Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Doctor of Theology Dissertation   Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1967

Ezekiel 40-48

Gerald White
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_whiteg@csl.edu

Recommended Citation

EZEKIEL 40-48

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Old Testament Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Theology

by

Gerald Curtis White

May 1967

Approved by: *Walter R. Rohrs*
Advisor

Herbert H Mayer
Reader

Alfred von Rohr Sauer
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The author's interest in the book of Ezekiel and its
problems was kindled in a previous study involving an exe-
getical analysis of six passages selected from the first
thirty-nine chapters of the book. These problems may be
classified under the headings of (1) authorship and authen-
ticity, and (2) interpretation. The study now proposed in-
volves the investigation of these literary and theological
problems in order to determine (1) to what extent the pas-
sage under consideration may be attributed to the prophet
and how much must be ascribed to one or more editors, (2) the
relation between this section of the book bearing the name
of Ezekiel and the balance of the book, (3) the relation of
this section to the P, H and D codes of the Pentateuch, and
(4) the relevance of the passage for modern faith, life and
theology.

Resumé

The Book of Ezekiel, according to tradition, is the com-
position of the prophet of the Babylonian exile who was trans-
ported from Jerusalem in 597 B. C. to an exilic community at
Tel Abib. There he was called to serve as a prophet among
his fellow exiles five years after his deportation. During
the first five or six years of his ministry his message was

basically one of doom as he declared that the judgement of God rested on the people of Judah and Jerusalem because they had forsaken God. After the fall of Jerusalem in 586, he began to proclaim a message of hope or restoration. Twenty years after his call as a prophet he was granted a vision of the ideal and restored community and its worship which is now imbedded in the closing nine chapters of the book.

This picture of the book and the prophet behind it has been challenged on several counts. Certain scholars are convinced that every prophet was a poet and uttered only pessimistic oracles of doom. On the basis of this presupposition the prophet is responsible for merely 150-170 verses of the entire book, none of which are found in the final nine chapters. (Proof of this contention is yet to be presented.) On the other hand, the quality of the poetry in the book has been given diverse reviews, some scholars being convinced that the prophet had no poetic talent whatever. It is highly probable, since poetry was exceedingly common in ancient Israel, that the prophet may have utilized existing verse from the pen of other writers, adapting it to his own purpose.

Other scholars have asserted that the book could not have been written or delivered by a prophet of the exile, because the prophet seems to have had a message intended for the citizens of Jerusalem. Further, the Babylonian setting requires that the prophet be endowed with the power of clairvoyance. These objections have been set aside very effectively by the observation that they rest on an inadequate under-

standing of the nature of revelatory speech and presume that there could be no form of communication between Jerusalem and the exilic community.

The problem of Aramaisms imbedded in the book has also been advanced to challenge the traditional date and setting. Howie argues that this problem has been overstressed, and that, far from proving a late date for the book, the Aramaisms actually serve to reinforce the traditional views.

The portrait of the prophet emerging from the first thirty-nine chapters of the book is of a remarkable, but not unbelievable, person. He was an ecstatic visionary prophet of the exile who belonged to a priestly family. His behavior seemed strange even to his contemporaries; yet they sought his counsel and recognized him as an artist both with words and ideas and with musical instruments. Such an individual would have interest in the temple and the worship of God, a broad vocabulary, and a knowledge of Israel's history and literature.

The book was never viewed as a pseudepigraph, although it may have been subjected to a final editing long after the death of the prophet. That the text of the entire book of Ezekiel is corrupt has been recognized by all scholars; the observation is equally valid for 40-48. There are significant variances between the Septuagint and the Hebrew; the Septuagint appears to be a careful translation of a text other than the present Hebrew. Several sections, notably in 40-48, may be rearranged to form a new sequence of topics which

appear to be quite defensible. These considerations converge
to suggest that the text has suffered greatly in transmission.

Certain scholars have attempted to discern which sections
of 40-48 may be attributed to the prophet and which must be
denied him. The strongest argument for the deletions is that
those passages which do not fit with the introductory form-
ulae in 40:1-4 and 44:1-5 are secondary. In these sections
the prophet is told to look, listen and think, and then de-
clare the result to the whole house of Israel.

Johannes Lindblom has recently defined the concept of
the literary vision which helps one gain an appreciation of
the content of these chapters. A literary vision is a com-
position by a prophet written after he has had time to reflect
on the content and significance, embodying, therefore, both
the actual visionary experience and his own interpretation
based on his imagination and reflection.

Childs has presented another useful tool to aid in com-
prehending the significance of the chapters as he defines the
category of the broken myth. The biblical writer, he con-
tends, broke, but did not destroy, an existing myth. Rather,
he recast the myth into a new form and used it in an entirely
new way to portray a vision of the future in terms of the
ancient past.

These two literary categories, which have not figured
importantly in previous discussions of Ezekiel 40-48, lend
to the section a new dimension of unity which has not been
recognized, and they aid us in discerning the significance

of the chapters.

The prophet sets forth a new arrangement of the tribes in the restored land. The region now known as Trans-Jordan is forfeited as the tribes take up their abode in the land to the west of the Jordan. The tribal arrangements, closely following that in the Samaritan Book of Joshua, shuffles the tribes in such a manner that the old national rivalries become an impossibility, and it appears that the center of government and worship is moved northward from Jerusalem to a new site, possibly Shechem. The capital is the focal point, together with the temple, of the restored land. From the temple there flows a river to the south-east, imparting to the land a fertility resembling that of Paradise.

The temple itself is described in great detail and seems to be based on features common to the temples of Solomon and Zerubbabel. The interest which the prophet shows in the details of the temple construction lead one to several conclusions. First, it appears that he was familiar with one of the existing structures. It is possible that the temple was in need of repair at the time of the composition of the sketch, a condition which did obtain at the time of the exile. Further, any deletions by the author would appear to be deliberate. It is recognized that the prophet deletes all reference to the Day of Atonement, the High Priest, and the Ark of the Covenant. It is known that the ark disappeared near the time of the fall of Jerusalem and that Ezekiel's elder contemporary, Jeremiah, had indicated that in the future the ark would not

be rebuilt nor even missed.

The altar of Ezekiel appears to be quite similar to that designed by Solomon--so similar that many scholars are convinced that Ezekiel's description is of Solomon's altar. The prophet indicates that the altar he has in mind should be approached by steps, clearly in opposition to the provisions of the Book of the Covenant (JE).

All these considerations suggest that the prophet appears quite independent in his use of traditions, that the sketch he has designed should be considered as an ideal, not as a blueprint for the immediate future. Further it would suggest that the prophet did not consider the Pentateuchal codes available to him as being binding for his purposes. If this be true, perhaps the Torah experienced some editorial revision both before and after the exile; however this revision in no way proves that the Torah or its parts are to be viewed as a post-exilic composition.

The authenticity of the concluding nine chapters has been denied, as noted above, on the basis of the hypothesis that the genuine Ezekiel was a poetic prophet of doom. This hypothesis is not proven. Sandmel argues that the calendar indicates that these chapters are from an era later than that of the first thirty-nine. This contention assumes that the prophet was dependent on a known calendar of post-exilic composition. It is equally plausible that the post-exilic calendar to which Sandmel alludes is based on Ezekiel, or that the calendar in question may be older than Sandmel admits.

Berry has attacked the problem from the standpoint of
the vocabulary employed in the two divisions of the book;
his evidence, however, when examined critically, is found to
be totally inconclusive. The attempt to drive a wedge be-
tween the first thirty-nine chapters of the book and the
remaining nine is futile; the attempt rests on invalid pre-
suppositions.

Chapters 40-42 and 47-48 seem quite well-planned and
consistent within themselves. The remainder of the chapters
contain intertwined aspects of cultic regulations which could
be rearranged with great ease. Unfortunately, no large-
scale reconstruction seems to satisfy anyone but its designer.
Perhaps the problem of entangled traditions is best under-
stood as being inherent in a brief sketch of a broad topic.

The relation between Ezekiel and the Pentateuchal codes
has long been debated. While some scholars are convinced
Ezekiel was familiar with H and/or P, as well as JE and D,
others believe that H and/or P are post-exilic compositions
not available to the prophet.

Ezekiel speaks of the several sacrifices defined in the
Pentateuch as well-known realities; he gives no detail con-
cerning the manner in which they are to be handled, except
to specify that the tasks once handled by foreigners are now
to be done by the Levites. The details which are desired are
given in H and P. Ezekiel has no Day of Atonement on the
tenth day of the seventh month as does H; this is in keeping
with his failure to include any reference to the ark of the

covenant and the high priest. There is reason to suspect
that the prophet deliberately eliminated the high priest to
end the lust for power among the priests, assigning it rather
to the prince. It will be recalled that the unique function
of the high priest concerned his actions near the ark on the
Day of Atonement. With the ark missing, there was no need
for either high priest or Day of Atonement. On the other
hand, the prophet does include within his symmetrical ar-
rangement of the calendar two days of atonement for cleans-
ing the temple.

It is impossible to prove conclusively the precise re-
lation between Ezekiel and the Pentateuchal codes. It appears
from this study that the codes in existence at the time of
Ezekiel were not binding in their authority regarding details.
The view held by this writer is in agreement with Procksch,
that Ezekiel was familiar with a pre-exilic version of H and
P as well as JE and D. The relation between these pre-
exilic versions of the codes and the Torah which we now
possess involves a study beyond the scope of this paper.

CHAPTER II

THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL

A General Survey of Its Content

The question of the authorship and authenticity of chapters 40-48 is, in part, based on its relation to the first thirty-nine chapters. It is therefore necessary to review briefly the content of the entire book and the conflicting views of biblical scholars.

The broad outlines of the book of Ezekiel are clearly discernible. Chapters 1-24, which speak of the call of the prophet and the impending doom of Jerusalem, date between 592 B. C. and 587 B. C. The major theme of the second half of the book (25-48) is restoration and generally bears dates following 587 B. C.[1] Chapters 40-48 deal with worship in the restored community and the geographical distribution of the tribes. Chapters 33-39 are a collection of oracles related to the general theme of restoration.

The basic message of the book is also easily summarized. The prophet is called by God (1-3) to proclaim that Jerusalem will be overthrown and her inhabitants taken into captivity as a punishment for the wickedness rampant in the city (4-11). The judgment is determined by Yahweh who withdraws His glory

---

[1]Chaps. 25-32 could also be considered an appendix to 1-24. This section of judgment of the nations bears some early dates.

(<u>kabod</u> <u>Yahweh</u>) from the temple and the city as a prelude to
the final judgment. Thus, just as Jeremiah had insisted that
the temple in itself was no basis for assurance (Jer. 7:1-14),
Ezekiel now proclaims that the presence of God is not con-
fined to that temple; God is neither a local nor a tribal de-
ity whose presence is restricted statically to a given city
or temple. There can be no advantage for those who remain in
the land over those who have gone into exile (11).

The exile is not averted by the pious platitudes of
false prophets and the magic charms employed by certain citi-
zens (12-13), but will come because the people of Israel have
gone astray and are being deceived (14). Israel is a vine
which Yahweh planted or a female foundling that Yahweh loved,
reared and married (15-24). The vine has proved fruitless
and the bride, faithless. The unfaithfulness was essentially
religious but has political repercussions; Israel is under
the judgment of God.[2] One ray of hope penetrating the gloom
of this picture is the doctrine of individual responsibility:
children must not suffer for the sins of their parents. Yet
even here the prophet stresses that the judgment is a "must"
and there is need for general repentance on the part of all
the people.

The prophet insists that the restoration set forth at

_____

[2]In the book of Ezekiel, the term <u>Israel</u> usually refers
to Judah or both Judah and Israel, and never applies to the
northern tribes exclusively. Cf. the study by John Battersby
Harford, <u>Studies in the Book of Ezekiel</u> (Cambridge: at the
University Press, 1935), pp. 31-32; 93-101.

length as a hope in the latter half of the book finds its
basis not in the worthiness of Israel, nor even in the love
of God, but rather in the dignity of God who acts for the
sake of His Name.[3] The restoration from captivity is compared
to a resurrection from the dead (37).[4] The prophet is given
the duty to prepare God's people for the events to follow.

The judgment of Jerusalem, which took the form of polit-
ical exile, began with the departure of the kabod Yahweh from
the sanctuary in Jerusalem. The restoration of the people to
the land is completed by the return of the kabod Yahweh to
the restored temple (40-48). This concept, as well as the
recurrent phrases, "The hand of the LORD was upon me" and
"The Word of the LORD came to me," and the system of dating
employed throughout the book of Ezekiel impart the impression
of unity.[5]

---

[3]Cf. Ezek. 36. This idea is also mentioned in Ezek. 20:
9,14,22.

[4]But cf. J. Grassi, "Ezekiel XXXVII 1-14 and the New Test-
ament," New Testament Studies, XI (1965), 162-164. On p. 162
he states, "The original sense of the passage is commonly ex-
plained as referring to the regeneration of a new Israel,
following the exile. However, the rabbinic commentaries in-
terpreted it as a prophecy of the final resurrection in the
messianic era. It was read in this sense during the Passover.
A number of the early Christian Fathers explained the passage
in the same manner. We wish to suggest here that there is
evidence that the vision of the resurrection of Israel in
Ezek. xxxvii was close in the background of Matthew and John
as they tried to teach that the resurrection of Jesus opened
up the messianic era, whose great sign was the resurrection
of the dead."

[5]These characteristics of the book could be assigned to
a later redactor. The phrase, "The Word of the LORD came to
me," is used fifty-one times in chaps. 1-39 and never in

From the first thirty-nine chapters of the book of Ezekiel
we gain the impression of an ecstatic visionary prophet of the
Babylonian exile who belonged to a priestly family (1-3); a
man whose behavior was considered strange (24:15-27), whose
counsel and guidance, nevertheless, was respected by the elders
of Israel (8:1; 20:1), and who was recognized as an artist both
with words and musical instruments (20:49; 33:30-32). These
features constitute a portrait of a truly outstanding man of
many talents.

The Setting

Certain scholars feel compelled to shift the setting of
the prophet from Babylon to Palestine, in whole or in part.[6]

40-48. The phrase, "The hand of the LORD was upon me," is
used six times: in the context of the call to preach (1:3);
when the prophet is given the scroll to eat, symbolizing his
reception of a message to proclaim (3:14); when the prophet
in a vision beholds the wickedness of Jerusalem (8:1); when,
after the fall of the city, the prophet's tongue is free to
speak (33:23); in the vision of the restoration of Israel in
the form of a resurrection of the dead (37:1); and in the
vision of the restored community (40:1). These features, to-
gether with the "prophetic 'Lehrhaus'" in 8:1 and 20:1, and
the "auto-dramatic element," lead W. Zimmerli, in "The Spe-
cial Form and Traditio-Historical Character of Ezekiel's
Prophecy," Vetus Testamentum, XV (October 1965), 515-527, to
connect Ezekiel with the pre-classical prophets. (Hereafter
Vetus Testamentum shall be referred to as VT.

[6]Carl Gordon Howie, The Date and Composition of Ezekiel
(Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1950), lists
(pp. 6-8) eight problems which prompt this view: "(1) The
prophet's commission was to the House of Israel . . . ; (2)
The prophet . . . actually addressed the people . . . face
to face . . . ; (3) The prophecies . . . would have been
completely irrelevant for the exiles at Tel-Abib . . . ;
(4) Several verbal references imply that Ezekiel was actually
in Jerusalem . . . ; (5) The prophet's intimate, first hand

Matthews[7] and Harford,[8] following Herntrich,[9] suggest that
the visions, dates and Babylonian setting are all from the
hand of the editor and that the real Ezekiel functioned in
Palestine during the period between 598 and 587. Matthews
also accepts a second phase of the prophet's activity lasting
to 570 but is uncertain of the locale of the prophet during
this second period.[10] Bertholet,[11] Auvray[12] and Van den
Born[13] hold that the prophet's ministry was in Palestine un-
til 586 and in Babylon thereafter. Snaith[14] and Oesterley
and Robinson[15] believe that the prophet began his ministry

---

knowledge of conditions in and about Jerusalem [indicates]
he was a part of the life of the city . . . ; (6) Acceptance
of a Palestinian locale would eliminate the necessity for
assuming the gift of second sight. . . ; (7) The symbolic
actions of Ezekiel would be completely meaningless in Babylon
. . . ; (8) Babylonian elements [in the prophecy] can easily
be explained [as] the work of one or more Babylonian redactors."

[7]I. G. Matthews, Ezekiel, An American Commentary on the
Old Testament (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication So-
ciety, 1939), pp. 17-18.

[8]Harford, pp. 77-101.

[9]Volkmar Herntrich, Ezechielprobleme (Giessen: Alfred A.
Töpelmann, 1933), pp. 73-130. Cf. Howie, pp. 10-11.

[10]Matthews, pp. 18-23.

[11]Cited in Howie, p. 11.

[12]Cited in Ibid., pp. 11-12.

[13]Cited in Ibid., p. 12.

[14]Norman H. Snaith, "The Dates in Ezekiel," Expository
Times, LIX (1947-48), 315-316.

[15]William Oscar Emil Oesterley and Theodore H. Robinson,
An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament (London:
Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1934), pp.
328-329.

in 608-602 B. C. in Palestine and was carried away in the exile of 598. Curt Kuhl also favors a dual setting, the Babylonian ministry beginning after the prophet's escape from Jerusalem to the golah where he experienced a second call to prophesy.[16] Fisher suggests that the prophet went with the exile in 598 to Babylon, returned to Palestine for the original part of his ministry, and then returned to Babylon after the fall of Jerusalem.[17]

A more radical proposal is set forth by James Smith. He suggests that the prophet Ezekiel functioned during the reign of Manasseh as a prophet of the northern kingdom, and that the book was given a Babylonian setting by a later redactor. The smitten city, Smith believes, is Samaria, not Jerusalem. To accomplish this reconstruction he finds evidence of three dating schemes in the book.[18]

G. R. Berry[19] is convinced that the prophet lived in Jerusalem and that the oracles which have "the true prophetic tone" are found only in chapters 1-24;[20] since Ezekiel was

_____

[16]Curt Kuhl, The Old Testament, Its Origins and Composition (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1961), pp. 193-201.

[17]Cited in Howie, p. 12.

[18]James Smith, The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel (London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1931), pp. 15-21.

[19]George Ricker Berry, "The Composition of the Book of Ezekiel," Journal of Biblical Literature, LVIII (1939), 163-175.

[20]Moses Buttenwieser, "The Date and Character of Ezekiel's Prophecies," Hebrew Union College Annual, VII (1930), 1-18, believes, on the other hand, that "the entire first part of

a prophet of doom, the legal portions of the book are not appropriate. The Babylonian setting was imposed by an editor in the third century to give the prophet the image of an outstanding man in order to justify the Jerusalem cult in a polemic against the Samaritans. This view is refuted by Gaster[21] and Spiegel[22] who point out that the Samaritans express less opposition to Ezekiel than to the other prophets and conclude that the message of Ezekiel, far from being available for use against the Samaritans, tends to be somewhat sympathetic to their cause. There will be opportunity to return to this question.

Torrey goes a step further. Operating on the presuppositions that Josiah's reform was a permanent success without relapses and that there was no Babylonian exile worthy of mention, he solves the problem of Ezekiel by making the book an historical novel, composed around 230 B. C., to depict the times of King Manasseh. A later editor gave the book its Babylonian setting.[23]

---

his book, that is, chap. 1-31, are not real prophecies but are only disguised as such--they are, without exception, vaticinia post eventum" and were written sometime after 586 as a preface or introduction to chaps. 40-48 which are the most important part of the book.

[21]Moses Gaster, The Samaritans--Their History, Doctrines and Literature (London: Oxford University Press, 1925), pp. 1-39.

[22]Shalom Spiegel, "Ezekiel or Pseudo-Ezekiel?" Harvard Theological Review, XXIV (October 1931), 245-321.

[23]Charles Cutler Torrey, Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), pp. 32-64.

Torrey's view is echoed in the writing of Nils Messel[24] who insists that a Palestinian setting makes it easy to understand how the prophet's message reached Jerusalem. In adopting this thesis, he disregards all Babylonian allusions in the book and assumes that the prophet totally ignored the divine judgment of 598. The golah, to whom the prophet delivered his message, were the people who had returned from exile.[25] The years mentioned in Ezekiel 4:4-6 are to be taken literally; adding the 390 years for the northern kingdom and the round figure of 40 years for the southern kingdom, he arrives at an approximate date for the prophet's activity as shortly before the time of Alexander.

In a similar way Laurence Browne suggests that it would be interesting to take Ezekiel 4:4-6 as "the first certain indication of the date of the book and see what happens."[26] What happens is that Browne determines the date for Ezekiel's prophecy by subtracting 254 years from the dates given in the text and substitutes the name of Alexander for Nebuchadnezzar. The article, however, is brief and fails to support the proposal with valid evidence.

George Dahl insists that the Daniel mentioned by Ezekiel

---

[24]Nils Messel, Ezekielfragen (Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1945), pp. 21-25.

[25]This fact scarcely justifies the elimination of all references to a Babylonian setting merely to justify a late date for the book.

[26]Laurence E. Browne, Ezekiel and Alexander (London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1952), pp. 1-34.

(14:14) was the biblical hero and concludes that Ezekiel is later than the book of Daniel. The Aramaisms in the book and the problem of clairvoyance are regarded as further indications of the later date.[27] On the other hand, Howie concludes that the problem of Aramaisms has been exaggerated and insists that this linguistic feature serves as evidence for the traditional date and locale of the prophet's ministry.[28]

Lindblom, in his rather exhaustive study of prophecy in Israel, points out that the thesis that Ezekiel worked in Palestine and delivered his message personally to the residents of Judah depends on

> an inadequate conception of the nature of revelatory
> speech. What is a revelatory speech? It is a speech
> based on a revelation given to the prophet in a mental
> state of high inspiration or even ecstasy. . . . it
> comes in a compelling manner; it drives the prophet to
> proclaim what he has received. The content of a revel-
> atory speech was not necessarily addressed to those who
> were actually listening to the prophet when it was ut-
> tered. Usually, of course, it was addressed to the pro-
> phet's immediate audience. . . . But the oracles against
> the foreign nations, for instance, of which there are
> many, prove that what a prophet said might apply directly
> to those who were not present to hear it. . . . Thus,
> he [the prophet] was to a great extent independent of
> his audience; and it does not follow that, because Ezek-
> iel's words and actions applied to the inhabitants of
> Jerusalem rather than to the exiles in Babylon, they
> must have been uttered in Palestine. It would also be
> noticed that the prophecies about Jerusalem and the
> Jews in Palestine were often applicable to the exiles.
> We must, moreover, allow for the possibility that some
> of Ezekiel's revelations were sent to Jerusalem and
> Judea as messages from the exiled prophet. . . . It is

---

[27]George Dahl, "Crisis in Ezekiel Research," Quantulacum-que. Edited by Robert P. Casey, Silva Lake and Agnes K. Lake (London: Christophers, 1937), pp. 265-284.

[28]Howie, p. 68.

reasonable to suppose that a deputation may have come from Jerusalem to seek an oracle from the well-known prophet.[29]

The traditional setting is well attested and inconclusively challenged. Since the book was never viewed as a pseud-epigraph, there is every reason to agree with the judgment of G. W. Anderson that "the various post-exilic dates proposed are inherently improbable."[30]

The Style

In 1924 Gustav Hölscher complained, "Fast an allen prophetischen Büchern des Kanons hatte man längst das Messer der Kritik gelegt, nur Hesekiel blieb unberührt."[31] Hölscher is convinced that only the visions, some dates, and the poetic passages of doom were from the original Ezekiel. The balance from the hand of the editor was so voluminous that the book is a veritable pseudepigraph.[32]

Millar Burrows goes further: "Ezekiel is a late pseudepigraphon, therefore, or its origin and history must have been somewhat as Hölscher supposes, though the date to which

---

[29] Johannes Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), pp. 261-262.

[30] George Wishart Anderson, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., Ltd., 1959), pp. 138-139. Cf. also infra, p. 37.

[31] Gustav Hölscher, Hesekiel, Der Dichter und das Buch (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1924), p. 1. Although his study already extended over a ten-year period, he had no doubts that his analysis would be found to be incorrect in many cases, and he anticipated correction in the years to come. Ibid., p. 4.

