26, 29, 34, 36; XXIII:7, 8, 11, 14, 17, 18, 19, 29, 35, 43; from .

= a kind of leather; found only in Ez. XVI:10 & Ex. XXV-XXXIX & Num. IV; Del. connects with Ak. tahâu; "What is its name", says Herr., "we do not know". H.W.B. conjectures "sheepskin".

= violet stuff; found only in Ez. XXVII:7; from Ak. takiltu.

= a kind of leather; found only in Ez. III:15; is probably an Ak. loan-word from tilu = a ruin, a heap; til-abubi = a deluge-mound; according to Herr. is "Plenenschreibung" for ; Jeremias regards as a mistake for .

= exalted, lofty; found only in Ez. XVII:22; from root and .

= Babylonian Duzu (also Dumuzi).

= whitewash; found only in Ez. XIII:10, 11, 14, 15, XXII:28; akin to ; connected with tapâlu = to besmear (?).

NOTE: Words marked * are regarded by Kautzsch as indubitable Aramaisms. Those marked † are possibly Aramaisms.
(B) Words & Expressions Suggestive of Akkadian Influence.

The reference is probably to the rock of God in the North, the dwelling-place of Anu, the "summus deus".1

"This conception lies behind the language of Is. XIV:12-15"2, and from the definition יִתְנָה יִזָּה (Is. XIV:13), it is a justifiable inference that the reference is to an Olympus, an assembly-rock of the gods.3

Ezekiel's conception is in part influenced by Akkadian symbolism.4

This phrase corresponds to the Ak."marivelim" = son of a Freeman, free citizen.5

This phrase, characteristic of Ezekiel, is an Ak. form of expression, similar to bit Ḥumri = Israel, bit Ammanu = לֹא יְהֹוָא.6

This phrase corresponds to the opening formula of the Ak. royal edict.7

Ez. may have in view the Assyrian custom during their military campaigns of spreading the slain in the ravines and valleys.8

(VII:2) corresponds to the Ak. kippatšame irsitim = the four quarters of the world.9

The supernatural spirits of destruction dwell in the North.10

The is suggestive of Nebo,11 the messenger or intermediary who carried out the orders of Marduk.12 Nebo is the "god of the stylus", regarded by the Assyrians as the god of writing & wisdom; he holds the "tablets of fate" on which are written the destinies of individuals, & as "scribe" among the gods.
records' their decisions.  


These judgments are mentioned in the epic of Gilgamesh; and, as in Ez. only the righteous will be saved.  "The resemblance between his(Ezekiel's)great discourse & the Babylonian document is too close to be accidental". 

The eagle as a type of the conqueror is referred to in Dt.XXVIII:49, Hos.VIII:1, & Jer. XLVIII:40, but Ez. is probably influenced by Assyrian-Babylonian conceptions of the eagle as the King of birds. 

"Lions were transported & kept, by the Assyrians, in cages formed by thick bars of wood.... Captured princes of nations conquered by Assyrian kings were sometimes confined in cages". 

This expression is found only here, Cf.Ak. "ummi ḫarrānî" which, however, has a different interpretation. 

(XXI:26) may have been images or symbols of Yahweh, or mummied human heads & then representations of ancestors. This latter interpretation would "make it easy to understand how....Nebuchadrezzar is represented as resorting to this method of divination". 

"The inspection of the liver of the sacrificial animal & of the liver alone, lies at the foundation of Babylonian-Assyrian divination, & may be designated the method of all others for determining what the gods had in mind". 

