

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

8-1-2012

Honorable Shame: The Rhetorical Use of Didactic Shame Discourse in Ezekiel 36:16-32

Ronald Mudge

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ronald.mudge@cuw.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/phd>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mudge, Ronald, "Honorable Shame: The Rhetorical Use of Didactic Shame Discourse in Ezekiel 36:16-32" (2012). *Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation*. 46.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/phd/46>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

HONORABLE SHAME:
THE RHETORICAL USE OF DIDACTIC SHAME DISCOURSE IN EZEKIEL 36:16–32

A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

By
Ronald Mudge
August 2012

Approved by _____
Andrew H. Bartelt, Ph.D. Advisor

R. Reed Lessing, Ph.D. Reader

Daniel L. Mattson, Ph.D. Reader

To Lisa, מִתְּמֵד עֵינִי

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------|
| TABLES | vii |
| PREFACE | viii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | ix |
| ABBREVIATIONS | xi |
| ABSTRACT | xv |
| Chapter | |
| INTRODUCTION: OVERVIEW OF THE DISSERTATION | 1 |
| The Challenge of Understanding Ezek 36:16–32 | 1 |
| Other Areas of Inquiry | 6 |
| Thesis | 8 |
| Methodology within the Context of Current Research | 9 |
| Overview of the Chapters | 16 |
| 1. A STUDY OF THE LOGICAL MATERIAL IN EZEK 36:16–32 | 20 |
| Rhetorical Unit | 21 |
| Rhetorical Situation | 28 |
| Choice and Arrangement of the Material | 30 |
| Chapter Summary | 50 |
| 2. THE MEANING AND FUNCTION OF SHAME DISCOURSE IN EZEK 36:16–32 | 51 |
| A Philological Study of the Shame Lexemes in Ezek 36:16–32 | 52 |
| The Sociological Functions of Shame Discourse in Ezek 36:16–32 | 69 |
| Other Scholarly Interpretations of Shame Discourse in Ezek 36:16–32 | 91 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Shame and Other Status Discourse | 97 |
| Chapter Summary | 102 |
| 3. YAHWEH AND STATUS IN THE SOCIAL WORLD SURROUNDING | |
| EZEK 36:16–32 | 105 |
| The Impact of Yahweh’s Relationship with Israel on His Status | 106 |
| Honorable Shame | 127 |
| Basic Patterns of the Role of Shame Discourse in the Relationship between Yahweh and Israel | 131 |
| A Sociological Study of the Logical Material of Ezek 36:16–32 | 135 |
| Chapter Summary | 148 |
| 4. ETHICAL MATERIAL, EMOTIONAL MATERIAL, AND RHETORICAL TECHNIQUES USED FOR PERSUASION IN EZEK 36:16–32 | 151 |
| Ethical Material | 154 |
| Direct and Indirect Emotional Material | 157 |
| Rhetorical Techniques Used for Persuasion | 174 |
| Chapter Summary | 183 |
| 5. EZEK 36:16–32 WITHIN THE STRUCTURE AND RHETORICAL STRATEGY OF THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL | 185 |
| Ezekiel 1:1–24:27: Sin Described and Judgment Foretold | 189 |
| Ezekiel 25:1–32:32: Judging Israel’s Enemies | 216 |
| Ezekiel 33:1–39:29: Reconciliation Achieved | 219 |
| Ezekiel 40:1–48:35: Bearing Shame in the Restoration | 235 |
| Chapter Summary | 247 |
| CONCLUSION: A SOCIOLOGICAL-RHETORICAL STUDY OF EZEK 36:16–32 | 249 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Summary of the Chapters | 249 |
| Conclusions | 251 |
| EPILOGUE: EZEKIEL 36:16–32 AND THE THEOLOGY OF THE CROSS | 259 |

Appendix

| | |
|--|-----|
| 1. בוש in the Hebrew Bible Ordered by Form | 261 |
| 2. חפר in the Hebrew Bible Ordered by Form | 268 |
| 3. כלם in the Hebrew Bible Ordered by Form | 269 |
| 4. חרף in the Hebrew Bible Ordered by Form | 272 |
| 5. קלה in the Hebrew Bible Ordered by Form | 277 |
| 6. Shame Lexemes in the Hebrew Bible Ordered by Citation | 279 |
| 7. Shame Lexemes in the Hebrew Bible Ordered by Function | 293 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 307 |
| VITA | 328 |

TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Competing Shame | 119 |
| 2. Cycle of Conflict between Views of Status | 139 |

PREFACE

During my service as a missionary in French speaking West Africa, I was astounded at how often my assumptions about relationships proved to be wrong in an African setting. Remarkably, the substance of relationships was quite similar to the substance that I expected from my Western upbringing, but the meaning was different. Time and again I thought that I was sending one message only to find that I had sent a different message. And it was difficult for my African friends to teach me how to relate to others because their assumptions about relationships were as automatic as my own. The issue of relationships slowly became the prominent characteristic among many characteristics of African culture that seemed to offer insight into the world of HB that might be missed because of unconscious Western assumptions.

I entered graduate school with the hope that I would be able to use my experiences in Africa to gain a fresh view of the HB. When Dr. Lawrence Boadt suggested that I study Ezek 36:16–32 because of my interest in the role of shame in relationships, I had no idea what a great role this passage would come to play in my life. Ezekiel 36:16–32 turned out to be the perfect text for wrestling with my questions about relationships.

Dr. Andrew Bartelt became my *doktorvater* and submitted my eclectic manner of questioning the text to scholarly rigor. I sought the appropriate method for getting the answers I thought were necessary from the text and ended up with a sociological and rhetorical study of the passage. Dr. Bartelt consistently pressed me to make my work clear to others and to interact with other scholars. I trust that this work accomplishes his goals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is my pleasure to thank the many people who have shaped and supported me throughout the dissertation process.

My wife, Lisa, provided constant encouragement and patience with this project. My children, Jonah, Isaiah, Ella, Aaron, and Nathan prayed for this dissertation with a childlike faith that gave me confidence under the most challenging of circumstances.

My father, Ronald Sr. (d. 1996), gave me the tenacity to finish this project, and my mother, Sidonye, has always expected the best from me. My wife, Lisa's parents, David and Kathy Roslansky, provided endless encouragement, and our extended families also pushed me along.

Revs. Désiré Tadé and Glenn Fluegge, my colleagues from Africa, have shaped me as a person and as a scholar.

Dr. Andrew Bartelt formed me and shaped my ideas as we struggled to solve a crux in Ezekiel in a way that would be clear to other scholars and would draw from the work of others.

Drs. R. Reed Lessing and Daniel Mattson brought fresh eyes and fresh ideas to our work on this dissertation. Even before dissertation, however, they and Dr. Paul Raabe focused my ideas as we worked through the proposal together.

Deaconess Ruth McDonnell and Krista Whittenburg, both of whom have served in the Advanced Studies Department at Concordia Seminary, have helped me immensely with the fine details of the format of the dissertation and the process for completing the project.

I have also received help and encouragement from countless others who have walked a similar path: Prof. Charles Schulz, Prof. Brian Mosemann, Dr. InHee Cho, Dr. Richard Blythe, Pastor Michael Hayes, Dr. Philip Penhallegon, Dr. Jason Soenksen, Dr. Thomas Feiertag, Dr. John Oberdeck, Dr. Daniel Paavola, Dr. Timothy Maschke, Pastor Steven Smith, Dr. Albert Garcia, Dr. Joel Elowsky, and Dr. Nathan Jastram.

Finally, I thank God for the strength to finish this project and pray that He would use it to accomplish His will. I also ask Him to bless all those mentioned here and those others who are not mentioned but who helped me with this project nonetheless.

COPYRIGHT ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

BWHEBB [Hebrew] and BWGRKL [Greek] Postscript® Type 1 and TrueType fonts
Copyright © 1994–2006 Bible Works, LLC. All rights reserved. These Biblical Greek and
Hebrew fonts are used with permission and are from BibleWorks, software for Biblical exegesis
and research.

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|--------|---|
| AB | Anchor Bible |
| ABD | <i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992. |
| ABR | <i>Australian Biblical Review</i> |
| ANE | Ancient Near East |
| ASTI | <i>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</i> |
| ATANT | Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments |
| BBR | <i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i> |
| BDB | Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Oxford, 1907. |
| BETL | Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium |
| BHS | <i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> . Edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart, 1983. |
| Bib | <i>Biblica</i> |
| BibInt | <i>Biblical Interpretation</i> |
| BN | <i>Biblische Notizen</i> |
| BSac | <i>Bibliotheca sacra</i> |
| BTB | <i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i> |
| BZ | <i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i> |
| BZAW | Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die altesetamentliche Wissenschaft |
| CBC | Cambridge Bible Commentary |
| CBQ | <i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i> |
| CBQMS | Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series |
| COS | <i>The Context of Scripture</i> . Edited by W. W. Hallo. 3 vols. Leiden, 1997– |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| <i>DHC</i> | <i>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . Edited by D. J. A. Clines. Sheffield, 1993– |
| ESV | English Standard Version |
| <i>EvQ</i> | <i>Evangelical Quarterly</i> |
| Even-Shoshan | Even Shoshan, A., ed. <i>A New Concordance of the Bible</i> . Jerusalem, 1977, 1983 |
| FB | Forschung zur Bibel |
| FOTL | Forms of the Old Testament Literature |
| GBS | Guides to Biblical Scholarship |
| GKC | <i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Edited by E. Kautsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2d English ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910 |
| <i>HALOT</i> | Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm. <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden, 1994–1999 |
| <i>HAR</i> | <i>Hebrew Annual Review</i> |
| HB | Hebrew Bible |
| <i>HBT</i> | <i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i> |
| <i>HUCA</i> | <i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i> |
| <i>HvTSt</i> | <i>Hervormde theologiese studies</i> |
| IBC | Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching |
| <i>IBHS</i> | <i>An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax</i> . B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor. Winona Lake, Indiana, 1990 |
| <i>IBS</i> | <i>Irish Biblical Studies</i> |
| ICC | International Critical Commentary |
| <i>Int</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
| ITC | International Theological Commentary |
| <i>JAAR</i> | <i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i> |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| <i>JBL</i> | <i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i> |
| <i>JFSR</i> | <i>Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion</i> |
| <i>JNSL</i> | <i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i> |
| Joüon | Joüon, P. <i>A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew</i> . Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. 2 vols. <i>Subsidia biblica</i> 14/1–2. Rome, 1991 |
| JSOT | <i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i> |
| JSOTSup | Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series |
| <i>JSP</i> | <i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i> |
| <i>JTS</i> | <i>Journal of Theological Studies</i> |
| LXX | Septuagint |
| MT | Masoretic Text |
| <i>Neot</i> | <i>Neotestamentica</i> |
| NIBCOT | New International Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament |
| NICOT | New International Commentary of the Old Testament |
| <i>NIDOTTE</i> | <i>New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis</i> |
| NIV | New International Version |
| <i>NovT</i> | <i>Novum Testamentum</i> |
| <i>OTE</i> | <i>Old Testament Essays</i> |
| OTG | Old Testament Guides |
| OTL | Old Testament Library |
| OTM | Old Testament Message |
| OTS | Old Testament Studies |
| OtSt | Oudtestamentische Studiën |
| PTMS | Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| <i>R&T</i> | <i>Religion and Theology</i> |
| <i>RelSRev</i> | <i>Religious Studies Review</i> |
| <i>ResQ</i> | <i>Restoration Quarterly</i> |
| SBLDS | Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series |
| <i>SBLSP</i> | <i>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</i> |
| SBLSymS | Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series |
| <i>Semeia</i> | <i>Semeia</i> |
| SHR | Studies in the History of Religions (supplement to <i>Numen</i>) |
| SK | <i>Skrif en kerk</i> |
| <i>TDOT</i> | <i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley, D. E. Green. 8 vols. Grand Rapids, 1974– |
| <i>TLOT</i> | <i>Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by E. Jenni, with assistance from C. Westermann. Translated by M. E. Biddle. 3 vols. Peabody, Mass., 1997 |
| TOTC | Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries |
| <i>VT</i> | <i>Vetus Testamentum</i> |
| VTSup | Supplements to <i>Vetus Testamentum</i> |
| WBC | Word Biblical Commentary |
| WUNT | Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament |

ABSTRACT

Mudge, Ronald R. "Honorable Shame: The Rhetorical Use of Didactic Shame Discourse in Ezekiel 36:16–36" Ph.D. diss., Concordia Seminary, 2012. 328 pp.

After promising Israel such wonderful gifts as a new heart and a return to the land, Ezek 36:16–32 ends with a command for Israel to be ashamed. Biblical scholars have offered a number of different explanations for this unusual order without consensus.

A methodology that employs sociological interpretation and rhetorical analysis covers new ground and resolves the crux of Ezek 36:16–32. A basic word study demonstrates that primary shame lexemes in Ezekiel refer to low status as judged by an audience or to the emotions of fear and anxiety surrounding low status. A study of the sociological function of shame discourse provides evidence for a didactic use of shame where Israel's acknowledgment of low status in their relationship with Yahweh demonstrates that Israel has learned from the punishment they received and opens the way for reconciliation with Yahweh. This study also describes differences between Yahweh's view of what causes honor and shame and the view held by most human beings.

When the insights from the word study and the sociological research are applied to an analysis of the rhetorical strategy of the book of Ezekiel, it becomes clear that Yahweh and Israel blame each other for the failure of their covenant and the resulting exile. Ezekiel 36:16–32 is the place where the book intends to resolve the issue of blame by accomplishing its rhetorical goal of persuading Israelites readers to acknowledge shame in their relationship with Yahweh.

The command for Israel to acknowledge low status follows positive promises because the promises prove that Yahweh desires and will accomplish Israel's well-being and, therefore, that Israel alone is responsible for the exile. This argument is intended to create a New Israel as it persuades the Israelite readers to acknowledge shame before Yahweh. The ensuing reconciliation and restoration will raise Israel's status and Yahweh's status in the eyes of the nations, demonstrating that didactic shame is honorable shame.

INTRODUCTION
OVERVIEW OF THE DISSERTATION

The Challenge of Understanding Ezek 36:16–32

(It is) *not for your sake* (that) I am about to act—declaration of the Lord Yahweh—let it be known to you. Be ashamed and be dishonored because of your conduct, house of Israel.¹

Ezek 36:32

My work on Ezek 36:16–32 for a graduate course² led me to study this passage in detail and to realize that scholars give a variety of interpretations of it. Margaret Odell calls attention to the unusual order of positive promises that are abruptly followed by references to shame in Ezekiel: “Jerusalem feels shame only after God forgives”³ In fact, the majority of scholars who deal with Ezek 36:16–32 note the unusual order of promises followed by a command to be ashamed and offer a variety of explanations, some of which are diametrically opposed to each

¹ All translations of the HB are the translations of the author unless otherwise noted. Also, when the versification of the MT and English translations disagree, the dissertation follows the versification of the MT.

² When I expressed an interest in studying the social role of shame in Ezekiel, Lawrence Boadt suggested that I research Ezek 36:16–32. Some of the material from the resulting unpublished paper appears in this dissertation.

³ Margaret Odell, “The Inversion of Shame and Forgiveness in Ezekiel 16:59–63,” JSOT 56 (1992): 102. Ezekiel 16:59–63 is similar to Ezek 36:16–32 and includes the same problem of shame coming after good news.

other. While some interpretations include rich insights, the diversity of the explanations illustrates the need to evaluate methodological issues and to pursue questions that have not been adequately addressed.

In Ezek 36:16–32, Yahweh recounts the story of Israel’s unfaithfulness and punishment and tells how Israel profaned his name among the nations. As a consequence, Yahweh states that he will act for his name’s sake. He plans to give Israel a new heart and a new spirit, so that they will be faithful as they live in the productive land and will never again suffer disgrace among the nations. But in spite of that positive future, Yahweh says that the memory of their evil conduct will cause them to loathe themselves, and he concludes with a striking command to be ashamed and dishonored.

In this way, Yahweh appears to encourage Israel with a description of the wonderful gifts that he will give them only to crush them by ordering them to be ashamed. The audience expects such talk of dishonor to accompany Yahweh’s recounting of Israel’s sinful past earlier in the passage and to serve as a sign of repentance that comes before the shift to salvation. However, the text does not follow the expectations of the audience; the unusual order of good news of restoration followed by the demand to be ashamed constitutes a crux of interpretation in Ezek 36:16–32.

Commentaries and scholars give a variety of reactions to the unusual progression from salvation to dishonor in Ezek 36:16–32, and some simply appear to avoid the problem by failing to acknowledge it.⁴ Those who do address this crux do so with widely divergent interpretations.

⁴ The following scholars do not talk about the problem of references to shame coming after good news: C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Ezekiel–Daniel* (vol. 9 of *Commentary on the Old Testament*; 10 vols.; trans. James Martin and M. G. Easton; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001), 305; Ronald M. Hals, *Ezekiel* (FOTL 19; ed. Rolf P. Knierim and Gene M. Tucker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 108, 112, 265–66; Henry McKeating, *Ezekiel* (OTG; ed. R. N. Whybray; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 15; John W. Wevers, *Ezekiel* (*The Century Bible*; ed. H. H. Rowley and Matthew Black; London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1969), 161; Ralph W. Klein, *Ezekiel*:

For example, Baruch Schwartz argues that the Israelites will find no pleasure in the restoration because they will be overcome with feelings of shame.⁵ According to Schwartz, Yahweh must restore Israel to protect his honor. However, Yahweh will ultimately cause the Israelites so much emotional suffering that they will not be able to enjoy their positive exterior condition. Schwartz and others assert that Yahweh's final goal is for Israel to feel the emotion of shame and that shame is punitive.⁶

Another approach treats the unusual order in which positive promises come before references to shame as part of the historical development of doctrine. Keith W. Carley employs this approach and concludes, "The importance of such thought for later Christian theories of the atonement is self-evident, though the Christian response of joy is lacking here."⁷ In Carley's opinion, Ezek 36:16–32 represents a step in the development of the doctrine of divine monergism because Yahweh acts graciously toward Israel without any merit or cooperation on

The Prophet and His Message (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1988), 147; G. A. Cooke, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (ICC; ed. S. R. Driver, A. Plummer, and C. A. Briggs; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1936), 71; Donald E. Gowan, *Ezekiel (Knox Preaching Guides)*; ed. John H. Hayes; Atlanta: John Knox, 1985), 121; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel* (IBC; ed. James Luther Mays, Patrick D. Miller Jr., and Paul J. Actemeier; Louisville: John Knox, 1990), 168–69; Peter C. Craigie, *Ezekiel (The Daily Study Bible)*; ed. John C. L. Gibson; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983), 122, 258; Toni Craven, *Ezekiel-Daniel (Collegeville Bible Commentary)*; Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1986), 39, 77; Aelred Cody, *Ezekiel, with an Excursus on Old Testament Priesthood* (vol. 11 of *Old Testament Message: A Biblical-Theological Commentary*; ed. Carroll Stuhlmueller and Martin McNamara; Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1984), 174; and Leslie Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48* (WBC 29; ed. David Hubbard and Glenn Barker; Dallas: Word, 1990), 179. Odell adds five scholars to this list: F. Hitzig, H. Ewald, C. H. Cornill, C. C. Toy, and Herrmann. See Odell, "Inversion," 102. Examples of scholarly treatments of shame may come from Ezek 36:31–32; 6:9; 16:61–63; or 20:43.

⁵ Baruch J. Schwartz, "Ezekiel's Dim View of Israel's Restoration," in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives* (SBLSymS 9, ed. Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong; Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 60–61.

⁶ Schwartz, "Dim," 60–61; Andrew Mein, *Ezekiel and the Ethics of Exile* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 238; S. Fisch, *Ezekiel* (Soncino Books of the Bible; ed. A. Cohen; London: The Soncino Press, 1950), 244; and Keith W. Carley, "From Harshness to Hope: The Implications for Earth of Hierarchy in Ezekiel," in *Ezekiel's Hierarchical World: Wrestling with a Tiered Reality* (SBLSymS 31; ed. Stephen L. Cook and Corrine L. Patton; Atlanta: SBL, 2004), 114–15.

⁷ Keith W. Carley, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel* (CBC; ed. P. R. Ackroyd, A. R. Leaney, and J. W. Packer; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 108. It appears that Carley changed his view of the crux after this early publication concerning Ezekiel. Odell, "Inversion," 102, notes that the following scholars take this same approach: A. Bertholet, Fohrer, and R. Kraetzschmar.

Israel's part. Presumably, Ezek 36:16–32 only represents a step in the development of theology because there is no mention of vicarious atonement or any reason for Yahweh's graciousness toward Israel. Carely argues that references to shame come after good news because the theology has not yet developed to the point where good news will prevent Yahweh from requiring Israel to be ashamed. He foresees a time when Christian theology will conclude that the appropriate response to the death of Jesus on behalf of Christians is to be joyful.

Rather than dealing with the historical development of theology, Martin Klopfenstein focuses on Yahweh's undeserved kindness toward the Israelites. He concludes that Yahweh's benevolence makes the Israelites conscious of their guilt. According to Klopfenstein's interpretation, the salvation section in the oracle is intended to show the Israelites that Yahweh is kind to them even when they do not deserve it and thus to lead them to realize that they are in the wrong. When Yahweh commands Israel to be dishonored in v. 32, he is commanding them to admit their guilt.⁸ Therefore, Klopfenstein translates the second imperative, "*wißt euch schuldig*," ("know yourselves (to be) guilty").⁹

Eric Ortlund takes a different approach. In an M.A. Thesis, he contends that Israel reflects a new knowledge of Yahweh by being ashamed after the restoration. As Ortlund presents his argument, it is necessary for the Israelites to be ashamed after being restored in order for them to know Yahweh truly as Judge and Savior. Their shame reflects an experiential knowledge of why Yahweh judges them and from what he delivers them.¹⁰ Yahweh judges Israel because they did

⁸ Guilt as culpability is to be distinguished from the emotion of guilt that is often referred to as feeling guilty. However, Klopfenstein may have both meanings in mind here.

⁹ Martin A. Klopfenstein, *Scham und Schande nach dem Alten Testament* (ATANT 62; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972), 72.

¹⁰ Eric Nels Ortlund, "Shame and Restoration: An Exegetical Exploration of Shame in Ezekiel's Restoration Prophecies" (M.A. thesis, Trinity International University, 2003), 165–68. John B. Taylor, *Ezekiel* (TOTC; ed. D. J. Wiseman; Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1969), 233, expresses essentially the same view.

wrong and saves them from the complete destruction they deserve because of their wrongdoing. Israel's shame shows that they know these facts.

In her article on shame in Ezekiel, Jacqueline Lapsley uses modern Western psychology to conclude that Yahweh makes it possible for restored Israel to feel shame, and that he uses shame to teach the Israelites to see themselves as he sees them. She characterizes the problem by saying, "The pre-deliverance people are apparently unable to feel shame, that is, they do not have an acute sense of themselves and their actions as others see them, and this is a moral failing in their character."¹¹ She argues that salvation comes before references to shame in the text because the Israelites must experience Yahweh's salvation before they will be able to be ashamed. In this way, Lapsley argues that Yahweh's intervention changes the Israelites psychologically so that they are able to see their actions as others do. While Ortlund stressed a new knowledge of Yahweh, Lapsley argues that the Israelites will have a new knowledge of themselves.

According to Daniel Block, restoration comes before references to shame in Ezek 36:16–32 because Yahweh's salvific work produces feelings of shame in the Israelites. Block argues that Yahweh saves the Israelites before they are filled with shame over their previous behavior. In his words, "Ezekiel declares that Israel's experience of divine grace will produce intense disgust over her perverted ways."¹² The gist of Block's argument is theological. People who have experienced Yahweh's grace have been changed in such a way that they are ashamed of their previous sinful behavior. Shame is synonymous with repentance.¹³ There is some overlap

¹¹ Jacqueline E. Lapsley, "Shame and Self-Knowledge: The Positive Role of Shame in Ezekiel's View of the Moral Self," in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives* (SBLSymS 9; ed. Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong; Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 146, 148, 150, 154, 157, 159.

¹² Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25–48* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 358–59.

¹³ For scholars who are basically in agreement with Block see Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel Chapters 1–24* (Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; trans. R. E. Clements; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 250; Paul Joyce, *Ezekiel: A Commentary* (Library of Hebrew Bible/OTS 482; ed. Claudia V. Camp and Andrew Mein; New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 92; Moshe Greenberg,

between Block's view and Lapsley's view because both argue that salvation comes before shame in the text because the Israelites must experience Yahweh's salvation before they will be able to be ashamed. However, Lapsley goes on to talk about a change in the self, while Block highlights the attitude that saved people have toward their previous behavior.