[32] Ibid., pp. 26, 40, 44.

the present investigation points is much later than that to
which Hölscher assigns the principal redaction."[33]

H. Knight gives strong approval to Hölscher's method
and stresses the importance of distinguishing between

> the prose of the redactor with its Aramaisms and un-
> couthness, and the spontaneously poetic speech and rich
> imagery of the prophet. . . . This poetic quality of his
> mind connects him with Semitic prophecy in its original
> and distinctive form, namely, the production of short,
> inspired, poetic oracles rather than of logical didac-
> tic discourse.[34]

He goes on to say:

> Try as we will these antithetic personalitites cannot be
> harmonized or blended in a consistent and convincing
> psychological portrait. They must therefore point to a
> duality or plurality of authorship. Hence the conclu-
> sion which is the outcome of modern criticism, based
> upon historical and philological research, is strongly
> reinforced by an inquiry which takes its point of depar-
> ture in the psychology of religion.[35]

Van Selms believes that "Ezekiel and also every legiti-
mate prophet must be a poet who brings out his prophecy in
poetic form."[36]

---

[33]Millar Burrows, as cited in William A. Irwin, The Prob-
lem of Ezekiel: An Inductive Study (Chicago: University of
Chicago Press, 1943), p. 14. Hölscher had acknowledged the
Babylonian setting in a pre-Maccabean era. Cf. Herbert Gordon
May, "The Book of Ezekiel," Interpreter's Bible, VI (1956), 43.

[34]Harold Knight, "The Personality of Ezekiel: Priest or
Prophet?" Expository Times, LIX (1947-48), 117-118. As con-
tended by Hölscher, Knight believes Ezekiel was a poetic pro-
phet of lamentation and woe who functioned in Jerusalem. An
exilic school of priestly writers who were concerned with
"the future development of the national institutional religi-
on" gave the book the exilic setting.

[35]Ibid., p. 120. Cf. also, p. 117.

[36]A. van Selms, "Literary Criticism of Ezekiel as a The-
ological Problem," OTWSA (1961), pp. 24-37, as summarized by

Irwin's method, which consists of a preliminary study
of the textual apparatus, followed by a meticulous literary
comparison and analysis, leads him to conclude:

> One of the prime elements in the style criterion is
> that of metrical form, especially valuable as it is in
> its indication of the limits of the oracles. . . . [Our
> study has shown] that all the oracles of Ezekiel are in
> poetic form. . . . Identification of the poetic original
> is frequently beset with difficulty, owing to the
> state of the text. Further, there is a small but sig-
> nificant body of spurious poetry.[37]

The thesis that Ezekiel spoke only poetic oracles of

doom is regarded by Hylmö as an unproved assumption which has

not been demonstrated.[38] In effect, he raises the same ob-

jections to Irwin's view which the latter expresses against

Auvray and van den Born:

> They have advanced no cogent reasons for their deletions
> from the text; still worse, they have not argued, but
> have merely assumed, the originality of the remainder.
> They have given us an illustration of the method that
> is far too frequent in Old Testament criticism, that of
> presenting a plausible story as final evidence in a
> case, when in reality it is not evidence at all.[39]

F. C. Fensham in IZFGB, IX (1962-63), 409. Bernhard W. Ander-
son concurs in Understanding the Old Testament (Englewood
Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), p. 362. Lind-
blom, p. 2, disagrees completely: "In the experience of in-
spiration and the feeling of necessity and constraint there
is a kinship between the prophet and the poet. The prophet
. . . is not in himself a poet; but from a psychological point
of view there is a great similarity between the two types."

[37]Irwin, pp. 279-280.

[38]Gunnar Efraim Hylmö, Gamla Testamentets Litteratur-
historia (Lund: G. W. K. Gleerups Förlag, 1938), p. 262.
"Tva obevisade antagonden, nameligin att Hesekiel's egna ut-
sagor endast varit domsutsagor och at han alltid skrivit
sina utsagor på vers."

[39]Irwin, "Ezekiel Research Since 1943," VT, III (1953),
59.

While the quality of Ezekiel's poetry is recognized by
B. W. Anderson,[40] Spiegel,[41] and Lindblom,[42] Kuhl contends
that Ezekiel merely borrowed existing poetry, phrases and
fables which he revised to suit his own purposes.[43] Sandmel
also has reservations. In speaking of Ezekiel's style he
writes,

> Another problem is that, unlike ordinary prose, which
> is easier to understand than poetry, Ezekiel's prose is
> more difficult than the poetry of the earlier prophets;
> we miss in it the simple parallelism which, in the poetic
> prophecies, gives clarity to the writer's intention,
> even in the obscure verses. If Ezekiel was a poet at
> all, he was one in a minor way only. There is a certain
> grandeur in some of the visions, but it is the grandeur
> of content and not of style or expression.[44]

Bewer is more emphatic regarding Ezekiel's style:

> Ezekiel's style shows no distinction. He was prosaic
> even when he wrote poetry. Not that he lacked imagin-
> ation; he delighted in allegories and symbolic expres-
> sions . . . and he could visualize things and situations
> sharply, but he had no poetic talent.[45]

Hölscher and Irwin have been somewhat successful in dis-
tinguishing the prose from the poetry, but they have given no
cogent reason for confidently believing that the poetry is

---

[40] Bernhard W. Anderson, p. 367.

[41] Spiegel, p. 249.

[42] Lindblom, p. 263.

[43] Kuhl, p. 196.

[44] Solomon Sandmel, The Hebrew Scriptures—An Introduction
to Their Literature and Religious Ideas (New York: Alfred A.
Knoph, 1963), p. 153.

[45] Julius August Bewer, The Literature of the Old Testa-
ment (Third Edition; New York: Columbia University Press,
1962), p. 198.

authentic. The _qinah_ meter which Irwin recognizes in the
oracles of Ezekiel is employed in numerous other texts. Ir-
win contends that chapter 15 contains both genuine oracle and
spurious commentary.[46] He disagrees with Gordis who calls
the commentary (verses 6-8) "expected" and Howie who finds it
logical, implying that these verses are an extension or ex-
position of the oracle.[47] The truth probably lies between
the views of these men. It could be suggested that the com-
mentary is tangentially related to the oracle, but this by no
means proves Irwin's charge that the commentary is spurious.
It seems more plausible to assume, since the prophet did on
numerous occasions avail himself of extant literary materi-
als,[48] and since poetry was exceedingly common at the time
of Ezekiel,[49] and since the poetry imbedded in the book is

---

[46] Irwin, _Problem of Ezekiel_, p. 36: "The unity of chap-
ter 15 may be dismissed as out of reasonable consideration.
It contains an oracle in verses 1-5 and a spurious commentary
in verses 6-8. . . . As the study of the book progresses,
probability will harden into full certainty that verses 1-5
are the genuine utterances of the prophet Ezekiel, and on
this prospective certitude we advance."

[47] Irwin, "Ezekiel Research Since 1943," p. 65.

[48] James Muilenburg, "Ezekiel," _Peake's Commentary on the
Bible_, edited by H. H. Rowley and Matthew Black (Edinburgh:
Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962), p. 569, calls the prophet "the
heir to a long literary tradition of which he avails himself
. . . . he uses ancient myths . . . . . he has memories of old
folk tales (esp. chs. 16, 23), which he recasts and elaborates
to suit his theological design."

[49] Clyde T. Francisco, "The Importance of Literary Analysis
in Old Testament Interpretation," _Review and Expositor_, XLIV
(October 1947), p. 419, observes that the variety of words
for "song" in Hebrew literature indicates that poetry was a
very common literary form in ancient Israel.

of widely divergent character or quality, that the prophet
borrowed much, and possibly most, of the poetry in the book.
Nevertheless, whether the prophet composed or borrowed the
poetry, it may justly be ascribed to him; it is in his book
alone that it has been preserved.

Conclusions

There appears to be no compelling reason to reject the
book of Ezekiel or to view the book as a late pseudepigraph;
sufficient internal and external evidence supports the claim
of the book that its contents (particularly chapters 1-39)
stem from the prophet of the golah. This does not say that
the book as we now have it was entirely the result of Ezekiel's
literary activity. Rowley may be correct when he suggests
that "for the editing of the book we are thus brought down
to the fifth or fourth century B. C. But here, as in other
books, the editor worked with sources containing oracles of
the prophet, and the book was not thought of as a pseud-
epigraph."[50]

The portrait of the prophet found in the first thirty-
nine chapters of the book[51] can therefore also be regarded
as reliable. From a priest it would be quite reasonable to
expect an expression of concern for cultic transgressions

---

[50]H[arold] H[enry] Rowley, The Growth of the Old Testa-
ment (London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1961), p. 107.

[51]Supra, p. 4.

as is found in chapters 8-11. Visionary and ecstatic revel-

ations are not unbelievable in a man whose behavior and exper-

iences were deemed unusual by his contemporaries. A man held

in such high regard that he was consulted by the elders of

his people can be expected to speak words of wisdom reflect-

ing a thorough grasp of both past history and the current

situation. Such a man would employ ideas and literary forms

borrowed from previous generations. This literary dependence

may reasonably be expected from a man who was considered an

artist with words and could manifest itself in broad vocab-

ulary and varied style.

G. W. Anderson states the case well when he writes:

When all is said, the impressive unity of the book re-
mains. Skinner's assertion that the book bears "the
stamp of a single mind in its phraseology, its imagery,
and its mode of thought," needs little, if any, quali-
fication. The diversity of interest, to which refer-
ence has been made . . . bears witness to a remarkable,
but not an incredible, personality.[52]

---

[52]G. W. Anderson, p. 137.

CHAPTER III

A SURVEY OF CHAPTERS 40-48

Before considering the problem of authorship and authenticity of chapters 40-48, it seems desirable to review the content of this section of the book in order to determine, if possible, any factor or factors that may have guided the author and/or editors in compiling the several themes comprising the whole. These themes (geography, temple, altar and calendar) will all be discussed before any general conclusions are drawn. The discussion of the cultic personnel (prince, priests and Levites) is deferred to chapter four.

While the prophet focused his attention first on the temple, which, we may assume, he considered the most important aspect of this section, it may serve the purpose of this study better to begin with the broader subject of the geography of the land as a whole.

Ezekiel's Geography

Ezekiel conceives of the restored Israel as comprising twelve tribes dwelling in the land between the Mediterranean Sea and the Jordan River (47:13-48:35).[1]

The text presents certain difficulties. In verse 47:13 גה should be replaced by זה; the definite article should be

_____

[1]Numbers 34:2-12 and Joshua 15:1-4 allot this space to nine and one-half tribes.

expected with גבול; and the הגבל in the final phrase should
be repointed as a dual.[2]   One might transpose verse 13, be-
ginning with זה גבול, and all of verse 14 to the place be-
tween verses 20-21.[3] If this arrangement be accepted, the
text in translation reads:

> (13) Thus says the Lord God, (15) "This is the border
> of the land to the north side, from the Great Sea (by)
> way of Hethlon to the going in to Hamath, (passing by)
> Zeday, (16) Berothah, (and) Sibraim which lie on the
> border between Damascus and Hamath, (and proceeding un-
> to) Hazor-haticon which is on the border of Harran.
> (17) There is a border from the sea to Hazer-enon, the
> north border of Damascus and the border of Hamath, and
> it is your north side."[4]

---

[2]In agreement with some MSS, LXX, Targums, and Crawford
Howell Toy, The Book of Ezekiel: Critical Edition of the Heb-
rew Text, with notes (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1899), p. 114;
Hartmuth Gese, Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel, Kap. 40-
48, Traditionsgeschictlich Untersucht (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr,
1957), p. 95; Georg Fohrer, "Die Glossen im Buche Ezechiel,"
Zeitschrift fur alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, LXIII (1951),
p. 41 [Publication hereafter referred to as ZAW], suggests
that יוסף הגבל is a marginal or interlinear gloss. All
agree that it is better to repoint it as a dual if it be re-
tained.

[3]Gese, p. 98, has pointed out that the author has the
habit of using a stereotyped introductory and closing phrase
in vv. 15-20. If vv. 13-14 are left in the present setting,
there are two introductory statements regarding the division
of the land and no closing statement. Further, vv. 13-14
speak of the division of the land between the tribes, a mat-
ter which does not begin until v. 21. If vv. 13-14 are trans-
posed, the section opens and closes with the phrase, "These
are the boundaries," and the verses in their new location
serve as a logical introduction to v. 21. It could have been
a marginal note at one time.

[4]Herbert Gordon May, "The Book of Ezekiel," The Inter-
preter's Bible, VI (1965), 329-340, lists tentative identi-
fications which have been made of several of these sites. In
accord with these, this proposal suggests that הדרך חתלן be
understood as the name of a road leading to Hethlon; לבוא חמת
refers to the Orontes river valley leading to Hamath, and
that Zedad, Berothah and Sibraim are border towns between

Thus the northern border begins at some undesignated point
on the Mediterranean Sea and proceeds eastward along the bor-
der between Hamath and Damascus until it reaches Hazar-enan
(47:15-17). The border turns south at Hazar-enan and passes
between Hauran and Damascus, along the Jordan River and the
shore of the Dead Sea until it reaches Tamar (47:18). The
south border proceeds from Tamar by Meribath-kadesh to the
Brook (of Egypt) and on to the Mediterranean Sea (47:19).
The Sea itself constitutes the west border. These borders
generally correspond with those defined in Numbers 34:2-12
and Joshua 15:1-4.[5]

The author, anticipating that the priests and Levites
have only a living space around the temple (48:8-14), or
recalling the same fact from 45:1-5, assigns to Ephraim and
Manasseh a section of land as an inheritance, thus preserving
the idea of twelve tribal portions. He recalls that the land
is given to the sons of Israel in accord with a covenant oath
(47:14). The resident aliens are allotted tracts equally with

---

Damascus and Hamath. The identity of חצר התיכון and
חצר עינון is accepted here as well as the suggestion to
invert חמת and צדרך. Cf. Toy, p. 114 and Gese, pp. 95-96.
Cameron MacKay, "The Integrity of Ezekiel 40-48," Evangeli-
cal Quarterly, XXXII (January-March 1960), 15-24, says:
"This border location eliminates from Israel the land of
Gebalites and Baalbek-Helopolis, the respective homes of
Adonis and Sun worship condemned in ch. 8."

[5]"of Egypt" is interpolated in English translations
from Numbers 34:5 and Joshua 15:4,47. In the LXX, 47:19
reads παρεκτεινον and 48:28 reads κληρονομιας : they, too,
were perplexed.

the native sons of Israel (47:21-23).[6]

Beginning with the northern border, all twelve tribes are assigned tracts of land of equal width extending from the eastern to the western border. The tracts, allotted from north to south are, in order: Dan, Asher, Naphtali, Manasseh, Ephraim, Reuben, and Judah (48:1-7).

Immediately south of the tract assigned to Judah, in the center of the land extending from east to west, there is a tract measuring 25,000 cubits square. A portion, 10,000 cubits by 25,000 cubits, adjacent the tribe of Judah is assigned to the Levites (48:13-14). A segment of equal size adjoining the Levitical allotment is reserved for the Zadokite priests; the temple stands in the midst of this section (48:8-12). The remaining section, measuring 5,000 cubits from north to south and 25,000 cubits from east to west, is designed for the construction of the city and its lands. The city stands 4,500 cubits square with a vacant space of 250 cubits on each side as a border. The remainder of the land, comprising two tracts of equal size, 5,000 by 10,000 cubits, lying one on either side of the city, is dedicated to the production of food for the workers in the city (48:15-20).

---

[6]This division is in general agreement with the Pentateuchal codes, but really goes farther than any of them. George Ricker Berry, "The Authorship of Ezekiel 40-48," Journal of Biblical Literature, XXXIV (1915), 23, notes that full citizenship for sojourners "is not found in P or elsewhere, and is naturally later than P." [Journal hereafter referred to as JBL] A fuller discussion will be given in the section dealing with the relationship of Ezekiel and the codes. Infra, pp. 66-100.

The space to the east and west of the 25,000 cubit square tract is reserved for the prince (48:21-22) on whom falls the responsibility of supplying the state offerings.[7]

South of the princely portion and the holy tract, the tribal division resumes: Benjamin, Simeon, Issachar, Zebulon, and Gad, in order. The eight tracts lying nearest to the central holy square are assigned to the sons of Leah and Rachel, while the more remote districts fall to the sons of the handmaids, three such tracts in the north and one in the south. The semi-desert condition of the southern land does not discriminate against Gad: the river of life flowing out from the temple will impart fertility to all the land.[8]

While most commentators are inclined to view this arrangement as an impossible ideal or as a division that becomes possible only in the millennium, Steinmann insists that the proposed division squares very well with the real country.[9] He further notes that the tribes are rearranged so that Benjamin passes to the south and Judah to the north,

---

[7]The state offerings and the role of the prince will be discussed later (infra, p. 96). D. O. Procksch, "Fuerst und Priester bei Hesekiel," Zeitschrift Für Die at Wissenschaft, LVIII (1941), 110, doubts the authenticity of 45:9-16.

[8]Jean Steinmann, Le Prophète Ezékiel (Paris: Les Editions Du Cerf, 1953), p. 238.

[9]Ibid., p. 233. George Ricker Berry, "The Composition of the Book of Ezekiel," JBL, LVIII (1939), 172, is sure the division is ideal. Gleason Leonard Archer, A Survey of Old Testament Introduction (Chicago: Moody Press, 1964), p. 361, is convinced the description is of a new geography in millennial Israel. If this new division never comes to pass, "we are faced with a portion of Scripture containing false prophecy."

probably in an attempt to stamp out the old provincialism
and national rivalries between the north and the south.[10]

A different listing of the tribes presents itself when
the gates of the city are named. Here the name of Joseph
returns to take the place of Ephraim and Manasseh, and the
name of Levi reasserts itself. The north and south sets of
gates are named in honor of the sons of Leah (compare Ezekiel
48:31,33 and Genesis 35:23). The gates to the west are
given the names of three sons of concubines. The fourth son
of a concubine, Dan, gives his name to one of the east gates
along with Joseph and Benjamin, the sons of Rachel.[11]

The precise location of the city has been the subject
of some disagreement. At no time does the prophet insist
that the city is Jerusalem; his favorite designation is sim-
ply "the city" (הָעִיר). Cameron MacKay believes that the pro-
phet favors Shechem as the new holy city.[12] Douglas is un-
certain whether the city of Jerusalem was moved north, or
whether the prophet anticipated a change in the land, as is

_____

Archer then extends this millennial idea also to the cultic
regulations.

[10]Steinmann, p. 236. Cf. also, Ezek. 37:15-23.

[11]Cf. Gen. 35:25. Dan is a son of Bilhah, Rachel's hand-
maid. Genesis 29 speaks of Jacob's preference of Rachel to
Leah. His partiality to Joseph, Rachel's son, which gave
rise to intense sibling rivalry is stressed in Genesis 37.
In Ezekiel the distinction between the sons of Leah and the
sons of Rachel is maintained.

[12]Cameron MacKay, "Prolegomena to Ezekiel 40-48," Exposi-
tory Times, LVI (1944-45), 292-296.

apparently expected by Zechariah (Zechariah 14:4,8,10).[13]
Steinmann stresses that Ezekiel accepts the destruction of
the past, including the city and its history. The city of
which the prophet speaks is a new city with a new name. The
old city received its name from the god Shelem; the new holy
city receives the name Yahweh shamma, Yahweh is there. This
city is at once sacred and profane. It is holy because Yahweh
is there; it is profane because it is carefully segregated
from the temple.[14]

"There is a river whose streams make glad the city of
God, the holy habitation of the Most High. God is in the
midst of her; she shall not be moved."[15] Of such a river
Ezekiel speaks. Its source was under the threshold of the
temple toward the east (47:1). According to Farmer, the top-
ographical details of the river vision are verifiable, but
the river radically alters the geography of Palestine. Both
the river and the temple whence it flows may be viewed as
focal points of a cosmic salvation; where the river goes, all
things live.[16]

Bewer has suggested that this river "is neither literally

[13]George C. M. Douglas, "Ezekiel's Temple," Expository
Times, XIV (May-June 1903), 427.

[14]Steinmann, p. 239.

[15]Psalm 46:4-5a (RSV). This paper is not concerned with
the precise relation between these references.

[16]William R. Farmer, "The Geography of Ezekiel's River
of Life," Biblical Archeologist, XIX (1956), 17-22.

nor figuratively a blessing for the whole world. The desert and the Dead Sea are impossible in the holy land where Yahweh dwells and where everything is fruitful."[17] Yves Congar thinks that the point of departure for the prophet was the spring of Gihon, which Hezekiah channeled into the city during the siege of Sennacherib. Just as Isaiah "found it easy to pass from the fact of this water which enabled Sion to resist a rigorous siege, to the concept of Yahweh, the only source of Israel's strength," so Ezekiel "transfers the spring from Sion [sic] to the Temple and sees in it a source for the fruitfulness . . . of the Holy Land."[18] Steinmann would also stress the possibility that Ezekiel could have gathered his inspiration from an observation of the irrigation canals in Babylon.[19]

Berry is convinced that Ezekiel's picture of the river is an elaboration of the brief references in Joel 4:18 (3:18 in English translations) and Zechariah 14:8.[20] The latter prophet speaks of a great day of the Lord when Yahweh would fight for His people, when the Mount of Olives would be split and water would flow forth from Jerusalem in a divided stream,

---

[17]Julius August Bewer, The Literature of the Old Testament, Revised by Emil Kraeling (Third edition; New York: Columbia University Press, 1962), p. 197.

[18]Yves M. J. Congar, The Mystery of the Temple, translated by Reginald F. Trevett (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1962), pp. 74-75.

[19]Steinmann, p. 229.

[20]Berry, "Authorship," JBL, p. 23.

"half of them toward the eastern sea, and half of them toward
the western sea: in summer and in winter shall it be." The
words he selects to describe the river are מים חים (living
waters). Joel writes, "all the stream beds of Judah shall
flow with water; and a fountain shall come forth from the
house of the LORD and water the valley of Shittim." Obvi-
ously the reference in Joel is a closer parallel than that
in Zechariah. But the question must be asked whether it is
necessary to go so far afield in search of parallels. For
Ezekiel's contemporary, Jeremiah, also spoke of a river with
trees growing beside it. To these trees he, like the author
of the first Psalm, likened the righteous man. The degree of
relation between Ezekiel and Joel is no greater than that
which exists between Ezekiel and Jeremiah and slightly less
than that between Ezekiel and Psalm 1.[21] The nature of the
relationship in each case is somewhat tangential. It seems
more plausible to posit a direct literary relationship between
Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Psalm 1.

Steinmann calls attention to the relationship which ex-
ists between the river of Ezekiel and the rivers of the gar-
den of Eden. Here four rivers flowed among the trees of the
garden, imparting to it a great fertility, evidenced by lush

---

[21]The only thing in common between Zechariah and Ezekiel
is that they speak of water. From the opening phrase of Psalm
1:3 (והיה כעץ שתול על פלגי מים) Jeremiah deletes פלגי. Psalm
1:3 (ועלהו לא יבול) in Ezekiel is inverted to לא יבול עלהו.
All agree that the trees by the side of the river remain green
and have fruit.

fruit trees and animal life.[22] Perhaps this is best explained

in the manner proposed by Childs. Beginning with several

definitions of the term "myth" he proceeds to show that prim-

itive peoples lacked forms of expression to develop an ade-

quate sense of chronology and time sequence, and thus employed

myth in their cults. The biblical writer, he asserts, "broke,"

"without destroying," the myth, and adapted the mythological

categories to his own purpose, using them as a witness to his

understanding of history. One of the mythological categories

is that of time, of which Childs says,

> It is characteristic of mythical time to conceive of
> primeval time as identical with eschatological time
> (Urzeit = Endzeit). In opposition to modern historical
> thinking which understands the future as growing out of
> the past but never repeating itself, the myth envisages
> the future as a return to the past.[23]

A second mythological category investigated by Childs

is the concept of mythical space. He finds that it has a

"non-homogeneous character," is a "copy of the primeval world

structure which shares the same sacred reality" and under-

stands

> every sign of similarity in the world of reality as an
> indication of identity in essence. Zion and Jerusalem
> share these qualities; Zion is the copy of the heavenly
> reality, Jerusalem is the navel from which the world is
> nourished and Zion is conceived as the copy of the Gar-
> den of Eden (cf. Ezek.)[24]

---

[22]Steinmann, pp. 229, 238.