"A written document is thought of, according to which Babylonians & Assyrians will judge in the judgment between Yahweh & His people."
Ez. is familiar with Assyrian-Babylonian atrocities. Mutilation of captives was common. Exposure of the legs & removal of the train of the garment was imposed upon female captives as a humiliation. (cf. Is. XX:4; Jer. XIII:22, 26; Nah. III:5; Mic. IV:11). Sar šarrāni was a title of the Assyrian kings Tīglāth-Pileser I, Ashur-nasirpal, Esarhaddon & Ashurbanipal. Mölscher quotes the phrase "ša ina Kabal tam-din" in the inscriptions of Esarhaddon as parallel to the expression "כַּבְּלוֹת".
The "Aramaic" influence is more pronounced in Ezekiel than in any other pre-exilic writing. Holscher accepts the presence of these Aramaisms as proof of the secondary character of sections of the book. But, in the words of Gunkel, "we cannot always deduce a late origin from an Aramaic expression... The task of distinguishing Aramaic words which are to be found in the most ancient texts from those which were not introduced till later times, is a problem for the future. In the meantime it is only with the greatest reservation that we should draw the conclusion of a late origin from Aramaisms". "In Assyria... the use of Aramaic endorsements on contract-tablets shows that the Aramaic language & alphabet began to prevail among the people from the eighth-seventh centuries onwards; & in Palestine from being the language of official intercourse (II K.XVIII:26), it spread, & ultimately became the language of the people".

The following words are accepted by Kautzsch as Aramaisms:

- شه (XXXIV:11) = to search after;  יָעִב (XXIV:26) = a causing to hear;  הָרָג (XVII:9) = a leaf;  הָנָו (XIII:9) = writing, register;  הָרָי (XVII:2) = a riddle;  יָעִב (XXI:17) = to deliver over, the part-hoph of  יָעִב ; the root may be  יָעָן = to throw;
- כָּרָד (XXIX:8) = a province;  כָּרָד (XXV:6) = to strike; to clap (the hand);  כָּרָד (XXVII:9, 27, 29) = mariner, but this may be a loan-word from Ak. malahu;
- כָּרָד (XXVI:9) = an attacking-engine (or);

The following are possibly Aramaisms:

- כָּרָד (VIII:2) = brightness;
- כָּרָד (XIII:22) = to be cowed; but the text is doubtful;
- כָּרָד (XXII:21) = to gather;  כָּרָד (XX:28) = offering: "Vielleicht ist  כָּרָד direkt aus dem Assyrisch-Babylonischen herübergekommen;"
- כָּרָד (XVI:40, XXIII:47) = to stone;  כָּרָד (I:22) from כָּרָד to beat.
Hölscher, remarking on the distinction between "hen & n'vi" says that "n'vi is "hier etwa als Stammes- oder Geschlechtsstamm
ing neben dem König" 1 but to the writer n'vi appears throughout the book to mean the head of the religious organisation, the chief-priest. That special reference should be made to him is in accordance with expectations. The priesthood exercised a dominant influence upon the ancient world. It was the influence of the Phoenician priests that caused a revolution in Israel, a revolution the effects of which can be traced for many years in Israeli history. 2 In any early civilisation where religion played an important part, the priesthood could not fail to have a large share in the shaping of national policy. The priests were the real "centres of rebellion" as we can see from the Biblical narrative. It is Zephaniah, the chief (II K. XXV:18, Jer.LII:24) and principal overseer of the police arrangements in the Temple (Jer.XXIX:25 f), that appears before Jeremiah as the emissary of Zedekiah (Jer.XXI:1, XXXVII:3). To him and the priesthood the letter was sent from Shemaiah with instructions to put Jeremiah in the stocks (Jer. XXIX:24). The embassy that went to Nebuchadrezzar with assurances of fidelity was headed by the chief priest and other representatives of the Jerusalem priesthood. Nebuchadrezzar regarded Zedekiah as a puppet in their hands and in apportioning punishment he imprisoned and blinded the king (Jer.XXIX:3, II K.XXXV:7) whereas he put the leading priests to death 3 (Jer.III:24-27).

There was a priestly organisation with gradations of rank (II K. XXIII:4, Jer.XX:1). Jeremiah makes mention of נִּכְוָא נִר' (XIX:1).
At its head was a chief priest who was not honoured with the title that was later applied to that dignitary (II K. XXV: 18, XII: 8, 10). Seraiah, the high priest, is the (Jer. LII: 24) & next in order came the (II K. XXV: 18). The title applied to Hilkiah (II K. XXII: 4, 8, XXIII: 4) "is due to antedating or may be a later insertion". During the earlier monarchy the priests in Judah seem to have played the part of the prophets of the North, and even in early times the influence of the chief priest must have been very great. Twice the chief priest led in the rescue of the ancient faith: Jehoiada after the apostasy of Athaliah (II K. XI: 4 ff; XII: 3), and Hilkiah after that of Manasseh.