Hummel also stresses God's grace, as he develops the link between grace and repentance. According to Hummel, God must act *sola gratia* in restoring Israel before his people will be able to experience contrition fully.¹⁴ He states, "Repentance is no mere generalized feeling of being less than perfect, but is a particularized self-examination, with a confession of sins of omission and commission—to the extent that one is aware of them—combined with the knowledge that one's whole being is sinful."¹⁵

Other Areas of Inquiry

The scholars described above provide many helpful insights into the crux of Ezek 36:16–32, but they have given scant attention to two related areas of inquiry that may contribute to a solution. They have not used rhetorical analysis or considered the sociological role of shame in analyzing the text. Rhetorical criticism deals with both the art of composition and the art of persuasion in biblical passages, but this dissertation will focus primarily on the art of persuasion.

Ezekiel 21–37: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 22A; ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman; New York: Doubleday, 1964), 731–32; Bruce Vawter and Leslie J. Hoppe, *A New Heart: A Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (ITC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 97; William H. Brownlee, *Ezekiel 1–19* (WBC 28; ed. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker; Waco, Tex.: Word, 1986), 252; F. W. J. Schröder, *Ezekiel* (*Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*; trans. Patrick Fairbairn and William Findlay; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1950), 341; John Calvin, *Commentaries on the First Twenty Chapters of the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel* (vol. 20 of *Calvin's Commentaries*; trans. Thomas Myers; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 184; Horace Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48* (Concordia Commentary; St. Louis: Concordia, 2007), 1058–59; Walther Eichrodt, *Ezekiel: A Commentary* (OTL; trans. Cosslett Quin; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970), 504; Ellen Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll: Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel's Prophecy* (JSOTSup 78; ed. David J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies; Sheffield: Almond, 1989), 115; and Steven Tuell, *Ezekiel* (NIBCOT; ed. Robert L. Hubbard Jr. and Robert K. Johnston; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2009), 97.

¹⁴ Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1058–59.

¹⁵ Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1059.

It will do this in order to understand what the text as a whole is trying to accomplish in the implied readers.¹⁶ Such an approach raises the question of what Ezek 36:16–32 is trying to bring about in the readers by describing Yahweh’s salvation before Israel’s shame.

One of the essential tools of a rhetorical approach is the study of social constructs. As David Howard Jr. has noted, rhetoric makes use of social customs.¹⁷ Wilhelm Wuellner agrees with Howard, when he highlights the ability of rhetorical criticism to treat the text of the Bible as social discourse.¹⁸ In order for such analysis to be possible, however, it is necessary to understand how the social customs employed by the text are used for persuasion. For this reason, rhetorical analysis draws attention to the function of shame in the society of the implied hearers and readers of Ezek 36:16–32. The idea that shame may be used for persuasion is not a new idea. Even Aristotle discusses the motivational role of shame in relation to rhetoric.¹⁹ With this in mind, a rhetorical study must concern itself with the persuasive potential of dishonor whenever a text employs shame discourse, that is, references to shame that appear in communication between two or more parties. Ezekiel 36:16–32 is a clear example of shame discourse because Yahweh is using Ezekiel to deliver a message about shame to the Israelites.

The realization that social customs may play a role in the crux of Ezek 36:16–32 places the interpretations offered by the exegetes above in a new light.²⁰ Although these scholars agree that the passage deals with shame, they do not agree on the definition of dishonor or on how

¹⁶ The implied reader is a construct that uses the text to describe what the author expects the readers to be like and how the author expects the readers to react.

¹⁷ David M. Howard Jr., “Rhetorical Criticism in Old Testament Studies,” *BBR* 4 (1994): 96–99.

¹⁸ Wilhelm Wuellner, “Where Is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?” *CBQ* 49 (1987): 448–63.

¹⁹ Aristotle, *Rhetoric* (trans. W. Rhys Roberts; New York: Modern Library, 1954), 107–9.

²⁰ Odell, “Inversion,” 101–12; Johannes Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture* (trans. Aslaug Moller; 4 vols.; London: Oxford University Press, 1926); John H. Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006); and David M. Howard Jr., “Rhetorical Criticism in Old Testament Studies,” *BBR* 4 (1994): 96–99.

references to it affect the interpretation of the text. They also do not address the function of shame in Israelite society. However, a cultural understanding of communication that deals with dishonor may offer essential information for explaining what Yahweh is trying to accomplish by telling the Israelites to be ashamed immediately after promising them blessings.

Thesis

This dissertation will identify a distinct use of dishonor communication that will be referred to as didactic shame discourse. Didactic shame discourse is the key to resolving the crux in Ezek 36:16–32. Yahweh uses the references to dishonor in Ezek 36:32 to command the Israelites to abandon their pride and to acknowledge shame in their relationship with him. This is the didactic function of shame discourse because such an admission demonstrates that the Israelites have learned from the punishment they have received and thus affirms a proper relationship between the Israelites and Yahweh. But this proper relationship is only possible when the Israelites agree with Yahweh’s view of dishonor. Instead, the Israelites have been following the customs of the nations concerning honor and shame (Ezek 11:12) and, therefore, have been saying that Yahweh is not justified in judging them (Ezek 33:17).

Under these circumstances, Yahweh describes all the good that he will do for the Israelites before he orders them to be ashamed because he intends to prove that he is not to blame for the exile. Yahweh is saying that the Israelites brought the exile upon themselves by repeatedly violating the Sinaitic covenant and thus shaming themselves. When the Israelites agree that their behavior merits dishonor, it shows that they accept Yahweh’s definition of honor and shame. In response to the Israelites’ admission of dishonor before him, Yahweh raises the status of the Israelites in his own eyes, while also promising to raise their status among the nations. The shame described in Ezek 36:16–32 is honorable because it results in an increase of status for

Israel. Yahweh establishes this type of shame as a key characteristic of the remnant—a characteristic that the true Israelites are to maintain even after the restoration.

Methodology within the Context of Current Research

As noted briefly above, little attention has been given to rhetorical criticism or the sociological role of shame in Ezek 36:16–32, even though these areas of inquiry may contribute to a solution. Therefore, this dissertation will cover new ground by employing rhetorical criticism²¹ that considers the sociological role of shame discourse in the passage, as it seeks to explain the unusual thought progression of Ezek 36:16–32. Rhetorical criticism has been offered as means of solving the crux found in Ezek 36:16–32 because of its use of social customs and because of its consideration of what communication is trying to accomplish. The rhetorical study will focus upon the persuasive features of the passage and will draw substantially from Aristotle’s work on rhetoric. Aristotle dealt with the preparation of persuasive speeches and recognized three types of arguments that are used in such communication. He referred to these arguments as *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos*.²² The logical material (*logos*) deals with rational arguments and progression of thought. The ethical material (*ethos*) focuses on the author’s character and argues for the reliability of the author in order to convince the audience to trust him. The emotional material (*pathos*) appeals to the emotions of the audience in recognition of the role of human emotions in decision-making.²³

²¹ Aristotle is the foundation of the study of rhetoric as applied to spoken communication. See Aristotle, *Rhetoric* (trans. W. Rhys Roberts; New York: Modern Library, 1954); Yehoshua Gitay, *Prophecy and Persuasion* (FTL 14; Bonn: Linguistica Biblica, 1981), 36–41; Yehoshua Gitay, “A Study of Amos’s Art of Speech,” *CBQ* 42 (1980): 293–309; Thomas Renz, *The Rhetorical Function of the Book of Ezekiel* (VTSup 74; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 14–26; and Wuellner, “Where ?”, 448–63. See also Dale Patrick and Allen Scult, *Rhetoric and Biblical Interpretation* (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1990). Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington: Ind. University Press, 1985), stands out from other rhetorical work in the HB because of an approach that does not employ classical categories.

²² Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 24–26.

²³ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 25.

Although the term rhetorical criticism as used by James Muilenberg in his watershed call to go beyond form criticism²⁴ actually focused on the art of composition, the same term is now used more appropriately to designate the art of persuasion as well.²⁵ Scholars such as Gitay, Wuellner, and Renz have modified the work of Aristotle and employed it to study the persuasive features of the written communication of the HB. In doing this, they have provided a guide that will be employed in the following research.²⁶

The rhetorical study²⁷ of the text will provide the framework of the dissertation. This analysis will include the five steps that are often used in rhetorical studies, as described by such scholars as Gitay, Wuellner, and Renz. Those steps are: (1) determination of the rhetorical unit that will be studied, (2) determination of the rhetorical situation in order to understand the circumstances of the communication, (3) study of the choice and arrangement of the material, (4) study of the rhetorical devices employed for persuasion, and (5) study of the role of the material in its greater context.²⁸ These five parts will build upon each other, with earlier steps raising questions that will be answered by later steps. In this way, the rhetorical study will seek to resolve the crux of Ezek 36:16–32.

A rhetorical approach is literary, holistic, and pragmatic. This research will not address the historical or literary setting of the oracle outside of its present form as part of the book of Ezekiel. Although it is evident that the oral speech described in the book of Ezekiel was first

²⁴ James Muilenberg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," *JBL* 88 (1969): 1–18

²⁵ See Renz, *Rhetorical*, 1.

²⁶ See Gitay, *Prophecy*, 36–41, for a brief description of classical rhetoric and an example of how it has been modified to serve the study of the HB. See also Gitay, "A Study," 293–309.

²⁷ Classical rhetoric focuses on prepared speeches and thus deals both with the invention or discovery of material for a speech and the way that the material is organized. Rhetorical analysis normally focuses on both together as it studies the final product.

²⁸ See Gitay, *Prophecy*, 36–41; Renz, *Rhetorical*, 22–26, and Wuellner, "Where?" 455–60.

spoken to hearers, the methodology of this dissertation will focus upon the intended original readers of the entire book of Ezekiel. Therefore, Ezek 36:16–32 will be analyzed within the context of the book of Ezekiel based upon its role in the persuasive goals of the book as a whole. The study will assume the historical and social setting presented in the book.

Although this research will cover all of the steps of a typical rhetorical study as described above, it will focus upon and expand the third step, the choice and arrangement of the material, in order to provide the background necessary for understanding the thought progression of the passage. This is the appropriate step for describing the social function of shame discourse. The choice and arrangement of the material will include research into the logical, ethical, and emotional material of Ezek 36:16–32. The analysis of the logical material will present a description of the meaning and function of shame discourse because an understanding of this key concept is necessary to follow the logic of the passage fully. The examination of the emotional material will include a study of the text using speech-act theory to highlight what individual statements within the passage are trying to accomplish and how shame discourse engages the emotions for persuasion.²⁹

The dissertation will analyze the meaning and function of the key concept of shame discourse in Ezek 36:16–32 by engaging in sociological interpretation.³⁰ Sociological interpretation is an umbrella term for approaches to the Bible that stress the need to study the

²⁹ For a description of speech-act theory, see J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (2d ed., Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975); and John R. Searle. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1979). For an example of speech-act theory used to study prophetic discourse, see Paul R. Raabe, “Why Prophetic Oracles Against the Nations?” in *Fortunate the Eyes that See* (ed. Astrid B. Beck, et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 236–57.

³⁰ Martin, Dale B. “Social-Scientific Criticism.” in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application* (ed. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes; Louisville: Westminster, 1999), 125–42. See also John H. Elliott, *What is Social-Scientific Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).

cultural context surrounding biblical texts.³¹ Elliott states that the sociological approach studies “the intended consequences of the communication process” and the manner in which the text “was designed to serve as an effective vehicle of social interaction.”³² He goes on to note that the goal is, “the determination of the meaning(s) explicit and implicit in the text, meanings made possible and shaped by the social and cultural systems inhabited by both authors and intended audiences.”³³ This chapter will use sociological techniques to analyze the way that the lexemes for dishonor in Ezek 36:16–32 function within relationships. This sociological approach is useful for describing shame because it addresses the complex function of dishonor within society. Most of the sociological analysis will focus upon the use of the shame lexemes in relationships, but the same techniques will also bring understanding to discourse that deals with the concept of shame without employing specific Hebrew lexemes for dishonor.

In many cases, biblical scholars who engage in sociological interpretation build upon the work of sociologists and anthropologists who focus upon modern cultures and draw conclusions concerning the role of shame and honor in those societies.³⁴ This dissertation will refer to such an approach as the comparative method. Biblical scholars who employ the comparative method

³¹ Richard N. Soulen and R. Kendall Soulen, *Handbook of Biblical Criticism* (3d ed., rev. and exp.; Louisville: Westminster John Know Press, 2001), 176.

³² Elliott, *What*, 7, deals with social-scientific criticism, one of the specific approaches that falls under the umbrella of sociological interpretation.

³³ Elliott, *What*, 8.

³⁴ Scholars who use this approach in the area of biblical studies include: Claudia V. Camp, “Understanding a Patriarchy: Women in Second Century Jerusalem Through the Eyes of Ben Sira,” in *Women Like This: New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World* (ed. Amy-Jill Levine; Atlanta: Scholars, 1991), 1–39; N. P. Lemche, “Kings and Clients: On Loyalty between the Ruler and the Ruled in Ancient ‘Israel,’” in *Ethics and Politics in the Hebrew Bible (Semeia 66)*; ed. D. A. Knight; Atlanta; Scholars Press, 1995), 119–32; Jerome H. Neyrey, *Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew* (Louisville: Westminster, 1998); Bruce Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (3d rev. and exp. ed.; Louisville: Westminster, 2001); and John J. Pilch and Bruce J. Malina, eds. *Biblical Social Values and Their Meaning: A Handbook* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1993).

have studied the Bible using insights from such resources as the work of Ruth Benedict with Japanese culture and the research of J. K. Campbell and others in Mediterranean cultures.³⁵

The use of modern Mediterranean studies to understand biblical texts has been consciously defended by some biblical scholars³⁶ but has been criticized convincingly by others. John K. Chance highlights three characteristics of sociological studies of honor and shame that have been embraced by biblical scholars who employ modern Mediterranean research. He then goes on to criticize this comparative approach. The characteristics he summarizes are as follows:

- (1) Honor and shame form a value system rooted in gender distinctions in Mediterranean culture. Preservation of male honor requires a vigorous defense of the shame (modesty, virginity, seclusion) of women of the family or lineage.
- (2) Honor, most closely associated with males, refers to one's claimed social status and also to public recognition of it. Shame, most closely linked with females, refers to sensitivity towards one's reputation, or in the negative sense to the loss of honor.
- (3) Mediterranean societies are agonistic, or competitive. Challenges to one's status claims (honor) are frequent and must be met with appropriate ripostes. The ensuing public verdict determines the outcome, and whether honor is won or lost.³⁷

It appears that this description of Mediterranean society has substantial weaknesses when imposed on the Bible. Chance faults the methodology of biblical scholars who assume these characteristics because they give the impression that society represents one group in total

³⁵ Although the following sources are old, they continue to have a strong influence on the comparative method: Ruth Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture* (New York: New American Library, 1946), 222–23; J. K. Campbell, *Honour, Family and Patronage: A Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1964); Julian Pitt-Rivers, *The Fate of Shechem or the Politics of Sex: Essays in the Anthropology of the Mediterranean* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977); J. G. Peristiany, ed., *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society* (The Nature of Human Society Series; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966); and David D. Gilmore, ed., *Honor and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean* (Special Publication of the American Anthropological Association 22; Washington, D. C.: American Anthropological Association, 1987).

³⁶ Victor H. Matthews and Don C. Benjamin, "Social Sciences and Biblical Studies," *Semeia* 68 (1994):17–18.

³⁷ J. K. Chance, "The Anthropology of Honor and Shame: Culture, Values, and Practice," *Semeia* 68 (1994): 142.

agreement.³⁸ He urges them to recognize the possibility of divergent groups within a society. In his opinion, it is also necessary to lay local differences and international similarities side by side.³⁹ Like Chance, Anthropologist Michael Herzfeld also criticizes the comparative method. He criticizes this approach for assuming similarity in regard to honor and shame across linguistic barriers and throughout the entire Mediterranean region.⁴⁰

In response to the compelling criticisms above, this dissertation will employ sociological techniques to study the text of the HB in a way that recognizes the distinctive characteristics of the HB. Such an approach will verify or adjust the assertions of the comparative method rather than employing the comparative method. That is to say that this dissertation will not use sociological studies of modern cultures to bring needed information to Ezek 36:16–32 but will supply that information by applying sociological interpretation to clearer biblical texts. Such an approach will be referred to as the historical method. Johannes Pedersen did early, foundational work using the historical approach for sociological interpretation while Saul Olyan and T. R. Hobbs have done more recent work in the same vein. All of these scholars have offered helpful insights into the HB's use of the concept of shame within society.⁴¹

The conclusions of Olyan and of those who employ the historical method will interact with Ezek 36:16–32 as a necessary part of the third step of the rhetorical study, the choice and

³⁸ Chance criticizes the characteristics referred to in this dissertation as the comparative method. He does not name the method. This is true of the other criticisms cited as well.

³⁹ Chance, "Anthropology," 143–48.

⁴⁰ Michael Herzfeld, "Honor and Shame: Problems in the Comparative Analysis of Moral Systems," *Man* 15 (1980): 339–40.

⁴¹ Pedersen, *Israel*, 214–44; Saul M. Olyan, "Honor, Shame, and Covenant Relations in Ancient Israel and Its Environment," *JBL* 116 (1996): 201–18; and T. R. Hobbs, "Reflections on Honor, Shame and Covenant Relations," *JBL* 116 (1997): 501–3. See also Bechtel, "Biblical"; Timothy S. Laniak, *Shame and Honor in the Book of Esther* (SBLDS 165; Atlanta: Scholars, 1998); Dianne Bergant, "My Beloved Is Mine and I Am His (Song 2:16): The Song of Songs and Honor and Shame," *Semeia* 68 (1994): 23–40; Gary Stansell, "Honor and Shame in the David Narratives," *Semeia* 68 (1994): 55–79; W. R. Domeris, "Shame and Honour in Proverbs: Wise Women and Foolish Men," *OTE* 8 (1995), 86–93; Ronald A. Simkins, "Return to Yahweh: Honor and Shame in Joel," *Semeia* 68 (1994):

arrangement of the material. This will be done by means of a sociological analysis of shame language in Ezek 36:16–32 and elsewhere in Ezekiel. This sociological study will describe the manner in which the book of Ezekiel uses the concept of shame within relationships. It will also recognize that the social function of dishonor makes it possible for shame discourse, that is, communication that employs references to disgrace, to be used to accomplish rhetorical goals. Therefore, the research will go on to identify the characteristics of specific rhetorical functions of shame terms in Ezek 36:16–32 in order to understand how those terms are used to achieve rhetorical ends in the passage. Such a study will ultimately make it possible to describe the social world surrounding shame as presented in the book of Ezekiel. This research will identify patterns in the use of shame in the relationship between Yahweh and humans. These patterns will then be applied to the rhetorical study of Ezek 36:16–32 in the greater context of the book of Ezekiel.

Other scholars have also applied rhetorical criticism that makes use of sociology to various texts. For example, Jerome Neyrey has combined a sociological approach with rhetorical concerns in the study of the New Testament,⁴² and David DeSilva has done the same for a pseudepigraphal writing.⁴³ Furthermore, rhetorical criticism alone and sociological interpretation alone have been applied to Ezek 36:16–32—albeit in a limited fashion. Thomas Renz has done a fine rhetorical study of the book of Ezekiel but has given little attention to shame discourse. He treats the shame language in Ezekiel as referring to repentance.⁴⁴ Margaret Odell has applied sociological interpretation to the unusual order of Ezek 36:16–32. However, her treatment of the

41–54; and P. Botha, “Honour and Shame as Keys to the Interpretation of Malachi,” *OTE* 14 (2001): 392–403.

⁴² Jerome H. Neyrey, “Questions, Chreiai, and Challenges to Honor: The Interface of Rhetoric and Culture in Mark’s Gospel,” *CBQ* 60 (1998): 657–81.

⁴³ David A. DeSilva, “The Noble Contest: Honor, Shame and the Rhetorical Strategy of 4 Maccabees,” *JSP* 13 (1995): 31–57.

⁴⁴ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 77, 84, 110–13, 120, 123, 159, 168, 171–72, 175.

problem is brief and does not employ rhetorical criticism.⁴⁵ This dissertation breaks new ground by applying rhetorical criticism that makes use of sociology to the crux of Ezek 36:16–32 beyond what others have done. Such an approach will explain the unusual order of blessings followed by reference to shame in Ezek 36:16–32, as it shows how shame discourse is used to accomplish rhetorical goals.

Overview of the Chapters

Chapter 1 deals with the first three steps of a typical rhetorical study. It determines the rhetorical unit and the rhetorical situation before focusing upon the choice and arrangement of the material in Ezek 36:16–32. This chapter highlights the rhetorical features of the text that are important for solving the crux of Ezek 36:16–32 and raises questions about the meaning and function of the shame words that cannot be answered by the text alone. These questions must be dealt with before the logic of the passage can be fully grasped.

Therefore, chapter 2 continues the third step of a rhetorical study by seeking a full understanding of the use of shame discourse in the passage. This involves the use of philology and sociological interpretation to analyze the shame lexemes that appear in Ezek 36:16–32 in order to shed light on the logic of the text. The philological research in this dissertation affirms the conclusions of Seebass and Stolz⁴⁶ by arguing that all of the words analyzed refer in some way to an inferior position in a relationship or a ranked group—low status. The sociological analysis of the terms for dishonor leads to the discovery of a didactic function of shame discourse—the key to understanding Ezek 36:16–32. The didactic use of low-status language is employed when one party admits to shame before another party as proof that learning has taken

⁴⁵ Margaret S. Odell, *Ezekiel* (Macon, Ga: Smyth & Helwys, 2005): 440–46. She also addresses the role of shame as she studies a similar text in Odell, “Inversion,” 101–12.

⁴⁶ H. Seebass, “בושׁ,” *TDOT* 2:50–60; Stolz, “בושׁ,” *TLOT* 1:205–6.

place after correction. It is this didactic function of shame discourse that is at work in Ezek 36:16–32, where the lexemes for dishonor in v. 32 are intended to convince the implied readers to acknowledge low status before Yahweh as a sign that they have learned from the punishment they received. When the implied readers are ashamed before Yahweh, they show that they have abandoned pride and are now among the humble.

Chapter 3 further develops the logic of Ezek 36:16–32 by describing the role of shame within the social world of Ezekiel and explaining how Yahweh relates to shame and uses it in his relationship with Israel. This chapter approaches Yahweh’s interaction with human beings from the perspective of social norms. According to the social customs of the nations, the status of the Israelites should be based upon their wealth and power. Instead of following the nations, however, Yahweh considers the Israelites to be shamed because they have failed to trust in him and walk in his statutes as the Sinaitic covenant requires. He responds to the disobedience of the Israelites by punishing them with defeat and exile until they are reconciled to him and restored by him. However, the Israelites blame Yahweh for the exile and thus lower Yahweh’s status. In Ezek 36:23–31, Yahweh describes his plan to restore Israel in order to prove that he is not at fault and thus to defend his reputation. This proof is intended to convince the Israelites to acknowledge low status in their relationship with Yahweh and, in this way, to show that they have learned from the punishment they received. The promises come before references to shame in Ezek 36:16–32 because the promises prove Yahweh’s innocence. Yahweh is faithful to Israel. The Israelites brought the exile upon themselves. Under these circumstances, it is honorable for the Israelites to acknowledge shame.

Chapter 4 completes the third step of a rhetorical study by presenting the ethical and emotional material in Ezek 36:16–32 before going on to deal with the fourth step, an analysis of the rhetorical techniques that are used for persuasion in the passage. The ethical material

supports Yahweh's values and authority and thus encourages readers to affirm that Yahweh is their God. The emotional material presses readers to acknowledge shame in a manner that forces each reader to accept or reject Yahweh.

The rhetorical techniques continue to push the readers to clarify their relationship with the God of Israel. Yahweh implies that he will give Israel the gift of shame by describing the self-loathing of the Israelites along with the other gifts that he will give to them. At the same time, however, he commands the Israelites to be ashamed. In this way, Yahweh describes his role in providing shame while still applying rhetorical pressure on the readers to be ashamed. He does this in a context where his promises have not been visibly fulfilled in order to create the opportunity for the Israelites to trust in him. The text does not include a general statement that Israel is ashamed because it intends for each ethnic Israelite to obey or to refuse the command to be dishonored. As a result, Ezek 36:32 marks the rhetorical moment when each implied reader's relationship with Yahweh is clear. Each reader is either ashamed and in an appropriate relationship with Yahweh or stubborn and separated from Yahweh. In this way, Yahweh divides the ethnic Israelites into two groups.