[23]Brevard S. Childs, Myth and Reality in the Old Testa-
ment (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1960), pp. 73-82.

[24]Ibid., pp. 83-93.

The category of the broken myth seems to afford the best
tool for grasping the significance of these chapters. If
this concept is applied to the geography in general and to
the river in particular, one can conclude that the prophet
was attempting to set forth a picture of the future in ideal
or symbolic terms using forms and figures with which his
readers would be quite familiar. The picture presented is
that God once again dwells amongst His people in the land
which He had promised. Where He is dwelling with His peo-
ple the original purpose of creation, fellowship between man
and God, is fulfilled, and the creation itself becomes a
paradise.

The utopian quality extends also to the arrangement of
the tribes. The shrine, located at an undesignated point,
possibly Shechem, is the central focus of the restored land.
The tribes are arranged in such a manner that they may have
convenient access to the shrine and that the national rivalry
might be dispelled by having segments of both Israel and Ju-
dah on both sides of the shrine. The principles of the first
thirty-nine chapters of Ezekiel which look forward to the re-
union of the nation are in agreement with this tribal re-
arrangement.

Ezekiel is seen to be more similar to Jeremiah than to
the post-exilic prophets, Joel and Zechariah, suggesting that
a late date for the book of Ezekiel, though possible, is hardly
necessary. On the other hand, the traditional exilic date be-
comes quite probable.

The Temple

The land allocated for the construction of the temple
of Ezekiel, a tract five hundred cubits square with a fifty
cubit border (45:2), lay in the midst of the district allotted
to the priests of the sons of Zadok (45:1-5). This temple,
described in detail by Ezekiel, has been interpreted in many
ways. Fairbairn speaks of four basic views: historical-
literal, historical-ideal, Jewish carnal, and Christian spir-
itual.[25] He selects the last-named, suggesting that the
temple represents "a grand complicated symbol of the good God
had in reserve for His Church, especially under the coming
dispensation of the Gospel."[26] Gaebelein notes three modes
of interpretation: (1) the temple as fulfilled in the return
of the remnant from Babylon or the ideal of the Jewish state,
(2) as an imaginary structure, (3) as an allegorical repre-
sentation of the Church. The third mode, in his estimation,
is the weakest of all.[27] He accepts the literal one "which
looks upon these chapters as a prophecy yet unfulfilled and
to be fulfilled when Israel has been restored by the Shepherd
and when His glory is once more manifested in the midst of

---

[25] Patrick Fairbairn, Ezekiel and the Book of His Prophe-
cy--An Exposition (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1855), pp.
432-435.

[26] Ibid., p. 435.

[27] Arno Clemens Gaebelein, The Prophet Ezekiel: An Ana-
lytical Exposition (New York: Publication Office of "Our
Hope," 1918), pp. 271-273.

His people."[28] Unger undertakes a similar analysis and con-
cludes that "Ezekiel's Temple is a literal future sanctuary
to be constructed in Palestine as outlined during the Millen-
ium."[29] [sic] Congar believes that the temple was not an
architectural project but had a prophetic meaning:

> [Ezekiel] foretells the messianic establishment of a
> sphere of purity which will be the place of God's dwell-
> ing and transcend the material existence of Israel and
> the Mosaic institutions.[30]

Beaseley-Murray says,

> The conclusion of Ezekiel's prophecy, therefore, is to
> be regarded as a true prediction of the kingdom of God
> given under the forms with which the prophet was famil-
> iar.[31]

Fuerbringer rejects the idea that it could be literal or
millennial, affirming that it is ideal-prophetic:

> Wir werden später sehen, dass diese ganze Schilderung
> des neuen Tempels nicht buchstäblich aufzufassen ist,
> nicht auf den zweiten Tempel unter Josua und Serubabel
> geht, auch nicht einen im Millenium zu errichtenden
> Tempel, wie die Chiliasten schwärmen, sondern eine
> grosse wunderbare Weissagung in allegorischer Form auf
> den neutestamentlichen Tempel ist, die eine heilige
> christliche Kirche, die aus der Zeit in die Ewigkeit
> übergeht.[32]

There is no need to enumerate additional views regarding

_____

[28] Ibid., p. 273.

[29] Merrill F. Unger, "The Temple Vision of Ezekiel," Bib-
liotheca Sacra, CV (October-December 1948), 423.

[30] Congar, p. 69.

[31] G. R. Beaseley-Murray, New Bible Commentary, edited by
Francis Davidson, A. M. Stibbs, and E. F. Kevan (First edition;
Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1953), p. 664.

[32] Ludwig Ernest Fuerbringer, "Kleine Hesekielstudien," Con-
cordia Theological Monthly, VIII (January-June 1937), 91.

the temple of Ezekiel before determining its form and rela-
tion to the historical temples of Solomon, Zerubbabel and
Herod.

The description of the temple of Ezekiel begins with
chapter 40:5 in which the prophet introduces the reader to a
wall surrounding the bait. This word has been studied, to-
gether with the word miqdash, by Hartmuth Gese, who concludes
that for a proper understanding of chapters 40-48 it is es-
sential for one to distinguish carefully between the temple
proper and the total temple complex. In 40-42, he observes,
the word bait is used to identify both structures. Later
there appears to be a tendency to use miqdash to define the
total complex and bait to refer to the temple building it-
self.[33]

A massive wall about nine feet high and nine feet thick
surrounds the total complex.[34] The wall is pierced by three
gates, one on each side, east, north and south.[35] Each gate

_____

[33]Gese, pp. 126-127.

[34]Ezek. 40:5 speaks of the wall being one reed high and
one reed thick. The reed is defined as six long cubits, ca.
eighteen to twenty-one inches. Cf. Cooke's discussion of the
cubit: George Albert Cooke, A Critical and Exegetical Comment-
ary on the Book of Ezekiel in International Critical Comment-
ary (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1951), pp. 430-431. (Here-
after referred to as ICC.)

[35]The gates have been discussed by Carl Gordon Howie, The
Date and Composition of Ezekiel (Philadelphia: Society of
Biblical Literature, 1950), pp. 43-46, and "The East Gate of
Ezekiel's Temple Enclosure and the Solomonic Gateway of Megid-
do," Bulletin of the American Schools for Oriental Research,
CXVII (1950), 13-19. [Hereafter referred to as BASOR] Cf.
also the diagrams in Cooke, ICC, Figures I-III.

comprises a rather substantial building with a set of seven
steps or stairs which lead to the outer court. Assuming a
comfortable step nine inches in height, the outer court is
about five feet three inches higher than the land surround-
ing the temple complex. The mass of earth enclosed by these
walls could require a retaining wall, but scarcely one nine
feet thick.[36] It may have been prompted by a concern for
symmetry or to symbolize the barrier between the holy and the
profane.

Assuming the five-foot elevation of the outer court
above the surrounding ground, the height from the outer court
to the top of the outer wall is a scant four feet. Thirty
chambers are located, possibly in banks of five, on the east,
north and south sides of the wall, facing the lower pavement
of the outer court. In the corners of the outer court are
large kitchens where the Levites prepare the peace offerings
for the people.

Eight steps lead from the outer court to the gates join-
ing it to the inner court. These gate structures are identi-
cal to those that breached the wall between the outside and
the outer court. It is strange, however, that no mention is
given of a wall separating the inner from the outer court.

---

[36]Pfarrer G. Richter, Der Ezechielische Tempel (Güters-
loh: C. Bertelsmann, 1912), p. 23, suggests that the retain-
ing wall was necessary to hold the weight of the earth be-
hind it. Yet the inner court is eight steps higher than the
outer court, and there is no mention of a supporting or re-
taining wall there. Great stress is laid, however, on the
gates which join the courts.

One could conceive of the inner court being only a terrace considerably higher than the outer court, but then the gate houses become rather meaningless symbols.

Allusions are made to certain structures within the temple complex which are accessible from the inner court (42:1-43:12). These references are so vague that it is necessary to confess with Procksch,

> nur dass bei der architektonischen Anordnung besonders in Kap. 42:1ff, 46:19ff. manches dunkel bleibt, zumal der Text oft verderbt ist, und sich unbedeutende Zusätze wie 40:38-44 finden.[37]

Within the inner court to the west of the altar of burnt offering, the temple proper stands on a platform six cubits, or about nine feet, high, scaled by ten steps. On either side of the door that confronted the priest mounting the steps stand the massive pillars. It is generally agreed that they were free-standing, lofty cressets, but it is rather uncertain what they symbolized.[38] Albright suggests three possibilities. They may have a cosmic, dynastic, or an historical significance.[39] Scott proposes that the names of Jachin and Boaz were actually the first two words of inscriptions on the pillars and suggests the probable nature

---

[37]Procksch, p. 100.

[38]Herbert Gordon May, "The Two Pillars Before the Temple of Solomon," BASOR, LXXXVIII (1942), 19.

[39]William Foxwell Albright, Archeology and the Religion of Israel (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1942), p. 148. By cosmic he means "the reflection of the columns between which the sun rose each morning"; by dynastic, "endurance, continuity"; by historical, "to commemorate the pillar of

of the inscription.[40] In the ancient ceremonial the king

stood by these pillars to make his covenant to serve Yahweh

(2 Kings 23:3).[41]

Behind the lofty pillars are the doors leading into the

temple proper. The nine-foot thick walls of this structure

suggest a fort.[42] Within are three rather large rooms. The

first is a porch or vestibule or narthex. Adjacent the porch

is the holy place, and beyond it, the Most Holy place. The

latter room was a perfect cube, twenty cubits in each dimen-

sion.[43] The nave, or holy place, was twenty by forty cubits,

and the vestibule, twelve by twenty cubits. The nave, the

Most Holy place and the vestibule were panelled and adorned

with alternating carved palm trees and two-faced cherubim.

---

cloud which accompanied the Israelites by day and the pillar
of fire . . . ."

[40]R. B. Y. Scott, "The Pillars Jachin and Boaz," JBL,
LVIII (1939), 148: "On the south pillar - Yakin (Yahweh)
kisse Dawid umamlakto lezavo ad olam - He (Yahweh) will es-
tablish the throne of David and his kingdom to his seed for-
ever. On the north pillar - beoz Yahweh yismah melek - In
the strength of Yahweh shall the king rejoice. Or another,
possible inscription could be translated, 'By thy strength,
O Yahweh, thou didst divide the sea, thou didst crush the
heads of dragons upon the waters.'" For other proposals,
cf. Andre Parrot, The Temple of Jerusalem, translated by
B. E. Hooke (London: S C M Press, 1957), pp. 27-28.

[41]Steinmann, p. 218.

[42]William Foxwell Albright and George Ernest Wright,
"Comments on Professor Garber's Article," JBL, LXXVII (1958),
130.

[43]It may have been elevated above the nave: cf. Parrot,
p. 54. There is no mention of any furniture in this room of
Ezekiel's temple. Presumably the ark was destroyed in 586
B. C.

A small table or altar stood within the nave before the door that led to the Most Holy place.[44]

Ninety side chambers, arranged in three stories with thirty cells per story, surround the main temple building on the north, west and south sides. Wright and Albright suggest that access to these cells was through doors opening to the platform on which the temple itself was mounted.[45] Access to the upper stories was from the cells below. One possible reconstruction of the central structure may be seen in the Westminster Historical Atlas.[46]

Many scholars are convinced that Ezekiel's temple reproduces the basic forms of the temple of Solomon.[47] While Procksch agrees with this position in principle, he feels it necessary to admit the fact that the courts in Ezekiel's description are innovations from those in the Solomonic

---

[44]Berry, "Authorship," JBL, p. 22, suggests that this probably was the incense altar. There is no mention by Ezekiel of any other furniture in the nave.

[45]They reject the proposal that the access to these cells was from within the temple proper. That idea rests on the assumption that the cells were intended as storage vaults for temple treasures and demands that the access be made through the very thick walls. (Albright and Wright, p. 131) They also suggest that the upper stories rest on offsets in the main wall. Gese, p. 185, disagrees.

[46]Westminster Historical Atlas, edited by George Ernest Wright and Floyd V. Filson (Revised edition; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956), p. 48. The picture here is of the Solomonic temple, but the authors of WHA (as it is hereafter referred to) believe that Ezekiel described Solomon's.

[47]Albright, p. 151; Howie, Date and Composition, pp. 43-46; Procksch, p. 100.

temple.[48] Hölscher is convinced that chapters 40-41 are
from the hand of a redactor who presents, not the plan of
Solomon's temple, but that of Zerubbabel which had already
been built. He then goes on to note that a simple copy of
an existing temple would be unnecessary; hence the redactor
presented a picture of the ideal temple but based it gener-
ally on the plan of Zerubbabel.[49] Berry adopts a similar
position, noting, however, that the temple of Solomon had
"actually only one court, while the temple here has two. In
the Old Testament itself there is no account of the courts in
Zerubbabel's temple, in the Maccabean period there were two,
1 Macc. 4:38, 48, etc."[50] Messel answers this objection in
his criticism of Hölscher:

> Erstens war der Vorhof des Salomonischen Tempels von dem
> "grossen Vorhof" (1 Kön 7,9), der Königspalast und Tem-
> pel umfasste, umschlossen; der eigentliche Tempelhof
> heiszt deshalb 1 Kön 6,36 der "innere Vorhof." Zweitens
> setzt der Text von Ez 8f an zwei unangreifbaren Stellen
> (8,16. 9,7) das Vorhandensein von zwei Vorhöfen voraus.
> In 8,16 will Hölscher (s. 71) penimit streichen, kann
> aber keinen anderen Grund angeben als dass Ezechiel ja
> den Salomonischen Tempel, der nur einen Hof hatte, be-
> schreibe.[51]

---

[48]Procksch, p. 100.

[49]Hölscher, pp. 31-32. Joachim Jeremias, Hesekiel Tempel
und Serubbabel Tempel (Zeitschrift fuer Alttestamentliche
Wissenschaft, 1934), p. 112, in contrast, feels, "Die Uberein-
stimmungen zwischen dem Tempelentwurf Hesekiel und dem Neubau
des Tempels nach dem Exil sind so weitgehende, dass alle
Wahrsheinlichkeit dafür spricht, dass der Neubau auf Grund
des Entwurfs, [Ezek. 43:11], errichtet worden ist."

[50]Berry, pp. 32-33.

[51]Nils Messel, Ezekielfragen (Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1945),
p. 127.

Chary also points out that the great court was soon sub-divided to provide a second court (1 Kings 7:12; 2 Kings 21:5; 2 Chronicles 20:5).[52]

The worship structures called by the names of Solomon, Ezekiel, Zerubbabel and Herod, as well as the tabernacle of P, have as common features an inner court with an altar of burnt offering, a Holy Place with an incense altar, and a Most Holy place. Solomon's temple is unique in having ten lavers and ten candlesticks. The ark of the covenant which occupied the Most Holy place in the tabernacle and Solomon's temple is replaced by a simple flat stone in the temple of Zerubbabel. In Herod's temple the Holy of Holies was com-pletely empty. Ezekiel is silent regarding the ark and the cherubim. His temple is unique also in its mention of the enigmatic longer and shorter chambers comprising a building lying to the north and the south of the temple proper (Ezekiel 42:1-12), in the special chambers for the priests (42:13-14; 40:44-46), and in the eight tables for slaughter (40:38-43). The building facing the temple yard on the west side (41:12) seems to have its equal in the temple of Solomon, but regard-ing its function one can only conjecture.

The preceding review indicates that the author presented much detail in regard to the construction of the temple. One could, therefore, suspect that any omissions were deliberate;

_____

[52]Theophane Chary, _Les Prophètes et Le Culte á Partir De L'exil_ (Tournai: Desclee, 1955), p. 9. Cf. also Ezek. 8:16, 9:7.

on the other hand, some of the omissions leave the reader
perplexed regarding both form and function of seemingly im-
portant features of the temple, such as the nature of the
barrier between the inner and the outer courts, the purpose
of the chambers to the north, west and south of the main
temple building, and the ark itself.[53]

Ezekiel's temple shares the common features of the tab-
ernacle and the temples of Solomon and Zerubbabel. If the
sketch of Ezekiel was intended, as Berry and Hölscher believe,
to be a guide for the renovation of an existing building in
a state of disrepair, the most probable dates are either the
exilic age or the late pre-Maccabean era. The latter date,
favored by Berry and Hölscher, would make at least this por-
tion of the book pseudepigraphic. Since this stigma never
attached to the book, and if it had, it is doubtful that the
book could have found acceptance in the canon in view of its
divergence from the Pentateuch, we must conclude with Anderson
that the late dates for the book are inherently improbable.

The position of Ezekiel's temple, as it lies in the midst
of the holy tract assigned to the Zadokite priesthood surrounded
by a holy border within the ideal land arrangement, seems to
carry out this theme. Its structural design, with the great

_____

[53]Ezekiel's failure to mention the ark may be due to its
disappearance shortly before the fall of Jerusalem (cf. 2 Mac-
cabees 2:1-8 for one tradition) or to an acceptance of Jeremi-
ah's thesis (Jer. 3:16-17) that in the latter days there would
be no ark nor even a remembrance of it. Cf. R. Brinker, The
Influence of Sanctuaries in Early Israel (Manchester: Manches-
ter University Press, 1946), pp. 50, 85.

emphasis on symmetry and profound concern for the distinction between the holy and the profane is also compatible with the view that it is an ideal.

The Altar

One can conceive of worship existing amongst the Israelites without the ark or the tabernacle or temple, but not without an altar.[54] The probable appearance of the altar of Solomon has been illustrated by Stevens, following suggestions by Albright and Wright.[55] These men suggest that "the only detailed description we have to work from [in reconstructing Solomon's altar] is Ezek. 43:13-17."[56] They acknowledge, however, that

> It is, of course, possible that the Ezekiel passage on the altar is describing . . . the altar of Ahaz, copied from the one which that king saw in Damascus (II Kings 16:10-16). It seems questionable, however, whether the latter structure would have survived the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah.[57]

Procksch concludes, as does Albright, that the altar of Ezekiel was identical in size with that of Solomon.[58] Parrot

---

[54]Cf. Procksch, p. 122. All feasts and sacrifices had some connection with the altar, but the ark, for example, played a role only on the Day of Atonement. Cf. Douglas, p. 366.

[55]WHA, p. 49; George Ernest Wright, "The Stevens' Reconstruction of the Solomonic Temple," BA, XVIII (1955), 43.

[56]Albright and Wright, JBL, p. 130; Cf. Procksch, p. 102.

[57]Albright and Wright, p. 130.

[58]Procksch, pp. 102-106. Cf. Albright, "The Babylonian Temple-Tower and the Altar of Burnt Offering," JBL, XXXIX

observes that both Ezekiel's and Solomon's altars were of
such design that the officiating priest had to ascend it by
steps, clearly in opposition to the description of the Book
of the Covenant (Exodus 20:26).[59] Herod's altar, on the
other hand, was constructed with a ramp, not steps, on the
south side for the priest to ascend.[60]

An involved ritual of atonement (43:18-26) to consecrate
the altar to the worship of Yahweh preceded its use. A bull
(פר בן־בקר) was to be slaughtered as a sin-offering (חטאת)
the day the altar was erected (43:18-19). The blood of this
animal was to be smeared on the horns of the altar, the four
corners of the ledge and on the rim around the altar; in this
way the altar would be cleansed and atoned (וחטאת אותו וכפרתהו)
(43:20). The carcass of the bull was to be burned in the
מפקד of the בית , that is, outside the מקדש (43:21).[61] During
each of the next seven days a goat was to be treated in the

_____

(1920), 139-140. However, Berry, "Authorship," JBL, p. 22,
thinks the altars of Second Ezekiel "do not correspond entirely
to any known in history."

[59]Although the Book of the Covenant is generally assigned
an earlier date than any given to the book of Ezekiel, the
prophet appears quite willing to disregard its injunction
against the use of steps; he shows a similar independence of
tradition regarding the temple. Whether the prototype of
Ezekiel's altar was that of Solomon or Ahaz or partially of
both may be left unanswered.

[60]Parrot, pp. 43, 91.

[61]Gese (Supra, p. 30) has shown that מקדש refers to the
whole structure, בית to the house in the midst of the inner
court. It is rather clear then, that the carcass of the bull
is burned in what might be called an incinerator or cremator-
ium and not on the altar itself. The מפקד was outside the

same manner as a sin-offering (חטאת) (43:22, 25) and both a
bull and a ram were to be sprinkled with salt and offered
(43:23, 25).[62] Upon completion of these days, the routine
sacrifices of burnt offerings (עלה) and peace-offerings (שלם)
could begin and be acceptable to Yahweh (43:27).

Summary

The foregoing discussion has served to indicate that
chapters 40-48 of the book of Ezekiel are united in two ways.
There is first the unity of several themes which converge on
the central idea, that of the purified worship of God by His
redeemed people in an ideal or restored land. This aspect
of the unity of the last nine chapters has never been seri-
ously questioned.

A second way, which has not yet figured importantly in
the discussions of 40-48, is Child's concept of the broken
myth. This literary category, already seen in relation to
the geography of Ezekiel, appears to apply more broadly to
the temple and altar as well, and imparts to chapters 40-42
and 47-48 a new dimension of unity. It will be recalled that
Ezekiel's temple (Ezekiel 40:4; 43:11) was constructed accord-
ing to a divinely revealed pattern; thus in some sense, the
structure appears as a copy of the heavenly which has been

מקדש; the altar was within the court of the מקדש. Cf. also,
Gese, p. 309.

[62] The manner of offering the bull and the ram on the
second through the eighth day is not specified.

recast as an ideal and projected to the future.

The prophet has shown great concern for detail in his composition. One may conclude, therefore, that any omissions are deliberate. Further, he has demonstrated independence in his use of traditions, such as those imbedded in the JE source, the Book of the Covenant. Such independence suggests that the Torah, whether it existed in written or oral form, was not considered authoritative or binding in detail at the time of the prophet Ezekiel. Hence, we may conclude that any deviations from the cultic provisions of the Torah which appeared in any stage of Israel's history may not be used to prove a late date for the Torah as a composition, but may be used to reinforce the thesis that the Torah was not considered as absolutely authoritative until the post-exilic era.

CHAPTER IV

AUTHORSHIP AND AUTHENTICITY

Contemporary Views

The last nine chapters of the book of Ezekiel, present-
ing an account of a vision of a restored temple within a
restored land, are easily distinguished from the preceding
sections of the book. A closer study of these chapters leads
many to the conclusion that they are not all "visionary," but,
at least in part, "legislative." This fact, among others,
has led certain scholars to reject the authenticity of 40-48
in its entirety.

Irwin, for example, is convinced that there is "nothing
whatever in these nine chapters that reveals even a slight
relationship with the genuine work of Ezekiel."[1] Hölscher
assigns the entire section to a series of editors.[2] Accord-
ing to Herntrich, the doubts that arise regarding the authen-
ticity of the last nine chapters from a study of the literary
style are strengthened by a comparison of their content with
those which precede.[3] The authenticity of these chapters is

---

[1]William A. Irwin, The Problem of Ezekiel--An Inductive
Study (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1943), p. 258.

[2]Gustav Hölscher, Hesekiel, Der Dicter und Das Buch
(Giessen: Alfred A. Töpelmann, 1924), p. 208. Nevertheless
he proceeds to analyze the section to distinguish between the
original visionary material and the still later supplements.

[3]Volkmar Herntrich, Ezechielprobleme (Giessen: Alfred A.
Töpelmann, 1933), pp. 119-121.

rejected also by Knight who thinks that the portrait of the
prophet as the author of both sections is quite unbelievable.[4]
The problem of the Sacred Calendar is raised as an issue by
Sandmel who contends that its adoption requires a period
later than the period of the exile.[5] On the other hand, he
feels that these chapters are quite consistent with the view-
point of Ezekiel.[6] Messel believes the whole book to be a
composition of editors of a post-exilic prophet Ezekiel who
worked in Palestine among the exiles after his return from
Babylon.[7] Berry assigns chapters 40-48 to a "second Ezekiel,"
contending that there are great differences between first
and second Ezekiel in vocabulary and viewpoint. The first
Ezekiel is prophetic; the second has a priestly view of the
messianic hope and shows familiarity with portions of the
post-exilic priestly code which was in use but not yet in
written form.[8]

The essential integrity of the section is defended by
Hylmo. He contends that the author was a Zadokite priest

---

[4]Harold Knight, "The Personality of Ezekiel--Priest or
Prophet?" Expository Times, LIX (1947-48), pp. 9-10.