While it cannot be maintained with certainty that the term is always used in the same sense throughout the book, the references suggest that the word is applied to the head of the religious order, and one would on that ground alone urge that the passages in which the word occurs come from the same hand.

Let us turn to the texts.

apparently means Chief Priest. Verse 27 and preceding verses show a Jerusalem existing with its civil and religious organisation with the & the at their head.

appears to the writer to mean Chief Priest. Seraiah was taken to Riblah and put to death (II K. XXV: 18 ff; Jer. LII: 24 ff). "The general of the Babylonian king now overthrew the city, and removed the people, and took for prisoners the high-priest Seraiah, and Zephaniah the priest that was next to him, and the rulers that guarded the Temple who were three in number.... So the king commanded
the heads of the high-priest, and of the rulers to be cut off there but he himself led all the captives and Zedekiah to Babylon. 7

Ezekiel apparently announces the downfall of the chief-priest and gives him precedence over the king. "Mitre and crown shall tumble down". מיטל is used only of the turban of the chief-priest. 8

In I Sam. I:9 & IV:13, כוכב is used of the throne of the chief-priest, and in Jeremiah XVII:12 the sanctuary is called כוכב. (cf Ez.XLIII:7). Read with ג.ן and even if כוכב is retained our argument is unaffected as in P. כוכב is used of the robe of the priest (Ex. XXVIII:31,34;XXIX:5;XXXIX:22,24,25,26; Lev. VIII:7).

(XXVII:21) דוד וְאֶלֶף. The Sabaean rulers of Arabia from the 9th to the 6th century B.C. seem to have been priest-kings. 9

(XXX:13) "אֲלֹהֵי אֲדֹנָי נֶחֱזָק נִכְסֶרוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל נָא לְגִבֹּרָה. From the reference to the נָא and the יִשְׂרָאֵל it seems that יִשְׂרָאֵל = chief-priest. 9

(XXXII:29) Here the נִכְסֶרוּ and the יִשְׂרָאֵל appear to be the heads of the civil and the religious organisations.

(XXXIV:24) In this chapter Ez. pictures Israel as a flock of sheep with Yahweh Himself as their deliverer. The יִשְׂרָאֵל appears to be thought of as a religious head. Even if the references to דָּלָה be retained there
is no reason why he should not be thought of as the religious leader of the community.

The interpretation which we have given to נִוְיִי corresponds to the use of the term in Ez.XLV, XLVII, XLVIII, where, as Berry has recognised, the נִוְיִי is apparently the chief-priest. In P. נִוְיִי is used in connection with the religious organisation of the community.¹²
NOTES.
CHAPTER I.

1. Ecc.XLIX:8 - Ez. is praised for his book, no light being shed upon his personal history. Hierakion says Ezechiel, Ezechiel, Ezechiel, and his book is praised. Yet no light is shed upon his personal history.

2. "Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi stridonensis presbyteri operum" (Tomus Quintus) studio ac labore Dominici Vallarsii (1768) p. 3:

"Aggregiar Ezechiel Prophetam cujus difficultatem Hebraeorum probat traditio. Nam nisi quis apud eos aetatem sacerdotalis ministerii, id est, tricesimum annum impleverit, nec principia Geneseos, nec Canticum Canticorum, nec hujus voluminis exordium et finem legere permittitur ut ad perfectam scientiam, et mysticos intellectus, plenum humanae naturae tempus accedat".

Cf. Epist. ad Paulinum: "Tertius (Ezechiel) principia et finem tantis habet obscuritabibus involuta, ut apud Hebraeos istae partes cum exordio Geneseos ante annos triginta non legantur".

3. "Oceanum et mysteriorum Dei labyrinthum"


5. "Oceanum et mysteriorum Dei labyrinthum".