Yahweh also uses the issue of dishonor to redefine the house of Israel, excluding those who are not ashamed. He does this by linking the self-loathing of the Israelites inseparably with the gifts of a return to the land and productive crops. Only those who are ashamed are a part of the house of Israel and will receive the gifts of the restoration.

Chapter 5 engages the fifth step in the rhetorical study by analyzing the role of Ezek 36:16–32 within the context of the book of Ezekiel. This chapter concludes that Yahweh uses the same basic pattern in the entire book of Ezekiel as he does in Ezek 36:16–32. He also has the same goal. The text intends for the readers to admit their shame in Ezek 36:16–32, and thus to form the

true Israel—a group characterized in part by their acknowledged shame before Yahweh. This goal makes Ezek 36:16–32 a key turning point in the entire book of Ezekiel.

CHAPTER ONE

A STUDY OF THE LOGICAL MATERIAL IN EZEK 36:16–32

This dissertation will employ the framework of a rhetorical study of Ezek 36:16–32 in order to solve the crux of the passage: why references to shame follow good news. Therefore, this chapter begins the larger study by first establishing the rhetorical unit, then describing the rhetorical situation, and finally analyzing the logic of Ezek 36:16–32.¹ The information presented in this chapter will serve as the foundation of the dissertation and will make initial steps toward responding to the crux of Ezek 36:16–32. It will serve the rest of the dissertation because the translation of the rhetorical unit, the rhetorical situation, and the logic of the passage will be employed in the analysis found in the later chapters. The problem of the text will be addressed through a study of the key rhetorical features of the text. This analysis will argue that it is possible for the Israelites to be ashamed while still in exile and that the command to be ashamed in Ezek 36:32 is intended to be believed immediately. At the same time, this basic rhetorical study reveals the need for a deeper understanding of shame because Ezekiel 36:16–32 does not define shame or explain how shame functions in relationships.

¹ See Gitay, *Prophecy*, 36–41; Renz, *Rhetorical*, 22–26; and Wuellner, “Where?” 455–60 for details concerning the steps of a rhetorical study.

Rhetorical Unit

Establishing the Rhetorical Unit

The first step in a rhetorical study is to establish the rhetorical unit.² Rhetorical criticism treats books of the HB as texts that are intentionally composed to persuade readers. Each unit has a beginning and an ending that makes it stand apart from other units as it plays the role in the communication for which it was designed. It is important to establish the rhetorical unit in order to know which verses are intended to work together to accomplish a rhetorical goal. The beginning and ending of the rhetorical unit may be discovered using textual cues and content.

Internal and external markers indicate that Ezek 36:16–32 is a discrete rhetorical unit that is closely linked to Ezek 36:33–38. The word-event formula and the divine address, son of man, in 36:16 mark the beginning of a new oracle. The end of the unit in v. 32 is established by the signatory formula and a final reference to the conduct of the house of Israel. Block notes that the recognition formula and the signatory formula are awkward in v. 23 because they do not seem to mark the beginning or ending of a unit as they often do.³ The context shows, however, that in v. 23 Yahweh is summarizing what he will do (וְקִדְשָׁתִי אֶת־שְׁמִי הַגָּדוֹל), “And I will sanctify my great name”) and what the result will be (וַיֵּדְעוּ הַגּוֹיִם כִּי־אֲנִי יְהוָה), “And the nations will know that I [am] Yahweh”). The signatory formula is an interjection to add force to Yahweh’s statement. This rhetorical unit focuses upon the implications that Yahweh’s relationship with the Israelite people has on his reputation.

² See Gitay, *Prophecy*, 36–41; Renz, *Rhetorical*, 22–26; and Wuellner, “Where ?” 455–60.

³ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 337.

The book of Ezekiel presents Ezek 36:33–38 as a separate unit by employing the citation formula and shifting the focus to talk about rebuilding the ruins on the land.⁴ However, the phrase **בְּיוֹם טָהַרְתִּי אֶתְכֶם**, “on the day that I will make you clean,” in v. 33 uses the reference to the same time and the term *make clean* to create a strong link between Ezek 36:16–32 and the rhetorical unit formed by vv. 33–38.⁵ Ezekiel 36:33–38 also ends with the recognition formula in verse 38.

Preceding Ezek 36:16–32, Ezek 36:1–15 forms a separate oracle addressed to the mountains of Israel. This rhetorical unit is marked by the use of the phrase *son of man* and by Yahweh’s command to Ezekiel to prophesy in Ezek 36:1 and the end of the message to the mountains of Israel in v. 15. After Ezek 36:33–38, Ezek 37:1 begins another unit as demonstrated by the statement, **הַיָּתָה עָלַי יְדֵי־יְהוָה**, “The hand of Yahweh was upon me,” and by the change in setting when Ezekiel is brought to a valley by the Spirit of Yahweh.

Both textual markers and content set Ezek 36:16–32 apart as a discrete rhetorical unit—the unit that will serve as the focus of this dissertation. These verses focus upon the manner in which Yahweh’s relationship with Israel affects his reputation before the nations. This passage will be analyzed with the understanding that there is a tight relationship between these verses and a more distant relationship between this text and the rhetorical units that come before and after it.

Ezekiel 36:16–32 plays a discrete role in the overall goal of the book of Ezekiel. With the

⁴ This passage is closely related to Ezek 36:16–32 but is a separate unit. Ezekiel 36:33 shifts quickly from cleansing Israel to restoring the land. In fact, Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 176, sees vv. 33–36 and vv. 37–38 as oracles that are distinct from Ezek 36:16–32. H. van Dyke Parunak, “Structural Studies in Ezekiel,” (Ph.D. Diss., Harvard, 1978), 477, also treats Ezek 36:33–38 as a separate unit based on structure and content. He notes that Ezek 36:33–38 is linked to Ezek 36:16–32 but, “it is fundamentally different from that section, which emphasized the Lord’s reputation over Israel’s wellbeing.” On pp. 471–81, he gives Ezek 36:33–38 the title Economic Restoration of Israel and relates it most closely Ezek 36:8–12.

⁵ Dieter Baltzer, “Literarkritische und Literarhistorische Anmerkungen zur Heilsprophetie im Ezechiel-Buch,” in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation* (BETL 74; ed. J. Lust; Louvain: Louvain University Press, 1986), 176. Another link is that the text continues to use the second person without saying who is being addressed. See Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 176.

rhetorical unit defined, it is now appropriate to translate the text from the Hebrew in order to begin to understand the rhetorical goal of this passage and thus to respond to the crux of Ezek 36:16–32.

A Translation of Ezek 36:16–32 with Textual and Grammatical Notes

The following translation of Ezek 36:16–32 will be employed throughout the dissertation. It will be used to study the thought progression of the passage in this chapter. The analysis of the meaning and function of the shame terminology in the passage will then bring added understanding to the text in chapter 2 and chapter 3. A study of the ethical and emotional material and the rhetorical techniques employed in the passage will further flesh out the dissertation’s solution to the crux of Ezek 36:16–32 before the placement of this rhetorical unit within the entire book in chapter 5 supplies added evidence that the solution is correct.

The translation itself demonstrates that shame plays a major role in the passage and that the use of shame terminology in vv. 31–32 is ambiguous. It is this ambiguity that has led scholars to such diverse interpretations as those offered by Schwartz and Block.⁶ However, the use of rhetorical analysis with attention to the role of shame in relationships will bring needed clarity to the passage.

This translation is intentionally literal, with careful attention to and comments on the Hebrew text. Influenced by rhetorical criticism, it assumes a unified text and thus resists emending the MT. As the translation will describe below, there is some conflict between the LXX and the MT, but the Masada Hebrew text agrees quite closely with the MT.⁷ Because of a

⁶ Schwartz, “Dim,” 60–61. Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 358–59.

⁷ Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37*, 738, 740. Also, Horace Hummel, *Ezekiel 1–20* (Concordia Commentary; St. Louis: Concordia, 2005), 7, gives the general note that the Dead Sea Scrolls fragments of Ezekiel follow the MT quite well.

concern with the unusual order of the passage, the following translation reflects the logical nature of the progression in vv. 23–32.

16 And the word of Yahweh came to me saying: 17 “Son of man, the house of Israel,⁸ while they were dwelling⁹ on their ground, made it unclean by their conduct and by their deeds. Like the uncleanness of menstruation¹⁰ was their conduct before me. 18 Then¹¹ I poured out my wrath on them¹² on account of¹³ the blood which they had poured out¹⁴ on the land and on account of¹⁵ their dung idols¹⁶ (with which)¹⁷ they had made it unclean.¹⁸ 19 And I scattered them among the nations, and they were dispersed among the countries. According to their conduct and according to their deeds I judged them. 20 And¹⁹ they came²⁰ to the nations to which they came,²¹

⁸ This construction reflects the fact that *house of Israel* is singular (collective) while the participle is plural. Ezekiel often uses a plural verb with a singular noun for the house of Israel (Ezek 3:7; 8:16; 39:22).

⁹ According to *IBHS*, § 37.6 d, “With reference to a *past* state of affairs, a participle may describe the circumstances accompanying a principal event.”

¹⁰ I begin this sentence with the words “like the uncleanness of menstruation” to reflect the Hebrew word order, to emphasize the simile which magnifies the disgust that the conduct of the Israelites caused for Yahweh, and to reflect the high literary style of the passage.

¹¹ The *waw* may express, “an informal inference, or consequence.” See BDB, s.v. ׀, 4.

¹² The original Greek text of the LXX is missing the rest of v. 18. This is a case of random omission. The reading of the MT should be retained.

¹³ This term gives the cause or reason. See BDB, s.v. על, II 1 f b.

¹⁴ This is an idiom for murder. See Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 346.

¹⁵ See BDB, s.v. ב, III 5. In spite of the use of a different preposition, ב rather than על, the meaning, “on account of,” is the same.

¹⁶ Literally, “pellets of dung,” but used in reference to idols (See also v. 25). Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1026, translates this term as “fecal deities.”

¹⁷ Parentheses show that words that do not appear in the Hebrew text have been added to make the English translation easier to follow.

¹⁸ These last two verbs are perfects but are referring to the time before Yahweh poured out his wrath and, therefore, are rendered as pluperfect. See GKC, § 106 f; Joüon, § 112 c.

¹⁹ The first part of the sentence gives the context for what follows, so it could be translated, “And when they came to those nations, they profaned.”

²⁰ Literally, “And it came” with “it” being a reference to Israel collectively. The BHS apparatus prefers to follow the Cairo Geniza, a few Hebrew mss (See Kennicott, de Rossi, and Ginsburg), and the marginal corrections of all or most versions which read, “and they came.” The apparatus may be confusing the Cairo Geniza and the Targums because of similarity of symbols. I was able to verify that the Targum Jonathan does have the variant, but I

and they profaned my holy name,²² when it was said of them:²³ ‘These (are) the people of Yahweh, but²⁴ they left *his land*.’²⁵ 21 Then²⁶ I was concerned²⁷ for my holy name which the house of Israel²⁸ had profaned²⁹ among the nations to which they had come.³⁰

22 Therefore, say to the house of Israel: ‘Thus has the Lord³¹ Yahweh said: (It is) *not for your sake*³² (that) I am about to act,³³ O house of Israel, but rather³⁴ for my holy name which you have profaned among the nations to which you came.³⁵ 23 I will sanctify³⁶ my great name which

was not able to verify the Cairo Geniza material. The marginal corrections (*Sebirin*) should be understood as, “it has been suggested wrongly,” and therefore strengthen the MT reading. See Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 64. Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 344, sees the MT reading as metathesis. On the contrary, the alternate reading is a harmonization with the plural form found later in the verse. The MT reflects Ezekiel’s habit of treating the house of Israel as a singular and plural entity at the same time, as he does in v. 21 where the singular subject, “the house of Israel,” is placed with the plural verb, “profaned.”

²¹ Literally, “they came to the nations to which they came there.”

²² Literally, “the name of my holiness.” Joüon, § 140 b, notes that such a use of the genitive is best translated, “my holy name.”

²³ Literally, “when saying in regard to them.”

²⁴ This is a disjunctive *waw* that introduces a contrast. See *IBHS*, § 39.2.3 b. In this case, the contrast is between what should have happened and what did happen. The Israelites should have stayed on Yahweh’s land.

²⁵ Literally, “from his land they went out.” Italics here and elsewhere in the translation of the text signify emphasis in the Hebrew.

²⁶ This *waw* expresses an informal consequence.

²⁷ Literally, “had compassion on” or “spared.” See BDB, s.v. חָמַל, Qal. The verb חָמַל appears elsewhere in Ezekiel in 5:11, 7:4, 7:9, 8:18, 9:5, 9:10, and 16:5. In all uses but Ezek 16:5 the verb refers to Yahweh’s decision not to have compassion on Israel as he judges them. Ezekiel 16:5 deals with Israel’s childhood and says that no one had compassion on Israel. But Yahweh shows by his command to live in v. 6 and the health that he brought to Israel in v. 7 that he did have compassion on Israel in their youth. In Ezek 36:21, it appears that Yahweh is motivated to act by a desire to protect his name from further damage.

²⁸ The subject is singular while the verb is plural. Literally, “the house of Israel, they profaned.”

²⁹ Literally, “had profaned *it*.”

³⁰ Literally, “among the nations which they had come to there.”

³¹ A Greek LXX ms excludes the word *Lord* to avoid redundancy since it translates both this term and the tetragrammaton as “Lord.” The MT should be retained.

³² When אֵל is used to negate a noun clause, it is emphatic. See GKC, § 152 d, and Joüon, § 160 c.

³³ When the participle refers to a future situation is usually carries a sense of immanence. See *IBHS*, § 37.6 f. The words *I am about to act* reflect immanence.

³⁴ BDB, s.v. אָנֹכִי, 2 b.

³⁵ Literally, “which you came there.”

has been profaned among the nations—which you profaned in their midst.³⁷ And the nations will know that I (am) Yahweh—declaration of the Lord Yahweh³⁸—when I show myself holy through³⁹ you before their eyes.⁴⁰ 24 I will take you from the nations; I will gather you from all⁴¹ the countries; and I will bring you to your ground.⁴² 25 I will sprinkle clean water on you, and you will be clean. From all your uncleannesses and from all your dung idols I will make you

³⁶ Literally, “I will set my great name apart as holy.” The *waw* has not been translated for the sake of style in English. This verb marks the beginning of a long string of *waw*-consecutive perfects that continues through v. 31. I will translate the *waws* throughout at my discretion. See *IBHS*, §32.2.1 and 32.2.5 a.

³⁷ The Old Latin Codex Wirceburgensis omits vv. 23bβ–38. See Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, “Le témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l’étude de la tradition des Septante Ézéchiél et Daniel dans le Papyrus 967,” *Bib* 59 (1978): 388. See also J. Lust, “Ezekiel 36–40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript,” *CBQ* 43 (1981): 519, 521–24. Lust agrees with Bogaert that Papyrus 967 omits vv. 23bβ–38 and asserts that Papyrus 967 represents a form of Ezekiel earlier than the MT. As evidence of this view, Lust offers the observation that 36:23b ends with the recognition formula which usually marks the end of an oracle or unit. Also, 36:23c–38 contains much unique style and vocabulary. For example, v. 25 is the only place in the OT where זָקַר is used for pouring clean water over Yahweh’s people and v. 28 is the only place in Ezekiel where אֲנִי is used for “I.” Lust argues that such unusual features are suspect in a text that does not have anything original but rather borrows from other parts of Ezekiel. Jörg Garscha, *Studien zum Ezechielbuch: Eine Redaktionskritische Untersuchung von Ez 1–39* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1974), 217, on the other hand, argues that the text is secondary because there is a development of thought from 36:1–15. Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 340, counters Lust by noting that there are other examples in Ezekiel, such as 28:22, where the recognition formula appears in the middle of an oracle. He also asserts that the high literary style of this section may be attributed to Ezekiel’s understanding of the importance of the subject matter. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 245, notes that without vv. 23bβ–38 there is no explanation of how Yahweh sanctifies his great name (v. 23a). Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37*, 738, 740, argues that the unique ideas in our text, such as the sprinkling in v. 25, account for the unique vocabulary that the text employs. He also notes that the unpublished Masada Hebrew text contains clear remains of Ezek 36:24–34 that are identical to the MT. The Masada Hebrew text predates Papyrus 967. Greenberg received this information from Sh. Talmon, who is responsible to publish the text.

³⁸ Two original Greek Mss exclude “declaration of the Lord Yahweh.” This is parablepsis with the scribe’s eye skipping from the first appearance of “Yahweh” to the second. The MT reading should be retained.

³⁹ The preposition, כִּי, could also be translated “among you” in this case, but it is better understood as expressing means. See BDB, II 2. See also Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 349. I follow Block’s translation because v. 24 describes Yahweh taking Israel from the nations and thus using Israel as a means of showing himself holy before the eyes of the nations.

⁴⁰ Some Hebrew mss and edd (See Kennicott, de Rossi, and Ginsburg) have “through them” and “before your eyes.” All that Yahweh does in the following verses supports the reading “through you” which should be retained.

⁴¹ Some Hebrew mss, the Cairo Geniza, and the Syriac exclude “all.” This is random omission. The MT reading should be retained.

⁴² The use of the term ground, אֲדָמָה, rather than land, אֶרֶץ, here and in v. 17 is significant. See Stewart Crown, “The Significance of the Phrase אֲדָמָה יִשְׂרָאֵל in Ezekiel” (S.T.M. thesis, Concordia Seminary, 1995), 85, 170–76. Crown argues convincingly that in these verses *ground* refers to, “the tangible context for Israel’s relationship with Yahweh.” This relationship was intact in v. 17 and will be intact again in v. 24. On the other hand, *land* appears to focus on geography in vv. 18 and 20 and the place to which Israel will return in v. 28. Ezekiel 36:28 gives continuity with Israel’s forefathers and the historical faith of Israel.

clean.⁴³ 26 I will give to you a new heart, and a new spirit I will put⁴⁴ in your inner part. I will remove the heart of stone from your flesh,⁴⁵ and I will give to you a heart of flesh. 27 And my Spirit I will put in your inner part. And I will cause⁴⁶ you to walk *in my statutes* and to observe and do *my ordinances*. 28 You will dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers. You will be my people, and *I*⁴⁷ will be your God. 29 I will save you from all your uncleannesses. I will summon the grain, and I will increase it. I will not put famine on you. 30 I will increase the fruit of the tree and the produce of the field so that you will never again⁴⁸ suffer⁴⁹ the disgrace of famine among the nations. 31 Consequently,⁵⁰ you will remember your evil conduct⁵¹ and your deeds⁵² that (were) not good and will loathe yourselves⁵³ on account of your iniquities and on account of your abominations. 32 (It is) *not for your sake* (that) I am about to act—declaration of the Lord

⁴³ This verb is an unconverted imperfect that maintains the future orientation of the section.

⁴⁴ This verb is an imperfect. The root, נָתַן, is the same root used for the previous verb, but with a slightly different nuance here.

⁴⁵ This is the same word that is translated “flesh” at the end of the verse and could be translated “body.”

⁴⁶ Literally, “I will make (DO marker) that you will walk.” Concerning object-clauses introduced by אֲשֶׁר, see GKC, § 157 c.

⁴⁷ This is the only use of אֲנִי for *I* in the book of Ezekiel. A few mss and the Cairo Geniza materials replace this form with אֲנִי. This is harmonization with Ezekiel’s other uses of the pronoun *I*. The MT reading should be retained. Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 357, agrees and sees the MT reading as a conscious archaism from the covenant formula.

⁴⁸ The term *never again* is common in the restoration oracles of Ezekiel and Jeremiah (Ezek 16:42, 34:10). See Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 350.

⁴⁹ This is a rare use of לָקַח found elsewhere only in Hosea 10:6. See Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 350. The word is similar to the more common נָשָׂא and carries a similar idea to that of bearing shame.

⁵⁰ This is a *waw*-consecutive perfect and, therefore, is not distinguished from the previous verses grammatically. However, this is the end of a chain of *waw*-consecutive perfects that began in v. 23. Verse 31 is best translated using the word *consequently* to express logical succession. See *IBHS*, § 32.2.1 c.

⁵¹ The Hebrew is plural. See also v. 32.

⁵² This is the only time that this form of the term *deeds* appears in Ezekiel. It is much more common in Jeremiah. See Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 243.

⁵³ Literally, “you will feel disgust in your face.”

Yahweh—let it be known to you. Be ashamed and be dishonored because of your conduct, O house of Israel.’”

This translation gives an initial indication of two important issues in the text. First of all, it uses the term *consequently* in v. 31 to show that this is the end of a chain of *waw*-consecutive perfects that is best understood as expressing logical succession. Secondly, the translation of v. 32 highlights the two shame terms in the imperative. These commands naturally apply to the readers at the time that they read them.

Rhetorical Situation

The translation of the Ezek 36:16–32 highlights the ambiguity of the text and leads to a study of the rhetorical situation in the hope of finding needed details.⁵⁴ Although the rhetorical situation only begins to solve the crux of the passage, it does frame the text as it describes the context that Ezek 36:16–32 is addressing. The text is speaking to a group of people who are trying to make sense out of the fall of Jerusalem and the exile even as they are being influenced by the cultures of the nations.

Although the exact details of the rhetorical situation of this oracle are not given in the book of Ezekiel, the book does give substantial description of the implied readers and their context. The passage does not state that Yahweh addressed a particular group of Israelites through Ezekiel at a particular time. But the text clearly addresses the Israelites. In the oracle in Ezek 36:16–32, Yahweh orders Ezekiel to address the house of Israel. Ezekiel was among the exiles near the Chebar River (Ezek 1:1). Therefore, it is likely that this oracle would have been heard

⁵⁴ The analysis of the rhetorical situation is the second step in a standard rhetorical study. See Gitay, *Prophecy*, 36–41; Renz, *Rhetorical*, 22–26; and Wuellner, “Where ?” 455–60.

by the elders in exile (Ezek 20:1–3) and later read⁵⁵ by the exiled population at large.⁵⁶ It is also possible that this oracle would have been read by other Israelites who had gone into exile more recently or even by some of those who remained in Israel. The term *house of Israel* naturally applies to all Israelites.

The most likely readers of this text, however, were already in exile in Babylon. The nearest date formula preceding Ezek 36:16–32 is in 33:21. Block dates this formula to January 8, 585 BC.⁵⁷ But the date is much less important than the event that this verse conveys. In Ezek 33:21, a man who had escaped from Jerusalem told Ezekiel that Jerusalem had fallen.

News of the fall of Jerusalem is striking in the face of Israel’s apparent misunderstanding that Yahweh would never allow Jerusalem to fall. Block argues that the Israelites clung to the, “conviction of an inseparable bond among national patron deity (Yahweh), territory (land of Canaan), and people (nation of Israel).”⁵⁸ While this attitude agrees with the normal ANE view, it is also based on theological convictions, namely, “Yahweh’s ownership of the land of Canaan, Yahweh’s eternal covenant with David, and Yahweh’s residence in Jerusalem.”⁵⁹ However, the refugee’s bad news is proof that Israel has misunderstood Yahweh’s plan and that Yahweh has punished the Israelites for their lack of faithfulness to the Sinaitic covenant.⁶⁰ Yahweh did what

⁵⁵ This dissertation focuses upon Ezek 36:16–32 within the context of the entire book of Ezekiel and does not concern itself with those who may have heard the oracle apart from the rest of the book.

⁵⁶ See Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 5. Block notes that, “Ezekiel’s primary audience was the community of Jews in Babylon.” Renz, *Rhetorical*, 16–17, also refers to the recipient of this communication as the exilic audience. Concerning the book as a written whole, he notes that, “the book of Ezekiel makes little effort to distinguish the audience of the book from the prophet’s original audience; rather the former is seen in continuity with the latter.”

⁵⁷ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 254.

⁵⁸ Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 7–8.

⁵⁹ Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 7–8. See also Boadt, “Ezekiel, Book of,” *ABD* 2:271. Boadt attributes this misunderstanding to a misreading of 2 Sam 7.

⁶⁰ The Sinaitic covenant is important to this study because it requires the Israelites to walk in Yahweh’s statutes and to trust him alone as their God. Therefore, it can be violated by Israel, resulting in punishment from Yahweh. At the same time however, the Sinaitic covenant and the covenants that Yahweh made with Noah, Abraham, and David

he had previously only threatened to do (Ezek 5:8–10). According to Ezek 33:10, the Israelites see themselves as rotting away because of their sins and do not know how they will live. They are in a state of despair. Their relationship with Yahweh is broken, and they do not act to restore it. Under these circumstances, the implied author treats the implied readers as Israelites who have sinned against Yahweh without seeking reconciliation.