[5]Solomon Sandmel, The Hebrew Scriptures: An Introduction
to Their Literature and Religious Ideas (New York: Alfred A.
Knopf, 1963), p. 165.

[6]Ibid., p. 166.

[7]Nils Messel, Ezekielfragen (Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1945),
pp. 21-25.

[8]George Ricker Berry, "The Authorship of Ezekiel 40-48,"
Journal of Biblical Literature, XXXIV (1915), pp. 17, 36.
(Hereafter known as JBL)

who had officiated in the temple of Jerusalem prior to going
to Babylon. Only in this way can one account for his love of
the temple and his minute knowledge of the priestly ritual.[9]
Except for "relatively unimportant glosses and repetitions
for added emphasis," the entire book of Ezekiel is from one
author, according to Smith.[10] The psychological problem in-
herent in assigning chapters 40-48 to the author of the pre-
vious part of the book is recognized by Lofthouse. He does
not, however, consider this problem insuperable and points
out that these chapters do not demand an entirely different
environment, since Ezekiel's interest "as a priest, in rit-
ual, is shown in many small, but by no means insignificant,
references in his earlier work."[11] Conversely, he holds that
it is a priori "not impossible that a priest should be able
to give expression to prophetic ideals."[12] MacKay, arguing
from tradition and from the points of similarity between the
first and second parts of the book, contends that chapters
40-48 are from the prophet himself.[13]

---

[9]Gunnar Efraim Hylmo, Gamla Testamentets Litteratur-
historia (Lund: G. W. K. Gleerups Forlag, 1938), p. 263.

[10]Louise Pettibone Smith, "The Eagle(s) of Ezekiel 17,"
JBL, LVIII (1939), 50.

[11]W. F. Lofthouse, Israel after the Exile, Vol. IV in
the Clarendon Bible, edited by Bishop Wild and Canon G. H.
Box (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1928), p. 68.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Cameron MacKay, "The Integrity of Ezekiel 40-48," Evan-
gelical Quarterly, XXXII (January-March 1960), pp. 15-24.

Mediating positions have been held by a number of scholars, who attribute to the prophet the basic part of chapters 40-48, but also allow for revisions made either by editors or by oral tradition or both.[14] Bewer observes that there is "increasing confidence that at least a nucleus of the material comes from the prophet's pen. The introduction 40:1-4 can hardly be discounted and demands this kind of continuation."[15] Eissfeldt agrees that "there are no really decisive arguments against the reliability of the tradition which finds expression in many passages in the book, particularly in regard to dating."[16] On the other hand, he, like Hölscher, finds a considerable number of passages in 40-48 "which in form or content contradict the purpose set out in the introduction in xl 1-4"[17] and even insists that, in large measure, chapters 40-48, although expanded secondarily, are made necessary by the largely negative content of chapter 20.[18]

---

[14]Cf. John Patterson, _The Goodly Fellowship of the Prophets_ (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), pp. 173-175; John Bright, _A History of Israel_ (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), p. 319; Bernard W. Anderson, _Understanding the Old Testament_ (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), p. 374.

[15]Julius August Bewer, _The Literature of the Old Testament_, revised by Emil G. Kraeling (Third edition; New York: Columbia University Press, 1962), p. 194, n. 7.

[16]Otto Eissfeldt, _The Old Testament. An Introduction. The History of the Formation of the Old Testament_ (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965), p. 372.

[17]_Ibid._, p. 379. Hölscher, p. 191, finds a second introduction in 44:5.

[18]Eissfeldt, p. 376.

Lindblom believes that the solution of the problem of Ezekiel 40-48 lies in the assumption that it represents partly an oral and partly a scribal transmission of the text.[19] The content of these chapters represents literary visions[20] or fictitious visions.[21] His thesis is "that the prophet . . . saw the future city and the future temple in their general contours in an ecstatic vision."[22] He continues,

> After the passing of the ecstatic rapture the prophet worked out all the details contained in the nine chapters, giving to all that emerged in his imagination and reflection the form of a long series of visionary experiences linked to the basic ecstatic visions. Most of the "visions" in Ezek. xl-xlviii are consequently to be classified as literary visions.[23]

While "many disparate and even secondary elements are discernible,"[23] he feels

> There are no good grounds for denying that the main substance may be attributed to Ezekiel . . . . It is highly probable that the original revelation was written down by the prophet himself or by a scribe (cf. xliii. II). Accordingly xl-xlviii is not a 'collection' in the proper sense, but was used as a written document by the collector of Ezekiel's revelations and incorporated into his work as a fitting conclusion of it.[24]

---

[19]Johannes Lindblom, _Prophecy in Ancient Israel_ (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962), p. 263. Hartmut Gese, _Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezekiel (Kap. 40-48)_ (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957), p. 3, bypasses the question of oral tradition as not relevant.

[20]Lindblom, p. 147.

[21]_Ibid._, p. 137.

[22]_Ibid._, p. 147.

[23]_Ibid._, p. 264.

[24]_Ibid._

Gese contends that a _traditionsgeschictliche_ study of
Ezekiel 40-48 reveals that the section is composed of dis-
parate sections which were pressed into a strong literary
scheme either by the original author or a later hand.[25] He
also believes that the material, supplementing the temple
sketch of chapters 40-42, now found in chapters 43-48, shows
that the first three chapters were a closed literary unit
while the last six were in the process of being compiled.[26]

Procksch acknowledges the existence of several themes
within the last nine chapters but holds that much genuine
material has been transposed to false locations.[27] He also
asserts that such a transposition does not determine the ques-
tion of authenticity.[28] He identifies as genuine the follow-
ing passages: 40-42; 43:13-17; 45:1-8a,17a; 43:1-8,12;
44:1-3,4f; 43:18ff; 45:18ff; 46:1-3,8-10,12; 46:21-24; 47:
1-12.[29] Within these sections he finds secondary material in
40:38-44,[30] and 43:7a,b,8b. He goes on to suggest that although
misplaced, 43:9-11; 44:6-31; 45:8b,9-16,17b; 46:4-7,11,13ff,19ff

---

[25]Gese, p. 2.

[26]_Ibid._, p. 109.

[27]D. O. Procksch, "Fuerst und Priester bei Hesekiel,"
Zeitschrift für Die at Wissenschaft, LVIII (1941), 102: "denn
gerade im Schlussteil des Hesekielbuches (Kap. 40-48) ist
manches echte Gut an falscher Stelle überliefert."

[28]_Ibid._ "Doch ist damit seine Echtheit nicht anzuzweifeln."

[29]_Ibid._, p. 114.

[30]_Ibid._, p. 100.

bear the impression of the spirit of Ezekiel's style, speech
and thought, and must be assigned to his time.[31]

Within the book of Ezekiel, Georg Fohrer identifies 341
glosses in the genuine work of Ezekiel and twenty-three in
secondary sections of the book.[32] Only those glosses which
have been identified by three or more exegetes are listed;
all others are dismissed from his study.[33] It is important,
he contends, to remove such additions in order to regain the
original text which alone can give a clear picture of the Old
Testament faith. The supplementary materials can only supply

---

[31]Ibid., p. 114.

[32]Georg Fohrer, Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezekiel
(Berlin: Alfred A. Töpelmann, 1952), pp. 99-100. His listing
of the major secondary glosses is as follows: 40:6bb,8b,9aab,
12,13b,14,18,28bb,29b,30,32bb,33b,36b,38-43,46bb; 41:6aa,
15b-26; 42:2,6ab,13abba,14b; 43:8,10-27; 44:3,7b,8a,11,12ab,
15b,16,18,19b,26,30-31; 45:1b-2,10-12,14ab,15abb,17b,18-25;
46:1-24; 47:9bb-11,12b,14,21-23; 48:1-35. Herbert G. May,
"The Book of Ezekiel," The Interpreter's Bible, VI (New York:
Abingdon Press, 1956), 314, assigns 45:1-25; 46:1-18; and
48:8-22 to an editor.

[33]Georg Fohrer, "Die Glossen im Buche Ezechiel," Zeit-
schrift für alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, LXIII (1951),
39-44, classifies the minor glosses as repeated, clarifying,
expansive, transforming, editorial or obscure glosses:
מהב'ת — השער 9-8:40 ; ובאא — רחב 6:40 ;הב'אני 2:40 ; שמה 1:40
אל — הב'מ'ה 4:42 ; הדרך 1:42 ; הד רום 28:40 ; דרך הקרים 10:40
י'הוה ; 5:44 ; ולא — החצ ונה 14:42 ; מהארץ 6:42 ; לבני 5:42
ונשאו 12,18:44 ; עשרתע' 10:44 ; (all) 8a:44 ; גא — בי'א' 7:44
עיונם 19:44 ; אל — הח'צ ונה ; 27:44 ; אל — הקדש 1:45 ; ארך 14:45 ; עשר — חמר
חבת חשפו ; 17b:45 (all) ; ושבני 6:47 ; בש'יבני 7:47
הנחל — והי' 9:47 ; חבל'ס 13:47 ; יורך . Julius Lewy, "The
Biblical Institution of Deror in the Light of Akkadian Docu-
ments," Eretz Israel, V (1958), 21-31, has confirmed the
"antiquity of Lev. 25:10ff and the authenticity of Jer.
34:8ff and Ez. 46:17." (Abstracted in Religious and Theological
Abstracts, IV (1961), Abstract 573.

information regarding the faith of their times.[34] Very objective rules must be applied in such a critical analysis lest the method be rejected or replaced with a theory of oral tradition.[35]

The Relation Between 1-39 and 40-48

Since a comparison between these sections of the book of Ezekiel with regard to style and content has led certain scholars to deny the closing chapter to the prophet of the exile, it may be well to review the nature of their observations.

Hölscher and Irwin, as previously noted,[36] contend that the prophet was a poet. This hypothesis forces them to deny the closing chapters to the prophet Ezekiel. Hölscher's second thesis, also an unproven assumption, that the prophet was exclusively a prophet of doom, leads him to the same conclusion regarding the closing chapters of Ezekiel as did his first thesis.[37]

George Ricker Berry believes that chapters 40-48 do not display the mark of the author of 1-39.[38] Part of his evidence is linguistic and has not always been subjected to careful analysis in the literature. He notes that אברים, אביקים,

---

[34]Fohrer, "Die Glossen," Zeitschrift, p. 33.

[35]Ibid., pp. 34-35.

[36]Supra, pp. 10-15.

[37]Supra, p. 10.

[38]Berry, "Authorship," JBL, pp. 17-40.

שאש and the plural form אֹרצֹת, are found in chapters 1-39 and
not in 40-48. The word צִיצ is generally used in the doubled
form in 40-42, but is usually found without reduplication in
the rest of the book. The word for porch, אֵלֹם, occurs only
in 40-41 while the word אוּלֹם is found in all parts of the book.
He further emphasizes that

> the Hebrew has three principal words for linen, פֵשֶת,
> usually in plural פִשׁתִים, בַד, and שֵׁשׁ. As descriptive of
> the sacred garments of the priests, second-Ezekiel uses
> פִשׁתִים, 44 17-18. P, for the same purpose, uses בַד and,
> less often, שֵׁש, but never פִשׁתִים. In Ex. 28 42, already
> referred to as parallel to Ez. 44 17-18, the word is בַד.
> First-Ezekiel never employs פִשׁתים; in connection with
> the young man seen in vision as the agent of revelation,
> [Ez. 9:2,3,11; 10:2,6,7], it uses the word בַד.[39]

In answer to these observations, it should be noted that
the word שֶאש is used only three times in the entire Old Test-
ament (Ezekiel 16:57; 28:24; 28:26). The absence of this term
from 40-48 is a rather tenuous basis for a conclusion. אֲפִיקִים,
אֲגֹּם, and אֹרצֹת are used only in passages which speak of
divine action upon the land or its topographical features in
judgment or restoration. A merely statistical analysis of
word usage hardly suffices to prove anything. One must ask
why a given word is used. These three words are not called
for in the contexts of chapters 40-48 and there is no reason
for the author of 40-48 to employ them.

Furthermore, J. E. Dean has made a study of Berry's
evidence for multiple authorship, based on the single and
the doubled צִיצ as well as his observations regarding the

---

[39] Ibid., p. 27b.

peculiar use of the preposition וְ. He observes that Berry's position is "weakened perceptibly by a study which indicates these peculiarities are due to textual corruption."[40]

According to Berry, chapters 34-37 present a prophetic and 40-48, a priestly ideal.[41] An equally significant difference is seen in the picture of the prince. Berry believes that in the prophetic section of the book he is depicted as a world leader, while in the priestly chapters he is reduced to a mere shadow of such a personage.[42] Regarding this problem of the prince, Harford has noted that "it is a curious fact that there has been some deliberate alteration of the titles 'king' and 'prince' either in MT or in LXX."[43] He goes on to note that in the book of Ezekiel the term nasi is used thirty-seven times; eight times in reference to foreign rulers, four times of the kings of Judah, five times of the prince of Israel (where Israel is used in the sense of Judah), twice to refer to the Messianic son of David, and eighteen times in chapters 40-48.[44] Once again Berry's conclusions outrun the evidence.

---

[40] J. E. Dean, "The Date of Ezekiel XL-XLIII," American Journal of Semitic Language and Literature, XLIII (1926-27), 233.

[41] Berry, "Authorship," JBL, p. 17.

[42] Ibid., pp. 17-18.

[43] John Battersby Harford, Studies in the Book of Ezekiel (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1935), p. 65.

[44] Ibid.

The fact that certain oft-repeated phrases characteristic of the book of Ezekiel, such as, "the hand of the LORD was upon me," "the Word of the LORD came to me," "kabod Yahweh," and "you shall know that I am the LORD," are used either chiefly or exclusively in the first thirty-nine chapters of the book could also suggest a possible multiple authorship. This evidence seems quite impressive, but upon closer examination proves inconclusive.

The phrase, "the hand of the LORD was upon me," is used six times in the book (1:3; 3:14; 3:22; 8:1; 37:1; 40:1). In each case it serves to introduce a vision. The final nine chapters have the form of a single grand vision and therefore require the use of this phrase only once as an introductory statement.

"You shall know that I am the LORD" is used repeatedly in the first thirty-nine chapters to indicate the result that will be forthcoming from the acts of God in history. No such acts are mentioned in the closing nine chapters, and there is no need for the phrase.

"The Word of the LORD came to me," says the prophet in numerous passages in the first thirty-nine chapters. In each case the phrase introduces that which purports to be a direct verbal communication from God to the prophet. The mode of revelation indicated in 40-48 is a vision from which the prophet is expected to draw the lesson to relay to the people. It is rather arbitrary to insist that God must always deal with an individual in the same manner, especially when the

span of time equals or exceeds twenty years.

The first twenty-four chapters of the book tell of the forthcoming fall of the city of Jerusalem, the destruction of the temple, the departure of the glory of the Lord from the temple, and the exile of the people in a land far from home. Were the prophecy to end at this point, Ezekiel would be, as Hölscher suggests, only a prophet of doom.[45]

Chapters 33-37 speak of the restoration of the people to their land, their return being likened to a new exodus. A new ruler, a son of David, would rule over them in justice. God would be recognized as the King in truth and would establish with His people a new covenant. Should the prophecy end here, there would be no sequel to the broken city, the ruined temple, and the disrupted worship, and the departed kabod Yahweh. These elements are essential if the book is to present a balanced picture of the judgment and restoration. First, if there is no mention of the return of the kabod Yahweh, the impression is given that God withdrew His presence from His people prior to the judgment, and that although He was willing to see His people return to the land, He was unwilling to associate with them. Such a situation scarcely constitutes a complete restoration. Second, the omission of these elements can be made only on the assumption that the prophet was hostile to the cult. The sins of the people and the kings were strongly scored in the first

---

[45]Chaps. 25-32 could also belong to a prophet of doom.

thirty-seven chapters of the book, but the sins condemned are,
for the most part, cultic in nature. The impression is con-
veyed that the author of 1-39 was concerned about and not
opposed to the cult. The ideal temple and its cult are in-
tended to preserve the holiness of God inviolate.

The effort to drive a wedge between the first thirty-
nine and the last nine chapters of the book of Ezekiel on
the grounds of vocabulary seems unsatisfactory.

The Literary Forms

Since several themes are recognized by scholars in chap-
ters 40-48 of the book of Ezekiel, the relation between them
needs to be reviewed in dealing with the question of the au-
thenticity of the whole and its parts.

Hölscher has proposed that the section under considera-
tion has two introductory formulae, the one in 40:4 and the
other in 44:5. These two verses are not disputed, but all
segments of material which do not fit under these two intro-
ductory statements must be considered as secondary to the
original vision.[46]

The first statement or indication of content is given
in 40:4 which is a part of the context comprising 40:1-4.
These verses, in the present edition of the work, apply to
the entire section 40-48 as well as more specifically to the

---

[46]Hölscher, pp. 191-192. This does not suggest that he
considers the chapters to be from the pen of Ezekiel as we
have seen previously (supra, p. 10).

opening three chapters.[47] Rabbi Fisch, in agreement with
Kimchi, believes that the dating indicates this vision was
seen in the year of Jubilee (Leviticus 25:9).[48] If this
interpretation is correct, light is shed on many problems.
First, a dual system of dating in the book is indicated.
One system stems from the year of Jubilee and the other from
the exile of Jehoiachin. Second, the enigmatic thirtieth
year of Ezekiel 1:1 refers neither to the age of the prophet
at the time of his call nor to the year in which the pro-
phecies were first committed to writing, but to the thirti-
eth year since the year of Jubilee, 622 B. C., the year of
Josiah's reform.[49] Third, this passage (40:1-4) is an al-
lusion to a pre-exilic observance of the year of Jubilee
prescribed in Leviticus.[50]

---

[47] Gese, p. 8.

[48] S. Fisch, Ezekiel--Hebrew Text and English Translation
(London: the Soncino Press, 1960), p. 266. While the Hebrew
New Year begins on the first of Tishri, the Jubilee year was
inaugurated on the tenth of that month (Lev. xxv.9f). The
beginning of the Jubilee year, which is also the Day of Atone-
ment when the enslaved regain their freedom and sinners have
their transgressions pardoned, was thus a most appropriate
day for the vision which portrayed the redemption of Israel
and the rebuilding of the temple (Kimchi). Gese, pp. 9-10,
agrees that "Die Angabe בראש השנה wird noch expliziert durch
die Tagesangabe בעשׂור לחדשׁ. Bei diesem Neujahrstermin, der
auf den zehnten Tag eines Monats fällt, kann es sich nur um
den aus Lv 25,9a bekannten Neujahrstag 10. VII handeln."

[49] Bright, History of Israel, p. 297.

[50] Even so, this possibility does not prove the date of the
written form of the reference to the year of Jubilee. Further,
no other allusion to the observance of year of Jubilee has been
recognized, nor is there other indication in Ezekiel that a
dual system of dating has been used.

The relevance of this suggestion to the topic under consideration is rather involved. First, it is difficult to prove an allusion, and proof is not attempted here. It is merely suggested that should such an allusion exist, there is an indication Ezekiel is later, in present form, than the oral or written traditions regarding the Day of Atonement. Hence we may conclude that one of two possibilities is correct: (1) If the Ezekiel reference is authentic, the Day of Atonement is pre-exilic; or (2) If the Day of Atonement is post-exilic, the reference in Ezekiel must be very late or could be merely an interpolation. This problem cannot be solved by literary study; data from non-biblical sources, not available at this time, must be employed.

The second verse, 44:5, states that the prophet was brought to the land of Israel in visions of God (מראות אלהים). Pfarrer G. Richter notes that this phrase is a technical term to introduce a vision and may comprise several experiences which follow one another but are viewed as if they were one.[51]

The prophet is commanded in verse four to listen, to look, to think, and to declare to the house of Israel all that is seen. A similar command is given to the prophet in 44:5. Here he is told to look, to listen, and to pay attention

---

[51]Pfarrer G. Richter, Der ezechielische Tempel: Eine exegetische Studie uber Ezechiel (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1912), p. 21: "Der Plural deutet an, dass mehrere Erscheinungen aufeinander folgen, dass es sich also um einen visionären Zustand handelte."

(literally, "to set your heart") to what is told him concerning the ordinances of the temple. It would seem from these introductory statements that the prophet is given a comprehensive assignment. What he sees comes in a series of visions, and all of them are equally authentic. The revelation regarding certain laws and ordinances is a part of the vision included in these introductory statements, and need not be dismissed as secondary.

In these chapters there is presented, as Lindblom observes, a "literary vision."[52] Certain aspects of the section display the form identified by Childs as "broken myth."[53] Both of these observations converge to suggest that an ideal or symbolic interpretation of the whole and its parts is fully as justifiable as, and perhaps preferable to, the literal. In either event, there is within 40-48 a message which was relevant for Israel.

Viewed as a whole, the section forms a unit. It has its focus in the message that God tabernacles in the midst of His redeemed people. His presence makes the whole land holy, and yet there are degrees of increasing holiness as one proceeds from the outlying districts to the tract reserved for the

_____

[52]Lindblom, p. 141: "in an exalted state of mind, a prophet receives an inspiration in the form of a visual creation of the imagination. What the prophet produces in such a psychic state resembles the products of visual poetry; but the prophetic imagery differs from the products of the poets in so far as it appears in the form of revelations given by God." Cf. also, supra, p. 46.

[53]Supra, pp. 26-27.

priests, to the area set aside for the temple complex, and within the temple, as one moves from outer to inner court and thence to the holy place and the Most Holy place. From His throne there flows a river which imparts to the whole land a fertility which transforms it into a paradise. Within this holy community man has the fellowship with God for which he was created; this communion is expressed in forms of worship that stress that man draws near to God by grace and not by right.

The Short Themes

Before any attempt is made to distinguish between several minor sections within chapters 43-46, it is well to be aware of the broad outlines which are readily discernible. Chapter 43 is concerned with the prophet's observations within the inner court (43:5) while chapter 44 appears to have reference to the outer court. Chapter 45:1-17 concerns civil laws of inheritance and justice, while the balance of the chapter and the whole of chapter 46 deals with worship regulations, the calendar and the cultic personnel.

Procksch and Fohrer have recently made studies of the book of Ezekiel with special concern for the question of its authenticity.[54] Some of the deletions proposed by Fohrer and others are well supported in the critical apparatus of Biblia

---

[54]Their works are selected for special consideration since they are balanced studies summarizing and evaluating not only their own efforts, but those of other recognized scholars.

Hebraica and are essential to obtain a readable text.[55] Other passages questioned by Fohrer should be subjected to a critical study of the text before a final decision is made.[56] A few of the passages listed as glosses are of such length and importance that they must be considered here.[57]

It has been noted that Fohrer and Procksch recognize considerable genuine material in 45:1-9, but consider 47:13-48:35 as secondary. May assigns both sections to the hand of an editor because (1) "it falls outside the vision framework," (2) The form of address is second person plural rather than singular, and (3) "the editor's prince occurs prominently." Nevertheless, he suggests that it is only a matter of conjecture whether any of the material found here is original.[58]

The material in 47:13-48:35 is merely an expanded form of that contained in 45:1-9. According to Gaster, the land division is very similar to that prescribed in the Samaritan Book of Joshua.[59] Whether or not either or both of these

---

[55]40:6bb,8b,9aa,30; 42:13ba,14b; 44:8a; 45:14aa, and the entire list of minor glosses in n. 33, supra, p. 48.

[56]These include: 40:12,13b,14,29b,32bb; 42:2; 44:7b. This task is not assumed here as acceptance or rejection of these brief verses does not greatly affect the question of authenticity.

[57]41:15-26; 43:10-27; 45:1-2,10-12,18-25; 46:1-24; 47: 13-23; 48:1-35. Of these it will be recalled that Procksch doubted only 46:13-20 and chapter 48. Supra, p. 47.

[58]May, p. 314.

[59]Moses Gaster, The Samaritans, Their History, Doctrines and Literature (London: Oxford University Press, 1925), p. 15.

sections is actually from Ezekiel, it is legitimate to distinguish them from the fully visionary sections where the singular form of address is employed. With this distinction in mind, it appears that these passages present ideas which can be characterized as born in the mind of the prophet or a disciple as a result of the visions, without actually being a part of the vision.[60]

Although it is impossible to prove beyond doubt that these passages are authentic, Sandmel points out that they are not contrary to the emphasis of the prophet.[61] In a vision recorded in chapter 37, Ezekiel had foreseen the restoration and reunion of Ephraim and Judah and the tribes associated with each. The land division assumes such a restoration and reunion. The assignment of tribes in the restored and reunited nation is clearly ideal and involves a geographic rearrangement that places segments of the old northern kingdom on both sides of the holy district reserved for the city, prince and priests. These considerations suggest either authenticity or composition by a disciple thoroughly saturated with the views of the prophet. Further debate of this issue is irrelevant to an understanding of the message of the section.