6. Davidson: Prefatory Note.

7. "die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden" (2nd edn.)
1892, pp. 165-170 - assigns the book to the early Persian period, but in Z.D.M.G. "Bibelkritisches II Ezechiel" Vol.XXVII(1873) pp. 676-81, he assigns it to 440-400 B.C., approximately the period to which Ho. (p.33) assigns the redaction of the book.


13. Smend p.XXI.

14. W. Gesenius: "Geschichte der Hebräischen Sprache und Schrift" (1815) p.35: "This book belongs to that not very numerous class which, from beginning to end, maintains by means of favourite expressions & peculiar phrases such a oneness of tone as by that circumstance alone to prevent any suspicion that separate portions of it are not genuine".


Bertholet - p.XIX F. - accepts Smend's statement with a slight qualification.

Jean Lajciak: "Ezechiel, Sa Personne et son Enseignement" (1905) p.160.


17. Toy.
18. Kr. p.XIII & introductory remarks to Ch.I(p.1ff.) & Ch.VII
(p.71 ff.).
19. Kr.pp.XII-XIII.

Baba bathra folio 14b & 15a:-

נביאות חת 된衎 ותנשומ סימה ותסיכה יריהו
יויחדיהו ישוע ותשומ ותשומ וכמתה זרהה
ניחב ייחדיהו ותשומ ותשומ

20. A.Kuenen in "Budd's Gesam. Abhandlungen zur Bibl. Wissens-
Vol.IX p.103, Art."Ezekiel".
22. Jahn.
23. Jahn. For a critical examination of Kr.'s hypothesis,see
"Das literarische Problem des Buches Ezechiel",by E.Kreipe(1913).
24. Jahn p.III.
25. Ho.p.3.
26. Her.(1).
27. Her.
& J.G.Eichhorn:"Einleitung in das A.T"(1824) Vierter Band
p.237 ff.
29. Her.p.XXIV.
30. Ho.
31. "op.1.
33. G.A.Cooke in "Review of "Slscher's 'Hesekiel:der Dichter und
34. That Ez. is a poet of no mean order was recognised long ago:
e.g. R. Lowth - "Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews", trans. by G. Gregory (1835) - assigns to Ez. the same rank among the Hebrews which Aeschylus holds among the Greeks (p. 233). "In that species of composition to which he seems by nature adapted, the forcible, the impetuous, the great & solemn, not one of the sacred writers is superior to him...The greater part of Ez. is poetical".


36. For a review & criticism of Ho., see G. A. Cooke - op. cit.; cf. Sprank.


38. (a) Ez. XX: 15 מְנַשְׁנָה נָבִיָּה (Insert נָבִיָּה with G.). This expression may be borrowed from Ex. III: 8, 17. Stade - Z. A. T. W. Vol. XXII p. 321f. - considers that this phrase occurs only in passages which may all be regarded as late.

(b) Ez. XX: 20 & Ex. XXXI: 13.

CHAPTER II.

2. Davidson p. XXI.
3. Her. (1) p. 66.

7. J. Skinner: H.D.B. Vol. I p. 816. Cf. Ewald quoted by P. Fairbairn in "Ezekiel & the Book of his Prophecy: An Exposition" (1863) p. 4 - "As we see him (Ezekiel) in his book, he appears more as a writer than as a prophet taking part in public life... The more the man grows as an author & a cultivator of learning he loses in the same proportion as a genuine prophet... His book "proceeds almost entirely from the study of a learned retreat".

12. Lofthouse: p. XII.
"The Prophets & Prophecy in Israel", trans. by A. Milroy (1877) pp. 43-4

points apparently to the clear profound insight which is peculiar to the prophet. It denotes the ecstatic gazing of the prophet & alludes thus to the visions which fall to his lot. They differ mainly as Seer & Gazer."