An understanding of the rhetorical situation gives a context within which to interpret Ezek 36:16–32. The major issue in the context is the broken relationship between Yahweh and Israel reflected in the fall of Jerusalem and the exile. The prominence of this relationship justifies the use of sociological interpretation to seek a solution to the crux of the passage. The rhetorical situation also raises the issue of the influence of the nations on the Israelites' understanding of their relationship with Yahweh. Chapters 2 and 3 will employ sociological interpretation, and chapter 3 will address the influence of the nations. The rhetorical context also highlights the crux and raises the issue of when the events described in the passage are to take place. Since the implied readers have not sought reconciliation with Yahweh, it is strange that Yahweh would offer good news in vv. 23–30. It is also unclear how that good news relates to the command to be ashamed in v. 32 and when Yahweh intends the Israelites to be ashamed. The question of when Israel is to be ashamed will be resolved by an analysis of the choice and arrangement of the material in Ezek 36:16–32.

Choice and Arrangement of the Material

The disposition of the material builds upon the rhetorical situation. The rhetorical situation supplies the context to which the passage is speaking while the choice and arrangement of the

all reflect his unconditional faithfulness to Israel. See Elmer Martens, *God's Design: A Focus on Old Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), 217.

material deals with what the text is trying to accomplish in the readers and how it is attempting to persuade them. The analysis of the choice and arrangement of the material is the third step in a typical rhetorical study.⁶¹ This section will present the type of rhetorical goal, the thought progression, and the rhetorical goal of the passage. In this way, this part of the rhetorical study will describe the logic and the goal of the passage in order to gain understanding concerning the use of shame discourse in Ezek 36:16–32. It will highlight the role of time in the passage and will raise questions that call for sociological interpretation in order to answer them.

Type of Rhetorical Goal

With the context of the communication in Ezek 36:16–32 established, it is possible to consider what Yahweh is trying to accomplish in the Israelites and how he addresses them because of his goal. An analysis of the type of rhetorical goal in the passage draws attention to the dense and complicated nature of these verses.

Baltzer describes Ezek 36:16–32 idiosyncratically as a disputative, stylized salvation oracle.⁶² The text is disputative in the sense that Yahweh is proving his case against Israel (v. 17–19) and stylized because of its use of unusual lexemes and constructions. For example, Ezek 36:28 is the only place in the book of Ezekiel where the term אֲנִי is used for the pronoun I.⁶³ The passage is a salvation oracle because it promises cleansing, a new heart and spirit, a restoration of the covenant, and a return to the land that will be fruitful for Israel. However, it is difficult to identify the type of rhetorical goal that is at work in this oracle because in it Yahweh proves his case against Israel at the same time that he promises salvation for Israel.

⁶¹ See Gitay, *Prophecy*, 36–41; Renz, *Rhetorical*, 22–26; and Wuellner, “Where ?” 455–60.

⁶² Baltzer, “Literarkritische,” 175.

⁶³ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 357.

As Gitay observes, classical rhetoric identifies three types of goals when persuasive discourse is employed, and the type of goal decides the genre of the discourse.⁶⁴ A deliberative goal focuses on leading the audience to make a decision about the future. A forensic goal is in view when the audience is asked to pass judgment on an event from the past. The goal is epideictic when it attempts to lead the audience to assign praise or blame in the present.⁶⁵ Renz notes that an epideictic goal intensifies adherence to certain values as it assigns praise or blame.⁶⁶

Renz argues convincingly that there is an overlap of types of rhetorical goals in the book of Ezekiel and especially in Ezek 36:16–32. He identifies Ezek 36:16–32 as essentially deliberative and thus intended to lead the Israelites to a decision about their future.⁶⁷ As Renz sees the situation, however, Israel’s future does not focus on a decision they will make but rather on “the life-giving power of the prophetic word.”⁶⁸ Therefore, the text is deliberative, “not in the sense that the community is expected to take an initiative themselves, but in the sense that they are asked to identify with Yahweh’s future action.”⁶⁹ The oracle also includes forensic characteristics in that it presses the readers to judge Israel’s past as worthy of shame. Finally, the passage includes epideictic characteristics because it pushes the readers to assign blame in the present (Ezek 36:17–21) and seeks to intensify allegiance to Yahweh’s values.

This analysis makes it clear that Yahweh is using both good news and references to shame to win an argument with Israel. His goal in this passage is to lead the Israelites to a decision about their future—to embrace his plans for their future. In order to get this point, however, the

⁶⁴ Gitay, *Prophecy*, 36; and Renz, *Rhetorical*, 23–24.

⁶⁵ Gitay, *Prophecy*, 36; and Renz, *Rhetorical*, 23–24, 57–61.

⁶⁶ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 58–59.

⁶⁷ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 57.

⁶⁸ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 60.

⁶⁹ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 57.

Israelites must accept that their past behavior was shameful and must blame themselves for the broken relationship with Yahweh. This information aids in the understanding of the past, present, and future time references in the passage and the holistic way in which Yahweh is using shame discourse in the passage. Any explanation for the difficult order of positive promises followed by references to shame must take these details into account.

The Thought Progression of the Logical Material

The progression of thought of Ezek 36:16–32 focuses on Yahweh’s plan to sanctify his great name. In order for Yahweh to do this, the Israelites must acknowledge their shameful past, they must be ashamed in the present, and they must embrace Yahweh’s plans for their future. Although shame plays an important role in Yahweh’s relationship with Israel, however, the text does not explain the meaning and function of the shame language that it employs.

According to classical rhetoric, the logical material is that part of a message that focuses on rational arguments.⁷⁰ The logical material in this text can be broken into two sections with Ezek 36:16–21 serving as a presentation of the problem and vv. 22–32 presenting Yahweh’s solution. In both sections, Yahweh’s concern with his reputation is primary. Ezekiel 36:16–21 lays out the problem as a conversation between Yahweh and Ezekiel. Ezekiel 36:16–17 makes it clear that Yahweh is addressing Ezekiel only and is not instructing Ezekiel to announce the content of the conversation to Israel.

In this oracle, Ezek 36:17 explains the role of the Israelites in creating the problem by their behavior and their obsession with the land. Yahweh refers to the land as their ground.⁷¹ He does

⁷⁰ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 25.

⁷¹ Yahweh refers to the land as belonging to Israel in this specific oracle. He refers to the land as his in Ezek 36:5 and Ezek 38:16.

not to claim the land for himself but has distanced himself from it, implying that the Israelites' focus on the land is part of the problem. As Yahweh tells the history of Israel's exile, however, it begins with Israel living on the land. This means that Yahweh was acting out his covenant faithfulness by allowing Israel to remain on the land. Furthermore, according to the text, there is no reason to believe that Israel would have left the land if they had not engaged in bad behavior toward each other and toward Yahweh. When they had the land they wanted, however, they made it unclean through their conduct and their deeds.

In Ezek 36:18, Yahweh describes Israel's bad conduct and his reaction to it. The text speaks of murder with the words *עַל-הַדָּם אֲשֶׁר-שָׁפְכוּ עַל-הָאָרֶץ*, "on account of the blood which they had poured out on the land." The text also mentions idolatry with the words *וּבְגִלּוֹתֵיהֶם*, "and on account of their dung idols," in reference to Israel's unwillingness to accept Yahweh as their one and only God.⁷² Yahweh's reaction is to pour his wrath out on Israel just as Israel had poured out blood on the land.⁷³ The clear implication is that Israel deserved the punishment they received.

In v. 19, Yahweh shows that when he poured out his wrath, he scattered Israel among the nations. This is an obvious reference to exile, a situation that left Israel in a state of shame in regard to the surrounding nations (Ezek 7:18, 24; 34:29). Once again, Yahweh states that Israel is at fault for this judgment. He goes on to assert that the degree of his judgment reflected the degree of Israel's conduct. The punishment fit the crime. Israel's behavior brought about the exile.

⁷² John F. Kutsko, "Ezekiel's Anthropology and Its Ethical Implications," in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives* (SBL Symposium Series Number 9; ed. Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong; Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 138–39, sees a link between the image of God (Gen 9:6) and our text. Shedding blood is wrong because humans are in the image of God, and idolatry is wrong because it is a misrepresentation of the image of God.

⁷³ The Hebrew term is the same in this intentional play on the word *pour*.

Ezek 36:20 deals with the result of Israel's being scattered among the nations and introduces the problem that is the subject of the text. Israel is responsible for the profanation of Yahweh's holy name.⁷⁴ The text does not state bluntly that the nations held Yahweh in low esteem. Presumably, the implied author avoids such a statement out of respect for Yahweh. However, the text does make that point in more subtle terms. The people from the nations were saying, "These (are) the people of Yahweh, but they left *his land*" (עַם-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי וּמְאַרְצוֹ (צוֹרְאֵי)). Allen notes that the nations believe that Yahweh was too weak to keep his people on his land.⁷⁵ The unspoken implication of this statement is that Yahweh's reputation in the eyes the nations has been hurt.⁷⁶

Greenberg argues for a different and less convincing view when he concludes that Israel's behavior among the nations profaned the name of Yahweh.⁷⁷ Ezekiel 36:20, however does not mention Israel's conduct. The profanation of Yahweh's name occurs when members of the nations associate Yahweh with Israel and note that Israel left Yahweh's land. The verse focuses on Israel's departure from the land as the cause of the profanation of Yahweh's name. Furthermore, the solution to the problem as presented in this text also focuses on a return to the land. In vv. 23–24, Yahweh proves his holiness before the eyes of the nations by bringing Israel back to the land. This view receives more support from the following chapters (38–39) where

⁷⁴ Yahweh reacts when the nations ridicule his chosen people and thus himself in Ezek 36:20. See Garscha, *Studien*, 216–17. Yahweh is present in his name and can be invoked by name by Israel. His name represents his person. See Robert Martin-Achard, "Ezéchiel, Témoin de l'Honneur de YHWH," *Cahiers de la Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse* 11 (1984): 327.

⁷⁵ Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 178. See also Martin-Achard, "Ezéchiel," 327.

⁷⁶ Johanna Stiebert, *The Construction of Shame in the Hebrew Bible* (JSOTSup 346; ed. David J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies; London, London: Sheffield, 2002), 97–8. See also Y. Sherwood, *The Prostitute and the Prophet: Hosea's Marriage in Literary-Theoretical Perspective* (JSOTSup 212; Gender, Culture, Theory 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 225, 233.

⁷⁷ Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37*, 729. Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1049, also entertains this as a possibility.

Yahweh fights for Israel. Yahweh's goal also comes through clearly in Ezek 39:23–24. Here, Yahweh states that the nations will know why Israel really went into exile.

Although Ezek 36:16–32 certainly does deal with Israel's behavior, this text and the entire book present the problem as the profanation of Yahweh's name because Israel left the land. Ezekiel 20:8–9 deals with the same issue. The text speaks of the past and notes that Yahweh did not punish the Israelites because he knew that such punishment would result in the profanation of his name.⁷⁸ Although Ezek 43:7⁷⁹ does associate behavior with profanation, this verse speaks within the context of Israel itself rather than the nations. In this text, Yahweh presents specific conduct as the cause for the profanation of his name in Israel. However, Ezek 36:16–32 focuses upon Yahweh's reputation before the nations and presents the profanation of his name as the problem of the text.

These verses present the forensic orientation of the passage most clearly. Yahweh intends for the Israelites to judge their past behavior as worthy of shame. They are to admit that they deserved the punishment that Yahweh gave to them.

At the same time, there are epideictic characteristics in this passage. The Israelites should blame themselves for their broken relationship with Yahweh and for the profanation of Yahweh's name before the nations. If they do this, they will be affirming their allegiance to Yahweh's values. That is, they will agree that their past behavior and their present refusal to be reconciled to Yahweh have brought about their broken relationship with him.

⁷⁸ Rolf Rendtorff, "Ez 20 und 36,16ff im Rahmen der Komposition des Buches Ezeckiel," in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation* (BETL 74; ed. J. Lust; Louvain: Louvain University Press, 1986), 261.

⁷⁹ Lev 20:3 presents a similar situation.

In v. 21, the passage finishes its description of the issue that it is going to resolve. Here, Yahweh shows concern for his holy name in relation to the nations. The profanation of his name among the nations matters to him. Readers should expect a reaction.

The problem presented in vv. 16–21 is resolved in vv. 22–32. This complicated solution reflects Yahweh’s desire to restore his reputation (“sanctify his great name”) before the nations and within his relationship with Israel.

This section begins with the connecting word לָכֵן—a rarity in a passage that otherwise gives little explanation of how the clauses fit together (v. 22). Because of what Yahweh has said in vv. 16–21, he now commands Ezekiel to speak to the Israelites. The message of this verse contains two parts: Yahweh is about to act, and he is acting for his name’s sake, not for Israel’s. These two parts present the proper understanding of the message that is coming. Yahweh is going to solve the problem. At the same time, he does not want the Israelites to imagine that they deserve what he is about to do for them. The Hebrew terminology, לֹא לְמַעַןְכֶּם, deals with purpose,⁸⁰ and makes it evident that Yahweh is not acting for Israel. Rather, Yahweh is about to act for the honor of his name. There is no positive sense in which Israel is motivating Yahweh to act. Israel has not done anything to deserve the good gifts that Yahweh promises to give to Israel.⁸¹ On the contrary, Israel’s bad conduct brought about the exile and the need for restoration.

However, Israel’s lack of merit does not mean that Yahweh is unaware that what he is about to do is good for Israel or that he is unwilling to do something that is good for Israel.

⁸⁰ See BDB, s.v. לְמַעַן, a.

⁸¹ This view is supported by the LXX translation of the same words in Ezek 36:32 as οὐ δι’ ὑμᾶς, “not on account of you.” At the same time, the LXX translates Ezek 36:22 using the dative: οὐχ ὑμῖν “not to you.” The translation in Ezek 36:22 may reflect an error on the part of the translation because it does not adequately convey the meaning of the Hebrew.

Although Yahweh is not acting because of Israel, he is acting in a way that benefits Israel.

Ezekiel 36:37 makes it clear that Yahweh is willing to do something good that Israel wants him to do for them when it says, “This once more I will allow myself to be sought by the house of Israel to do for them” (עוד זאת אֶדְרֹשׁ לְבֵית־יִשְׂרָאֵל לַעֲשׂוֹת לָהֶם).

Ezekiel 36:22 states that Yahweh is not acting for Israel’s sake.⁸² Yahweh’s primary concern in vv. 22–32 is to overcome his own poor reputation (the profanation of his name) and to prove that he merits the respect of the nations. However, it is his relationship with Israel that brought about the profanation of his name. Therefore, Yahweh addresses the main problem by saying that he is about to act at the same time that he addresses his relationship with Israel by saying that he is not acting for their sake.⁸³ The verses that follow will deal with both issues as Yahweh resolves the problem.

Ezekiel 36:23 begins a string of *waw*-consecutive perfects that continues through v. 31 with only an occasional interruption by an imperfect verb that serves to reinforce the future orientation of the passage. The string of *waw*-consecutive perfects gives grammatical unity to this section. These verses deal with Yahweh’s reaction to the problem.

In v. 23, Yahweh restates the problem and summarizes his solution. The Israelites profaned his great name among the nations, but Yahweh will sanctify his great name.⁸⁴ Yahweh’s focus on the nations is striking. He cares what the nations think and agrees—at least to some extent—with their evaluation of the situation. It looks as though Yahweh is weak, and Yahweh is going to do

⁸² Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 337.

⁸³ Yahweh is going to act for the sake of his name. Isaiah 43:25 and Isa 48:9–11 echo this sentiment by saying that Yahweh will act for his sake. Baltzer, “Literarkritische,” 177, argues persuasively that the similarity comes from a theology of exile. Yahweh recognizes that punishing Israel with exile presents problems for his reputation before the nations.

⁸⁴ Yahweh’s name is an important term in the book of Ezekiel that is linked to his honor or glory (כְּבוֹד).

something about it. Furthermore, when he shows himself holy,⁸⁵ the nations will know that he is Yahweh. Yahweh wants the nations to know his true identity.

Yahweh intends to use Israel to accomplish his plan in the sight of the nations. Yahweh has sent Israel into exile, but exile is not Yahweh's solution to the problem of the profanation of his name before the nations, nor is it the end of Yahweh's relationship with Israel. Yahweh has used the exile to punish Israel for their unfaithfulness to the Sinaitic covenant but still intends to use Israel in a positive way to show his identity to the nations. Yahweh's reference to sanctifying his great name and showing himself holy before the eyes of the nations implies a major demonstration of his power but does not give details.

Ezekiel 36:24–31 gives the details that are lacking in v. 23. These verses describe what Yahweh means when he says that he is about to act, and that his action will sanctify his great name. All that is included in vv. 24–31 describes what Yahweh will do through Israel before the eyes of the nations to show himself holy. These verses describe a subtle progression of thought as Yahweh deals with his concerns surrounding the profanation of his name.

In Ezek 36:24, Yahweh describes the major demonstration of power that v. 23 implied. This verse gives Yahweh's solution to his primary concern regarding the profanation of his name before the nations. When Israel went into exile, the nations concluded that Yahweh was a weak god. Yahweh is going to bring Israel back from the nations to prove that he is strong. This is Yahweh's response to his greatest concern in the passage. It is part of how Yahweh will sanctify his great name. He will take Israel from the nations, and of course the nations will see what he is doing. Furthermore, when Yahweh brings Israel back from exile, he will demonstrate that he is powerful in terms that the nations will recognize. Yahweh's response shows that he agrees with

⁸⁵ The holiness of Yahweh is a key theme in the book of Ezekiel. The text uses references to Yahweh's holiness and sanctifying his name to refer to Yahweh's positive reputation.

the judgment of the nations that weakness hurts his reputation and a show of power will raise his esteem in their eyes. Yahweh will use Israel to show the nations that he is powerful, and the nations will know this part of his identity. When Yahweh vindicates his own reputation, he will also bring the Israelites back from exile.

Yahweh makes an abrupt shift in v. 25. Although the nations are still tacit witnesses to Yahweh's continuing activity, he does not mention them. He focuses rather on the Israelites and his relationship with them. According to the progression of thought in this passage, Yahweh has already responded to the problem of the profanation of his name by bringing Israel back to the land. Ezekiel 36:25 begins to deal with the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. Yahweh does not overlook Israel's bad conduct. While Yahweh does give the Israelites the land, he also insists on doing more. Yahweh makes Israel clean.⁸⁶

By making the Israelites clean from their bad conduct Yahweh goes beyond the apparent demands of the nations and begins to move toward the cause of the exile. Yahweh refers generally to uncleannesses and more specifically to dung idols as causing the need for cleansing. The general uncleannesses come from Israel's bad conduct (vv. 17–18). The reference to dung idols shows that Israel has not trusted Yahweh. Israel's bad conduct and idolatry constituted failure to be faithful to the Sinaitic covenant and caused Yahweh to send Israel into exile (v. 19). The exile was sufficient punishment for Israel, but the uncleannesses remain until Yahweh makes Israel clean. It is logically necessary for Yahweh to make Israel clean so that the Israelites

⁸⁶ Baltzer, "Literarkritishe," 177, underlines Ezekiel's concern with cleanness (Ezek 36:17, Ezek 36:25) as proof of a priestly view with ties to the Holiness Code in Lev 17–26. However, Boadt, "Ezekiel," 715–16, notes that Ezekiel does not follow the ideas of any other groups strictly but rather develops his own ideas. The passage does use cleanness terminology, but this terminology also has a strong relationship with Yahweh's reputation.

may enter into his presence.⁸⁷ He makes Israel clean by sprinkling them with clean water.⁸⁸ Then Yahweh is free to carry out his transformation of Israel.⁸⁹

Yahweh begins to deal with the root of the problem in Israel's relationship with him in v. 26. Israel has a heart of stone. Israel's heart of stone causes them to be stubborn in their relationship with Yahweh.⁹⁰ So, Yahweh will remove Israel's heart of stone to solve the problem. He will give them a new heart,⁹¹ a heart of flesh instead.⁹² This heart of flesh will not be stubborn. It will lead Israel to follow Yahweh in the appropriate manner. Along with a heart of flesh, Yahweh will also give Israel a new spirit.⁹³

Yahweh goes on to say in v. 27 that he will put his Spirit in Israel's inner part.⁹⁴ This gift will solve the fundamental problem of Israel's conduct definitively.⁹⁵ Israel will walk in

⁸⁷ HALOT 2:369–70.

⁸⁸ The image of sprinkling with clean water uses purification rites as a metaphor for forgiveness and spiritual cleansing. See Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 179.

⁸⁹ Martin-Achard, "Ezéchiel," 324–25, notes that Israelites would have understood Ezek 36:16–32 as referring to transformation.

⁹⁰ See Ezek 3:7.

⁹¹ Daniel I. Block, "Divine Abandonment: Ezekiel's Adaptation of an Ancient Near Eastern Motif," in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives* (SBL Symposium Series Number 9; ed. Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong; Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 39, argues convincingly that this text is adapting the ANE motif of divine abandonment. Normally, the god has a change of heart, but in this case Yahweh gives his people a new heart. Israel's new heart makes it possible for Yahweh to change his attitude toward Israel.

⁹² Yahweh's plan to give the Israelites a new heart in Ezek 36:26 is related to his plan to write the law on the hearts of his people in Jer 31:33. See Dieter Vieweger, "Die Arbeit des jeremianischen Schülerkreises am Jeremiabuch und deren Rezeption in der literarischen Überlieferung der Prophet Ezechiels," *BZ* 1 (1988): 26. Both prophets present a change in the hearts of the Israelites as the solution to the problem.

⁹³ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 249, uses 1 Sam 10:6 as proof that the spirit makes it possible for a person to engage in new activities.

⁹⁴ Yahweh is not planning simply to restore the past. He intends a radical, interior transformation for the Israelites. See Robert Martin-Achard, "Brèves remarques sur la signification théologique de la loi selon l'Ancien Testament," *Cahiers de la Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse* 11 (1984): 103.

⁹⁵ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 353, notes that vv. 25–28 deal with Yahweh's activity to bring about spiritual renewal in Israel.

Yahweh's statutes and observe and do his ordinances.⁹⁶ Therefore, Yahweh will not have to punish Israel with exile again and will thus avoid any further damage to his reputation.

In v. 28, Yahweh specifically addresses his concern that his people trust him as their God. Therefore, he uses covenant language to describe his relationship with Israel restored to what it should be. He refers to the fathers of the Israelites and uses the archaic long form of the pronoun *I*⁹⁷ to say that they will be his people and he will be their God. Ronald Hals calls these phrases the covenant formula and cites the example in this verse.⁹⁸ Yahweh begins the verse by showing that it is part of his plan for Israel to dwell on the land he gave to their fathers. In Yahweh's view, however, Israel's presence on the land is secondary to the events of the previous verses when dealing with their relationship with him. Yahweh will cleanse Israel, they will receive a new heart and Yahweh's Spirit, and they will live in ongoing obedience to Yahweh. These gifts prepare for the covenant to function as Yahweh intended it, with Israel dwelling on the land. Furthermore, Yahweh's cleansing of his people and his restoration of a good relationship with them are part of his solution to the problem of the profanation of his name.

After showing Israel that he does not intend to exile them permanently, Yahweh describes the ideal situation where the Israelites are his people and he is their God. The simple phrase, "and *I* will be your God," shows that both exclusivity and trust are involved. Israel will not have any other gods or trust in anyone or anything else. Yahweh will be their God.

In v. 29 Yahweh continues his description of the ongoing future situation he has planned. Hummel notes that Yahweh's salvation from uncleanness refers to uncleannesses that may

⁹⁶ Lawrence Boadt, "The Function of the Salvation Oracles in Ezekiel 33 to 37," *HAR* 12 (1990): 6, highlights Yahweh's role in transforming Israel so that they obey the covenant.

⁹⁷ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 357. See also Mark F. Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of Ezekiel* (JSOTSup 90. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 74.

⁹⁸ Hals, *Ezekiel*, 360.

come after the initial cleansing and, therefore, is not simply a repetition of v. 25.⁹⁹ In this way, Yahweh shows that it will be possible for Israel to be made unclean after the initial cleansing. The obedience that he plans to give Israel is not so absolute that it makes any kind of wrongdoing impossible. At the same time, Yahweh sees his ongoing role as saving the Israelites from any such uncleannesses.¹⁰⁰ This is a part of what it means for Yahweh to be Israel's God.

Under these ideal and ongoing circumstances, Yahweh speaks again of the nations. Yahweh has already spoken of returning Israel to the land in order that the nations recognize his strength. He will also increase the grain for the Israelites. He will not put famine on them. In fact, Yahweh will take such good care of Israel that, according to v. 30, Israel “will never again suffer the disgrace of famine among the nations” (לֹא תִקְחוּ עוֹד חֲרֻפַּת רָעֵב בְּגוֹיִם).