Fohrer considers 45:18-25 and the entire chapter 46 as

---

[60]Note Lindblom's concept of "literary visions," supra, pp. 57, 46.

[61]Sandmel, p. 166. He doubts the authenticity of 40-48 but agrees "they are consistent with Ezekiel's viewpoint."

"unecht";[62] Procksch accepts 45:18-25 and 46:1-3,8-10,12, 21-24.[63]

Regarding 41:15-16, Gese has observed that from the standpoint of style, this section, which Fohrer considers secondary, has the full visionary style found in chapter 40:6-19 and 40:48-41:4. Consequently, Gese believes that the section appears to be misplaced and that it is concerned with a description of the temple proper which ended with 41:4 or 41:9 at the latest.[64]

Fohrer would delete 43:13ff, but Procksch would transpose these verses to a point immediately following 40:47. He says, "Dort, wo von den Massen des inneren Vorhofs die Rede ist, in dessen Mittelpunkt der Altar ja steht, erwarten wir diese Beschreibung."[65] On stylistic grounds Gese considers it to be secondary.[66] The section is concerned with the description of the altar and the ritual for consecrating it to the worship of Yahweh. The present location of the passage may not appeal to the contemporary reader, but this fact does

_____

[62]Fohrer, Die Hauptprobleme, p. 100.

[63]Procksch, pp. 110-113: "Dagegen bewegen wir uns im Folgenden (45:18ff.) auf festem Grunde. Der Zusammenhang mit Kap. 43:18ff liegt vor Augen . . . ." (p. 110). "Ebenson original ist der Grundstock von Kap. 46, wo der Fürst gleichfalls im Mittelpunkt steht. Als echt muss v. 1-3,8-10,12 gesprochen werden." (p. 112). "Mir scheint v. 21-24 unverdächtig . . . ." (p. 113).

[64]Gese, p. 26.

[65]Procksch, p. 102.

[66]Gese, pp. 44-50.

not disprove authenticity.[67]

Chapter 43:10-12 speaks of the purpose for the vision
and the conditions which should prevail before the prophet
would be free to express the details of his message. May
suggests the latter may once have followed 42:20.[68]

Chapter 45:1-17 may best be discussed as a section
united by the catchword תרומה which is used eight times in
these verses.[69] May has proposed that verse two would fit
better after verse four.[70] Verse one appears to be a log-
ical introduction to verse three and seems connected to the
balance of the section by the catchword. Within the larger
section (45:1-17) the prince is mentioned both in the second
and third person as well as in the singular (45:7,8a,17)
and plural form (45:8b,9).[71] This could suggest that 45:17
would fit immediately after 45:8a or that the plural form is
used, as May suggests, to refer to the "successive rulers of

---

[67]On the other hand, it has been noted (supra, p. 37)
that it is possible to conceive of a Semitic shrine without
a temple but not without an altar. Furthermore, it was sug-
gested in chapter 20 that in the restoration of the people
to the homeland, sacrifices would then be acceptable to
Yahweh (20:40).

[68]May, p. 303.

[69]Gese, pp. 67-68, proposes the catchword idea. The
word in some form is used in vv. 44:30; 45:1,6,7,13,16.
Chap. 48 displays the same tendency with twelve occurrences
in vv. 8,9,10,12,18,20,21.

[70]May, p. 315.

[71]Gese, p. 110, speaks of the short nasi section (44:1-3;
45:21-25; 46:1-10,12). נשיא is singular; people are עם-הארין.

the restored Davidic line."[72] Verses 10-12 define the system
of measures employed in the offerings of 45:13-17. Aside
from this fact they show no obvious relation to either verses
1-17 or to the entire context of chapters 40-48.

Chapter 45:18-25 "ist keine Einheit," says Gese.[73] It
is true that verses 18-20 speak of an atonement for the sanc-
tuary to be held on the first day of the first and seventh
months;[74] verses 21-25 prescribe regulations for the Passover
on the fourteenth day of the first month and for another
festival on the fifteenth day of the seventh month. In the
first segment, the command is given to the priest in the sec-
ond person; the second directive is to the prince (singular)
in the third person.

Within chapter 46 Hölscher identifies verses 1-3,8-10,12
as the latest supplements to the text.[75] Procksch is con-
vinced these same verses are clearly the oldest.[76] These
seven verses discuss the role of the prince in the worship
activities. The same is true of 46:4-7,13-15. Verses 16-18
restrict the gifts that the prince may make to a son or to a

---

[72]May, p. 317.

[73]Gese, p. 75.

[74]In 45:20 the LXX καὶ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ μηνὶ is preferred to
MT ‏שדח ב תעבשב השמח ןכ‎.

[75]Hölscher, p. 202.

[76]Procksch, p. 112: "Hölscher secht in 46:1-3,8-10,12
gerade die jüngsten Elemente im Text, während es in Wirk-
lichkeit die ältesten sind." Fohrer, Die Hauptprobleme, p.
100 dismisses the entire chapter as secondary.

servant. Verses 19-20 return to a visionary formula as the
prophet is shown the place where the priest should boil the
guilt and sin offerings. Verses 21-24 describe the vision of
kitchens in the corners of the outer court.

Summary

Chapters 40-42 and 47-48 seem quite well-planned and
consistent within themselves. The remainder of the chapters
(43-46) contain a variety of intertwined aspects of the cul-
tic regulations.[77] But this lack of logical order does not
appear to be a valid reason for denying the authenticity of
the closing nine chapters of the book of Ezekiel. It is tempt-
ing to rearrange much of the text, especially the material in
chapters 43-46, but no such large-scale reconstruction seems
to satisfy anyone but its author; the attempts to separate
the strands of tradition fare no better. One must conclude
either that the correct analysis has not yet been made or
that this approach to the problem is not proper.

The apparent lack of logical organization in the arrange-
ment of detail in chapters 43-46 may be explained, in part,

---

[77]These chapters discuss the return of the glory of the
Lord and the closing of the east gate following that return;
the prince and his role in relation to the closed door, to
his sons and his servants, and his duty to provide the sacri-
fices of the state as well as his privilege to receive offer-
ings from the people; the description of the altar, the regu-
lations for consecrating it and the sacrifices offered upon
it. There is a curious interchange in the narrative; both
prince and priests are addressed or mentioned; both the sing-
ular and plural form is used of each, and both second and
third person references exist.

by assuming that the prophet expressed the material while thoroughly overwhelmed by the visions he had experienced. It is possible, and perhaps probable, that the text was transmitted orally for a time and that some secondary material was introduced in this way, but there seems to be no certain means for distinguishing such material.

If this view be correct, one can readily understand the divergent opinions of the scholars. The present text contains fragments of several recensions, all having their origin with the prophet and none being sufficiently extensive to permit a definitive separation from the others.

The problem of the intertwined material or traditions seems to be inherent in so brief a sketch of a broad topic; no satisfactory resolution of the strata is likely to appear. The section is best viewed as a "literary vision" which employed the broken myth. The authenticity which is claimed is that of theological content, not verbal identity.

CHAPTER V

EZEKIEL AND THE PENTATEUCHAL CODES

Contemporary Opinions

The importance of the relation between Ezekiel and the Pentateuchal codes was recognized by Delitsch who said,

> The book of Ezekiel has become the Archemedian point on which the Pentateuchal criticism has planted itself and from which it has lifted off its hinges the history of worship and literature in Israel as hitherto accepted.[1]

While some scholars are convinced that Ezekiel was familiar with the Pentateuch in its present form, others are equally sure the first five books of the Hebrew Scriptures owe their composition to persons familiar with the book of Ezekiel. Thus Hölscher insists that the redaction of Ezekiel must have preceded the composition of Pg [sic]. Pg, he says, projects a priestly ideal into the past and speaks of matters of which Ezekiel and his redactors knew nothing.[2] W. F. Lofthouse is certain that "Ezekiel could not have been written without the first (Deuteronomy); it could not have been written had the second (P) been known to the author."[3]

---

[1]as quoted in Ludwig Ernest Fuerbringer, "Kleine Hesekielstudien," Concordia Theological Monthly, VIII (1937), 92.

[2]Gustav Hölscher, Hesekiel, Der Dicter und das Buch (Giessen: Alfred A. Töpelmann, 1924), p. 32.

[3]W. F. Lofthouse, Ezekiel: Introduction; Revised version with notes from the Century Bible--Caxton Series (London: Caxton Publishing Co., ca. 1911), p. 29. His argument is that in D the priests equal the Levites but in P the priests

Somewhat more cautiously, Rowley proposes that "The date of P is carried into the post-exilic age if it is later than Deuteronomy."[4] Freedman suggests that "apparently" Ezekiel was familiar with the Holiness Code, and the redactor of the Pentateuch was familiar with Ezekiel.[5] Patterson warns that it is hazardous to draw too many conclusions from these chapters because of their uncertain authorship. He merely concludes that the theocracy introduced by D "is carried to new heights," and that "Judaism is emerging" in the book of Ezekiel.[6]

Berry is convinced that the differences between Ezekiel and P "are of such a nature as to suggest for second Ezekiel a date later than that of P."[7] The regulations of Ezekiel, he says, "embody the actual practice of the third century."[8]

---

are not equal to the Levites. Ezekiel uses priests to do the work once done by aliens. D has a king and foreign wars; P has neither, and Ezekiel has no high priests and replaces the king with the prince. D is silent regarding the Day of Atonement; P has an impressive ritual and Ezekiel has two days of atonement. In sacrifice, P demands more than Ezekiel, who, in turn, demands more than D.

[4]H[arold] H[enry] Rowley, The Growth of the Old Testament (London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1961), p. 33.

[5]David Noel Freedman, "The Book of Ezekiel," Interpretation, VIII (October 1954), p. 468.

[6]John Patterson, The Goodly Fellowship of the Prophets (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), p. 175.

[7]George Ricker Berry, "The Authorship of Ezekiel 40-48," Journal of Biblical Literature, XXXIV (1915), 19. Henceforth, JBL.

[8]George Ricker Berry, "The Composition of the Book of Ezekiel," JBL, LVIII (1939), 172. His evidence may be

Dahl believes that Ezekiel "not improbably was acquainted with the entire P document we know today."[9]

Procksch agrees that Ezekiel shows this acquaintance.[10] There was, he believes, a pre-exilic matrix of the P code which was an important precursor for Ezekiel.[11] The similarities between Ezekiel and the Pentateuch are so striking that Torrey writes, "The plain fact, as one day will be generally recognized, is that the author of the book had before him the completed Pentateuch, in the very form in which it lies before us at the present day.[12] Muilenberg is also very emphatic as

---

summarized as follows: in Deut. 17:9, 19:7, priests are appelate judges with others, but in Ezek. 44:24 the priests are the only judges. Num. 15:20 assigns the best dough to Yahweh; Ezek. 44:30 gives it to the priests. Lev. 21:7 permits the priest to marry a widow, but Ezek. 44:22 forbids it unless she be the widow of a priest. Ex. 28:39-43 clothes the priest in linen, and Ezek. 44:7 prohibits wool. Lev. 27:28 devotes some things to Yahweh but doesn't say how; Ezek. 44:29 assigns the devoted items to the priests. Lev. 25:32 permits the sale of Levite land under certain conditions, but Ezek. 48:14 forbids sale. Num. 19:11,12 has a seven-day cleansing; Ezek. 44:26 calls for fourteen days. Lev. 2:13 requires salt for meal offerings only; Ezek. 43:24 requires it also for the burnt offering. In Lev. 2:3 meal and peace offerings do not expiate, but in Ezek. 45:15-17 they do. Ezek. 45:23 calls for a sin-offering at Passover; P (Ex. 12 and Lev. 23:5) omits it. Ezekiel has two atonement days; P, only one. Passover and matsoth are distinguished in P, united in Ezekiel.

[9] George Dahl, "Crisis in Ezekiel Research," Quantulacumque, Edited by Robert P. Casey, Silva Lake and Agnes K. Lake (London: Christophers, 1937), p. 276.

[10] D. O. Procksch, "Fuerst und Priester bei Hesekiel," Zeitschrift Fur Die at Wissenschaft, LVIII (1941), 116 (footnote).

[11] Ibid., p. 125.

[12] Charles Cutler Torrey, "Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy," Yale Oriental Series Researches, XVIII (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), 91.

he states, "The traditions of both the priestly and prophetic Torah obviously lie behind much of his work."[13] Archer, who acknowledges the differences between Ezekiel and P, argues that a post-exilic date for P does not adequately explain such divergences because "It is an undeniable fact that the provisions in Ezekiel differ just as much from Document D and even Document H, as they do from P."[14]

Redpath believes that Ezekiel 40-48 is an ideal[15] which evolves from a "working system," and, being more systematic than P, must be the later of the two.[16] Ezekiel's sketch, he believes, does not give a complete legislation; to assume that it did would force the conclusion that "he intended to abrogate . . . the feast of weeks [which] is universally acknowledged to have been binding before P was written."[17]

Herbert Haag argues that despite certain stylistic

---

[13]James Muilenburg, "Ezekiel," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, Edited by H. H. Rowley (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962), p. 570.

[14]Gleason L. Archer, A Survey of Old Testament Introduction (Chicago: Moody Press, 1964), p. 360.

[15]Henry A. Redpath, The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel. Vol. 23 in Westminster Commentaries, edited by Walter Lock (London: Methuen, 1907), xxii.

[16]Ibid. "If an ideal was in existence, and one put forth with all the authority of a recognized prophet of the Lord, what right would the priestly body have, who after all were only an executive body, to publish almost contemporaneously, a counter scheme of legislation to that which had been promulgated with what claimed to be divine sanction? None whatever; and we are driven at once to the conclusion that P was the earlier." (pp. xxii, xxiii.)

[17]Ibid., p. xxii.

peculiarities, the unity of thought in the prophet's work and his constant dependence on the priestly code prove authenticity of Ezekiel 40-48. In these chapters, he feels, Ezekiel rediscovers the central theme of P and projects it into the future, thereby showing himself to be the pure idealist whose legislation should not be taken literally. Haag believes that the anthological process was highly generalized by the time of Ezekiel and that it is, a priori, probable that the prophet was dependent, not only on D but also on H and P. This hypothesis becomes more probable in view of the undeniable doctrinal progress in rapport with his priestly sources, in the sense of interiorizing and spiritualizing. Although D data such as the unique sanctuary, the aversion for the idolatrous high places, the covenant and the majesty of the law, were available to the prophet, these factors also penetrated P, and it was to P that Ezekiel went for his information, so that his materials are more priestly than Deuteronomic.[18]

According to J. O. Boyd, "Dr. Driver's modified statement of the Wellhausen view of P . . . challenges our right to use any word or phrase, institution or idea concerned with priesthood, sanctuary and ritual to prove that P was pre-exilic."[19] He then selects three tests from the historical

---

[18]Herbert Haag, "Was Lehrt die literarische Untersuchung des Ezekieltextes," Freiburg doctoral dissertation reviewed by A. Robert in Revue Biblique, LIII (1946), 135-140.

[19]J. Oscar Boyd, "Ezekiel and the Modern Dating of the Pentateuch," Princeton Theological Review (1908), p. 48.

narrative portions of P to which he finds allusions in the
Book of Ezekiel. The first section selected belongs to the
oldest, the second to the youngest, and the third to the mid-
dle stratum of the priestly code.[20] On the basis of this
study Boyd concludes that the priestly code was pre-exilic,
and therefore, available to Ezekiel.

Arguments for several positions have been summarized.
Before drawing any conclusions regarding their validity, it
is necessary to examine the linguistic data and the detail
of instructions in the codes.

The Sacrifices

A large variety of terms for sacrifice is used in the
Book of Ezekiel. These terms include זבח , כליל , כפר,עלה,
מנחה,קרבן , אשם, חמאת, שלם, (43:18-26; 45:13-
46:24).[21]

The root זבח, from which the noun "altar" (מזבח) may
be derived, is used as a verb eight times in Ezekiel 1-39 and
never in 40-48, and as a noun only three times (40:42; 44:11;
46:24). According to the lexicon of Brown, Driver and Briggs,
the verb stresses the idea of slaughter, whether it be for
sacrifice, eating or judgment. The noun, on the other hand,
is viewed as being "the common and most ancient sacrifice,

_____

[20]Ibid. Torrey, p. 91, gives strong support to this view.

[21]Num. 15:8 implies four distinct sacrifices: עלה
זבח, נדר, שלם . Three of these words are used by
Ezekiel, but נדר is not used at all.

whose essential rite was eating the flesh of the victim at a
feast in which the god of the clan shared by receiving the
blood and fat."[22] Köhler believes that "the essential thing
about it is not the slaughter of the animal but the effecting
of communion" by means of the eating of the flesh of the sac-
rificed animal.[23] Snaith objects to this view of Brown,
Driver and Briggs and suggests that it is based on Robertson
Smith's The Religion of the Semites which has totemistic the-
ories regarding the origin of religion.[24]

זבח "denotes sacrifices of which but a part were con-
sumed, such as expiatory or eucharistic offerings,"[25] and
must be distinguished from the כליל or עלה offerings.[26]

---

[22]Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, ed-
itors, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Ox-
ford: Clarendon Press, 1955), pp. 256-257. Henceforth, BDB.

[23]Ludwig Köhler, Old Testament Theology, translated by A.
S. Todd (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957), p. 182. Cf.
also, A. S. Herbert, Worship in Ancient Israel (Richmond:
John Knox Press, 1959), p. 16, and George A[ngus] F[ulton]
Knight, A Christian Theology of the Old Testament (Richmond:
John Knox Press, 1959), p. 282.

[24]Norman H. Snaith, "Sacrifices in the Old Testament,"
Vetus Testamentum [Henceforth VT], VII (1957), 308-310. Totem-
ism is defined thus: "In comparative religions, the worship of
totems is regarded as marking a higher level of religious ad-
vancement than fetishism and supposed by some to be next to
fetishism in succession." Isaac K. Funk, editor, Funk and
Wagnalls' New "Standard" Dictionary of the English Language
(New York: Funk and Wagnall Company, 1962), p. 2539.

[25]Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, translator, Gesenius' Hebrew
and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures (Grand
Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954), p. 238.

[26]These terms are used interchangeably. Cf. George Buch-
anan Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament: Its Theory and Prac-
tice (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), p. 5. Herbert, p. 17,

There is general agreement that עלה denotes a "whole
burnt offering" and that it was a true gift by fire, the
word being derived from the verb עלה "to go up."[27] Snaith
stresses that the word means not "burnt whole" but "wholly
burnt."[28] Vriezen places עלה in association with מנחה, stat-
ing "this burnt-offering 'olah is therefore a true 'gift-
offering' of animal character just as the minchah (Lev. II)
is a gift-offering of a vegetable kind."[29]

Etymologically, מנחה is a gift and properly refers to a
cereal offering[30] or a meat offering (I Sam. 2:17).[31] Gesenius
stresses that it is an unbloody sacrifice as opposed to the
זבח which was bloody.[32] He also indicates that it was a
euphemistic term to denote "tribute, which was exacted from
a tributary people under the milder name of gift."[33]

According to Gray, the expiatory sacrifices חטאת and אשם

_____

views כליל as an amplification of עלה stressing the totality
of the offering.

[27]BDB, p. 750; Gesenius, p. 631; Köhler, p. 184.

[28]Snaith, p. 310.

[29]Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology
(Boston: Charles T. Branford Company, 1958), p. 290.

[30]Snaith, pp. 309-315.

[31]Köhler, p. 184; BDB, p. 585.

[32]Gesenius, p. 487.

[33]Ibid. Cf. also, Gray, p. 13, where, in his discussion
of minchah he mentions qorban as a technical ritual or relig-
ious term always used of sacred gifts only.

are not easily distinguished.[34] Gesenius was convinced that a
real distinction existed in the Mosaic codes regarding both
the ritual and the sins to be atoned, but suggested "the exact
difference between each kind of sin has hitherto been vainly
inquired."[35] Snaith differentiates them by noting that חטאת
"is concerned with unwitting offences," and the אשם is the
offering where damage has been done, loss incurred, and one
party realizes the offence so that restitution becomes pos-
sible; "the strict meaning of the Hebrew verb is 'pay for it,'
(Prov xxx 10) and the root has to do with paying compensa-
tion."[36]

The use of the term כפר in relation to both of these
sacrifices in P indicates their expiatory virtue.[37] Gray
notes that the theory that "to cover" as the fundamental
meaning of כפר can find support from Arabic sources and that
the alternative theory, that it means "wipe away" finds sup-
port in Syriac sources.[38] His own evaluation is very careful:

> to cover a wronged person's face so as to appease him,
> to cover a sin so as to make it inoperative, are both
> unquestionably Hebrew ideas whether they were ever ex-
> pressed by means of כפר and its derivatives or not.[39]

---

[34]Gray, p. 57.

[35]Gesenius, p. 86.

[36]Snaith, p. 80.

[37]Gray, p. 75.

[38]Ibid., p. 69.

[39]Ibid., p. 68.

Offerings designated by אלש may be considered sacra-
mental.[40] Their purpose seems to be to preserve the fellow-
ship or communion between a man and his God.[41] They are eu-
charistic sacrifices or sacrifices of thanksgiving.[42]

In all offerings or sacrifices certain matters are
constant, as Snaith has pointed out:

> God therefore always gets the same, whatever the offer-
> ing. He gets the whole of the whole offering. He gets
> all the fat, He gets all the blood. He gets all this
> because it is His right, and he gets it whatever the
> animal and whatever the intention of the rite.[43]

The instructions given by Ezekiel regarding these several
sacrifices may now be compared with those given in the Penta-
teuchal codes.[44]

The first term to be considered is זבח.[45] Ezekiel 1-39
gives no help for an understanding of the nature of the sac-
rifices designated by this word. In chapter 20 the prophet

---

[40]Vriezen, p. 290.

[41]Herbert, p. 17.

[42]Gesenius, p. 830.

[43]Snaith, p. 312.

[44]The analysis of G. T. Manley, The Book of the Law--
Studies in the Date of Deuteronomy (London: The Tyndale Press,
1957), p. 65, is followed regarding the identity of the codes.
Thus D equals Deut. 12-26; JE equals Ex. 20-23; H equals Lev.
17-26; P equals Ex. 25-31, 35-40, Lev. 1-11, 27, Num. 1-5, 25-36.

[45]The verbal form of זבח is used in Ezek. 20:28; 34:3;
39:17,19, but nowhere in 40-48. The noun is used in 20:28;
39:17; 40:42; 44:11; 46:24. The phrases are as follows:
20:28: וזבחו־שם את־זבחיהם 34:3: הבריאה תזבחו 39:17: וגו'
ושתיתם־דם לשכרה 40:42: עליהם ישחטו את־העולה־והזבח 39:19: זבחו לכם זבח.
זבחו 44:11: ישחטו את־העלה־ואת־הזבח 46:24: בית־המבשלים According to Stevenson, "zebach, zebach

is critical of the fathers for offering their sacrifices on the high places and under the green trees. Clearly, the reference is to idolatrous rites. The shepherds of Israel are rebuked in chapter 34 for abusing the people; this abuse is called a sacrifice. Here זבח is used in a metaphorical sense. The slaughter of the armies of Gog is described as a sacrificial slaughter for the birds in chapter 39.

In chapters 40-42 the prophet uses the verb שחט to describe the butchering of the Z.[46] The Z is boiled in kitchens by those who minister at the temple (bait).[47] Ezekiel (40:24-25) also speaks of these offerings being presented (קרב), offered (עלה), and provided (עשה). He provides no further instruction regarding the Z.

The SH are mentioned by Ezekiel in 46:2,12; 45:15,17;

---

shelamim and shelamim (shelem) [abbreviated by Stevenson and in this paper henceforth as Z, Z SH, and SH, respectively] are simply different names for the same kind of sacrifice." William Barron Stevenson, "Hebrew 'Olah and Zebach Sacrifices," Festschrift in honor of Alfred Bertholet, edited by Walter Baumgartner, Otto Eissfeldt, Karl Elliger, Leonhard Rost (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950), p. 492. On p. 493 he suggests, "Possibly Z SH was the term in official priestly use and the two others popular abbreviations. Perhaps Z was a Canaanite and Palestinian name (Ex 34:15, Num 25:2, Judg 16:23), equivalent to Hebrew SH, and P's Z SH a compromise compound or an expansion of Z to express the legitimate sacrifices of Israel."