24. Ehr. (p. 40) reads סניא ל for נויה נויה; Kr. (p. 126) changes נויה into סניא; Herr. (p. 75) regards the opening phrase as "unverständlich"; Toy (p. 60) suggests the insertion of מ before סניא & adds that the passage "seems to be a natural introduction to what follows". In נויה נויה we have one of Ez.'s word-plays. On word-play in the prophets see A. Knobel: "der Prophetismus der Hebräer" Vol. I (1837) pp. 366ff & 405ff.
26. Smend p. 68.
27. Ho. p. 80.
30. Lofthouse p. 185.
31. Cf. Kr. p. V. Fairbairn -op. cit. p. 9 - says: "beyond all question, he (Ez.) belongs to the first rank of those who were called to
the regular charge of the prophetic office... His spiritually enlightened eye takes the true gauge & measure of what was around him; looks through the appearances into the realities of things; so that with the assumed confidence of one who knew the mind of God, he gives forth the judgment of heaven respecting them". 
CHAPTER III.


2. Verse 1b is in bad grammar. We expect 1 consecutive (cf. Is. VI: 1).


3. The writer agrees with Herr. (p. 9), Bert. (p. 1) & Ehr. (p. 1) again at Co. (p. 178), Jahn (p. 2) & Ho. (p. 45), in regarding 1 & 3b as the original, 2 & 3a being interpolation. For the views of other scholars see Toy p. 41 & Kr. p. 1 ff. It is possible that vv. 1-3 from Jn formed no part of the original text. Verse 1/3 & 3b may have come from the redactor, & 2, 3a from a later interpolator.

4. Cf. I:1ff; VIII:1; XX:1; XXIV:1; XXVI:1; XXIX:1; 17; XXX:20; XXXI:1; XXXII:1, 17; XXXIII:21; XL:1.


11. Lofthouse p. 95.


14a. Welch p. 146 ff.

15. Welch p. 147.

17. This appears to the writer to be the most feasible explanation.
18. cf. Welch p. 4.
20.
CHAPTER IV.

1. Ho.p. 45.
2. Spinoza: "Principiorum Philosophiae" Pars. I & II(1663) p. 129
   (Tractatus Theologicopolitici).
3. Cf. Jahn p. 30; Co. (p. 194ff) arranges the vv. as follows: -4, 5, 6,
   8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15 -with the omission of 7 as a gloss(exile sym-
   bolism), & 1, 2, 3, 10, 11 (siege symbolism). Kr. (49ff) has recourse
   to his recension theory. Bert. (p. 27f) follows Co. but retains
   v. 7 & places vv. 10, 11 after v. 15.
4. Herr. (p. 31ff) arranges as follows: -1-3(7), 10-11, 16-17,
   4-6, 12-15, & remarks "besteht die Möglichkeit, dass Kap. IV
   ursprünglich in der Tat keine Exilsymbolik, sondern lauter
   Belagerungssymbolik enthielt". (p. 38),
5. Ho.p. 61 ff.
6. Most authorities read with Q.
7. Kr. ad loc.
10. Davidson p. 31.
12. F. Hitzig: "Der Prophet Ezechiel" (1847) p. 35.
15. Ehr. p. 17,
17. Kr.'s emendation 'נתך(p. 56) & Toy's (pp. 48-9) are too easy.
   Ehr. (p. 17) reads: כַּעַל יַחַיָּה נַעַנְיָה יֵעֵשׂ הַנַּעַנְיָה
24. Herr. p. 44.
25. Welch p. 5.
27. Ho. p. 67.
30. Kr. ad loc.
33. Welch p. 198.
34. Herr. p. 58.
35. Lofthouse p. 95.
37. Kr. ad loc.
38. Cf. Smend & Herr. ad loc.
39. Kr. ad loc.
41. Cf. Davidson p. 73.
42. Cf. Bert. p. 44, & Kr. p. 84, who regard the יְמַדַּי as the "vulgus profanum", "das gemeine Volk". According to Ho. (pp. 82, 167) they are the godless Palestinians. Herr. (p. 78) says: "das Wort ist also an die Adresse der in Juda Zurückgebliebenen, nicht der Mitexulanten Ezechials gerichtet". Cf. Klamroth p. 99f.
43. Ehr. p. 42.
44. Lofthouse p. 122.
45. Ho. p. 86.
46. Cf. Ho, p. 87.
49. Ho. p. 97.
50. Lofthouse p. 176.
52. Ho. p. 114.
53. K.H.B. & Toy (pp. 16, 74) omit "ἐλέεσ διατοὺς μαλλάν πρὸς τῶν ἀπάρχοντι πόνον καὶ τὴν θυμομάσθη ικ τῶν ἄνθρωπον ἐσ τὸ ἁρμύ, κατ' αὐξ ἄρσον τοὺς ἑπελθόντας.
54. Ehr. p. 83.
55. Ho. p. 115.
56. See pp. 98 ff of thesis.
60. Cf. Thucydides II: 52: ἐπίεσ διάτος μαλλὸν πρὸς τῶν ἀπάρχοντι πόνον καὶ τὴν θυμομάσθη ικ τῶν ἄνθρωπον ἐσ τὸ ἁρμύ, κατ' αὐξ ἄρσον τοὺς ἑπελθόντας.
63. Ho. p. 119.
64. Cf. Ho. p. 122f.
69. Ho. p. 126.
70. Ho. p. 126.
74. Jahn p. 179.
75. Ho. p. 131.
78. Lofthouse p. 271.