Ezekiel 36:31 concludes the chain of *waw*-consecutive perfects and, therefore, raises the issue of how these verses relate to each other. Waltke and O'Connor note that the *waw*-consecutive perfect usually signifies temporal or logical succession.¹⁰¹ Lapsley, Greenberg, and Davis assume a temporal succession so that self-loathing is the last chronological step in Yahweh's plan.¹⁰² They conclude that Israel will not be ashamed until after Yahweh returns them to their land. Lapsley says, “In an important sense, then, Ezekiel's message can only be understood from a future standpoint; it is unintelligible to the audience assumed in the present.”¹⁰³ It is, however, possible to understand the progression in these verses as logical rather

⁹⁹ Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1057.

¹⁰⁰ Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37*, 730, notes that the Day of Atonement in Lev 16:14–22 and Ezek 36:16–32 are the only places in the HB that use the plural to talk about uncleannesses .

¹⁰¹ *IBHS*, § 32.1.3 a–32.2 b.

¹⁰² Lapsley, “Shame and Self-Knowledge,” 155, 158–59; Moshe Greenberg, “Salvation of the Impenitent *Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam*: Ezek 36:16–32,” in *Transformations of the Inner Self in Ancient Religions* (SHR; ed. Jan Assmann and Guy G. Stroumsa; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 267; and Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll*, 58. Davis makes a compelling argument for the archival nature of the book of Ezekiel. It is important for this material to be written down. However, she goes on to assume that the words had no effect until after the return to the land.

¹⁰³ Lapsley, “Shame and Self-Knowledge,” 155, 158–59. See also Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll*, 61.

than strictly chronological. If the progression is logical, it is feasible for Israel to be ashamed before the return to the land and for the passage to be intelligible to the assumed present audience. In fact, the situation described in Ezek 6:9 supports such a view: “then those of you who escape will remember me among the nations (וַזְכְּרוּ פְּלִיטֵיכֶם אוֹתִי בְּגוֹיִם) ...and they will loathe themselves on account of the evils that they did, for all their abominations” (וַנִּקְטְוּ בְּפִנְיָהֶם אֶל-הַרְעוֹת אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ לְכָל תּוֹעֲבֹתֵיהֶם).

The self-loathing described in Ezek 6:9 takes place among the nations before the return to the land, making it difficult to take Ezek 36:22–31 to mean that the Israelites will only be disgusted with themselves after they return to the land. It is not necessary to read these verses as a strictly chronological succession with one verse in Ezek 36:24–31 happening only one time and before the next verse.¹⁰⁴ In fact, the text contains much material that has happened in the past and is not bound by a return to the land. Yahweh has given his Spirit and made hearts new and clean earlier in the HB (Exod 31:3, Ps 51:12–13, ET 51:10–11). Yahweh can certainly give the Israelites a new heart and his Spirit while they are still in exile. It is possible for Yahweh to cleanse Israel before the return to the land. It is also possible for Israel to be Yahweh’s people and for Yahweh to be Israel’s God (v. 28) in the present time of the reader in exile. The book of Ezekiel describes a situation where the Israelites are ashamed before and after their restoration to the land.

Therefore, a strictly temporal interpretation does not agree well with the flow of thought of the passage. Ezekiel 36:24–31 is better understood as a list of components in Yahweh’s plan to sanctify his great name. It presents that list in the logical order to accomplish Yahweh’s goal. Yahweh begins with a return to the land (v. 24) because it explicitly reverses the problem

¹⁰⁴ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 112, argues that the text does not establish temporal priority for political restoration or for spiritual restoration.

described in v. 20. It is the logical rather than the chronological first point in Yahweh's plan to restore his reputation. After describing the return to the land, Yahweh proceeds by presenting his plan to restore his relationship with Israel. Although Yahweh will likely repair his relationship with Israel before he repatriates them, he talks about the repatriation first because of its role in restoring his reputation.

Yahweh addresses Israel's self-loathing last in the logical succession because he will use the other components in his plan to lead the Israelites to abhor themselves. This sequence agrees well with the use of shame discourse in Ezek 16:53–54, where לְמַעַן is used to show a more explicit logical succession between the restoration and Israel's shame. In these verses, Yahweh promises to restore Israel, "so that you will bear your shame."

Ezekiel 36:31 is the last part of Yahweh's description of the ideal future that he will create as he sanctifies his holy name. Israel's self-loathing is part of that ideal future. Just as the Israelites may make themselves unclean during the restoration, they may also remember their previous behavior and be disgusted with themselves because of it. The ideal future is not perfect. This role of shame in the restoration is supported by Ezek 39:26, where bearing their shame is placed at the same time as living securely in their land and no one making them afraid. Ezekiel 36:31 does not focus on the disgust itself. Rather, the self-loathing of the Israelites is important because it is their reaction when they remember their previous conduct. Neither Ezek 36:31 nor 39:26 portrays the restored Israel in a state of constant and overwhelming self-aborrence. Yahweh promises that he will have compassion on the whole house of Israel (Ezek 39:25). This promise precludes chronic self-loathing on the part of the Israelites. They will only be disgusted with themselves on those occasions when they remember their previous conduct.

In fact, the context gives self-loathing positive associations by presenting it as part of the restoration. A return to the land, a new heart, and ample produce all appear along with self-

loathing. Under the positive circumstances of the restoration, the Israelites are disgusted with their previous negative behavior. Although the reference to self-loathing may seem out of place in a salvation oracle, it does not undermine the restoration.

As part of Yahweh's plan for the ideal future, the self-loathing mentioned in v. 31 is attributed to his activity. Lapsley and Davis argue convincingly that Yahweh takes action in Israel in order to make a positive relationship with him possible.¹⁰⁵ However, Block says that in v. 31, "The focus shifts from Yahweh's salvific work to Israel's response."¹⁰⁶ While v. 31 is certainly a response to all that Yahweh has done in the previous verses, it is not a natural response that the Israelites accomplish on their own. Rather, it is the result of Yahweh's activity in the Israelites, much like situations described earlier in the passage where the Israelites are the subject of the verbs. For example, when Yahweh says, "you will observe and do *my ordinances*," and, "You will be my people, and *I* will be your God" (vv. 27–28), he implies that Israel will be active in obedience and trust. However, Israel's activity flows out of Yahweh's initiative. Ezekiel 36:24–31 describes what Yahweh means when he says that he is about to act to sanctify his great name (vv. 22–23). Therefore, Israel's self-aborrence is a result of Yahweh's activity.¹⁰⁷ Yahweh makes Israel's disgust possible, but the self-loathing takes place within the Israelites. This gift is also a part of Yahweh's salvific work.¹⁰⁸ Yahweh refuses to cleanse, repatriate, and bless a

¹⁰⁵ Lapsley, "Shame and Self-Knowledge," 155, 158–59; and Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll*, 58.

¹⁰⁶ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 358.

¹⁰⁷ Lapsley, "Shame and Self-Knowledge," 155, 158–59, recognizes self-loathing as coming from Yahweh but limits its application because she takes the restoration in a strictly chronological sense and therefore believes that self-loathing can only come after a return to the land.

¹⁰⁸ Martin-Achard, "Brèves remarques," 104–5, notes that Yahweh gives to Israel what he demands of them and argues that the issue of shame at the end of the passage shows that Yahweh is concerned with Israel's relationship with him.

people who will forever refuse to obey him.¹⁰⁹ He gives the Israelites the gift of self-loathing, along with a new heart, as part of their transformation.

From the point of view of the readers, it is reassuring to know that Yahweh himself takes the initiative in providing shame. He does this in Ezek 36:31 with the words, “and you will¹¹⁰ loathe yourselves” (וּנְקַטְתֶּם בְּפָנֵיכֶם). By stating this phrase as fact, Yahweh is promising that the Israelites will be disgusted with themselves. From the human perspective, the implied readers should be open to Yahweh’s work of creating shame so that he may bring his positive plans to fruition.

Ezekiel 36:32 is not part of Yahweh’s description of Israel’s ideal future. Here Yahweh breaks the chain of *waw*-consecutive perfects and thus separates v. 32 grammatically from vv. 23–31 by using the imperatives, “Be ashamed and be dishonored” (בּוֹשֵׁוּ וְהִקְלָמוּ). This verse is also distinct from vv. 23–31 because Yahweh is no longer speaking in the future but has shifted to giving a present command. He is not describing Israel’s future; he is telling Israel what to do in the present.¹¹¹

While v. 32 is not part of the logical sequence of vv. 23–31, it does follow the progression of thought of the passage. Ezekiel 36:32 repeats material from v. 22 but with greater emphasis. Israel must not imagine that they deserve what Yahweh is about to do for them. From this statement, Yahweh goes on to repeat the key elements of v. 31 but in the imperative. “Be ashamed and be dishonored because of your conduct, O house of Israel.” Yahweh commands the

¹⁰⁹ Yahweh refuses to compromise his holiness and thus his identity by allowing the Israelites to go on living on the land even though they continue to violate the covenant. See Martin-Achard, “Ezéchiél,” 330.

¹¹⁰ In its context, this passage is best translated, “consequently...you will loathe.”

¹¹¹ Yahweh has covered much of the material found in Ezek 36:16–32 earlier in the book (Ezek 11:19–20, Ezek 16:59–63, Ezek 20:41–44). However, between these other passages and Ezek 36:16–32 Yahweh poured out his wrath on Israel by allowing Jerusalem to fall. See Rendtorff, “Ez 20,” 262. The fall of Jerusalem and the command to acknowledge shame are both present realities for the implied readers.

readers to be dishonored at the moment that they read the text.¹¹² Greenberg recognizes this but is convinced that the Israelites are not able to be ashamed before the return to the land. Rather than attributing v. 32 to Yahweh, he claims that it is the prophet who, “inconsistent with the postponement of contrition that he has just announced...summons them to contrition immediately, now.”¹¹³ Yahweh is, in fact, telling the Israelites to be ashamed when they read the text. He is telling Israelites who are still in exile to loathe themselves under the circumstances described in Ezek 6:9. In this way, Ezek 36:32 creates a connection with Ezek 6:9 and commands the readers to become the self-loathing Israelites-in-exile mentioned in that verse.

This second part of the passage highlights relationships, as Yahweh uses his relationship with Israel to deal with his poor reputation before the nations. Therefore, the content of Ezek 36:22–32 implies that sociological interpretation will be a useful tool in understanding the passage. This is so because of the text’s concern with both relationships and shame.

These verses also deal with the primary, deliberative nature of the rhetorical goal of the passage. Yahweh describes his future plan for Israel in vv. 22–31. Israel is expected to agree with this plan. However, it is not immediately clear whether Yahweh’s command for Israel to be ashamed in Ezek 36:32 is related to this issue or not. Although this study has demonstrated that Yahweh intends the Israelites to be ashamed as soon as they read the text even if they are still in exile, the ambiguity of the use of shame discourse make it difficult to determine how that command relates to the positive promises that come before it.

¹¹² According to *IBHS*, § 34.4 a, “The positive imperative differs from the regulative or legislative non-perfective in being more urgent or in demanding immediate, specific action on the part of the addressee.”

¹¹³ Greenberg, “Salvation,” 267.

Rhetorical Goal

The analysis of the thought progression of Ezek 36:16–32 leads to the identification of the rhetorical goal of the passage. The rhetorical goal is helpful because it distinguishes between the main topic of the passage and what Yahweh is trying to accomplish in the Israelites through these verses. The rhetorical goal should unify the passage, but the ambiguity of the shame language in Ezek 36:16–32 makes it difficult to discern how this takes place.

Many scholars have focused on Yahweh's plan to raise his status in the eyes of the nations¹¹⁴ and have given little attention to the rhetorical goal of the passage—what Yahweh intends to accomplish in the implied readers. The imperatives in v. 32 express the primary rhetorical goal of the passage, namely, for the readers to be dishonored at the moment that they read the text. The passage is intended to lead the Israelites to a decision about their immediate future and is, therefore, a deliberative goal. At the same time, this goal is presented as playing a role in Yahweh's plan to sanctify his great name.

However, the text remains difficult to understand fully because of unanswered questions surrounding the use of shame discourse. It is clear that Yahweh wants the Israelites to be ashamed, but the text does not explain how shame works in this situation. Specifically, the passage does not describe what the command to be dishonored signifies, that is, what Yahweh wants Israel to do. It also does not delineate the role that shame plays in relationships and thus the uses of shame discourse to accomplish rhetorical goals. These issues are best dealt with by analyzing the meaning and function of the same lexemes in other, clearer texts. Such a study will bring needed clarity to Ezek 36:16–32.

¹¹⁴ David A. Glatt-Gilad, "Yahweh's Honor at Stake: A Divine Conundrum," *JSOT* 98 (2002): 63–74. See also Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 349.

Chapter Summary

The rhetorical unit, the rhetorical situation, and the choice and arrangement of the material in Ezek 36:16–32 work together to highlight the prominence of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. The rhetorical unit may be identified by its consistent focus upon this key partnership. The rhetorical situation gives the context for Ezek 36:16–32—a context that underlines the broken relationship between Yahweh and Israel and the resulting fall of Jerusalem. The theme of partnership also comes through in the disposition of the material, where the text describes the break in Yahweh’s relationship with Israel but also promises restoration. The prominence of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel in these steps argues for the use of sociological interpretation to bring added understanding to the passage.

Although Ezek 36:16–32 focuses upon Yahweh’s plan to sanctify his great name, the rhetorical goal of the passage is for Israel to be ashamed. Yahweh presents his plan in a logical order rather than a chronological order. This means that it is possible for Yahweh to give Israel a new heart before the return to the land. Ezekiel 6:9 demonstrates that it is also possible for the Israelites to loathe themselves before they are restored to their ground. Therefore, Ezek 36:32 is best taken as a command for the Israelites to be ashamed when they read the text even if they are in exile. Any interpretation of Ezek 36:16–32 must account for these characteristics of the text, but they do not supply all of the information necessary to understand the passage fully. It is also necessary to discover the meaning and function of shame discourse within the social context of the passage.

CHAPTER TWO

THE MEANING AND FUNCTION OF SHAME DISCOURSE IN EZEK 36:16–32

Chapter 1 focused upon the rhetorical unit, the rhetorical situation, and the logical material in Ezek 36:16–32. This study underlined the importance of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel and noted that the relationship is defined by the covenant. The analysis of the thought progression of the passage went on to conclude that Yahweh is making a logical rather than a chronological argument leading up to the command for Israel to be ashamed. It also argued that this command is best understood as applying to the Israelites at the moment that they read the text.

Chapter 2 now continues the study of the logical material in Ezek 36:16–32 by seeking to explain what the specific vocabulary for shame terminology in the passage refers to and how it functions in the discourse. This effort will begin with philological analysis of shame lexemes that will include original research as it interacts with word studies that other scholars have done on these shame terms. Although the philological analysis is concerned with Ezekiel, it will consider the dishonor language in the entire HB in order to give a thorough context to the appearance of such language in Ezekiel. Diachronic issues will be addressed, and the analysis will focus upon occurrences of shame lexemes that are near to the book of Ezekiel in time and in context.

This philological research will then be laid against the analysis of how the HB presents the function of dishonor in society. Although this part of the study will consider the entire HB as it seeks a broad understanding of shame, it will focus upon the use of shame lexemes surrounding the fall of Jerusalem because this historical context is most relevant to Ezek 36:16–32. An

understanding of the role of dishonor in society will in turn make it possible to understand how shame functions in discourse in the HB in general and specifically in Ezekiel and other books that deal with the exile. The meaning and function of shame discourse will then be related to interpretations of dishonor language offered by other scholars as they deal with the issue of disgrace in Ezek 36:16–32. Finally, the uses of dishonor language will be situated among other types of related discourse, namely, discourse that deals with honor, pride, and humility. This final step will bring added understanding to the logic of the dishonor language in the passage.

A Philological Study of the Shame Lexemes in Ezek 36:16–32

A philological study of the Hebrew lexemes is necessary to prevent possible misunderstandings. As Walton says, “When we study an ancient text, we cannot make words mean whatever we want them to, or assume that they meant the same to the ancient audience that they do to a modern audience.”¹ It was noted in the introduction that Klopfenstein takes the shame terminology in Ezek 36:32 as referring to feelings of guilt.² A philological study of the words involved should help to conclude whether Klopfenstein’s view is convincing or not.

Although the HB contains a number of words that are related to shame,³ the terms for dishonor in Ezek 36:16–32 are **בוש** (be ashamed, Ezek 36:32),⁴ **כלם** (be dishonored, Ezek 36:32),⁵ **חרף** (reproach, Ezek 36:30),⁶ and **קוט** (feel a loathing, Ezek 36:31).⁷ Lyn Bechtel

¹ Walton, *Ancient*, 20.

² Klopfenstein, *Scham*, 72.

³ Lyn Bechtel, “The Biblical Experience of Shame/Shaming: The Social Experience of Shame/Shaming in Biblical Israel in relation to Its Use as Religious Metaphor” (Ph.D. diss., Drew University, 1983), 43–51.

⁴ **בוש** appears in Ezek 7:18, 16:52, 16:63, 32:30, and 36:32.

⁵ **כלם** appears in Ezek 16:27, 16:52, 16:54, 16:61, 16:63, 32:24–25, 32:30, 34:29, 36:6–7, 36:15, 36:32, 39:26, 43:10–11, and 44:13.

⁶ **חרף** appears in Ezek 5:14–15, 16:57, 21:33, 22:4, 36:15, and 36:30. This root occurs only as a noun in Ezek 36:16–32. BDB gives the gloss “reproach” for **חרף** I and “gather fruit, pluck” for **חרף** II. HALOT reverses the order and attaches the meaning “taunt” to **חרף** II. That is to say that there is some confusion between BDB and

distinguishes between primary and secondary lexemes, noting that primary shame lexemes refer to those words that deal specifically and consistently with shame and that secondary shame lexemes are those terms, “whose primary meaning may not be directly related to shame, but which under certain circumstances carry a definite shame connotation.”⁸ Of the four shame roots that appear in Ezek 36:16–32, Bechtel argues convincingly that **בוש**, **כלם**, and **חרף**⁹ are primary shame lexemes.¹⁰

To begin, the original research found in appendix 6 will interact with the conclusions of other scholars who have studied shame words¹¹ that appear in Ezek 36:16–32. Next, words in semantic parallel and contrast to shame lexemes will be analyzed. Finally, this chapter will give attention to the broader contextual characteristics surrounding the words for dishonor. The conclusions of this study will be illustrated by new research and the work of other scholars on particular passages from the HB. The results will then be applied to Ezek 36:16–32.

HALOT over whether to designate the meaning “reproach” as **חרף** I or **חרף** II. However, it is generally accepted that the root refers to reproach in Ezek 36:16–32. Therefore, it is the meaning “reproach” that is relevant to the present study.

⁷ **קוט** appears in Ezek 6:9, 20:43, and 36:31.

⁸ Bechtel, “Biblical Experience,” 47.

⁹ Bechtel, “Biblical Experience,” 43–45, 47. See also appendix 6 where I verify that each of these terms always refer to shame.

¹⁰ **קוט** is a secondary shame lexeme because it only refers to shame when it is reflexive. There are cases when **קוט** is not reflexive and refers to one entity loathing another. **קוט** is included both for its relationship to and distinction from primary shame terms and because it has played an important role in other studies, such as that of Lapsley, “Shame and Self-Knowledge,” 154–57. The view that **קוט** is a shame lexeme is reinforced by the parallel use of **כלם** and **קוט** in Ezekiel. Ezekiel 16:61 reads, **וְזָכַרְתָּ אֶת־דַּרְכֶיךָ וְנִכְלַמְתָּ**, “Consequently, you will remember your conduct and you will be ashamed,” while Ezek 36:31 reads, **וְזָכַרְתֶּם אֶת־דַּרְכֵיכֶם הָרָעִים וְיָמַעַלְלֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר לֹא־טוֹבִים וְנִקְטַחְתֶּם בַּפְּנֵיכֶם**, “Consequently, you will remember your evil conduct and your deeds that (were) not good and you will loathe yourselves.”

¹¹ See the following theological dictionary entries: Nel, “**בוש**,” *NIDOTTE* 1:621–27; Seebass, “**בוש**,” *TDOT* 2:50–60; Stolz, “**בוש**,” *TLOT* 1:205–6; Philip J. Nel, “**כלם**,” *NIDOTTE* 2:658–60; S. Wagner, “**כלם**,” *TDOT* 7:185–96; John E. Hartley, “**חרף**,” *NIDOTTE* 2:280–83; E. Kutsch, “**חרף**,” *TDOT* 5:209–15; Michael A. Grisanti, “**קוט**,” *NIDOTTE* 3:897–98; Schmoltdt, “**קוט**,” *TDOT* 12:573–75; Philip J. Nel, “**חפר**,” *NIDOTTE* 2:236–37; J. Gamberoni, G. J. Botterweck, “**חפר**,” *TDOT* 5:109–11; Philip J. Nel, “**קלה**,” *NIDOTTE* 3:924–25; and Marböck, “**קלה**,” *TDOT* 13:31–37.

A Philological Study of בּוֹשׁ

The primary shame lexeme, בּוֹשׁ (be ashamed) serves as a good starting point for this study because it is the most common shame lexeme, occurring 166 times in the HB,¹² and because it plays a key role in Ezek 36:16–32.¹³ However, its occurrence there provides little insight into the meaning of the term beyond the fact that Yahweh is using it to address Israel. This form of direct address also utilizes בּוֹשׁ in Ezek 16:52 and Ezek 16:63—circumstances similar to those in Ezek 36:32. However, the occurrence of בּוֹשׁ in Ezek 7:18 is more helpful in getting at the meaning

¹² The HB contains ninety-five appearances of this root in the qal, two verbs in the polel, eleven verbs in the standard form of the hiphil, twenty-two verbs in the alternate form of the hiphil, and one verb in the hithpael. The noun בִּשְׁתָּה appears thirty times, the noun בּוֹשָׁה appears four times, and there is one appearance of the noun בִּשְׁתָּה. This list of the appearances of all shame lexemes comes from Even-Shoshan, with supplemental material from BDB and HALOT. Information concerning בּוֹשׁ specifically may be found in Even-Shoshan, 161, BDB, 102, and HALOT 1:117. There were a number of issues that influenced the list of appearances of shame lexemes. HALOT postulates a בּוֹשׁ II having to do with hesitation that it applies to Ezra 8:22 and to the two appearances of בּוֹשׁ in the polel. HALOT includes Ezra 8:22 under both בּוֹשׁ I and בּוֹשׁ II. Stolz, “בוֹשׁ,” *TLOT* 1:205, also excludes the polel forms. I follow BDB by including the two polel forms and Ezra 8:22. Both polel forms appear in contexts with a strong connotation of shame. The Israelites assume that Moses’ delay in coming down from the mountain means that he has failed them, so they demand a golden calf (Exo 32:1). When Deborah’s song shows Sisera’s mother wondering why Sisera’s chariot is taking a long time to come, it is because Sisera has failed by being killed (Judg 5:28). The context of Ezra 8:22 supports a focus on shame more than a focus on hesitation because Ezra’s comments about Yahweh’s power would be undermined by a request for help from the king. On the other hand, I exclude כְּבָשִׁים because its only appearance is a reference to male genitalia (Deut 25:11) and is not helpful to the present study. However, there is an obvious connection between nudity and shame that is present in Deut 25:11. I also exclude names that contain the noun בִּשְׁתָּה, presumably in place of a reference to Baal, because they refer to human beings rather than to shame even though the meaning of shame is implied in the names. See 2 Sam 4:4 for an example. I do, however, retain appearances where בִּשְׁתָּה stands alone and appears to replace Baal because these instances equate Baal with shame and, therefore, deal directly with shame. See Jer 3:24 for an example. It is also difficult to establish the number of appearances of בּוֹשׁ in the HB because of overlap with forms of יָבֹשׁ and because of text critical issues. There is an alternate hiphil of בּוֹשׁ that is identical to the hiphil of יָבֹשׁ. These forms are identified by an asterisk following the conjugation in appendix 1, appendix 6, and appendix 7. Furthermore, some of the contexts where this form appears are ambiguous. In the case of ambiguity, I follow HALOT and BDB unless there are text critical issues to consider. In cases where text criticism is involved, I avoid emendation and conjectural readings where possible whether such readings would add or remove an appearance of בּוֹשׁ. I follow the qere reading in Isaiah 30:5 for contextual reasons. The text presents shame as coming from a people that does not profit others. This situation fits other shame passages better than the idea of the lack of help causing them to stink. This approach leads me to disagree with HALOT by including Hos 13:15 and two appearances in Psa 25:3 and by excluding Ezek 7:26, Psa 14:6, and Psa 53:6. None of these appearances is essential to my argument.