[46]Within the Pentateuch the verb שחט is used forty times in P, once in H, and never in JE or D. (The two references in Genesis are not counted.) The verb employed in D is זבח.

[47]According to Berry, "Authorship," JBL, p. 22, "In P the killing of sacrifices is performed by the layman who presents them, Lev. 1:11ff, 15ff., in Ez. 44:11 it is done by the Levites. The custom of P is naturally the earlier."

and 43:27.[48] The reference in 45:15 appears to be a tax list
indicating dues that are to be paid to the prince. The other
passages merely list the SH together with other sacrifices
which are to be presented but provide no details regarding
the manner of offering the SH.[49] Ezekiel seems to regard the
rites involved in the Z and the SH as well-known and needing
no description.

The usage in the Pentateuch is quite different from that
in Ezekiel. In H and P it is customary to use the double ap-
pelation Z SH. In H the verb associated with the sacrifice
may be חבז (19:5), קריב (22:21) or עשה (23:19). D uses the
term Z but not SH and shows a tendency to use the verb חבז.
Ezekiel shows affinities with D in the choice of the single
term for sacrifice, but with H and P in regard to the verb.
Both D and P provide some detail regarding the forms of sac-
rifice and the animals involved.

The word כליל is used only fourteen times in the Old
Testament. The three references in Ezekiel (16:14; 27:3;
28:12) use it as an adjective to modify beauty.[50] Exodus
28:31 and 39:32 require that the robe of the ephod was to be
all (kalil) of blue. The word is used in the same sense in
Numbers 4:6 which specifies that the cloth covering the ark

---

[48]The term Z SH, common in H and P, is not used by Ezek-
iel who prefers either Z or SH.

[49]The priest officiates. If the prince offers SH, he is
permitted to enter the east gate and watch.

[50]Ezekiel does not use כליל as a word for sacrifice.

in transit was all (<u>kalil</u>) of blue. In the Pentateuch the word is used of sacrifice only in Leviticus 6:15 (6:22-23 in English translation) and in Deuteronomy 13:16 and 33:10.[51]

A more common synonym of כליל is עלה.[52] Ezekiel prescribes that the unblemished bulls and rams (43:23) involved in the O were to be washed (40:38), butchered by the Levites (44:11) on tables in the gates between the outer and inner courts (40:39-43), salted (43:24), and offered on the altar (43:27). These offerings were to be presented by the prince at the festivals (45:17-25) and as free-will offerings (46:2, 4,12,15).

Deuteronomy provides no information regarding the O other than that it must be offered at the approved shrine (12:1-27) on an altar of unhewn stone (27:6). JE (Exodus 20:24) calls for the O, as well as the Z, to be offered at the altar of unhewn stone or earth wherever Yahweh caused His name to be remembered.

Considerably more detail is provided in P. The worshipper places his hand on the head of the sacrifice (Leviticus 1:4) which is killed before the Lord (1:5), skinned and butchered (1:6). The head and the fat are burned on the altar (1:8), the entrails and legs are washed with water, and the

---

[51]The use in Deut. 13:16 is unique in speaking of the total destruction of an apostate city as a sacrifice.

[52]Stevenson, p. 488, states that "sometimes כליל occurs as a synonym for עלה." Henceforth these sacrifices will be abbreviated O (עלה) and C (כליל).

entire carcass burned on the altar (1:9).[53]

The tables that Ezekiel reserved for the butcher of the O (40:39) are used also for the sin-offering and the guilt-offering.[54] The boiled meat (46:20) from the sin- and guilt-offerings is stored in the priestly dining room (42:13) and consumed by the priests (44:29). The flesh of the sin-offering bullock, sacrificed to consecrate the altar, was burned outside the miqdash in the miphqad belonging to the bait.[55]

Neither the sin-offering nor the guilt-offering is mentioned in either JE or D. H mentions the sin-offering only once and the guilt-offering twice; the remainder of the references appear to belong to P. Ezekiel speaks of a minchah associated with the O, but not of independent cereal offerings. In this respect Ezekiel differs from H and P and follows D.

---

[53]These regulations apply to a bull. Minor modifications are made if the O is another animal or bird. Berry, "Authorship," JBL, p. 19, points out a difference between Ezekiel and P. Ezekiel 45:24 calls for a larger meal offering to accompany the O than does P (Num. 28:20-21). He compares also Ezek. 46:14 and Num. 28:5; however, in noting the context it is seen that Ezekiel has but one lamb, P has two.

[54]Gray, p. 57: "Now the chief point to observe [in Ezek. 40-48] is that the sin-offerings and guilt-offerings stand alongside of burnt offerings and peace-offerings as things equally familiar; Ezekiel does not hesitate elsewhere to note the novelty of such variations from ancient practice as he introduces."

[55]Ibid., p. 65. He notes that these offerings as eaten by the priests are first attested by Ezekiel, but that this in no way shows them to be Ezekiel's innovations. Cf. the discussion of the altar consecration, supra, pp. 38-39.

In all the above references to sacrifice, detailed in-
formation regarding ritual is not found in the book of Ezekiel,
giving the impression that the offering was familiar. Such
information is available in P. The omission of detail by
Ezekiel may indicate one of the following possibilities: (1)
that Ezekiel's regulations are ideal, (2) that some detail of
the descriptions he once gave have been lost in transmission,
(3) that Ezekiel omitted these details as unessential to his
message because they were commonly practiced and were a part
of an oral tradition, or (4) that H and P, either in full or
in an abbreviated form, were available to the prophet.

The Calendar

Ezekiel appears to be familiar with feasts (חגׁים) and
appointments (מוׁעדׁים) but he lays no stress on the idea of
pilgrimage.[56] His calendar and requirements are defined in
45:18-46:15.

According to the prophet, an unblemished yearling lamb
was to be sacrificed each morning as an O with a cereal offer-
ing of one-sixth ephah of flour moistened with one-third hin
of oil (46:13-15). The O on the Sabbath was to be six lambs
and a ram, together with a specified cereal offering mois-
tened with oil (46:4-5).[57] The new moon O consisted of an

---

[56]Chap. 36:38 implies that Jerusalem was filled with pil-
grims at the מוׁעד. This word, translated in RSV as appointed
feasts, seems to imply that man has an appointment with God.

[57]The cereal offering is always one ephah of flour for

unblemished young bull, six lambs and a ram, together with
the cereal offering (46:6-7).

The first day of the first and seventh months were des-
ignated by Ezekiel as days of atonement on which a young, un-
blemished bull was to be sacrificed as a sin-offering (חטאת)
to cleanse (כפר) the temple.[58] The rite, consisting of plac-
ing the blood of the bull on the door posts of the bait, the
corners of the altar and the post of the gate of the inner
court (45:19), atoned for sins of error and ignorance (45:20).

The Passover, associated with a seven-day period during
which unleavened bread (מצות) was eaten and special sacri-
fices offered, was celebrated on the fourteenth day of the
first month (45:21-24).[59] An identical set of offerings is
prescribed for an unnamed seven-day feast beginning on the
fifteenth day of the seventh month (45:25).[60]

In the Pentateuch the Sabbath is primarily a day of rest.
On this day the nomads were not to gather manna (Exodus 16),

---

each bull and ram and as much flour as the prince can supply
for each lamb. This meal is moistened with one hin of oil
per ephah of flour. The daily offering called for one-sixth
ephah of flour moistened with one-sixth hin of oil. Cf. Ez.
46:11,14.

[58]In 45:20 the LXX is followed rather than MT to obtain
the reading of the first day of the seventh month. Vv. 18
and 20 seem to use מקדש and בית interchangeably.

[59]During the Passover week the daily sacrifice consisted
of seven bulls, seven rams as O, one male goat as a sin-
offering (חטאת), and the prescribed cereal offering. (Supra,
pp. 80-81, n. 58.)

[60]It is not clear whether the fifteenth day begins, ends
or lies in the middle of the festal week.

nor wood for fires (Numbers 15:32-36), nor do any form of
work (Exodus 20:8-11; 31:12-17; 35:1-3; Leviticus 19:3,30;
23:3; Deuteronomy 5:12-15). Its significance was rooted in
the creation (Exodus 20:8-11; 31:17) and in the Exodus from
Egypt (Deuteronomy 5:12-15). Its observance was an act of
obedience to the covenant (Exodus 31:16; Deuteronomy 5:2-15).
On the Sabbath the High Priest was to set the show bread in
order on the table in the holy place (Leviticus 24:8).[61]

The daily, Sabbath and New Moon sacrifices are defined
in Numbers 28 (P). The daily O consists of two lambs, one
sacrificed in the morning and the other in the evening, each
accompanied by a tenth ephah of flour moistened by a fourth
hin of oil (28:3-8). The Sabbath O comprises two unblemished
yearling male lambs with two-tenths ephah of flour (28:9-10).
The New Moon O requires two young bulls, one ram, and seven
unblemished male lambs. The prescribed meal offering which
accompanies the animals is three-tenths ephah of flour per
bull, two-tenths ephah for each ram, and one-tenth ephah for
each lamb. A drink offering of wine, consisting of a half
hin per bull, a third hin per ram, and a fourth hin per lamb
is specified. P also requires a male goat for a sin-offering
on the New Moon (Numbers 28:11-15).[62]

Ezekiel's stress on the first day of the first month

---

[61]The major festivals of Israel are also considered as
special Sabbaths.

[62]The sin-offering of the New Moon is always a goat in P
and a bull in Ezekiel (compare Ez. 46:6-7 and Num. 28:15; 29:5).

has no parallel in the Pentateuch, but his emphasis on the

first day of the seventh month finds counterpart in P (Num-

bers 29:1).[63] On the other hand, the Day of Atonement, which

according to H (Leviticus 16; 23:26-32) and P (Numbers 29:7-11)

fell on the tenth day of the seventh month is not mentioned by

Ezekiel. The ritual of the Day of Atonement in H calls for

two goats, one sacrificed as a sin-offering for the people

and the other sent into the wilderness, and a bull to be

sacrificed as a sin-offering for the High Priest. The High

Priest, wearing special vestments and shrouded by a cloud of

incense, springles the blood of the bull and the goat on and

before the mercy seat in the Most Holy place and sprinkles

additional blood from these animals at the altar.[64]

It is agreed by all sources (JE, D, P, H, Ezekiel) that

unleavened bread (מצות) is to be eaten for seven days begin-

ning with the fifteenth day of the first month.[65] In Exodus

23 the name מצות is given to the feast. Ezekiel and Deutero-

nomy mention that unleavened bread is to be eaten in conjunc-

tion with the Passover (פסח). H and P distinguish between

---

[63]It seems strange that P should require less on the first
day of the seventh month than on the first day of the others.
The O in Num. 29:2 has only one bull; 28:11 called for two.
In Ezekiel these days are for atonement of the temple; in P
it is a holy convocation (מקרא—קרש).

[64]Ezekiel neglects to mention not only the day but also
the ark and the High Priest. The title "High Priest" is rare
in the Old Testament.

[65]JE (Exodus 23:14); P (Numbers 28:17); H (Leviticus 23:6);
Ezekiel 45:21; D (Deut. 16:8). The D source calls for six days
of מצות.

Passover which falls on the fourteenth of the month and
which begins on the fifteenth.

In Deuteronomy the Passover sacrifice may be from either
the flock or the herd (Deuteronomy 16:2) and it is to be
boiled (Deuteronomy 16:7), but in P (Exodus 12:1-12) it is a
roasted lamb.[66] It is a pilgrim feast (D) at which one may
not appear empty-handed (JE) but must be prepared to make an
offering by fire (H). Detailed instructions regarding the
sacrifices which accompany the festal banquet are given in
Ezekiel and P.[67]

The Feast of Weeks mentioned by D (Deuteronomy 16:9-12)
and discussed in greater detail by H (Leviticus 23:15-22) and
P (Numbers 28:26-31) is entirely absent from Ezekiel.

Ezekiel and P (Numbers 29:12-16) leave unnamed the feast
beginning on the fifteenth day of the seventh month. In H
(Leviticus 23:33-36,39-43) and D (Deuteronomy 16:13-15) it is
identified by the name "booths" and is a joyous harvest fes-
tival at which the people live in booths. H specifies that
an offering shall be made but does not elaborate. P (Numbers
29:12-16) calls for thirteen bulls, two rams and fourteen
lambs the first day. Each day of the feast the number of

---

[66]These regulations need not be mutually exclusive. It
has been observed that the Samaritans scald the Passover lamb
in boiling water before dressing and roasting it.

[67]Ezekiel's requirements have been listed above, supra,
p. 81. P calls for two bulls, seven lambs, one ram as O and
one goat as a sin-offering. The meal offering is three-tenths
ephah per bull, two-tenths ephah per ram and one-tenth ephah
per lamb. These offerings do not replace, but supplement the
daily offerings.

bulls to be sacrificed decreases by one until on the last,
or eighth, day only seven bulls are offered. The number of
rams and lambs remains constant until the last day when only
one ram and seven lambs are offered. The usual meal offering
of P, consisting of three-tenths ephah per bull, two-tenths
ephah per ram and one-tenth ephah per lamb is specified in
this feast also.[68]

The calendar of Ezekiel has no Day of Atonement with a
ritual like that in H. Brinker thinks it may have been a
late addition to P.[69] Douglas suggests it is missing because
the atonement is complete.[70] Procksch believes the omission
of the feast indicates the author's concern for symmetry, as
well as a double pre-exilic system of calendars. The younger
calendar called for a vernal Day of Atonement and the older,
an autumnal. These two atonement days, he continues, were
not observed in the post-exilic era; in the Torah we read of
only one Day of Atonement. The symmetrical arrangement of
feasts permits only two chief festivals to remain, the feast
of weeks being omitted.[71] The remaining feasts stress sin
and forgiveness rather than joyful celebration.

---

[68]Ezekiel's requirements are listed above, supra, p. 88.

[69]R. Brinker, The Influence of Sanctuaries in Early Israel
(Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1946), p. 128.

[70]George C. M. Douglas, "Ezekiel's Temple," Expository
Times, IX (May-August 1898), 421. That this view is doubtful
is evident from the stress on semi-annual atonement rituals
for the temple itself and the continuing sacrifices for sin.

[71]Procksch, pp. 111-112.

The Priest

Bertholet[72] and Procksch[73] state that the distinction
between priests, Levites and laity was first made by Ezekiel.
The prophet points out that henceforth only the Zadokites
were to function as priests because they had been faithful
(44:15), while the Levites were demoted from true priestly
service because they had been unfaithful (44:10-12). However,
as Bertholet notes, we read in Ezekiel 8-11 that idolatry
was rampant in the temple during the last ten years prior to
the fall of Jerusalem, the period during which the temple was
under the control of the Zadokites (2 Kings 25:18-20).[74]
Blackwood proposes to solve this problem by assuming,

> Undoubtedly there had been corruption in the Zadokite
> ranks (Jeremiah 8:1-10, etc.), but on a comparative
> scale much less than among the country priests, or, as
> Ezekiel calls them, the "Levites."[75]

Procksch suggests that if the priests in charge of the house
(bait, 40:45) are identical with the Levites in charge of the
house (bait, 45:5), "so hat der wahre Hesekiel keinen Unter-
scheid zwischen Priestern und Leviten gemacht."[76] It now

---

[72]Alfred Bertholet, Der Verfassungsentwurf des Hesekiel
in Seiner Religions Geschictlichen Bedeutung (Tübingen: J. C.
B. Mohr, 1896), pp. 1-28.

[73]Procksch, p. 107.

[74]Bertholet, p. 17.

[75]Andrew W. Blackwood, Jr., Ezekiel--Prophecy of Hope
(Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1965), p. 258.

[76]Procksch, p. 109.

becomes necessary, therefore, to discuss the problem of iden-
tifying the Zadokites, Levites and the foreigners mentioned
in chapter 44. It has been noted that the author of Ezekiel
40-48 is quite liberal in his attitude to the foreigners liv-
ing in Israel; they are to be allotted land within the borders
of the tribe where they dwell (47:22). On the other hand, he
denies them access to the sanctuary (migdash) and rebukes the
Israelites for previously having permitted these foreigners
to have access to the temple and to function as a lower class
of priests within it (44:6-9).

These foreigners within the temple to whom Ezekiel ob-
jects were presumably engaged in menial tasks. Early in Is-
rael's history (Joshua 9:23-27) the men of Gibeon and its
neighboring cities were made temple and community slaves whose
function was to draw water and cut wood. Perhaps these and
other foreigners eventually rose to greater responsibilities.[77]
Some may have been adopted into the Levite tribe.[78] At an
early stage, according to Herbert, no emphasis was placed on
the priest having physical descent from either Aaron or
Levi.[79]

---

[77]George Albert Cooke, A Critical and Exegetical Comment-
ary on the Book of Ezekiel in ICC (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark,
1951), p. 479; Gray, p. 233; Blackwood, p. 256. Tasks included
gatekeepers, temple servants, butchers serving the people at
the shrine (44:11), presumably by boiling their sacrifices (46:21)

[78]William Foxwell Albright, Archeology and the Religion of
Israel (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1942), p. 109.

[79]A. S. Herbert, Worship in Ancient Israel (Richmond, Va.:
John Knox Press, 1959), pp. 36, 39.

Sandmel says,

> There are many puzzles about the Levites. The word
> seems to have meant almost the equivalent of priest
> without regard to ancestry, and seems also to have
> meant someone who was supposedly a descendant from Levi,
> the second son of Jacob. In these chapters [Ez. 40-48]
> priests are distinguished as a select group within the
> larger group of Levites. We are at a way station in
> the evolution of priesthood in Israel.[80]

Brinker presents a summary of the biblical evidence re-
garding the relation between the priesthood and the tribe of
Levi. He concludes:

> In tracing the history of the Hebrew priesthood from
> its probable beginnings in the institution of the first-
> born, through the more permanent office of the whole
> tribe of Levi to the priesthood as a monopoly of the
> house of Aaron (or Moses), we have been able to observe
> a gradual move in the direction of restricting the access
> to cultic offices to a steadily narrowing group of per-
> sons. . . . The selective process within the priesthood
> seems to have continued. . . . (an unsuccessful attempt
> seems to have been made by Ezekiel to confine the priest-
> hood to the narrower circle of the house of Sadok)[81]

On the other hand, as Meek observes, by the end of the Greek
period, the Zadokites constitute a distinct party and came to
be known as the Sadducees.[82]

Another group of Levites (הלוים), the sons of Zadok (בני)
or seed (זרע) are given the title of priests (כהנים). These
individuals are, according to Ezekiel, comprised of those who

---

[80]Solomon Sandmel, _The Hebrew Scriptures: An Introduction to Their Literature and Religious Ideas_ (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), p. 167.

[81]Brinker, p. 80.

[82]Theophile James Meek, "Aaronites and Zadokites," _American Journal of Semitic Language and Literature_, XLV (1928-29), 166.

were faithful in keeping "my sanctuary" (מקדשי, 44:15). The priests are privileged to enter the sanctuary (מקדשי) and approach the table (שלחני) of Yahweh (44:15-16). These men ministered in the inner court and at its gates (44:17). Within the inner court they were clad in linen (פשתים) breeches and turbans (44:18), to avoid any garment that would induce sweat. The linen garments were replaced before the priest returned to the outer court (44:19). His hair was to be neatly trimmed, but not shaved (44:20). While on duty the priest was to abstain from wine (44:21). He was permitted to marry a virgin or a widow of a priest, but not other widows. He must avoid the ceremonial defilement that would obtain from contact with the dead, with the exception of a member of the immediate family, such as a parent, sibling or child.[83] In the event of such ceremonial defilement, the priest remained unclean for seven days before offering the sin-offering.

Tasks of the priest were didactic (44:23: "Teach my people the distinction between holy and profane, clean and unclean"), judicial (44:24: "in a controversy act as judges, and . . . judge it according to my judgments"--משפטי), exemplary (44:24), sacrificial (46:19-20: boiling the sin- and guilt-offerings and baking the cereal offering; and, 44:15: manipulating the fat and the blood).

---

[83]In this connection Ezekiel was consistent. Note his behavior at the death of his wife (Ezek. 24:15-18). Regarding the sibling, Ezekiel specifies a brother or an unmarried sister (44:25). Similar rules for priests and stricter rules for the High Priest are given in Lev. 21.

There is a variety of theories regarding the identity of Zadok. According to one tradition (1 Chronicles 12:28) Zadok was a warrior who helped David win the kingdom. Hauer thinks of Zadok as a young Jebusite priest who probably went over to David prior to the conquest of the city and supplied him with valuable "intelligence" for which he was rewarded with the priesthood.[84] Rowley contends that two genealogies are given for Zadok, one of which is due to "textual corruption" and the other to "pious fabrication."[85] Meek asserts that the earliest reference to Zadok (2 Samuel 8:17) says nothing of his ancestry; hence, there is no connection between Zadok and Aaron,[86] and the connection established by the chronicler is to be considered a "genealogical fiction."[87] These conclusions are based on 1 Kings 2:27 which, he believes, indicates that Zadok and Aaron belonged to different families.[88]

Albright,[89] on the other hand, admits that "Zadok was not a descendant of Eli, but there is no adequate reason to

---

[84]Christian E. Hauer, "Who Was Zadok?" JBL, LXXXII (March 1963), 90-91. Jean Steinmann, Le Prophète Ezéchiel et Les Debuts de l'Exil (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1953), p. 220; Herbert G. May, "The Book of Ezekiel," The Interpreter's Bible, VI (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), 310; and H[arold] H[enry] Rowley, "Zadok and Nehustan," JBL, LVIII (1939), 113, share this view that Zadok was a Jebusite priest.

[85]Rowley, pp. 113-132.

[86]Meek, p. 159.

[87]Ibid., p. 165.

[88]Ibid., p. 159.

[89]Albright, Archeology, p. 110.

consider him as not Aaronid. By selecting Zadok, Ezekiel is in accord with the Samaritan tradition of restricting the priesthood the the family of Eleazar.[90]

Bright[91] and Brinker[92] suggest that Zadok probably belonged to the Gibeon priesthood which claimed certain connections with the tabernacle. Douglas believes that Zadok had been installed as a legitimate priest by Saul who recognized his descent from Eleazar.[93]

According to I Samuel the family of Eli is traced by way of Phinehas, Ahitub, and Ahimelech, to Abiathar (4:11; 14:3; 22:9; 22:20). Ahimelech was a descendant of Ithamar, the son of Aaron (1 Chronicles 24:3). The tradition that Ithamar and Eleazar were sons of Aaron is confirmed in 1 Chronicles 6:3, where the genealogy of Zadok is traced from Aaron by way of Eleazar, Phinehas, Abishua, Bukki, Uzzi, Zerahiah, Meraioth, Amariah, Ahitub, Zadok. Ezra (7:1-5) traces his genealogy by way of Zadok to Eleazar and Aaron in reverse order, but in complete agreement with 1 Chronicles 6.

It seems rather arbitrary to dismiss the evidence of Chronicles as "pious fabrication" and genealogical fiction,

---

[90]Moses Gaster, The Samaritans, Their History, Doctrines and Literature (London: Oxford University Press, 1925), pp. 7, 8, 15.

[91]John Bright, "The Prophets Were Protestants: Fresh Results of Valid Criticism," Interpretation, I (April 1947), 164.

[92]Brinker, p. 190.

[93]Douglas, p. 516.

despite the fact that it lies within a section of Scripture
with definite priestly interests. If it be true that the
priestly writers considered genealogies important, one would
expect them not to fabricate new ones, but to preserve the
existing ones. The Chronicles passage does not disagree with
1 Kings 2:27; the latter passage only states that Abiathar
was descended from Eli and that his suspension from the Jer-
usalem priesthood confirmed the judgment against Eli. It does
not suggest, as Rowley seems to believe, that Zadok is not of
the house of Aaron; it only confirms the obvious fact that
Zadok was not of the house of Eli.

In view of available evidence, it seems best to suggest
that Zadok was a Gibeonite priest of Aaronic background who
was installed at the Jerusalem shrine with Abiathar by David
and whose priesthood was confirmed in the days of Solomon.