84. See references above.

85. Welch p. 32.
1. So far from asserting that Yahweh had forsaken the earth, the
Jerusalemites insisted on the Temple as His sole abode.

2. Toy p.57.
6. Ho. p.75.
8. Toy p.59.

10. So Smend & Ho. Kr. suggests that 3.6a2.8-11,15,16 are parallel
to 4-7.12-14. C. Kuhl - "Die Literarische Einheit des Buches
Ezechiel"(1917) p.27 -is of opinion that two oracles have been
worked together, one relating to the people(vv.3,4,7a,8,9,11,
15b,16), & the other to the king(vv.5-6,7b,10,12-14,15a),


17. M. Jastrow: "The Civilization of Babylonia & Assyria" (1915)
pp.247 ff.


32. Ho., however, (p. 110) contends that "im Grossen und Ganzen ist das Kap. einheitlich".


34. Herr. p. 126.

35. Davidson p. 244.


37. Ho. p. 165.

38. Ho. p. 165.


40. Ho. p. 166.

43. I K. XXII:17; Hos. XIII:6; Jer. II:8, III:15, XIII:17; XXIII:1, XXV:36, XXXI:10, L:19; Is. XL:11; Zech. X:3; XIII:7; PSS. XXIII, LXXIV.
44. Ho. p. 169.
45. See pp. 98 ff. of thesis.
CHAPTER VI.

1. It is assumed by the writer in this chapter that the account of the Theophany is exilic.


2a. See Ch. VIII of thesis.

3. Ho. p. 27.

4. Herr.(1) p. 83; cf. R. Lowth -op. cit.- p. 230 f.: -Ez. "is deep, vehement, tragical... His sentiments are elevated, fervent, full of fire, indignant... He employs frequent repetitions not for the sake of grace or elegance, but from the vehemence of passion & indignation". Fairbairn -op. cit.- pp. 4-5:- says that Ezekiel's messages "breathe throughout such a living earnestness & practical vigour as clearly bespeaks the man of active labour, not the learned leisure & meditative quiet of the recluse. This moral spirit is stamped upon the whole of Ezekiel's writings... The Book possesses much of a rhetorical character, & has in a manner, but one aim, that of moral persuasion". Ezekiel is a νειπόσ "a freeman", "a free citizen".


Kr. (p. 22), Bert. (p. 13), & Redpath (p. XIV) & C. F. Keil - "A Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Ezekiel (1876)" Vol. I p. 47 - hold that the expression emphasises human weakness in contrast with divine might.

6. It is possible that it is Jeremiah of whom Josephus speaks & that the reading ὅς πρῶτος should be ὅς ἔστι πρῶτος. See Eichhorn -op. cit.- p. 249 f.; cf. G. H. Toy in E. B. Vol. II Col. 1462.

P. Volz - "Die vorexil. Jahweprophetie und der Messias" (1897) p. 84 - holds that our present book was originally twp, the second
part consisting of Chs. XL-XLVIII which are the work of a disciple of Ezekiel.