¹³ This root appears five times in the book of Ezekiel. See appendix 1, appendix 6, and appendix 7 for details. Appendix 1 organizes the analysis of בּוֹשׁ by grouping like forms together. Appendix 6 and appendix 7 present בּוֹשׁ along with the other shame lexemes. Appendix 6 is organized by where the lexemes appear in the HB, while appendix 7 groups the same functions of shame lexemes together.

and seems to present shame as an emotion that the Israelites feel as they face certain defeat. On the other hand, Ezek 32:30, which associates shame with death, appears to treat shame as an objective state that results from defeat and death. These initial impressions from Ezekiel will be tested against the work of other scholars and against independent research.

Seebass identifies *bāšu* as the Akkadian cognate to **בוש**¹⁴ and argues that *bāšu* means “to come to shame” in the G-stem and “to put to shame” in the D-stem.¹⁵ Nel agrees but argues for a more subjective meaning, “to feel ashamed,” in the G-Stem.¹⁶ Nel notes that the Ugaritic cognate for **בוש** may be *bū*, which “denotes the feeling of rebuke when behavior exceeds the expected norms of conduct.”¹⁷ These definitions of Semitic cognates are similar to the use of **בוש** in the HB and do not indicate a need to give further attention to cognates.

Among the theological dictionary entries for **בוש** only Seebass deals with the possible development of the term over time.¹⁸ Both Nel and Stolz study all of the occurrences of **בוש** in the HB together.¹⁹ As Seebass analyzes **בוש** in the HB, he begins by noting that there are few occurrences of the term before, “the great literary prophets of the 8th century B. C.”²⁰ Although Seebass argues that **בוש** retained essentially the same meaning throughout its use in the HB, he highlights the important role of this term surrounding the fall of Jerusalem. He says, “But it is noteworthy that the great prophets used this root in speaking of the catastrophe of their people

¹⁴ Although a brief description of cognates is given for the sake of completeness, it must be noted that cognates are weak and problematic as evidence. For this reason, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* does not include them. See David J. A. Clines, “Introduction,” *DCH* 1:17.

¹⁵ Seebass, *TDOT* 2:50–51.

¹⁶ Nel, *NIDOTTE* 1:621.

¹⁷ Nel, *NIDOTTE* 1:621.

¹⁸ Seebass, *TDOT* 2:52–53.

¹⁹ Nel, *NIDOTTE* 1:621–27; and Stolz, *TLOT* 1:205–6

²⁰ Seebass, *TDOT* 2:52.

before God.”²¹ Seebass discerns a subtle progression of meaning from Hosea to Isaiah and finally to Jeremiah. Hosea suggests that the people are foolish and will bring shame upon themselves by relying on false gods rather than Yahweh, who is truly reliable. Isaiah speaks more explicitly of the plan of the Israelites to seek Egypt’s help and the shame that will result from such an alliance. “Jeremiah continues the tradition of his predecessors, but differs from them in that he sees his personal existence completely intertwined with the catastrophe of his people.”²² It appears that **בוש** is used to describe the result of the fall of Jerusalem.

Theological dictionaries reflect general agreement that the term **בוש** normally deals with social status. Seebass and Nel agree that the HB presents a situation where individuals, groups, and even nations are ranked, and the word **בוש** refers to those who have low ranking.²³ Seebass states that **בוש** is used to describe a situation where a person or city, “underwent an experience in which his (or its) former respected position and importance were overthrown.”²⁴ There is, however, some disagreement over the direction that shame discourse takes in a given occurrence. In reference to low-status language, this direction is referred to as the orientation. Seebass argues that **בוש** always relates to the objective loss of a respected position after taking a risk. “Someone risked something to a power, whether it be to another person, a country, or a god, and thus undertook a daring venture.” But the venture failed and resulted in a lowering of status.²⁵ On the other hand, while Philip J. Nel agrees that **בוש** normally deals with rank and reputation, he also argues that certain occurrences focus on subjective emotions.²⁶ Nel defines this lexeme as, “a

²¹ Seebass, *TDOT* 2:53.

²² Seebass, *TDOT* 2:53–54.

²³ Seebass, “בוש,” *TDOT* 2:52; and Nel, “בוש,” *NIDOTTE* 1:622–24.

²⁴ Seebass, “בוש,” *TDOT* 2:52.

²⁵ Seebass, “בוש,” *TDOT* 2:52.

²⁶ Nel, “בוש,” *NIDOTTE* 1:622–24, refers to the objective orientation of shame as denoting the loss of reputation.

negative condition or experience as a result of a relationship in which perceived codes of conduct, honor, position, or expectations are not fully met or are violated.”²⁷

In response to the conflicting arguments of Seebass and Nel, Stolz gives a concise and convincing explanation of the use of בּוֹשׁ that balances the objective and subjective orientations of the term and covers almost all cases. He says that the objective meaning of בּוֹשׁ is “to come to nothing” and the subjective meaning is “the feeling of the one come to nothing.”²⁸ One who comes to nothing has failed to achieve high status and has thus been assigned low status.²⁹ As Nel has argued, the status of the entity in question is established within relationships with others.

The words used in semantic parallel with בּוֹשׁ support the view of Nel and Stolz that favors both an objective, external orientation and a subjective, internal orientation of the term בּוֹשׁ.³⁰ This distinction is essential for understanding shame and will be dealt with in detail, with the objective orientation being discussed first. Although it is difficult to distinguish between the objective orientation and the subjective orientation, contextual cues provide important evidence of which orientation is at work. Lexemes that appear in parallel with בּוֹשׁ and deal with the term’s objective orientation underline the external judgment of observers. They suggest the sense

²⁷ Nel, *NIDOTTE* 1:622.

²⁸ Stolz, *TLOT* 1:205.

²⁹ In reference to Obad 1:10, Paul R. Raabe, *Obadiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman; vol. 24D of the AB; New York: Doubleday, 1996), 170–71, recognizes the strong relationship between shame and public status. He says, “In a society where it matters what others think, where individual autonomy is not an ideal, public shaming is virtually tantamount to a death sentence.” He goes on to describe shame as a loss of honor and prestige and to note that it refers more to an objective status than to a subjective emotion.

³⁰ HALOT notes the following semantic parallels to בּוֹשׁ: חָפַר (be ashamed, Isa 1:29), חָתַת (be shattered, dismayed, 2 Kgs 19:26), כָּלַם (be dishonored, Isa 41:11), and בָּהַל (be disturbed, Psa 6:11). Stolz, *TLOT* 1:205, adds חוֹר (grow pale, Isa 29:22), סוּג (be turned back, Isa 42:17), פָּחַד (be in dread, Isa 44:11), שָׁדַד (be devastated, Jer 9:18), אָמַל (be feeble, Jer 15:9), אָבַד (perish, Psa 83:18), and כָּשַׁל (stumble, Jer 20:11). Seebass, *TDOT* 2:252, notes that only חָפַר (be ashamed) and especially כָּלַם (be dishonored) are found in parallel with בּוֹשׁ somewhat frequently. Stolz, *TLOT* 1:205, cites eleven instances where בּוֹשׁ is parallel with חָפַר and eleven instances of parallelism with כָּלַם if the instance he bases on textual emendation is excluded. He states that the noun בִּשְׁתָּ appears in parallel only with כָּלְמָה (shame, Isa 30:3) and חֲרִפָּה (disgrace, Isa 30:5).

of being weak, failing, and being destroyed. Such a view receives support from the semantic parallels that talk about being feeble (Jer 15:9, see also Jer 15:4), stumbling (Jer 20:11), being devastated (Jer 9:18), and perishing (Psa 83:18, see also Ps 83:10–11, 19). For example, Jer 9:18 describes Israel's defeat.

כִּי קוֹל נְהִי נִשְׁמָע מִצִּיּוֹן אֵיךְ שִׁדְדָנוּ בְּשָׁנוּ מְאֹד כִּי־עָזַבְנוּ אֶרֶץ כִּי הִשְׁלִיכוּ מִשְׁכְּנֹתֵינוּ

“For a sound of wailing is heard from Zion, ‘How we are devastated! We are greatly ashamed because we left the land, because they have cast down our dwellings.’” This verse places Israel's devastation in parallel with Israel's shame, which has come about because the dwellings of the Israelites have been cast down, and the Israelites have left the land. This clearly refers to military devastation and exile. The focus is on Israel's objective state of weakness and defeat in relation to others.

This external orientation is also demonstrated by the terms that are used in semantic contrast to **בוש**, as they present a situation where behavior and failure result in low status and a bad reputation. HALOT notes that **בוש** appears in contrast with **שכל** (act prudently, Pro 10:5). In this case, **בוש** appears to refer to behavior that is imprudent and leads to low status. Similarly, the semantic contrast that occurs in Zeph 3:19 serves to illustrate the external orientation of **בוש**. Yahweh states, “I will make them a praise and a name in every land of their shame” (**וְשִׁמְתִים** ; **לְתִהְיֶה וְלִשְׁמָם בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ בְּשִׁתָּם**). This verse implies a contrast between shame and renown. Yahweh creates a picture in which other nations praise Israel and attribute a good reputation to the Israelites. That is, the nations hold Israel in high esteem. As Adele Berlin says in her commentary on Zephaniah, “Jerusalem shall be famed and praised by the peoples of the world.”³¹

³¹ Adele Berlin, *Zephaniah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman; vol. 25A of the AB; New York: Doubleday, 1994), 148.

In Zeph 3:19, the Israelites' future state of renown is contrasted with their present situation where these nations are referred to as the land of Israel's shame. Shame is contrasted with praise and renown. The term **בוש** is used when the Israelites are mocked and have a poor reputation. Shame refers to Israel's low status among the nations. J. J. M. Roberts states, "The last two lines of the verse suggest that these former exiles will now be held in honor in the very lands where they once lived in shame as exiles."³² This passage demonstrates that **בוש** deals not only with failure but also with the result that failure has on the reputation or status of the group. Therefore, status is a key concept in the analysis of the term **בוש** in the HB and especially in texts that deal with the fall of Jerusalem and the restoration of Israel as Ezekiel does.

The broader contextual evidence also supports an external orientation to **בוש** with a concern for status. Not only does Zeph 3:19 give an example of a term in semantic contrast to **בוש**, it also serves as a helpful guide for considering the context of occurrences of **בוש**. It does this by supplying examples of three characteristics that are often found with dishonor language: (1) a comparison with others, (2) observers who witness the shame, and (3) visible causes of low status. One or more of these three characteristics often appears in the context of **בוש** and thus supports an understanding of **בוש** as focusing more on objective rather than on subjective low status. Employing the first category, the contrast between **בוש** and renown in Zeph 3:19 implies a comparison where some people have been judged as lower than other people. The observers of the low status are mentioned clearly as "every land of their shame" (**כָּל־הָאָרֶץ בְּשֹׁמֶם**). The focus is not on how the Israelites feel but rather on how certain lands judge them. Finally, the causes of the low status are visible causes that are easily seen by others. Zephaniah 3:19 mentions those who are humbling Israel, the lame, and the outcast and thus points to military

³² J. J. M. Roberts, *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Know Press, 1991), 223.

weakness, physical weakness, and perhaps exile. These are not hidden causes of low status but are obvious to any observer. Similar visible causes of shame often appear with shame lexemes and imply low status in cases where comparison is not explicitly mentioned.

The first such category, comparison with others, also appears in passages other than Zeph 3:19. For example, in Jer 50:12, Yahweh describes shamed Babylon (“your mother is greatly ashamed,” בּוֹשָׁה אִמְכֶם מְאֹד) as “last of nations” (אַחֲרֵית גּוֹיִם), making a clear comparison. This verse links בּוֹשׁ with low status in relation to others. It presents a situation where the nations are a ranked group with low status meaning a low position in the group, and Babylon has the lowest status. Seebass describes the shame of Babylon as very great, “because formerly she had been the first of the nations, but she will become the scum of the nations, dry and deserted.”³³ Isaiah 41:11 says, “Lo, all those who are angry against you will be ashamed and will be dishonored. Those who strive against you³⁴ (will be) as nothing and will perish” (הֵן יִבְשׁוּ (וְיִכָּלְמוּ כָּל הַנִּחָרִים בָּךְ יִהְיוּ כְּאֵין וְיִאָּבְדוּ אַנְשֵׁי רִיבְךָ). The term *nothing* is used to describe those who strive against Israel. This word implies comparison with others where *nothing* refers to the lowest rank. Therefore, this passage demonstrates that those who strive against Israel will have low status as compared to Israel and to others.

After Moab is shamed in Jer 48:1, v. 2 says that “the renown of Moab is no longer” (אֵין עוֹד הַהִלָּת מוֹאָב). The status of Moab has been lowered. Compared to others, Moab no longer holds a superior rank. As Seebass says, Moab’s “shame is made manifest by comparing Moab now with her former esteemed position.”³⁵ In Zech 10:5, Yahweh gives the Israelites the power to shame riders of horses. According to v. 11, the result of this power is that “the pride of Assyria

³³ Seebass, “בוֹשׁ,” *TDOT* 2:56.

³⁴ Literally, “men of your strife.”

³⁵ Seebass, “בוֹשׁ,” *TDOT* 2:56.

will be brought down” (וְהוֹרֵד גְּאוֹן אַשּׁוּר). Israel will lower Assyria’s status by defeating them. After Israel defeats Assyria, the Assyrians will have low rank when compared to other nations. Isa 29:4 states that Jerusalem will be low (וְשַׁפְּלָתָהּ) when it is under siege. The chapter goes on to contrast Jerusalem’s low status with a time when Jacob will not be ashamed (לֹא-עֲתָהּ יִבוֹשׁ יַעֲקֹב, Isa 29:22).

The second characteristic found in Zeph 3:19 also appears in Jer 50:12, where the nations serve as observers that judge Babylon as having low status. Other verses mention observers even more explicitly. Those who witness the shame mentioned in Psa 44:16 are described in the previous verse: “You made us a byword among the nations” (תְּשִׁימֵנוּ מְשָׁל בְּגוֹיִם). Jeremiah 50:2 also highlights the role of an audience when it says, “Tell among the nations” (הַגִּידוּ בְּגוֹיִם), “Bel has been put to shame” (הִבִּישׁ בֵּל). Yahweh may also serve as an observer of shame as he does in Ezra 9:6. Those texts of the HB that deal with the fall of Jerusalem often mention or imply observers in the context of shame lexemes because the observers assign low status to the people in question.³⁶ This is an important contextual component for understanding the meaning of בּוֹשׁ. Low status is assigned by others.

The term בּוֹשׁ often appears in a context that describes causes of low status that can be seen by others—the third category. Zephaniah 3:19 associates physical and military weakness with comparison and shame in a way that implies such characteristics always suggest low status.³⁷ This can also be seen in the context of Jer 50:12 where the visible cause of shame is given. Jeremiah 50:10 adds details to the use of בּוֹשׁ in v. 12 by saying that “Chaldea will become plunder” (וְהָיְתָה כְּשָׂדִים לְשָׁלָל). The reference is to military defeat, a situation that is plainly

³⁶ This statement is generally for all texts of the HB, but those texts that deal with the fall of Jerusalem are the most important texts for understanding how shame in Ezekiel relates to the fall of Jerusalem.

³⁷ Other passages that support such a view include Isa 41:11, Jer 48:1–2, Zech 10:5, 11, and Isa 29:4, 22. See also 2 Kgs 19:26, Isa 30:5, Isa 61:5,7, Jer. 15:4, 9, Ps 83:10–11, 18–19, and Psa 89:41–46.

visible to surrounding nations. Other visible causes of low status besides war include exile (Jer 9:18), drought (Jer 14:1, 3), widowhood (Isa 54:4), and death (Ezek 32:30). The visibility of the cause of low status draws attention to the many appearances of shame lexemes that take place within a context where Yahweh is judging Israel or another nation, such as when he judges Israel by allowing Jerusalem to fall.

While the context, along with words in semantic parallel and contrast to **בוש** offer substantial evidence for an external orientation of the term, other parallels and contrasts also support an internal orientation of this word. The internal orientation focuses on the shamed entity's attitude toward the shame, highlighting fear and emotional upheaval. These semantic characteristics are supported by references to the face growing pale (Isa 29:22),³⁸ being in dread (Isa 44:11), and being disturbed (Psa 6:11). For example, Isa 44:11 says the following concerning those who make idols:

הֵן כָּל־חֲבֵרָיו יִבְשׁוּ וְחָרְשֵׁים הֵמָּה מֵאָדָם יִתְקַבְּצוּ כָּלָם יַעֲמֵדוּ יִפְחָדוּ יִבְשׁוּ יַחַד

“Lo, all his companions will be ashamed, and the engravers, they (are) from man. Let them all assemble themselves and let them stand. They will be in dread; they will be ashamed together.” The last full sentence places the verb *be in dread* in a parallel relationship with the term *be ashamed*. The verse describes a situation where those who make and trust idols find that the idols are not able to help them. The result is the emotion of fear as these men have nothing to turn to for help but must rather face failure and defeat. This parallel relationship implies that shame is similar to the emotion of fear. The contrast between **שמח** (be glad) and **בוש** in Isa 65:13 supports a strong relationship between **בוש** and fear or sadness.³⁹

³⁸ Nel, “בוש,” *NIDOTTE* 1:623, argues that the paleness of face reflects emotional pain.

³⁹ Stolz, *TLOT* 1:206

The context of other passages also suggests that shame lexemes may be used to express subjective emotions related to the loss of status. For example, Jer 49:23 describes a situation where bad news results in feelings referred to as בּוֹשׁ along with fear and agitation. Nel uses this passage to illustrate his assertion that shame is often accompanied by fear and distress.⁴⁰ The term בּוֹשׁ reflects both emotional upheaval because of a lack of help and the pain of impending low status. The military defeat is described as young men falling and men of battle being made silent in Jer 49:26. The previous verse refers to Damascus as a city of praise and thus contrasts its previous high status with the low status that will result from defeat. The painful feelings described in Jer 49:23 are related to a loss of status.

The evidence just presented from words that are in semantic parallel and semantic contrast to בּוֹשׁ and from contextual characteristics all suggest that this term may have an external or an internal orientation. Therefore, בּוֹשׁ may normally be defined simply and generally as objective low status or the emotions that accompany low status.⁴¹ In either case, low status is the common denominator. Although this definition applies to the HB in general, the occurrences of shame lexemes are most frequent in texts that relate to the fall of Jerusalem. The term בּוֹשׁ appears to be one of the words of choice for describing the behavior and attitudes that led to the fall of Jerusalem, the fall itself, and the judgment of other nations as Yahweh restores Israel—all prominent issues in the book of Ezekiel.

⁴⁰ Nel, “בוֹשׁ,” *NIDOTTE* 1:623.

⁴¹ The issue of how to translate dishonor language will be dealt with after the study of the other shame lexemes found in Ezek 36:16–32. In brief, the glosses offered by the theological dictionaries will be employed in this dissertation. However, those glosses should be understood as referring to status.

The Other Shame Lexemes Found in Ezek 36:16–32

Wagner notes that כָּלֵם, one of the shame lexemes found in Ezek 36:32, is synonymous with and often appears in the same context as בּוֹשׁ and חָפַר.⁴² The book of Ezekiel has nineteen occurrences of כָּלֵם. The characteristics of בּוֹשׁ that have just been described also apply to כָּלֵם.⁴³ In fact, כָּלֵם is coupled with בּוֹשׁ in Isa 41:11, Isa 54:4, Jer 14:3, Ezek 32:30, Ps 44:16, and Ezra 9:6 in the examples above.

The shame root חָרַף appears as a noun in Ezek 36:30. When this root appears as a verb, it overlaps with the other primary shame lexemes as demonstrated by its appearance in parallel to the shame roots בּוֹשׁ and כָּלֵם. It is also found in parallel to קָלָה, a term that is similar in meaning to the other primary shame lexemes found in Ezek 36:16–32. However, while the verbal forms of בּוֹשׁ and כָּלֵם often deal with a person having low status, the verb חָרַף normally refers to one person attempting to lower the status of another person by insulting words or actions. This taunting challenges the other person and brings shame on that person in the process. The noun may carry the same connotation and be translated as *insult* or *contempt*. However, it may have a more general meaning that refers to a state of low status. In such cases it is translated *disgrace*, *shame*, or *reproach*, and is synonymous with noun forms of בּוֹשׁ and כָּלֵם.⁴⁴

⁴² Wagner, *TDOT* 7:186. Seebass, “בוֹשׁ,” *TDOT* 2:52, argues that כָּלֵם has a more active ring than בּוֹשׁ, with כָּלֵם focusing on the action of putting another to shame and בּוֹשׁ focusing on the state of being ashamed. However, בּוֹשׁ may appear in the hiphil with the meaning “put to shame,” (Psa 44:8) and כָּלֵם may appear in the niphal with the meaning “be dishonored” (Ezek 36:32). Seebass’s view is also difficult to prove because the two terms often appear in semantic parallel (Ezek 36:32) and because כָּלֵם often occurs in the niphal without an actor identified (Isa 45:16).

⁴³ The overlap in meaning between these first three lexemes is nearly complete. Nel, *NIDOTTE* 2:659, notes that בּוֹשׁ and כָּלֵם often appear together with a shared meaning. Nel, *NIDOTTE* 2:236, also observes that חָפַר is closely linked in meaning to בּוֹשׁ and כָּלֵם. In her work, Bechtel, “Biblical Experience,” 43–45, also states that there is substantial overlap in the contexts where the different shame lexemes appear.

⁴⁴ Hartley, *NIDOTTE* 2:280–81.

The secondary shame lexeme קוט stands apart from the primary lexemes because it does not always refer to shame. Schmoldt notes that the three appearances of קוט in Ezekiel are followed by פנים, which likely carries a reflexive sense, “in which case ‘loathe oneself’ is approximately the equivalent of ‘be ashamed.’”⁴⁵ The word קוט is only synonymous with shame when it is followed by פנים. This situation describes all three of the appearances of קוט in Ezekiel (Ezek 6:9; 20:43; 36:31). Furthermore, Ezekiel is the only book in the HB that uses קוט in this way.

However, a brief study of uses of קוט outside the book of Ezekiel may give insight into its meaning in Ezekiel. There are two occurrences of קוט that describe the psalmist as loathing Yahweh’s enemies (Psa 119:158; 139:21). In one example, Yahweh is shown loathing the generation of Israelites that spent forty years in the wilderness (Psa 95:10). These verses present loathing as a strong negative attitude. The three verses in Ezekiel show the Israelites applying this negative attitude to themselves. It is an attitude that one has toward one’s enemies. Ezekiel 36:31 describes a situation where the Israelites see themselves as their own enemies. At the same time, Grisanti links the use of קוט in Psa 119:158 and Psa 139:21 to loyalty to Yahweh and to covenant solidarity with him.⁴⁶ The same connotation applies to Ezek 36:31.

Summary

The main characteristics of shame lexemes are difficult to convey in English. While the English glosses for dishonor terms proposed by the theological dictionaries are useful and will be employed in this dissertation, they do not cover exactly the same semantic territory as the Hebrew shame words. When translating shame lexemes from Ezekiel, the term *shame* normally

⁴⁵ Schmoldt, *TDOT* 12:574.

⁴⁶ Grisanti, *NIDOTTE* 3:898.

refers to disgrace, which Klopfenstein expresses using the German word *Schande*.⁴⁷ In such cases, the focus is on the low status of the individual or group in relation to others. This is the external, objective orientation of shame. It may often be recognized because of a context that includes the three characteristics that appear in Zeph 3:19, namely, comparison with others, observers of the disgrace, and visible causes of low status.

Some of the Hebrew lexemes may also refer to emotions, as does the German *Scham*.⁴⁸ However, the emotion is not normally self-consciousness⁴⁹ but rather the feeling one experiences when one has or is in danger of having low status. Low status is normally a serious condition that produces an emotion of fear or sadness because one's being or one's well-being has been destroyed. This is the internal, subjective orientation of shame. References to feelings or a visible manifestation of feelings on the face may be used to recognize this orientation of disgrace.

While lexemes for dishonor always relate to status, different contexts focus the meaning in different ways. Shame terms may refer to disappointment that leads to low status (Isa 30:3), efforts to lower another person's status (Isa 37:4), the fear that status will be lost (Ezra 8:22), the emotions that accompany low status (2 Kgs 8:11), or the admission of low status (Jer 3:3). The most frequent meaning of shame, however, is simply the assignment of low status to a person or group (2 Chr 32:21).