Several answers have been given to the question of the
high priest. It has been contended that there was no high
priest in the pre-exilic era to compare with the one in the
post-exilic period. During the monarchy, Herbert states,
"the king was the priestly person par excellence, and it is
he who dominates the Temple and its cultus (I Kings 6; 7:15-
50; 8)."[94] Procksch believes that Ezekiel, himself a priest,

_____

[94]Herbert, p. 23. There is no doubt that the kings and
members of their families exercised certain cultic functions,
but the text which Herbert cites does not bear the weight he
places on it. Chaps. 6 and 7 are irrelevant. According to
chap. 8 the sacrifices comprising 22,000 oxen and 120,000
sheep (8:63) were offered by Solomon and all the people (8:5,
62). It is doubtful that one man in the allotted time could

knew of the office of high priest but deliberately chose to
omit it and make the prince the chief leader in the theocracy,
thus eliminating the lust for power among the priests.[95]
Douglas thinks the vision of Ezekiel sets forth an ideal re-
garding the priesthood and in no way was intended to subvert
the Mosaic law. His use of the name Zadok is a further in-
dication of the ideal or symbolic character of the priesthood
in Ezekiel, since the name means "righteous."[96] MacKay seems
to hold that Ezekiel himself was the functioning high priest
and that his activity in the vision should be compared with
the role of Moses. As evidence for this theory he says,

> Ezekiel was a Zadokite (1:3) and could enter the holy
> place (41:1-3) as a representative priest. Like Moses
> he is addressed from the seat on the cherubim (Num 7:8,
> 9); his primary task of bearing in his body the sins of
> Israel (4:4) suggests a national priest (Num 18:1) with
> day for year [sic] victim (Lev 16:21); and hierarchical
> rank is ascribed in his wife's personifying the Temple,
> while he, like the high priest in the Holiness Code
> (Lev. 21:10ff) is forbidden to mourn her death (24:15ff).[97]

Solomon Zeitlin asserts that Ezekiel 40-48 was written
during the second commonwealth and that the author had the
high priest in mind when he used the term _nasi_. He justifies
this view by the fact that, after the restoration, the high

---

slaughter so many head of livestock and manipulate the large
quantities of blood. The large number of animals involved
and the compound subject agree to suggest that the verb
is best understood in the sense of providing the sacrifice
rather than as describing a priestly activity.

[95]Procksch, p. 123.

[96]Douglas, p. 517.

[97]MacKay, pp. 20-21.

priest was charged with secular duties. According to this
scholar, the pre-exilic high priest was called כהן הראש and
the title כהן הגדול was employed in the post-exilic era for
the same individual. _Nasi_, he continues, is the word which
designates the secular head of any community, Jewish or non-
Jewish.[98] Brinker, on the other hand, concludes,

> An examination of the Hebrew sources dealing with the
> immediate post-exilic period seems to us to support
> Van Hoonacker's [The Aaronides] conclusion that also
> after the Exile the high priest did not correspond
> closely with the description of him as given in P.
> Apart from the passages in Zechariah, we find neither
> in Haggai nor in Ezra nor Nehemiah any indication of a
> high priest occupying such an exalted and all-powerful
> position in the re-established community at Jerusalem.[99]

Berry emphatically contends that the term "the priest" in
Ezekiel 40-48 "obviously" refers to the high priest.[100]

A survey of the biblical evidence indicates that if P,
Joshua and Kings are post-exilic, then all references to כהן
הראש, כהן הגדול, and כהן המשיח are post-exilic, excepting
one reference to כהן הראש in Jeremiah 29:26. The usual
reference to the head of any shrine is simply הכהן.[101] It

---

[98]Solomon Zeitlin, "The Titles High Priest and Nasi of
the Sanhedrin," _Jewish Quarterly Review_, XLVIII (1957-58),
1-5.

[99]Brinker, p. 83.

[100]Berry, "Authorship," _JBL_, p. 39.

[101]Note that כהן הגדל is used in Lev. 21:10; Num. 35:25,
28,32; Josh. 20:6; 2 Kings 12:11; Hag. 1:1,12,14; 2:2,4;
Zech. 3:1,8; 6:11; Neh. 3:1,20; 13:28; 2 Chron. 34:9. כהן
המשיח   is used in Lev. 4:3,5,16; 6:15; כהן הראש is used
in 2 Kings 25:18; Jer. 29:26; Ezra 7:5; 2 Chron. 19:11; 24:11;
26:20; 31:10.   הכהן הכהנים is found in 2 Kings 12:8 (v. 7
in English translations).

should be noted, however, that the date for the name of an office does not define the age of the office nor the age of the document in which it is found, but only the age of the present edition of that document.

Neither the high priest nor his function is mentioned in Ezekiel 40-48. As Procksch has indicated, the omission appears to be deliberate;[102] if so, one reason for it may be to eliminate a priestly lust for power. It has also been noted that the plan of the temple is highly symmetrical as was the division of the land. The review of the cultus in Ezekiel 40-48 indicates that a concern for symmetry prevails here also. This does not prove, but strongly suggests, that the author had an ideal in mind.

The Prince

Hebrew is well supplied with words that may be used to denote a secular or sacred ruler.[103] From this large variety the author of Ezekiel 40-48 restricts himself almost exclusively to נשיא. It is, therefore, desirable to study the precise meaning of this word and its usage throughout the history of Israel in order to elucidate why the prophet chose the term.

Procksch offers some help in this direction. He first points out that the prince and priests are "keine Phantasie-Gebilde, sondern Gestalten der Geschichte des Judentum, ihre

---

[102]Procksch, p. 123.

[103]Among them are: ‏מלך, נשיא, רעה, נגיד, משל, ארץ‎.

Bedeutung in Hesekiel's Entwurf klarzustellen ist also eine
Aufgabe der geschichtlichen Forschung."[104] The term, he con-
tinues, is first used prior to the monarchy in the Book of
the Covenant (Exodus 22:27) where the nasi is given protec-
tion from curses, a prerogative also claimed by the later
kings (1 Kings 21:10).[105] Thus the prince had a sacred role
from the beginning, he contends. The P code is fond of the
title, and even Abraham is called the prince of God (Genesis
23:6) and the ancestor of God's people. Tribal leaders were
also given the title.[106]

The results of Martin Noth's detailed investigation of
the relation of the nasi to the amphictyony are summarized
in his History of Israel. He notes that the nasi was the
official representative of the several tribes who met at the
annual festivals to discuss questions or problems of interest
to all the tribes. Their precise relation to the priesthood
is not yet clear. The term "may be taken to mean 'speaker,'
following the Hebrew expression נשא קול."[107]

The kinship between the prince and his people is stressed

---

[104] Procksch, p. 99.

[105] Ibid., p. 115: "Vor dem Königtum erscheint der Fürst
schon im Bundesbuch. Hier ist es verboten, Gott und dem
Fürsten zu fluchen (Ex 22 27), woraus ersichtlich ist, dass
der Fürst schon in der alten Stammesverfassung eine sakrale
Rolle spielte, wie sie später auf den König übertragen war
(I Reg 21 10)."

[106] Ibid., pp. 115-116.

[107] Martin Noth, The History of Israel, translated by Stan-
ley Godman (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958), p. 98.

by Procksch, who writes,

> Der Fürst ist stets natürlicher Repräsentant seines
> Stammes, mag er Israelit oder Edomiter, oder Ismaeliter
> sein; im Hesekielbuche ist er das vornehmste Glied des
> israelitischen Kirchenstaates. Er kann zum Statthalter
> des Grosskönigs ernannt werden, wie es bei Scheschbas-
> sar und Zerubabel der Fall war; doch "Fürst" wird er
> nicht durch sein Statthalteramt sondern ist es durch
> seine Geburt.[108]

He continues by suggesting that since Ezekiel had already
designated David and Zedekiah by the term nasi, it is probable
that he believed that in the restored theocracy the prince
would be of the Davidic house. In the early years after the
restoration this was actually the case. Later the Persian
king either reduced or retracted the post, possibly in re-
sponse to certain messianic hopes which were being attached
by some of the people to Zerubbabel. From that time on, mem-
bers of the Davidic family no longer appear as the "governors"
although they dwelt in Jerusalem and maintained their lin-
eage.[109]

There is a diffierence of opinion among scholars regard-
ing the status of the prince in Ezekiel 40-48. Anderson,[110]
Steinmann[111] and Bright[112] think that the prince held a role

[108]Procksch, p. 120.

[109]Ibid., pp. 120-121.

[110]Bernhard W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament
(Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), p. 381.

[111]Steinmann, p. 263.

[112]John Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: The
Westminster Press, 1959), p. 352.

entirely subordinate to that of the priests. Bertholet,[113] Procksch[114] and Gese[115] are certain that although the new state is a theocracy, the human king therein is the chief servant of God and the priests are subordinate to the prince. Lofthouse[116] speaks of the prince as the new civil head of the community who is a special creation of Ezekiel and who does not appear in P. Gese[117] finds both an ideal aspect and an historical aspect in the person of the prince. In Hölscher's estimation he is the most important person in the early post-exilic era.[118] Messel, as one would expect from the dates he proposes for the book, equates the nasi with pecha.[119] Unger proposes that both the prince and the priests could be "confined to resurrected Old Testament saints" who would offer these sacrifices during the millenium.[120] The view of Zeitlin, that the nasi refers to the high priest, has

---

[113]Bertholet, p. 12.

[114]Procksch, pp. 115, 122.

[115]Gese, pp. 110-112.

[116]W. F. Lofthouse, "Israel After the Exile," The Clarendon Bible, edited by Wild and G. H. Box, IV (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928), 87.

[117]Gese, p. 116.

[118]Hölscher, pp. 211-212. Cf. also, Herntrich, pp. 121-124. Herntrich thinks Ezekiel chose the term as a pun based on Jer. 23:33 and Ez. 12:10: הזה אשמה הם-אשה אתם (Jeremiah) הנשיא הזה הנשיא (Ezekiel).

[119]Messel, p. 116.

[120]Merrill F. Unger, "Ezekiel's Vision of Israel's Restoration," Bibliotheca Sacra, CVI (July-September 1949), 324.

already been mentioned.[121]

Bertholet believes that although the prophet envisions a dynastic rule, the word "king" is too strong for him. The prophet speaks, with only rare exceptions, of the ruler as a prince and reserves the title "king" for Yahweh Himself.[122] Procksch points out the fact that the name nasi is used by the prophet only in reference to the house of David. In the old monarchy the king had both a political and a sacral function of which only the sacred remained in Ezekiel's theocracy, and for this reason the prophet chose the term nasi. So dominant is the prophet's use of this term that the Septuagint even translates the rare occurrences of melek by $\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\omega}\nu$ rather than $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{u}s$.[123] Anderson sees in the prophet's choice of nasi a tendency, common among the prophets, to "'return' to the period of the tribal confederacy in their royal eschatology."[124] Steinmann thinks that the prince is given the title nasi rather than melek because the prophet accepts the legitimacy of the Zadokites.[125]

An examination of the text reveals that the word melek, occurring thirty-seven times in the book of Ezekiel,[126] is

---

[121]Supra, p. 94.

[122]Bertholet, p. 11.

[123]Procksch, p. 116.

[124]Anderson, p. 165.

[125]Steinmann, p. 263.

[126]Supra, p. 51.

used to designate the leader of Israel nine times (1:2; 7:27; 17:12; 37:22,24; 43:7,9). Of these nine references, the Septuagint deletes the second use in 37:22 and translates the remaining two in that chapter as if the text were nasi. If the Septuagint use of nasi in chapter 37 be correct, it may be observed that all references to the melek, whether it be of Israel or any other specific nation, are uncomplimentary in tone, describing a king who practices idolatry, awaits defeat from Babylon, is in exile in Babylon, or is dead. On the other hand, the remaining occurrences of the term refer to the king of Babylon in phrases that praise his power and authority.

It should be noted further that the term nasi is never used to refer to the king of Babylon, but is used to designate the chief executive or prominent member of the royal family of a nation subservient to Babylon. Of the thirty-five occurrences in the book, nineteen appear in the closing nine chapters. The word is used nine times (eleven in the Septuagint reading in chapter 37 is accepted) in chapters 1-24 and 33-37 in regard to an individual in Israel, and seven times in chapters 25-32 and 38-39 of a leader of a non-Israelite state.

This tendency leads one to suspect that political considerations prompted the prophet in the choice of terms. Such a Tendenz would be anticipated only during the age of the exile while the Babylonians were the dominant power, and lends strong support to the traditional date and authorship

of the book.

Ezekiel assigns to the prince very distinct duties and unique privileges in the restored community. No other citizen, including the priest, is permitted to enter the east gate through which the _kabod Yahweh_ re-entered the temple; the prince, however, is permitted to use this gate and to sit there and eat bread before Yahweh. This distinction suggests that the prophet viewed the _nasi_ as the representative of God among His people.

It will be recalled that the _nasi_ was also clearly recognized as a representative of the people.[127] It seems legitimate, therefore, to see the _nasi_ as a sort of mediator between God and man, having a cultic importance in addition to his responsibility of providing the state sacrifices.

On the other hand, the prince does not function as a priest; he is not granted access to the inner court and the altar which stands there. Further, the temple grounds are geographically distinct from the grounds of the city and the prince, and are no longer considered as legitimate burial grounds for the dead kings. Clearly the prophet wishes to abolish any sense of the temple as being a royal chapel.

---

[127] _Supra_, p. 97.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

The picture which emerges from this study of the book
of Ezekiel is of a book with greater unity than has been rec-
ognized by many scholars. Unless one proceeds from the un-
proven presupposition that only poetic oracles of doom are
appropriate to the prophet, the message of hope, including
the ideas imbedded in the closing nine chapters of the book,
is essential to a balanced presentation. There is no reason
to assume that a priest could have no interest in poetry, nor
is there reason to believe that a prophet overwhelmed with
bitterness over the message of doom to be proclaimed could
not find a message of hope when the tragedy he had predicted
becomes a reality. The portrait of the prophet is reliable;
to this portrait the unity of the book is tied.

Throughout the closing nine chapters of the book the
prophet appears to be the independent designer of a utopia.
Utilizing the broken myth as well as a full visionary style,
he sets forth a literary vision of the future. In certain
sections of these concluding chapters he pictures the future
as a return to the conditions of Paradise. Historical insti-
tutions with which he was familiar and geographical consider-
ations are recast to fit the ideal pattern established by his
view of Paradise. Some of these, such as the temple, are
described in a full-vision style in which a heavenly escort

addresses the prophet in the second person singular. The whole was composed by the prophet, not in the midst of, but probably following the visionary experience when he had had opportunity to contemplate the significance of all that had been revealed to him.

The prophet's independence is shown throughout the book in his use of the traditions to which he was an heir. He adapts existing poetry to his own purpose by presenting a commentary on it which is tangentially related to the original verse. The previously existing temple and altar of Solomon, apparently the models for his sketch, are modified by the addition of certain features and the removal of others. It may be presumed that he was familiar with the JE code, but he felt no constraint to follow its provisions in regard to altar design. It is generally recognized that the temple of Solomon was essentially a royal chapel, under the control of the king and located in close proximity to the palace. Ezekiel felt free to separate them widely. The prophet seems also to have favored moving the capital north from the Jerusalem site to a more central location, possibly Shechem. The tribes of Israel, in Ezekiel's pattern, were all moved to the region west of the Jordan, forfeiting their rights to Trans-Jordan, and being arranged in a manner that erased the old national lines. Temple tasks once assigned to foreigners were transferred by the prophet to the Levites, while the priesthood proper was delegated to the faithful of the house of Zadok.

It is impossible to prove conclusively the precise rela-
tion between Ezekiel and the Pentateuchal Codes. It appears
from this study that the codes in existence at the time of
Ezekiel were not binding in their authority for his purposes.
For this reason it is quite possible that the Torah experi-
enced some editorial revision in the post-exilic era. This
is not to say that the Torah was a post-exilic composition.
The view held by this writer is in agreement with Procksch,
that Ezekiel was familiar with a pre-exilic version of H and
P as well as JE and D. The precise relation between these
pre-exilic versions of the codes and the Torah which we now
possess involves a study beyond the scope of this paper.

The corrupt state of the text, the disagreement between
the Septuagint and the Hebrew, the ease with which rearrange-
ments have been proposed and defended, as well as the free
interchange between person and number when addressing the
priest and the prince in chapters 43-46, all converge to
suggest that the text of the book of Ezekiel has suffered
greatly in transmission. It is possible that the text was
transmitted orally for a season during which time insertions
and deletions were made, causing several recensions to de-
velop. There appears, however, to be no reliable criteria
to determine the nature and scope of all the glosses and
strata. What appears to one scholar to be clear objective
technique is to his colleague mere subjective opinion.

The message presented in the closing chapters of the
book of Ezekiel begins with a picture of the restored temple.

The importance of this restoration for the exiles who had
lost their sanctuary cannot be overemphasized. It stressed
that the God whom they had come to know more fully as the Lord
of history through the experience of national catastrophe had
not forsaken them but was willing once again to tabernacle in
their midst. It assured them, and informs us as well, that
the God who knows us at our worst still loves His fallen crea-
tures. His willingness to tabernacle with them is a clear
indication of divine forgiveness and restoration.

The temple the prophet was privileged to see was con-
structed in such a manner that every feature might impress
upon the worshipper the distinction between the sacred and
the profane. It was located in the tract of land assigned
to the Zadokites and removed from the city, stressing that
God was quite far removed from man, and that man approached
Him on His terms, not on man's own. Its succeeding areas of
holiness were elevated one above the other to stress the
ascent to God. Associated with the increasing holiness of
the more interior aspects of the temple was an increasing
restriction regarding the persons privileged to enter. The
Zadokites alone draw nigh to the temple proper to manipulate
the blood and ascend the altar in the inner court. Levites
are assigned to the heavier tasks of sacrifice within the
outer court. The prince has the unique privilege, as a rep-
resentative of God, to sit in the east gate to eat during
the worship activities. He is not, however, permitted to
officiate at the sacrifices even though he had provided them

as a representative of the people.

Forth from the temple the prophet saw flowing a river that watered the ground, transforming the land into a Paradise. When it is recalled that God was tabernacling in that temple whence the water flowed, it can be seen that the prophet wished to stress that the blessings of the earth, the fertility of the soil, the life-sustaining qualities of the plants and the sea all derive from the God who is also the Lord of all creation. From Him flow the blessings on which all life on earth depends.

Such a God, who is Lord of history and Lord of creation, dwells among His people assuring them of His forgiveness and fellowship, and invites His creature to appear before Him in worship that is appropriate. The prophet sets before the people a set of cultic regulations based on previous practices which stress that man draws near to God in worship on terms and conditions God Himself has ordained. The conditions are such that man can never forget that God is holy, and that man approaches by privilege, not by right.

The prescribed sacrifices are of such a nature that the worshipper is reminded of his responsibility to consecrate each day, each week, each month to the God who redeemed him. Nevertheless, he is reminded by the semi-annual offerings of reconsecration of the temple that even his best intentions and highest motives are so corrupt that he defiles that which is truly holy. Against this background of man's corruption the Book of Ezekiel projects a clear picture of the grace of God.

APPENDIX

Transliteration Key

kabod Yahweh . . . . כבד יהוה

qinah . . . . קינה

Yahweh shamma . . . . יהוה שמה

bait . . . . ב׳ת

miqdash . . . . מקדש

nasi . . . . נש׳א

melek . . . . מלך

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

Biblia Hebraica. New York: American Bible Society, 1950.

Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, editors. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955. Pp. 256-257.

Funk, Isaac K., editor. Funk and Wagnalls' New "Standard" Dictionary of the English Language. New York: Funk and Wagnall Company, 1962.

Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954.

Septuaginta. 2 vols. New York: American Bible Society, 1952.

Wright, George Ernest and Floyd V. Filson, editors. Westminster Historical Atlas. Revised edition. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956.

B. Secondary Sources

Aalders, Jan Gerrit. Gog en Magog en Ezechiel. With an English summary. Kampen: Kok, 1951. Pp. 166-172.

-----. "The Theophanies in the Old Testament," Free University Quarterly, VIII (1961), 3-15.

Ackroyd, P. R. "Criteria for the Maccabean Dating of Literature," Vetus Testamentum, III (1953), 113-132.

Albright, William Foxwell. Archeology and the Religion of Israel. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1942.

-----. "The Babylonian Temple-Tower and the Altar of Burnt Offering," Journal of Biblical Literature, XXXIX (1920), 137-142.

-----. The Biblical Period. Reprinted from The Jews; Their History, Culture and Religion. Edited by Louis Finkelstein. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

-----. From the Stone Age to Christianity. 2nd edition.
    Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday-Anchor Books, 1957.

-----. "King Jehoiachin in Exile," Biblical Archeologist,
    V (1942), 49-55.

-----. "The Seal of Eliakim and the Latest Pre-exilic Hist-
    ory of Judah, with Some Observations on Ezekiel," Jour-
    nal of Biblical Literature, LI (1932), 77-106.

-----. "Two Cressets from Morisa and the Pillars of Jachin
    and Boaz," Bulletin of the American Schools for Oriental
    Research, LXXXV (1942), 18-27.

-----. "What Were the Cherubim?," Biblical Archeology, I
    (1938), 1-3.

----- and George Ernest Wright. "Comments on Professor Gar-
    ber's Article," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVII
    (1958), 129-132.

Allen, E. L. "Exposition on the Book of Ezekiel," The Inter-
    preter's Bible. VI. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick,
    and others. New York: Abingdon Press, 1952. Pp. 67-338.

Allis, Oswald T. Prophecy and the Church. Philadelphia:
    Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1945.

Anderson, Bernard W. Understanding the Old Testament. Engle-
    wood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957.

----- and Walter Harrelson, editors. Israel's Prophetic Heri-
    tage. Essays in honor of James Muilenburg. 1st edition.
    New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

Anderson, George Wishart. A Critical Introduction to the Old
    Testament. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., Ltd., 1959.

Archer, Gleason L. A Survey of Old Testament Introduction.
    Chicago: The Moody Press, 1964.

Auvray, Paul. "Sur le sens du mot ayin en Ez i 18 et x 12,"
    Vetus Testamentum, IV (1954), 1-6.

Baab, Otto J. The Theology of the Old Testament. New York:
    Abingdon Press, 1949.

Barr, James. "The Interpretation of Scripture: Revelation
    through History in the Old Testament and in Modern The-
    ology," Interpretation, XVII (1963), 193-205.

Baumann, Eberhard. "Die Hauptvisionen Hesekiels in ihren zeit-
    lichen und sachlichen Zusammenhang untersucht," Zeitschrift
    fur alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, LXVII (1955), 56-57.

Beaseley-Murray, G. R. New Bible Commentary. Edited by Fran-
cis Davidson, A. M. Stibbs and E. F. Kevan. 1st edition.
Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953.

Bentzen, Aage. "Biblical Criticism; History of Israel and
Old Testament Theology," Evangelical Quarterly, XXIII
(April 1951), 85-88.

Berry, George Ricker. "The Authorship of Ezekiel 40-48,"
Journal of Biblical Literature, XXXIV (1915), 17-40.

-----. "The Composition of the Book of Ezekiel," Journal of
Biblical Literature, LVIII (1939), 163-175.

-----. "The Glory of Yahweh and the Temple," Journal of Bib-
lical Literature, LVI (1937), 115-117.

-----. "The Title of Ezekiel (1:1-3)," Journal of Biblical
Literature, LI (1932), 54-57.

-----. "Was Ezekiel in the Exile?," Journal of Biblical Lit-
erature, XLIV (1930), 83-93.

Bertholet, Alfred. Der Verfassungsentwurf des Hesekiel in
seiner religions geschictlichen Bedeutung. Tubingen:
J. C. B. Mohr, 1922. (Written in 1896).

Bewer, Julius August. The Literature of the Old Testament.
3rd edition. Completely revised by Emil G. Kraeling.
New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.

-----. "Textual and Exegetical Notes on the Book of Ezekiel,"
Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXII (September 1953),
158-168.

Blackwood, Andrew W., Jr. Ezekiel--Prophecy of Hope. Grand
Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1965.

Botterweck, G. John. "Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Ez xliv 3a,"
Vetus Testamentum, I (1951), 145-146.

Box, G. H. "The Permanent Value of the Old Testament in the
Light of Criticism," Expositor, Series 8, XVIII (July
1919), 1-23.