CHAPTER VII.

1. Ho. (pp. 45-8) omits vv. 5-27 as interpolation, & Herr. (p. 14) regards vv. 6-26 as a later insertion by Ez. himself.

2. The writer assumes that this chapter is exilic.

3. Cf. Herr. p. XXI:—"In a land where apparently the Babylonian gods were everywhere triumphant, the prophet had, on his part, tirelessly to repeat & to emphasise that Yahweh is the God who manifests Himself truly in what will happen according to His word, communicated by prophets, that Yahweh was truly active & trustworthy according to His name ("He is") & as Israel knew & honoured Him."


5. Jahn p. 70.

6. Ehr. pp. 1, 2.

7. Smend pp. 7, 50, 56, 66.


11. The identification is made in X: 20.


23. M. J. (1) p. 117f.; cf. Plate 15, Fig. 3. M. J. (2) pp. 223ff. 448ff.; cf.
25. M. J. (1) pp. 51, 122ff.; cf. Plate 18 Fig. I; M. J. (2) p. 229; cf.
   H. D. B. (Ex.) p. 547.
28. Ez. may have had Ashur chiefly in view, as Ashur ruled
   without a rival & stood virtually alone. Cf. Morgenstern
   in Z. A. Vol. 28 p. 43.
29. M. J. (1) p. 57 & Plate 30, Fig. I; M. J. (2) p. 59f. & Plate XVIII;
   A. T. A. P. Vol. I p. 94ff; cf. R. Kittel: "Die hellenistische
   mysterien religion u. das A. T." (1924) pp. 39, 80.
30. A. T. A. O. Vol. II pp. 283-9; M. J. (2) Plates V, XXXII, XXXIII;
   Toy (2) p. 94.
31. M. J. (2) Plate V, Fig. I; cf. Plates LIII, LIX; cf. P. G. (A) Vol.
32. W. H. Ward: "The Seal Cylinders of Western Asia" (1910) - Fig. 74a


34. M. J. (1) Plate 5. Fig. I.


38.
CHAPTER VIII.

4. B.D.B. -p.5 -regards the Ak. derivation as dubious.
5. G.B. pp.4,5,
8. Baer-Del. p.XI.
16. Baer-Del. p.XI.
27. B.D.B. p.199.
28. Baer-Del. p.XI.
34. B.D.B. p.246.
35. Baer-Del. p.XI.
42. Baer-Del. pp.XI-XII.
43. B.D.B. p.316.
46. Baer-Del. p.XII.
50. Baer-Del. p.XII.
51. B.D.B. p.413.
52. Herr. p. 102.
55. G.B. p. 293; on aspu see H.W.B. p. 147.
59. B.D.B. p. 495.
60. Baer-Del. p. XIII.
on karabu see H.W.B. p. 350.
64. H.W.B. pp. 369-70.
68. A. Van Hoonacker -op. cit.- pp. 334-5.
71. A. Van Hoonacker -op. cit.- p. 335; on ḫḏt see O.H. Gates -op. cit.- pp. 73-4; on tabu see H.W.B. p. 299.
73. G.B. p. 493.
76. Co. (p. 323) reads ḫḏṭ.
93. N.S.I. p. 58.
111. G.B. p. 622; on נָּשָּׁל see Art. "Fringes" by A.R.S. Kennedy.


116. Baer-Del. p. XVI.

117. G.B. p. 656.

118. Herr. p. 140; see H.W.B. p. 596.


120. B.D.B. p. 950.

121. G.B. p. 704.


123. B.D.B. p. 1003.


125. Ehr. p. 57; cf. Herr. p. 94.


CHAPTER VII.


8. D. H. Muller quoted by Herr. p. 44.


15. S. Daiches -op. cit.-


18. Toy(2) p. 132.


25. See Toy(2) pp.140-1.
CHAPTER VIII(C).

CHAPTER IX.

1. Ho. p. 68.
6. If not, then one hand, the interpolator must have worked warily.
10. W. R. Aytoun in J.B.L. Vol. XXIX pp. 24-43 argues that T17 is an interpolation.
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