⁴⁷ Klopfenstein, *Scham*, uses the German *Schande* to refer to the objective orientation of shame lexemes in his monograph.

⁴⁸ Klopfenstein, *Scham*, uses the German *Scham* to refer to the subjective orientation of shame lexemes in his monograph.

⁴⁹ The only exceptions are Judg 3:25, 2 Kings 2:17, and 8:11, which employ the distinctive construction עֲדֵבֹשׁ (as far as shaming).

Conclusions Applied to Ezek 36:16–32

The philological study of the shame lexemes in Ezek 36:16–32 makes it clear that the passage's references to dishonor are related in some way to low status in relationships. The focus on status agrees with the main theme of the Ezek 36:16–32, which is primarily concerned with Yahweh's reputation. However, the passage also deals with Israel's status since the two are linked by a covenant. The text uses shame language within the context of the fall of Jerusalem and the broken relationship between Yahweh and Israel in a manner similar to other texts of the HB that were written at about the same time. Although Ezek 36:16–32 does use shame terms to deal with status in relationships, the text's use of lexemes for dishonor appears to be a variation on the patterns just studied because this passage deals with the relationship between Yahweh and Israel.

When Yahweh promises Israel protection from the disgrace of famine (חֲרִפַּת רָעָב) among the nations in v. 30, he is telling Israel that they will no longer have low status in the eyes of the nations. The nations will not see famine, a visible cause of low status, and, therefore, will not be able to hold Israel in low esteem as compared to other nations. Although the disgrace of famine undoubtedly included emotions, this use of a shame term focuses upon the exterior judgment of the nations. This is a classic use of shame terminology, but the text has more to say.

In v. 31, Yahweh states that all that he will do according to vv. 23–30 will cause the Israelites to remember their behavior and to loathe themselves (וַיִּקְטְלוּם בְּפִיָּהֶם). The self-loathing of the Israelites will come in response to the memory of their past behavior. This situation obscures the link between shame and its visible cause because it refers to past behavior rather than a present cause for low status. In the situation surrounding the text, one would expect the Israelites to be ashamed because they are in exile. Also, it is not clear who the observer is. Yahweh is speaking, so, presumably, he will be aware of the shame. However, there is no

mention of the nations or any explanation of why Israel might be given low status before the nations by remembering their previous behavior. Finally, the text does not describe the comparison that results in low status.

The content of the passage and the covenant language in v. 28 make it evident that the text deals with the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. With this in mind, the use of קוֹט in v. 31 carries a connotation of Israel's covenant solidarity with Yahweh and against themselves and their previous behavior. This confirms Grisanti's argument that the term קוֹט reflects the appropriate attitude of someone in covenant solidarity with Yahweh toward an enemy.⁵⁰ That is to say that the Israelites, who are now on Yahweh's side, loathe themselves because they realize that their previous behavior violated the Sinaitic covenant and made them enemies of Yahweh. However, Ezek 36:31 gives no further explanation of the self-abhorrence. More information is needed.

Ezekiel 36:32 does not provide the missing information. Yahweh tells the Israelites to be ashamed and to be dishonored (בוֹשׁוּ וְהִכְלַמוּ) because of their conduct. The text mentions past behavior again, as it tells the Israelites to be ashamed in the present. It also highlights Yahweh's relationship with the Israelites by mentioning action that will affect them and by employing Yahweh's name. The imperatives in v. 32 demonstrate that Yahweh wants the Israelites to do something. He is not simply telling them that they have low status in his eyes. He is telling them to have low status. But Ezek 36:16–32 does not explain the role that low status plays in the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. Therefore, it is necessary to go beyond a simple word study in order to gain a sense of how shame functions in the social world of Ezek 36:16–32.

⁵⁰ See Grisanti, *NIDOTTE* 3:898.

Such knowledge will then clarify the rhetorical roles that shame discourse may play in this passage.

The Sociological Functions of the Shame Discourse in Ezek 36:16–32

Having dealt with the semantic elements and the connotations of the terms for dishonor, it is now necessary to go from meaning to function. The following sociological study will make it possible to discover how shame lexemes function in Ezek 36:16–32. The definition of shame as relating to low status points to the role of shame in society where it is used to deal with status in relationships. Status is a standard sociological category that is often expressed in terms of shame and honor.⁵¹ Scholars who have taken a sociological approach to studying the Bible, such as John Chance and, earlier, Johannes Pedersen,⁵² are in general agreement with the conclusions presented in the theological dictionaries even though Chance and Pedersen do not focus on lexemes. These scholars also treat shame as having to do with low status within relationships.⁵³ The sociological approach is most important to the present study, however, because it is a means of discovering how shame works in society and thus in turn how it may be used rhetorically. This section will describe the general role of shame in ancient Israelite society by studying the social

⁵¹ Campbell, *Honour*; and Peristiany, *Honour and Shame*. Although much attention has been given to the study of shame in the Mediterranean, it is also possible to study sociologists who work outside of the Mediterranean in order to gain insight into the role of shame. Stiebert, *Construction*, 21–23, is impressed by Scheff's fusion of sociology and psychology. Thomas J. Scheff, *Microsociology: Discourse, Emotion, and Social Structure* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 75, uses the United States as his area of research and concludes that, "The idea of disgrace seems to assume both public and private sides: outer demotion and inner shame." Scheff argues that the demotion comes from other people and pushes the subject to act because of painful feelings that result from the demotion. His view is also important because of the role he sees shame playing in social relationships. According to Scheff, *Microsociology*, 71, "The emotions of pride and shame play a key role in the model: pride signals an intact social bond; shame, a threatened one." This view is strikingly similar to the view expressed by Olyan, "Honor," and Hobbs, "Reflections," even though Olyan and Hobbs deal with the ANE and Olyan deals specifically with covenants. See also Gilmore, *Honor and Shame*.

⁵² Chance, "Anthropology," 142. See also Pedersen, *Israel*, 240–3.

⁵³ Although Pedersen, *Israel*, 240–3, does not explicitly define shame as low status, he does contrast shame with honor, which is high status.

and cultural context surrounding the shame lexemes found in Ezek 36:16–32. The focus will be upon biblical texts that use these terms for dishonor to talk about the time shortly before and after the fall of Jerusalem. The general role of shame in ancient Israelite society will then be applied to Ezek 36:16–32. Finally, the specific functions of shame will be dealt with in the same manner.

The following analysis will use sociological techniques to study the way that shame lexemes are used in relationships in Ezekiel from within the larger context of the HB. The Hebrew terms under consideration for this sociological study are the four shame terms that appear in Ezek 36:16–32, בוש (be ashamed), כלם (be dishonored), חרף (reproach), and קוט (feel a loathing), and the two others that often appear in parallel to them, חפר (be ashamed),⁵⁴ and קלה (be dishonored).⁵⁵ These lexemes will be used to identify texts that reveal how shame functions in relationships.

The analysis that is summarized in appendices 1–7⁵⁶ is a result of detailed study of every occurrence of the roots above in the HB in order to discover what causes shame and how shame works in society. The context of each appearance of a dishonor term was investigated with careful attention to who observed the shame, who was ashamed, what caused the shame, and how the dishonor was functioning. This analysis makes it possible to describe the roles that the

⁵⁴ All references to חפר will be to חפר II. חפר I is glossed as “dig, search for” and is not relevant to the study of Ezek 36:16–32.

⁵⁵ All references to קלה will be to קלה II. The gloss for קלה I is “roast, parch” and does not apply to this study. Bechtel, “Biblical Experience,” 43–45, identifies בוש, כלם, חרף, חפר, and קלה as primary shame lexemes for her sociological study. Klopfenstein, *Scham*, 5, 184–95, focuses on בוש, כלם, and חפר but includes an addendum on קלה (be dishonored) and thus considers it to have a close relationship with his primary lexemes. My research confirms that בוש, כלם, חרף, חפר, and קלה are primary shame lexemes.

⁵⁶ Appendices 1–5 deal with each of the five primary shame lexemes independently. These appendices are ordered by Hebrew form. Appendix 6 puts all of the occurrences of the shame lexemes together and is organized by book of the HB where the roots occur. Appendix 7 also includes all of the shame lexemes but puts instances of the same function of shame lexemes together.

shame lexemes play in society in general and also what specifically they are used to accomplish in relationships and, consequently, in rhetoric. The conclusions are summarized below with illustrative examples. As appendix 6 demonstrates, the book of Ezekiel contains more low-status vocabulary than most books of the HB,⁵⁷ suggesting the prominent role that shame plays in the book.⁵⁸

The General Uses of Shame in Society Relevant to Ezek 36:16–32

The occurrences of shame lexemes in Ezekiel give indications of how shame is used in relationships and, consequently, what causes shame. These impressions may be compared to the work of other scholars and to other clear passages before being applied to Ezek 36:16–32. In Ezek 5:14, for example, Yahweh speaks of making Israel a reproach among the nations and thus gives the impression that he will lower their status among the peoples. This verse suggests that dishonor may be used to organize relationships by rank. It also implies that low status reflects failure to achieve the values of others. In this case, the nations value productive crops, but Israel will experience famine (Ezek 5:16). Finally, Ezekiel 5:14 offers evidence that shame may be used as punishment. Yahweh shames Israel to punish them for their poor behavior. The book of Ezekiel also provides examples of three issues that may lead to shame: failure, behavior, and

⁵⁷ The following is a list of the books of the HB which contain these lexemes, with the number of occurrences given: Gen 3; Exod 1; Num 1; Deut 2; Josh 1; Judg 5; 1 Sam 14; 2 Sam 6; 2 Kgs 7; Isa 54; Jer 68; Ezek 34; Hos 9; Joel 9; Obad 1; Mic 7; Nah 1; Hab 2; Zeph 7; Zech 3; Psa 96; Job 11; Prov 25; Ruth 1; Lam 3; Dan 6; Ezra 4; Neh 5; 1 Chr 2; 2 Chr 3. There are thirty books of the HB that contain at least one shame lexeme, demonstrating broad distribution of the concept of shame in the HB. However, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Psalms, and Proverbs all contain a number of lexemes for dishonor and use shame as a theme.

⁵⁸ Although there is an inherent methodological weakness in an approach that treats the entire HB as a single entity for social construction, it is also important to study the shame lexemes and the functions of shame discourse in Ezekiel within the broader context of the HB. Such an approach gives a complete, canonical view of how the entire HB presents shame and shame discourse. This dissertation takes a canonical view while attempting to respond to the methodological weakness by using an inductive approach that looks for patterns rather than assuming similarity. In fact, this case by case study will demonstrate that the patterns are similar and consistent throughout Scripture.

challenges. Ezekiel 5:14 describes the failure of the Israelites to defend themselves and to feed themselves. Ezekiel 16:52 stresses the poor behavior of the Israelites. The issue of challenges comes through in Ezek 21:33 (ET 21:28) where the reproach of the Ammonites refers to the way that the Ammonites insulted Israel and thus Yahweh.

Already in 1926, Pedersen argued convincingly that shame organizes society, with terms for dishonor used to identify those of lower rank.⁵⁹ Pedersen's work confirms the initial impression given in Ezek 5:14 above. The contextual analysis of other shame lexemes also supports the conclusion that shame, in its broadest sense, is used to order relationships. Shame orders relationships within society, relationships between nations, and relationships with Yahweh. For example, David expresses concern about becoming the son-in-law of the king because he is in want and is, therefore, dishonored (וְאֶנְכִי אִישׁ־רָשׁ וְנִקְלָהּ, 1 Sam 18:23). The shame lexeme קלה is used here to order relationships in society by showing that David has low status compared to the king. Jer 50:12 serves as a helpful example of how low status works in international relationships. Shamed Babylon is the last of nations and is, therefore, lower in the hierarchy than other nations. The use of shame to order relationships with Yahweh comes through in Mic 7:16–17. “The nations will see and will be ashamed because of all of their strength (יִרְאוּ גוֹיִם וַיִּבְשׂוּ מִכָּל גְּבוּרָתָם), Mic 7:16). The strength of the nations will not be sufficient to keep Yahweh from lowering their status. The next verse describes the nations as licking the dust (יִלְחָכוּ עָפָר) and being in dread to Yahweh (אֶל־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִפְחָדוּ). These verses show a situation where shame is used to demonstrate the low status of the nations before Yahweh.

⁵⁹ Pederson, *Israel*, 225–26.

Further, shame orders society in a way that reinforces the culture’s values. Those who achieve the culture’s ideals have high status while those who do not have low status. Bechtel focuses on actions intended to force individuals down in relation to other people as punishment for failing to achieve the ideals of the culture.⁶⁰ In this way, the culture uses shame as social sanction intended to control the behavior of its members. Social sanction is a real or perceived punishment or reward intended to enforce the values of a group. A group evaluates an individual negatively and assigns low status within the hierarchy to that person.

However, a group’s evaluation of an individual is not necessarily social sanction intended to influence behavior. There are cases where a person who is in a state that is not expected to change—such as death or disfigurement—is evaluated as having low status (Ezek 32:25, 1 Sam 11:2).⁶¹ In 1 Sam 11:2, Nahash links disfigurement with disgrace. He wants to gouge out the right eyes of the Israelites and says, “and (thus) I will put (it) disgrace on all Israel” (**וְשָׁמַתִּיהָ** (**חֲרָפָה עַל-כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל**). In these cases of a static condition, shame is not used as a threat to achieve compliance or a punishment for noncompliance; it simply reinforces the culture’s values. In the case described above, the culture holds those who are disfigured in low esteem.

There are also instances where an entity’s situation could change but where the use of shame still highlights ideals rather than applying coercive pressure. This situation is especially clear when international relations are involved. Ezekiel 5:14 has already been presented, but it also serves as a helpful example of this phenomenon because Yahweh refers to Israel as, “a reproach (**חֲרָפָה**) among the nations”. The nations mentioned in this verse are not pressuring Israel to avoid defeat; they are recognizing the low status brought on by defeat.

⁶⁰ Bechtel, “Biblical Experience,” 49–51, 53, 55–56.

⁶¹ See Lemos, T. M., “Shame and Mutilation of Enemies in the Hebrew Bible,” *JBL* 125 (2006): 225–41.

On the other hand, there are also situations where an entity's status may change, and the assignment of shame or the possibility of shame may motivate the entity to bring about a change or to act in a certain way. For example, the reason Dinah's brothers give for not wanting her to marry Shechem is that allowing her to marry an uncircumcised man would be a disgrace to them (Gen 34:14). They say they want to avoid such behavior in order to avoid disgrace.

The examples above focus on the role of shame in relationships, even when those relationships are not positive. Dishonor highlights a negative evaluation by others and thus implies a relationship between an entity and observers. Peer nations consider defeated nations shamed whether the defeated nations agree or not. For example, when Yahweh says that the bad figs will be a reproach in every place where he will drive them (Jer 24:9), he is describing how other nations will evaluate them.

Having described how shame orders society and reinforces values, it is now feasible to consider what causes dishonor. Pederson's description of what causes shame falls into the three categories of failure, unanswered challenges, and behavior.⁶² These major categories have been confirmed by the detailed analysis presented in appendix 6. As dishonor is used to order society, observers assign a given entity a negative evaluation, and thus low status, based upon these three broad categories.⁶³ Failure results from weakness and poverty. It may deal with specific situations such as poor crops, defeat, or misfortune. This category also includes verses that highlight false trust in a power that does not bring the help expected. For example, Isa 20:5 makes it clear that those who trust in Egypt will be disappointed.

⁶² Pederson, *Israel*, 240–42.

⁶³ There are also two minor categories. See appendix 1 for details.

One entity may challenge another by taunting, attacking, or trying to undermine the success of the other entity. The status of the challenged entity is lowered until an adequate response has been given. For example, the speaker in Prov 27:11 talks about returning a word to the one reproaching him. In Psa 119:41–42, Yahweh’s faithfulness makes it possible for the psalmist to answer the one who taunts him. The texts do not speak specifically about what constitutes an adequate response. The response must prove that the challenge or taunt was false. Therefore, the response depends upon the challenge.

Shameful behavior refers to any way of acting that results in dishonor. Such behavior may violate the social order or the ideals of the observers concerning behavior. An entity’s conduct may cause low status by natural consequences or by punishment that results from the conduct and lowers the status of the entity. For example, Dan 9:8 says that shame is Israel’s because they sinned against Yahweh. Behavior resulted directly in shame. However, the broad context often shows that Yahweh caused failure because of what people did. For example, Mic 1:11 focuses on failure as the cause of shame. Micah 1:6 reinforces the role of destruction in causing the nakedness and shame mentioned in Mic 1:11. However, Mic 2:1–3 reveals that Yahweh intends to bring the failure about because of the conduct of the people.

Although there are many cases where shame can be removed, dishonor may also be indelible. In the instances where shame can be removed, this normally takes place when the cause of shame is removed. Joel 2:19 serves as a good illustration because it describes a situation where Yahweh gives the Israelites grain, wine, and oil and thus removes the reproach caused by famine. As an example of indelible shame, Ezek 32:25 speaks of people who bear their shame

because they are dead. They will not be able to remove their shame because they will not be able to come back from the dead.⁶⁴

The Uses of Shame in Society as Applied to Ezek 36:16–32

The section above provided a number of examples that demonstrate that dishonor deals with status within relationships, and that the HB reflects the use of dishonor to organize those relationships. Ezekiel 36:16–32 makes use of the general role of shame in society by employing dishonor to order the relationships between Yahweh, Israel, and the nations. The passage describes a situation where the nations hold Yahweh and Israel in low esteem because Yahweh's people left his land. Yahweh plans to return his people to the land in order to sanctify his great name and thus to raise his status among the nations. He will also prevent famine in order to protect Israel from disgrace before the nations. The nations judge Yahweh and Israel based on success in staying on the land and producing food and find that they have failed in these areas. The nations are using shame to clarify their values. They are saying that they hold gods and people in high esteem when they are able to stay on the land and produce food. Under these circumstances, the shame can be removed by reversing the situation that caused the shame, as Yahweh plans to do.

Yahweh uses shame in his partnership with Israel both as social sanction and as a way of defining the relationship. Yahweh judges the Israelites for their behavior and disciplines them by sending them into exile. In this way, he demonstrates that he is above Israel in their relationship. At the same time, Yahweh uses shame as social sanction to punish the Israelites for bad behavior. Their behavior will change, and the punishment and the shame will be reversed.

⁶⁴ Indelible shame would also apply to disfigurement (1 Sam 11:2).

However, Yahweh's use of shame with Israel is confusing because in the text Yahweh himself brings about the change in the behavior of the Israelites that he desires (Ezek 36:27).

Furthermore, it is unclear when that change will take place. Nevertheless, Yahweh associates a change in behavior with the removal of the shame that is caused by exile and famine.

The dishonor described in vv. 31–32, however, is not presented as coming to an end. Again, Yahweh focuses on the behavior of the Israelites and stresses their low status. But the shame in vv. 31–32 reflects the past behavior of the Israelites. Past behavior cannot be changed, so the shame will not go away. The use of dishonor here is intended to reinforce Yahweh's values and to show that Yahweh's values dominate the relationship. When Yahweh tells Israel to be ashamed, he is telling them to admit that they have violated his values. By being ashamed, they show that they agree with his values. In cases where Yahweh uses low status to reinforce his values, however, that shame remains. The attitude of the Israelites toward their past behavior should continue to reflect shame.

Functions of Shame in the Discourse in Ezek 36:16–32

The section above has argued that shame in the society surrounding the book of Ezekiel was used to order groups of people, to clarify values, and to punish those who failed to live according to the established values. Within these general uses of shame in society, the evidence suggests that there are also specific goals that shame is used to accomplish. Because low status is used to achieve such goals in society, passages from Ezekiel may employ these social functions in discourse to accomplish rhetorical ends.⁶⁵ The analysis of the various uses of shame discourse places them into four main groups. Three of the four categories have been identified and

⁶⁵ My interest in a sociological view of shame discourse springs in part from my experience as a missionary among the Guéré people of West Africa, where I observed attitudes toward shame discourse that might easily be overlooked by Westerners focusing only on lexemes.

described by other scholars although they do not use the same terminology as this dissertation or stress the rhetorical use of such discourse.⁶⁶ However, there is a fourth function of shame discourse that represents a unique contribution of this dissertation and the key to understanding Ezek 36:16–32. These four uses of dishonor language will be described and then applied to Ezek 36:16–32.

Three Established Functions of Shame in Discourse. Other scholars have identified three functions that low-status language seems to accomplish: the hierarchical function, the propriety function, and the challenge function.⁶⁷ Only two of these functions appear in Ezekiel, but the third is nevertheless relevant to this study. Both of the functions of low-status language that appear in Ezekiel also appear elsewhere in the HB, especially in texts that deal with the fall of Jerusalem. This demonstrates that Ezekiel uses shame communication in a way that is consistent with the use of low-status language found in the HB. Each of the three primary functions of shame discourse plays a different role in ordering relationships.⁶⁸

The designation *hierarchical* in appendix 7 denotes a situation where describing an entity's low position in the hierarchy is the primary goal of the use of shame discourse.⁶⁹ Although Seebass does not use the same terminology, he does describe shame as playing such a role in relationships.⁷⁰ This first function of low-status discourse is used to organize the social order by reinforcing the low status of an individual or group. Discourse that attributes high status⁷¹ to

⁶⁶ Seebass, *TDOT*, 2:52; Lapsley, "Shame and Self-Knowledge," 148–52; Laniak, *Esther*, 82; and Chance, "Anthropology," 142.

⁶⁷ Seebass, *TDOT*, 2:52; Lapsley, "Shame and Self-Knowledge," 148–52; Laniak, *Esther*, 82; and Chance, "Anthropology," 142.

⁶⁸ A rare fifth function occurs when one party makes a strong or repeated request in the hope that shame will lead to the request being granted (2Kgs 2:17).

⁶⁹ Appendix 7 organizes all of the occurrences of the designated shame lexemes by function.

⁷⁰ Seebass, *TDOT*, 2:52.

⁷¹ High status is often referred to as *honor*.

those who achieve the culture's ideals and low status to those who do not is one of the tools used by society to order itself. For example, having abundant crops is presented as a social value in Joel 2:19. Thus poor crops bring low status while abundant crops bring high status. Therefore, when the text says that Yahweh will give the Israelites produce and take away their shame among the nations, it uses dishonor communication to promise to raise the status of the Israelites. The same use of low-status language is found in Ezek 34:29. Here Yahweh speaks of giving Israel abundant crops and thus preventing the Israelites from ever again bearing the shame of the nations. In this way, the verse talks about Yahweh's plan to give Israel an increase in status.

The hierarchical function of shame discourse may also be used with social sanction. For example, in Hos 2:7 a mother who acted as a prostitute is described as having acted shamefully. Society uses discourse to attribute low status to her in order to bring about appropriate behavior or to punish inappropriate behavior. The text then compares this image to idolatry.⁷²

In a few instances, shame vocabulary is used to explain a person's attitude toward the codes of conduct of the culture—a second function of shame discourse. People who are ashamed to act against custom fear being held in low esteem by the society. Lapsley notes convincingly that that this type of shame is seen as a positive personal characteristic.⁷³ Job 19:3 illustrates this function of shame discourse. Job states that his friends are not ashamed to wrong him. He is accusing his friends of lacking propriety. They do not respect the codes of conduct of the society. This same sense comes through in Zeph 3:5, where “the evildoer does not know shame” (וְלֹא־יֹדַע עֲוֹל בְּשֵׁת). The propriety function of shame discourse is used to describe those who respect the values of the culture and thus are held in relatively high esteem by the society.

⁷² See appendix 7 for more examples of each function.

⁷³ Lapsley, “Shame and Self-Knowledge,” 148–52.

Laniak notes that people in the HB may challenge others in order to lower their status.⁷⁴ While the hierarchical function of shame discourse focuses upon an entity's state of low status, the challenge function reflects an active effort to lower status. The term *challenge* highlights the role of conflict in lowering one's status. This function of shame language may be used to lower the status of another individual or group by challenging that person or group. For example, 1 Sam 17:26 notes that Goliath lowered the status of the Israelite army by challenging them. The Israelite army was disgraced until they were able to respond to the challenge appropriately. David is describing an appropriate response when he talks about taking away disgrace from Israel by killing the Philistine who challenged the armies of the living God. Low status communication reflects a challenge in Ezek 36:6 as well. Ezekiel 36:2–5 clarifies that the reference to Israel's bearing the shame of the nations in v. 6 has to do with the nations' challenging Yahweh and Israel by mocking Israel (v. 2) and claiming the land (v. 5). Appendix 7 illustrates the overwhelming use of the verb חָרַף for challenges. The challenge function of shame discourse reinforces the results of a challenge. If the entity that has been challenged fails to give an appropriate response, that person or group is assigned a lower place in the social order. However, if the entity in question successfully responds to the challenge, there is an increase in status.