Boyd, J. Oscar. "Ezekiel and the Modern Dating of the Pent-
ateuch," Princeton Theological Review, XII (1908), 29-51.

Bright, John. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: The West-
minster Press, 1959.

-----. "The Prophets Were Protestants: Fresh Results of Valid
Criticism," Interpretation, I (April 1947), 153-182.

Brinker, R. The Influence of Sanctuaries in Early Israel. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1946.

Brockington, L. H. "The Face of God in the Old Testament," Expository Times, L (1939), 557-560.

-----. "The Presence of God," Expository Times, LVII (October 1945), 21-25.

Broome, Edwin C., Jr. "Ezekiel's Abnormal Personality," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXV (1946), 277-292.

Browne, Laurence E. Ezekiel and Alexander. London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1952.

Burrows, Millar. "Syncretism in the Old Testament," Journal of Bible and Religion, IX (February 1941), 10-16.

Buttenwieser, Moses. "The Date and Character of Ezekiel's Prophecies," Hebrew Union College Annual, VII (1930), 1-18.

-----. The Prophets of Israel, from the 8th to the 5th Century. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1914.

Buzy, Denis. "Les Symboles Prophetiques d'Ezechiel," Revue Biblique, XXIX (1920), 203-228, 353-358 and XXX (1921), 45-54, 161-195.

Cassuto, Umberto. The Documentary Hypothesis and the Composition of the Pentateuch. Translated from the Hebrew by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1961.

Chary, Theophane. Les Prophetes et le Culte a Partir de l'Exil. Tournai: Desclee, 1955. Pp. 1-70; 275-290.

Childs, Brevard S. Myth and Reality in the Old Testament. Naperville, Illinois: A. R. Allenson, 1960.

Congar, Yves M. J. The Mystery of the Temple. Translated by Reginald F. Trevett. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1962.

-----. "Criticism and Beyond," Interpretation, VI (April 1947), 219-225.

Cross, Franck M. "The Tabernacle," Biblical Archeology, X (1947), 45-68.

Cullman, Oscar. "The Necessity and Function of Higher Criticism," The Student World, XLII. 2. (1949), 117-133.

Cundall, Arthur E. "Sanctuaries (Central and Local) in Pre-
     exilic Israel, with Particular Reference to the Book of
     Deuteronomy," Vox Evangelica. Edited by Donald Guthrie.
     IV. London: The Epworth Press, 1965. Pp. 6-27.

Cross, Franck M. "The Tabernacle," Biblical Archeology, X
     (1947), 45-68.

Dahl, George. "Crisis in Ezekiel Research," Quantulacumque.
     Studies presented to Kirsopp Lake by pupils, colleagues
     and friends. Edited by Robert P. Casey, Silva Lake and
     Agnes K. Lake. London: Christophers, 1937.

Dean, J. E. "The Date of Ezekiel XL-XLIII," American Journal
     of Semitic Language and Literature, XLIII (1926-27), 231-
     233.

DeVries, Simon J. "Remembrance in Ezekiel," Interpretation,
     XVI (1962), 58-64.

Dobbie, Robert. "Sacrifice and Morality in the Old Testa-
     ment," Expository Times, LXX (1959), 297-300.

Donohue, John J. "Sin and Sacrifices: Reflections on Levit-
     icus," American Ecclesiastical Review, CXLI (1959), 6-11.

Douglas, George C. M. "Ezekiel's Temple," Expository Times,
     IX-XIV (1898-1903), passim.

Driver, G. R. "Ezekiel: Linguistic and Textual Problems,"
     Biblica, XXXV (1954), 145-159, 299-312.

Eissfeldt, Otto. The Old Testament. An Introduction. The
     History of the Formation of the Old Testament. New York:
     Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.

Enslin, Morton S. "The Bible--Asset or Liability?," Harvard
     Divinity School Bulletin--Annual Lectures and Book Re-
     views (1957-58), 65-84.

Eybers, I. H. "The Book of Ezekiel and the Sect of Qumran,"
     Oud Testament Wissenschaft Sud Africa (1961), 1-9. Ab-
     stracted by F. C. Fensham in Internationale Zeitschrift
     für Bibelwissenschaft un Grenzgebiete, IX (1962-63).

Fairbairn, Patrick. Ezekiel and the Book of His Prophecy--
     an Exposition. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1855.

Farmer, W. R. "The Geography of Ezekiel's River of Life,"
     Biblical Archeology, XIX (1956), 17-22.

Feinberg, Charles L. "The Scapegoat of Leviticus Sixteen,"
     Biblia Sacra, CXV (1950), 320-333.

Fensham, F. Charles. "Thunderstones in Ugarit," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XVIII (1959), 273-274.

Finegan, Jack. "The Chronology of Ezekiel," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXIX (March 1950), 61-66.

------. "Nebuchadnezzar and Jerusalem," Journal of Bible and Religion, XXV (1957), 203-205.

Fisch, S. Ezekiel--Hebrew Text and English Translation. London: The Soncino Press, 1960.

Flack, E[lmer] E. "Ezekiel," Old Testament Commentary. Edited by H. C. Alleman and E. E. Flack. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1948. Pp. 739-777.

Fohrer, Georg. "Die Glossen im Buche Ezechiel," Zeitschrift für alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, LXIII (1951), 33-53.

------. Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezekiel. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1952.

------. "Zehn Jahve Literatur zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie (1951-1960) - VIII Ezechiel," Theologische Rundschau, XXCIII (1962), 261-267.

Francisco, Clyde T. "The Importance of Literary Analysis in Old Testament Interpretation," Review and Expositor, XLIV. 4. (October 1947), 411-429.

Free, Joseph P. "Archeology and New Orthodoxy," Bibliotheca Sacra, CVI (1949), passim.

Freedman, David Noel. "The Book of Ezekiel," Interpretation, VIII (October 1954), 446-471.

------. "The Interpretation of Scripture: On Method in Biblical Studies; the Old Testament," Interpretation, XVII (July 1963), 308-318.

Fuerbringer, Ludwig Ernest. "Kleine Hesekiel Studien," Concordia Theological Monthly, VII (January-June 1937), passim.

Gaebelein, Arno C[lemens]. "The Prophet Ezekiel; an analytical exposition," Annotated Bible. New York: Publication Office of "Our Hope," 1918.

Garber, Paul Leslie. "Reconsidering the Reconstitution of Solomon's Temple," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVII (1958), 123-129, 132-133.

-----. "Reconstructing Solomon's Temple," <u>Biblical Archeology</u>,
XIV (1951), 2-24.

Gaster, Moses. <u>The Samaritans, Their History, Doctrines and
Literature</u>. London: Oxford University Press, 1925.

Gehman, Henry Snyder. "The Relations Between the Hebrew Text
of Ezekiel and that of John H. Scheide Papyri," <u>Journal
of American Oriental Society</u>, LVIII (1938), 92-102.

Gese, Hartmut. <u>Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezekiel (Kap. 40-
48)</u>. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957.

Gray, George Buchanan. <u>Sacrifice in the Old Testament: Its
Theory and Practice</u>. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925.

Greenberg, Moshe. "The Biblical Concept of Asylum," <u>Journal
of Biblical Literature</u>, LXXVIII (1959), 125-132.

Gruenthaner, Michael J. "Recent Theories About Ezekiel,"
<u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u>, VIII (October 1945), 438-
446.

Haag, Herbert. "Was Lehrt die literarische Untersuchung des
Ezekieltextes." Freiburg doctoral dissertation, reviewed
by A. Robert in <u>Revue Biblique</u>, LIII (1946), 135-140.

Haran, Menahem. "The Complex of Ritual Acts Performed Inside
the Tabernacle," <u>Scripta Hierosolymita</u>. VIII. Edited by
Chaim Rabim. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1961. Pp. 272-
302.

-----. "The Nature of 'Ohel Mo'edh' in the Pentateuchal
Sources," <u>Journal of Semitic Studies</u>, V (1960), 50-65.

-----. "The Use of Incense in the Ancient Israelite Ritual,"
<u>Vetus Testamentum</u>, X (1960), 113-129.

Harford, John Battersby. <u>Studies in the Book of Ezekiel</u>.
Cambridge: at the University Press, 1935.

Hauer, Christian E. "Who Was Zadok?," <u>Journal of Biblical
Literature</u>, LXXII (March 1963), 89-94.

Herbert, A. S. <u>Worship in Ancient Israel</u>. Richmond, Virginia:
John Knox Press, 1959.

Herntrich, Volkmar. <u>Ezechielprobleme</u>. Giessen: Alfred A.
Töpelmann, 1933.

Hölscher, Gustav. <u>Hesekiel, Der Dicter und das Buch</u>. Giessen:
Alfred A. Töpelmann, 1924.

Honeyman, A. M. "The Salting of Shechem," Vetus Testamentum, III (1953), 192-194.

Horner, Thomas M. "Changing Concept of the Stranger in the Old Testament," Anglican Theological Review, XLII (1960), 49-53.

Howie, Carl Gordon. "The Book of Ezekiel." Vol. XIII in the Layman's Bible Commentary. Edited by Palmer H. Kelley, et al. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1961.

-----. The Date and Composition of Ezekiel. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1950.

-----. "The East Gate of Ezekiel's Temple Enclosure and the Solomonic Gateway of Megoddo," [sic] Bulletin of the American Schools for Oriental Research, CXVII (1950), 13-19.

Hoyle, R. Birch. "Spirit in Ezekiel's Writings and Experience," Biblical Review, X (January 1925), 46-65.

Hylmö, Gunnar Efraim. Gamla Testamentets Litteraturhistoria. Lund: G. W. K. Gleerups Förlag, 1938.

Irwin, William A. "Ezekiel Research Since 1943," Vetus Testamentum, III (1953), 54-66.

-----. "Hashmal," Vetus Testamentum, II (1952), 169-170.

-----. "The Message of the Exilic Prophets for our Day," Journal of Biblical Literature, II (1943), 98-103.

-----. The Problem of Ezekiel--An Inductive Study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1943.

Jeremias, Joachim. "Hesekieltempel und Serubbabel Tempel," Zeitschrift fur alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLIX (1934), 109-112.

Keil, Carl Friedrich. Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Ezekiel. Vols. I and II. Translated by James Martin. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1950.

Kennett, R. H. "The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood," Journal of Theological Studies, VI (January 1905), 161-186.

Kenyon, Sir Frederic George. Literary Criticism, Common Sense, and the Bible. Cambridge, England: W. Heffner, 1949.

Kerr, David W. "Ezekiel," Christianity Today, III (November 10, 1958), 24, 25, 37.

Kevan, E. F. "The Covenants and the Interpretation of the Old Testament," Evangelical Quarterly, XXVI (January 1954), 19-28.

Knight, George Angus Fulton. A Christian Theology of the Old Testament. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.

Knight, Harold. "The Personality of Ezekiel--Priest or Prophet?," Expository Times, LIX (1947-48), 115-120.

Köhler, Ludwig. Old Testament Theology. Translated by A. S. Todd. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957.

Koenig, Ed. "The So Called 'Popular Religion of Israel,'" Expositor, XXIII (1922), passim.

Kuhl, Curt, The Old Testament, Its Origins and Composition. Translated from the German by C. T. M. Herriot. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1961.

Lehming, S[igo]. "Exodus XXXII," Vetus Testamentum, X (1960), 16-50.

Lewy, Immanuel. "The Story of the Golden Calf Reanalyzed," Vetus Testamentum, IX (1959), 318-322.

Lewy, Julius. "The Biblical Institution of DeRor in the Light of Akkadian Documents," Eretz Israel, V (1958), 21-31.

Lindblom, Johannes. Prophecy in Ancient Israel. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962.

Lindors, Barnabas. "Ezekiel and Individual Responsibility," Vetus Testamentum, XV (October 1955), 452-468.

Lofthouse, W. F. Ezekiel; Introduction; Revised Version with notes. London: Caxton Publishing Co., n.d. From The Century Bible--Caxton Series (ca. 1911).

-----. Israel After the Exile. Vol. IV in the Clarendon Bible. Edited by the Bishop of Oxford, Bishop Wild and Canon G. H. Box. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1928. Pp. 50-92.

MacKay, Cameron. "The Integrity of Ezekiel 40-48," Evangelical Quarterly, XXXII (January-March 1960), 15-24.

-----. "Prolegomena to Ezekiel 40-48," Expository Times, LVI (1944-45), 292-296.

McNeile, A. H. "The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood," Journal of Theological Studies, VII (1905), 1-9.

MacRae, George W. "The Meaning and Evolution of the Feast of Tabernacles," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXII (1960), 251-276.

Manley, G. T. The Book of the Law. Studies in the Date of Deuteronomy. London: The Tyndale Press, 1957.

-----. The New Bible Handbook. Rochester, Kent (Great Britain): The Stanhope Press, 1947. Pp. 226-232.

Matthews, I. G. Ezekiel. Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society, 1939.

May, Herbert Gordon. "The Book of Ezekiel," The Interpreter's Bible, VI (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), 39-338.

-----. "Some Cosmic Connotations of Mayim Rabbim," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 9-21.

-----. "The Two Pillars Before the Temple of Solomon," Bulletin of the American Schools for Oriental Research, LXXXVIII (1942), 19-27.

Meek, Theophile James. "Aaronites and Zadokites," American Journal of Semitic Language and Literature, XLV (1928-29), 149-166.

Melamed, E. Z. "The Concept of Atonement in the Hebrew Bible," Sinai, XXII (1959), 426-436.

Mendenhall, George E. "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law," Biblical Archeology, XVII (May 1954), 26-46.

Messel, Nils. Ezekielfragen. Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1945.

Milton, John P. "The Message and Purpose of the Old Testament," in The Bible: Book of Faith. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1964.

Minear Paul S. "How Objective is Biblical Criticism?," Journal of Bible and Religion, IX (November 1941), 217-222.

Mitchell, John L. "The Question of Millennial Sacrifice," Bibliotheca Sacra, CX (1953), passim.

Morgenstern, Julian. "A Chapter in the History of the High Priesthood," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, LV (1938), passim.

-----. "The Rest of the Nations," Journal of Semitic Studies, II (1957), 225-231.

Muilenburg, James. "Abraham and the Nations," Interpretation, XIX (October 1965), 387-398.

-----. "Ezekiel," Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by H. H. Rowley (Old Testament). Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962. Pp. 568-590.

-----. "The Form and Structure of the Covenantal Formulations," Vetus Testamentum, IX (1959), 347-365.

Nielsen, Eduard. Oral Tradition. Chicago: Allenson, 1954.

Noth, Martin. The History of Israel. Translated from the 2nd German edition by Stanley Godman. London: Adam and Black, 1958.

Oesterley, William Oscar Emil and Theodore H. Robinson. An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament. London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1934.

Orlinsky, Harry M. "Where Did Ezekiel Receive the Call to Prophesy?," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXXII (April 1951), 34-36.

Parrot, Andre. The Temple of Jerusalem. Translated by B. E. Hooke. London: S C M Press, 1957.

Patterson, John. The Goodly Fellowship of the Prophets. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948.

Payne, J. Barton. "The Relationship of the Chester Beatty Papyri of Ezekiel to Codex Vaticanus," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVIII (September 1949), 251-265.

Pedersen, Johannes. Israel, Its Life and Culture. London: Oxford University Press, 1926.

Petuchowsky, Jacob J. "The Supposed Dogma of Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch," Hibbert Journal, LVII (1959), 356-360.

Pfeiffer, Robert Henry. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941. Pp. 518-565.

Prichard, J. B. Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.

Procksch, D. O. "Fuerst und Priester bei Hesekiel," Zeitschrift Fur Die at Wissenschaft, LVIII (1941), 99-133.

Rabinowitz, Jacob J. "The Meaning of נירפ לע אזא in the Aramaic Papyri," Vetus Testamentum, VI (1956), 104.

Redpath, Henry A. The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel. Vol. XXIII in Westminster Commentaries. Edited by Walter Lock. London: Methuen, 1907.

Reider, Joseph. "Date and Composition of Ezekiel," The Jewish Quarterly Review, XLI (1950-51), 329-331.

------. "The Present State of Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," Hebrew Union College Annual, VII (1930), 285-315.

Richter, Pfarrer G. Der ezechielische Tempel: Eine exegetische Studie uber Ezechiel. Gutersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1912. Pp. 40-91.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. Two Hebrew Prophets: Studies in Hosea and Ezekiel. London: the Lutterworth Press, 1948. Pp. 65-125.

Roehrs, Walter. "Ezekiel," The Biblical Expositor, II (1960), 225-260.

Rowley, Harold Henry. "The Exodus and the Settlement in Canaan," Bulletin of the American Schools for Oriental Research, LXXXV (February 1942), 27-31.

------. The Growth of the Old Testament. London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1961.

------. "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament," Bulletin of John Ryland's Library, XXXIII (1950-51), 74-110.

------. "Melchizedek and Zadok (Gen. 14 and Ps. 110)," Alfred Bertholet Festschrift. Heraus gegeben durch Walter Baumgartner, Otto Eissfeldt, Karl Elliger, Leonhard Rost. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950. Pp. 461-472.

------, editor. The Old Testament and Modern Study. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1951.

------. "Zadok and Nehustan," Journal of Biblical Literature, LVIII (1939), 113-141.

Rowton, M. B. "The Date of the Founding of Solomon's Temple," Bulletin of the American Schools for Oriental Research, CXIX (1950), 20-22.

Rylaarsdam, J. Coert. "The Present Status of Pentateuchal Criticism," Journal of Bible and Religion, XXII (October 1954), 242-247.

Sandmel, Solomon. "The Haggada within Scripture," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXX (June 1961), 105-122.

-----. The Hebrew Scriptures: An Introduction to Their Lit-
     erature and Religious Ideas. New York: Alfred A. Knopf,
     1963. Pp. 152-168, 517-525.

Scott, R. B. Y. "The Pillars Jachin and Boaz," Journal of
     Biblical Literature, LVIII (1939), 143-149.

Segal, M. H. "The Composition of the Pentateuch--A Fresh Ex-
     amination," Scripta Hierosolymitana. VIII. Edited by
     Chaim Rabim. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1961.

Shillito, Edward. "Ezekiel and Reconstruction," Expositor,
     Series 8, XIV (July 1917), 72-80.

Smith, George Adam. The Book of the Twelve Prophets. Revised
     edition. Vol. II. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1928.

Smith, James. The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel: A New Inter-
     pretation. London: Society for the Propagation of
     Christian Knowledge, 1931.

Smith, Louise Pettibone. "Book Review of William Irwin's The
     Problem of Ezekiel," Journal of Biblical Literature,
     LXVIII (1949), 384-389.

-----. "The Eagle(s) of Ezekiel 17," Journal of Biblical
     Literature, LVIII (1939), 43-50.

Snaith, Norman H. "The Dates in Ezekiel," Expository Times,
     LIX (1947-48), 315-316.

-----. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. London:
     The Epworth Press, 1944.

-----. "Sacrifices in the Old Testament," Vetus Testamentum,
     VII (1957), 308-317.

-----. "The Sin-Offering and the Guilt Offering," Vetus
     Testamentum, XV (January 1965), 73-80.

Spiegel, Shalom. "Ezekiel or Pseudo-Ezekiel?," Harvard The-
     ological Review, XXIV (October 1931), 245-321.

-----. "Toward Certainty in Ezekiel," Journal of Biblical
     Literature, LIV (1935), 145-171.

Steinmann, Jean. Le Prophete Ezechiel et les Debuts de l'Exil.
     Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1953.

Stevenson, William Barron. "Hebrew 'Olah and Zebach Sacrifices,"
     Alfred Bertholet Festschrift. Heraus gegeben durch Walter
     Baumgartner, Otto Eissfeldt, Karl Elliger, Leonhard Rost.
     Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950.

Torrey, Charles Cutler. "Certainly Pseudo-Ezekiel," Journal
    of Biblical Literature, LIII (1934), 291-320.

-----. "Notes on Ezekiel," Journal of Biblical Literature,
    LVIII (1939), 69-86.

-----. "Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy," Yale Ori-
    ental Series Researches. XVIII. New Haven: Yale Univers-
    ity Press, 1930.

Toy, Crawford Howell. The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel: Crit-
    ical Edition of the Hebrew Text, with notes. Leipzig:
    J. C. Hinrich, 1899.

Turner, Nigel. "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel," Journal
    of Theological Studies, VII (1956), 12-24.

Unger, Merrill F. "Ezekiel's Vision of Israel's Restoration,"
    Bibliotheca Sacra, CVI-CVII (1949-50), passim.

-----. "The Temple Vision of Ezekiel," Bibliotheca Sacra, CV-
    CVI (1948-49), passim.

Van Nuys, Kelvin. "Evaluating the Pathological in Prophetic
    Experience (Particularly in Ezekiel)," Journal of Bible
    and Religion, XXI (1953), 244-251.

Van Selms, A. "Literary Criticism of Ezekiel as a Theological
    Problem," Oud Testament Wissenschaft Sud Africa (1961),
    24-37. Abstracted in Internationale Zeitschrift für
    Bibelwissenschaft un Grenzgebiete, IX (1962-63), 409.

Vincent, L-Hugues. "L'Autel des Holocaustes et le Caractere
    du Temple d'Ezekiel," Analecta Bollandiana, LXVII (1949),
    7-20.

Vriezen, Th. C. An Outline of Old Testament Theology. Boston:
    Charles T. Branford Company, 1958.

Walvoord, John F. "Premillenialism and the Church," Biblio-
    theca Sacra, CX-CXI (1953-54), passim.

Watts, John D. W. "Elements of Old Testament Worship," Journal
    of Bible and Religion, XXVI (1958), 217-221.

Weir, Cecil J. Mullo. "Aspects of the Book of Ezekiel," Vetus
    Testamentum, II (1952), 97-112.

Wellhausen, Julius. Prolegomena to the History of Ancient
    Israel. Translated by W. Robertson Smith, et al. New
    York: The World Publishing Company, 1878.

Westermann, Claus. "God and His People--The Church in the Old
    Testament," Interpretation, XVII (1963), 259-270.

Wevers, John W. "Evidence of the Text of the John H. Scheide Papyri for the Translation of the Status Construcus in Ezekiel," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXX (1951), 211-216.

Whatham, Arthur E. "The Early Religion of the Hebrews," Bibliotheca Sacra, LXV (1898), 629-655.

Whitley, C. F. "The Term Seventy Year Captivity," Vetus Testamentum, IV (1954), 60-72.

Witmer, John A. "Biblical Authority in Contemporary Theology," Bibliotheca Sacra, CXVIII (1961), 59-67.

Wolf, C. Umhau. "Remarks on the Tribes of Israel," The Jewish Quarterly Review, XXXVI (1945-46), 287-295.

Wright, George Ernest. "Archeology and Old Testament Studies," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVII (1958), 39-51.

------. Biblical Archeology. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957.

------. "The Christian Interpreter as a Biblical Critic: the Relevance of Valid Criticism," Interpretation, I (April 1947), 131-152.

------. "Cult and History. A Study of a Current Problem in Old Testament Interpretation," Interpretation, XVI (1962), 3-20.

------. "The Levites in Deuteronomy," Vetus Testamentum, IV (1954), 325-330.

------. "Old Testament Scholarship in Prospect," Journal of Bible and Religion, XXVIII (1960), 182-193.

------. "The Significance of the Temple in the Ancient Near East," Biblical Archeology, VII (1944), 65-77.

------. "Solomon's Temple Resurrected," Biblical Archeology, IV (1941), 17-31.

------. "The Stevens' Reconstruction of the Solomonic Temple," Biblical Archeology, XVIII (1955), 41-44.

Young, Edward J. "Christian Faith and the 'Scientific' Method," Evangelical Quarterly, XXIII (April 1951), 89-95.

------. "The God of the Fathers," Westminster Theological Journal, III. 1. (November 1940), 25-40.

-----. _An Introduction to the Old Testament_. Revised edition. London: Tyndale Press, 1960. Pp. 256-265.

Zeitlin, Solomon. "The Titles High Priest and the Nasi of the Sanhedrin," _Jewish Quarterly Review_, XLVIII. 1. (1957-58), 1-5.

Zimmerli, Walther. _Ezechiel_. _Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament_, XIII, 10. Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1962.

-----. "The Special Form- and Traditio-Historical Character of Ezekiel's Prophecy," _Vetus Testamentum_, XV (October 1965), 515-527.