Didactic Shame Discourse. Although most occurrences of shame lexemes fit these three established categories, there are a number of examples of low-status lexemes that do not fall into one of those groups. Many of these examples come from Ezekiel, including Ezek 36:16–32. In his study of the term בּוֹשׁ, Seebass refers to these uses in Ezekiel as not being productive for understanding this word and does not give any information about them.⁷⁵ Ortlund studies all of

⁷⁴ Laniak, *Esther*, 82. See also, Chance, "Anthropology," 142.

⁷⁵ Seebass, "בוֹשׁ," *TDOT* 2:52, 54–55, 57.

the shame lexemes in Ezekiel together and recognizes a difference between shame in a context of judgment and shame in a context of salvation without developing the insight.⁷⁶ However, these difficult occurrences of בּוֹשׁ and other shame terms may be categorized as a distinct function of low-status discourse that has not been identified by any other scholar. This function of shame discourse will be described in detail in order to demonstrate its validity.

When analyzed, many occurrences of shame discourse share a common theme that suggests that the acknowledgement of low status in a relationship actually signifies that learning has taken place. Lapsley has stated in general terms that Yahweh uses shame in teaching the Israelites. However, she has not linked this insight to particular functions of shame terms even though such a link is possible.⁷⁷ This use of low-status language is what this dissertation designates as the *didactic* function of shame discourse. According to the analysis that appears in appendix 7, The didactic function appears in Jeremiah fourteen times, in Ezekiel seventeen times, in Daniel two times, and in Ezra two times, for a total of thirty-five occurrences of shame lexemes used to show that learning has taken place. While the reflexive use of קוֹט appears in a didactic context three times and חָרַפָּה is used once, the rest of the appearances employ בּוֹשׁ or כָּלֵם.⁷⁸ Nel notes that בּוֹשׁ and כָּלֵם are often used together as a “fixed composite expression to describe an experience or condition of loss of honor and position as a result of sinful conduct, defeat, or distress.”⁷⁹ In fact, the didactic function of shame has a strong tendency to combine בּוֹשׁ and כָּלֵם and to use a lot of shame lexemes in general, as is demonstrated by appendix 7, and as found in Ezek 36:32.

⁷⁶ Ortlund, “Shame and Restoration,” 165–68.

⁷⁷ Lapsley, “Shame and Self-Knowledge,” 155, 158–59.

⁷⁸ Neither חָרַפָּה nor חָלָה is used for didactic shame in the HB. That these lexemes also do not appear in Ezekiel may point to the book’s bias toward didactic shame.

⁷⁹ Nel, *NIDOTTE* 2:659.

In Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and Ezra there is a striking progression in the relationship between didactic shame discourse and the exile. This progression seems to support Seebass's assertion that there is a close link between shame discourse and the fall of Jerusalem.⁸⁰ Jeremiah uses the didactic function to focus upon Yahweh's desire for Israel to acknowledge shame and Israel's stubborn refusal to do so. It then goes on to describe Ephraim's acknowledgment of shame before Yahweh. Jeremiah describes Israel as active while Ezekiel describes Israel as passive. In Jeremiah, Israel's acknowledgment of shame does not prevent the impending fall of Jerusalem but offers hope for restoration and a good relationship with Yahweh. In Ezekiel, Israel does not explicitly acknowledge shame or act to prevent the fall of Jerusalem, but a restoration is promised anyway. Daniel uses didactic shame discourse in a context well after the fall of Jerusalem but still during exile to reflect an appropriate relationship with Yahweh. Ezra also employs this use of low-status language to reflect a right relationship with Yahweh, but it does so from the point of view of a recent return from exile. The occurrences of didactic shame discourse in Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezra will be used to understand the same phenomenon in Ezekiel.

In Jer 3:25, Yahweh describes what he wants Israel to do. Although this verse could be taken as a literal statement uttered by Israel in the present time of the text, Jer 4:1 suggests that Israel has not yet acknowledged shame: "If you turn, O Israel—declaration of Yahweh—to me you will turn" (אִם-תָּשׁוּב יִשְׂרָאֵל נֶאֱמַר-יְהוָה אֵלַי תָּשׁוּב). Holladay's presentation of the verse as hypothetical confirms the impression that the Israelites have not yet admitted low status. Concerning this passage, he says, "What we have then in 3:21–25 is Yahweh's...description of what the people are likely to do in response to his appeal."⁸¹

⁸⁰ Seebass, *TDOT* 2:52–53.

⁸¹ William L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1–25*

Jeremiah 3:25 speaks from the point of view of Israel and says, “Let us lie down in our shame, and let our dishonor cover us for we have sinned against Yahweh our God” (נִשְׁכָּבָהּ) (בְּבִשְׁתָּנוּ וּתְכַסֵּנוּ כְּלִמְתָנוּ כִּי לִיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ חָטָאנוּ אֲנַחְנוּ). This text focuses on the relationship between Yahweh and Israel with no reference to the nations. Also, there is no reason to imagine that the nations are implicated since the cause of shame is Israel’s behavior of sinning against Yahweh. Yahweh is identified as Israel’s God, showing the relationship between the two. Yahweh has noted Israel’s negative behavior (Jer 3:20), and Israel is shown as acknowledging low status because of this negative behavior (Jer 3:25). Both components are necessary in order for the relationship between Israel and Yahweh to be repaired, and this is what Yahweh desires.

In the early chapters of Jeremiah, however, Israel and specific Israelites refuse to acknowledge shame. Jeremiah 3:3 stresses Israel’s stubbornness as Yahweh says to Israel, “you refused to be ashamed” (מֵאַנְתָּ הַפָּלִים). This verse deals with a situation where Yahweh has prevented rain from coming in order to punish the Israelites and to bring about their acknowledgment of low status before him. But Israel has refused. Jeremiah 2:30 highlights Yahweh’s desire that Israel learn from punishment but, “they did not take correction” (מִזְכָּר לֹא) (לִקְחוּ). The stress on stubbornness implies an unwillingness to acknowledge shame rather than an inability to feel shame as Lapsley has asserted in regard to Ezekiel.⁸² If Israel were incapable of being ashamed it would be unusual for Yahweh to punish them for it. When didactic shame is used with a negative particle, it shows that Israel is being stubborn and refusing to learn.

There are many similarities between Jer 6:15 and Jer 8:12, with both verses focusing on certain leaders within Israel and accusing them of failing to be ashamed (Jer 6:13; 8:9–10). The

(Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; ed. Paul D. Hanson; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 75.

⁸² Lapsley, “Shame and Self-Knowledge,” 146, 148, 150, 154, 157, 159.

text of Jer 8:12 says, “They acted shamefully when they did abomination, yet they would not be ashamed⁸³ at all; they did not know to be dishonored” (הַבְּשׁוּ כִּי תוֹעֵבָה עָשׂוּ גַם-בּוֹשׁ לֹא-יִבְשׁוּ) (וְהִכְפִּילִם לֹא יָדְעוּ).⁸⁴ The reference to acting shamefully describes the point of view of Yahweh rather than the nations. These leaders have acted shamefully in their relationship with Yahweh. The other shame lexemes describe their refusal to acknowledge shame before Yahweh. The punishment that is promised for those who do not admit low status demonstrates Yahweh’s desire that they acknowledge shame and the potential of such an admission of dishonor to accompany reconciliation with Yahweh.

In Jer 31:19, Ephraim finally acknowledges shame before Yahweh in response to the punishment that brought dishonor before the nations. This verse refers to the function of the exile as Yahweh’s correction of Ephraim. Ezekiel 5:14 demonstrates that the exile gave Israel low status before the nations when it says that Yahweh will make Israel a reproach among the nations by punishing them. Under these circumstances, Yahweh is using shame as social sanction. He then expects Israel to acknowledge shame before him to show that they have learned from this experience and have a positive attitude toward instruction. At first Ephraim was stubborn, “like a calf not taught” (כְּעֵגֶל לֹא לֻמָּד), as presented in v. 18. But the discipline has its desired effect, and Ephraim wishes to return to Yahweh. Jeremiah 31:18 goes on to stress repairing the relationship between Yahweh and Ephraim while it highlights Yahweh’s role as Ephraim’s God with the words, “for you are Yahweh, my God” (כִּי אַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי).⁸⁵

⁸³ The imperfect carries a modal sense. See Andrew H. Bartelt, *Fundamental Biblical Hebrew* (St. Louis: Concordia, 2000), 47.

⁸⁴ Some translations, such as the ESV, the NIV, and the RSV make the first phrase into a question even though there is no interrogative *heh*. Such an adjustment is not necessary and may reflect a Western understanding of shame as an emotion focused on the self. Holladay’s translation is more helpful: “They have behaved shamefully when committing abomination, yet they were not at all ashamed, nor did they know how to be humiliated” Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 274.

Then Ephraim shows that learning has taken place by saying, “I was caused to know” (הִנְדַּעַי, Jer 31:19). Ephraim acknowledges shame and dishonor in the relationship with Yahweh, stating, “I bore the reproach of my youth” (נִשְׁאַתִּי חֲרַפַּת נְעוּרָי). The term *reproach* refers to Ephraim’s low status because of previous idolatry and failure to walk in Yahweh’s statutes. There is no reference to shame before the nations or to the nations at all. This reproach is between Yahweh and Israel. Jeremiah 31:19 shows Ephraim doing what Yahweh accused Israel or certain Israelites of refusing to do earlier in the book. Ephraim’s acknowledgment of shame before Yahweh is an essential part of reconciliation with Yahweh. In fact, Yahweh announces compassion on Ephraim in the following verse and describes his plan to raise Israel’s status among the nations in Jer 33:9.

Daniel 9:7–8 is similar to Jer 31:19, as Daniel uses the shame lexeme בּוֹשׁ while confessing Israel’s sin and asking Yahweh to intervene. Daniel admits Israel’s “shame of face” (בִּשְׁתָּהּ הַפָּנִים). Daniel 9:2 specifically mentions Jeremiah and thus creates a clear link between the book of Jeremiah and the book of Daniel. The behavior of the Israelites in their relationship with Yahweh is the cause of their shame before Yahweh as stated in both verses 7 and 8. Daniel 9:7 specifically mentions Israel’s infidelity (בְּמַעַלָם) as the cause for their shame, and v. 10 mentions Israel’s failure to walk in Yahweh’s teachings. The reference to infidelity is a reference to idolatry. This Hebrew lexeme also appears in Ezek 39:26 and in chapter 9 of Ezra, establishing a relationship between didactic shame discourse and Israel’s failure to trust in Yahweh as their one true God. The focus of these verses is on Israel’s shame before Yahweh rather than their shame before the nations.

Chapter 9 of Daniel does not reference anything meritorious about Israel or the behavior of the Israelites. Rather, in these verses Daniel acknowledges Israel’s shame before Yahweh and falls on his mercy. Daniel is saying that Israel has nothing to be proud of and no claim on

Yahweh's help that is independent of Yahweh and his righteousness and mercy. The Israelites are trusting in Yahweh instead of their own merit. The Israelites are not depending upon their own claims of faithfulness to the Sinaitic covenant, they are depending upon their relationship with Yahweh, their God. The line of reasoning does not make any argument that Yahweh should act for Israel's sake or because of any good that the Israelites have done.

According to Dan 9:17, the reason that Yahweh should act is for his own sake (למען ארני). This comment comes after v. 15 refers to the reputation (שם) Yahweh made for himself by bringing Israel out of the land of Egypt. Daniel 9:18 further highlights the relationship between Yahweh and Israel by referring to "the city that is called (by) your name" (יהערך). The next verse connects the two lines of thought by urging Yahweh to act for his own sake before reminding him that he should act, "because your name is called over your city and over your people" (כי שמה נקרא על עירך ועל עמך).

This passage in Daniel has strong links with similar passages in Ezekiel. In addition to sharing the shame lexeme בוש, these passages stress that Yahweh's action is not for Israel's sake but for the sake of Yahweh's reputation (Ezek 20:44, Ezek 36:22, 32). The striking difference between Ezekiel and Daniel is that in Ezekiel it is Yahweh who is speaking. In Ezekiel, Yahweh states that his motivation for acting is concern for his reputation (Ezek 20:44, Ezek 36:22) and makes explicit what was only implied in Daniel: that he will not act for Israel's sake. Yahweh himself is presenting such an argument as reasonable motivation for his action, and Daniel follows the same line of thought.

Daniel's pleas are proven satisfying to Yahweh by the basically positive response that Yahweh sends via Gabriel (Dan 9:23–25). As in Jeremiah, Israel acknowledges shame before Yahweh has mercy on Israel and acts kindly toward Israel. This happens while Israel is still in exile.

On the other hand, Ezra 9:6 addresses a situation that takes place after a remnant has returned to the land. This text also uses shame discourse even though the Israelites are on their land again. Ezra confesses on behalf of Israel saying, “O my God, I am ashamed and dishonored” (אֱלֹהֵי בְשָׁתִי וְנִכְלָמָתִי). In vv. 8–9, Ezra recognizes that Yahweh has been kind to Israel by leaving a remnant and allowing them to return to the land, but his comment in v. 9 that they are still slaves to the Persians (כִּי־עֲבָדִים אֲנַחְנוּ), makes it clear that Ezra is hoping for more. Still, the return to the land—even under the most meager of circumstances—is a clear sign of restoration.

In this situation, Ezra confesses Israel’s past and present sins as the reason for their shame before Yahweh (Ezra 9:6–7). In the specific case of Ezra 9:6, the blessing (the return of the remnant) comes before the acknowledgment of shame. However, the situation is complex because of Israel’s present sin of intermarriage (Ezra 9:1–2, 13–14) and because Israel is still in a state of low status before the nations (Ezra 9:7).⁸⁵ At the same time, the general impression is that Israel’s past sins leave the Israelites in a state of shame before Yahweh. Ezra 9:6 says, “From the days of our fathers until this day we (are) in great guilt” (מִיָּמֵי אֲבוֹתֵינוּ אֲנַחְנוּ בְּאִשְׁמָה גְדֹלָה עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה). The verse speaks in collective terms with the sins of the people of Israel resulting in the collective guilt of the Israelites before Yahweh. As in Daniel, Ezra makes no claim that Israel deserves Yahweh’s help or has done anything good.

These examples give a context for comparison with the appearances of shame lexemes in Ezekiel. The book of Ezekiel displays the same function of low status language seventeen times. For example, Ezek 16:53–54 talks about a time after Yahweh’s correction of Israel when he will

⁸⁵ Daniel acknowledged Israel’s shame before a return to the land.

restore them in order that they bear their shame, that is, in order that they acknowledge their low status in their relationship with Yahweh. Israel's shame is linked to restoration.

The occurrences of didactic shame discourse in Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezra also demonstrate the primary characteristics of the phenomenon. Didactic shame discourse normally focuses on the strong and intimate relationship between Yahweh and Israel. When it functions appropriately, Yahweh and Israel both agree that Israel has low status before Yahweh. Yahweh is the observer who judges Israel based on a comparison with him and his values as reflected in the Sinaitic covenant. The visible cause of the low status of the Israelites is their behavior that violated the Sinaitic covenant and Yahweh's values. Didactic shame discourse is distinct from other uses of shame discourse because it deals with the strong and intimate covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel. The other uses of dishonor language usually refer to the weaker relationship between Israel and peer nations. The texts that use didactic shame discourse focus on Yahweh's evaluation of the Israelites rather than the evaluation of the nations. Israel's acknowledgment of shame before Yahweh is independent of Israel's status before the nations. Also, Yahweh expresses a great concern for behavior. This concern is not matched by the nations. Finally, although the behavior of the Israelites is visible even to the nations, it is important to Yahweh even after it has stopped and is no longer visible to others. Yahweh is concerned about how Israel behaved in the past.

Didactic shame discourse plays a positive role in Israel's relationship with Yahweh. Although the broad context in which such communication appears is a situation where Yahweh is threatening to punish Israel or has already carried out punishment, the specific context is one where Israel's acknowledgment of shame before Yahweh has positive implications. The admission of low status is presented as having the potential to prevent punishment or to repair the relationship between Yahweh and Israel as a move toward blessing and restoration.

Because of the importance of the relationship, low-status language with a didactic function calls for a new understanding of the orientation of dishonor. As discussed previously, many biblical scholars argue for either a subjective orientation of shame that focuses on the shamed entity's attitude or an objective orientation of dishonor that highlights evaluation by an observer.⁸⁶ However, didactic shame discourse appears to employ a *relational* orientation of dishonor where the shamed entity must agree with the judgment of the observer. It is not sufficient for Yahweh simply to tell the Israelites objectively that they are dishonored in his sight. It is also not adequate for the Israelites only to feel ashamed subjectively. The Israelites must acknowledge their low status in a way that shows that they have learned to respect their relationship with Yahweh.

Building on these characteristics of didactic shame discourse, it is possible to identify situations where dishonor is used in a similar fashion even when specific shame lexemes are not present. There are examples where people acknowledge shame and receive mercy. The acceptance of low status may be manifested by a sincere stance of ritual humiliation such as torn clothes, sackcloth, or ashes. David and the elders assume such a stance in 1 Chr 21:16 after David orders a census of Israel. In this case, David verbalizes his sin and foolishness, and Yahweh limits the plague (1 Chr 21:8, 27). Although this passage does not utilize specific shame lexemes, it does serve as an example where Yahweh shows mercy to those who manifest their low status before him. In 1 Kgs 21:27–29, Ahab demonstrates his low status in relation to Yahweh, and Yahweh decides not to bring evil during his days. A similar attitude may be seen among human beings. For example, Ben-Hadad uses sackcloth to assume a stance of weakness and shame before Ahab, and Ahab responds with mercy and makes a covenant with him (1 Kgs

⁸⁶ Nel, *NIDOTTE* 1:622.

20:31–34). Israelites who acknowledge low status in their relationship with Yahweh may reasonably hope that he will show them mercy.

Hierarchical and Didactic Shame Discourse in Ezek 36:16–32

The descriptions of the hierarchical and the didactic functions of shame discourse may now be applied to Ezek 36:16–32, since these are the two functions that appear in the text. The hierarchical function appears in Ezek 36:19–20 and 30. Although Ezek 36:19–20 does not employ specific shame lexemes, it does deal with low status. The nations consider the Israelites to be shamed because they are in a state of exile, that is, they have been scattered and dispersed. The nations also hold Yahweh in low esteem in essentially the same way they hold the Israelites in low esteem because of the exile. It is objective low status with the people of the nations acting as observers. Ezekiel 36:30 is similar but with an opposite conclusion. Here the text says that Israel will not have lower status than other nations. In both cases, the primary use of the low-status language is to establish order in the hierarchy.

Ezekiel 36:31–32 is best understood as employing didactic shame discourse. This understanding of what Yahweh is telling Israel to do when he tells them to be ashamed fits the context well. It is not sufficient for Yahweh to tell Israel that they are shamed. Yahweh is telling the Israelites to acknowledge low status before him because of their behavior. In doing this, the Israelites will show that they have learned from their punishment. These shame terms do show that Yahweh is above Israel, but the focus is on the Israelites' learning from their punishment and on reconciliation. So, the rhetorical goal is for the Israelites to acknowledge low status before Yahweh to show that they have learned. Furthermore, Yahweh associates Israel's acknowledgment of shame with restoration.

An understanding of didactic shame discourse also solves the apparent contradiction between the promise of an end to shame in v. 30 and the command to be ashamed in v. 32 by

drawing attention to the different observers involved. In v. 30, Yahweh promises that Israel, “will never again suffer the disgrace of famine among the nations.” The nations will never again serve as observers of Israel’s famine and resulting low status. Yahweh will act so that the nations will not be able to compare themselves to Israel and hold Israel in low esteem. Ezekiel 36:31–32 does not name the observer of Israel’s dishonor, but these verses do state clearly that the cause of the shame of the Israelites is their behavior. It is Yahweh who is concerned about the behavior of the Israelites. Furthermore, he is the one telling them that they will loathe themselves and ordering them to be ashamed. Therefore, Yahweh, rather than the nations, is the observer of the dishonor mentioned in Ezek 36:31–32. Israel will be protected from low status before the nations while having low status before Yahweh.

Other Scholarly Interpretations of Shame Discourse in Ezek 36:16–32

Now that the meaning and function of shame discourse has been analyzed, it is possible to revisit the way in which other scholars deal with the dishonor language in Ezek 36:16–32.⁸⁷ Previous research on this text has equated the meaning of shame in Ezek 36:16–32 with punishment, guilt, unworthiness, repentance, and autonomous self-evaluation. As will be shown, however, none of these concepts fully capture the meaning of the shame discourse in the passage.

Schwartz and others argue that the shame mentioned in Ezek 36:32 serves the function of punishing Israel.⁸⁸ These scholars are correct to recognize that Yahweh may use shame to punish Israel at times. This punishment shames Israel before the nations with the intention of pushing

⁸⁷ Schwartz, “Dim,” 60–61; Klopfenstein, *Scham*, 72; Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1058–59; Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25–48*, 358–59; and Lapsley, “Shame and Self-Knowledge,” 144.

⁸⁸ Schwartz, “Dim,” 60–61; Mein, *Ezekiel*, 238; and Fisch, *Ezekiel*, 244.

Israel to acknowledge sin and shame before Yahweh and to seek reconciliation with him. In this way, Yahweh uses shame as social sanction. However, Schwartz is confusing two functions of shame discourse. Hierarchical shame is used to punish people by lowering their status before their peers. On the other hand, didactic shame is presented as seeking to repair the relationship with Yahweh and is, therefore, surrounded by promises of forgiveness and blessing.

Klopfenstein highlights the relationship between guilt and shame but does not deal with the role of cause in that relationship.⁸⁹ The evidence supports his view that there is a close relationship between guilt and shame in some cases. However, shame is not synonymous with guilt. Rather, Yahweh speaks of guilt as the reason that he made Israel a reproach to the nations (Ezek 22:4). Ezra acknowledges his low status before Yahweh because of the guilt of his people (Ezra 9:6–7). In Ezra 9:6–7, guilt is the cause for didactic shame. Nel has also noted the association between shame and guilt in regard to Psa 69:6–8.⁹⁰ In this case, the concern is that guilt may result in shame before peers. Although the acknowledgment of shame may imply the acknowledgment of guilt, when people admit shame they are acknowledging that they have upset the social order or failed to achieve the appropriate values. Guilt highlights legal standing while dishonor underlines a break in a relationship. Guilt is legal while shame is social.

Klopfenstein also presents shame as resulting from a feeling of unworthiness.⁹¹ He argues that, in Ezek 36:32, Yahweh is telling the Israelites to have painful feelings because he promised

⁸⁹ See Klopfenstein, *Scham*, 72; and Nel, “בושׁ,” *NIDOTTE* 1:622, 624. Klopfenstein and Nel use a philological approach but do not define shame in Ezek 36:32 as low status. Klopfenstein defines shame in Ezek 36:32 as a consciousness of guilt. Although Nel normally relates shame to low status, he embraces Klopfenstein’s definition when he refers to the use of בושׁ specifically in Ezek 36:32 as a religious sense and defines it as, “the painful experience of guilt because of sinful conduct.” Both scholars struggle when confronted with a passage where the meaning of the lexemes is not clearly presented in the passage. The English term *guilt* brings confusion to the study of shame because it may refer to culpability or a feeling of remorse over wrongdoing while the Hebrew term בושׁ deals only with culpability. See HALOT 1:96.

⁹⁰ Nel, *NIDOTTE* 1:625.

⁹¹ Klopfenstein, *Scham*, 72. See also Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 358–59.

them gifts that they did not deserve. While shame is a posture of low status or unworthiness, the HB does not provide examples where the reception of undeserved gifts causes shame. As Odell notes, the HB also does not present undeserved forgiveness as resulting in shame.⁹² The occurrences of didactic shame in Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezra clarify that the rhetorical goal of the use of shame is not to cause the Israelites to feel shame because of undeserved grace. There is no suggestion that the Israelites should feel shame because of Yahweh’s kindness or forgiveness. For example, Ezra 9:6 links shame directly to Israel’s sin and guilt.

According to Block, shame is essentially the same as repentance.⁹³ However, there is a relatively weak link between repentance and dishonor. The only verse that includes a shame lexeme and a lexeme that is even tangentially related to repentance is Jer 31:19.

כִּי־אַחֲרַי שׁוּבִי נִחַמְתִּי וְאַחֲרַי הִנָּדַעַי סָפַקְתִּי עַל־יָרֵךְ בְּשֹׁתִי וְגַם־נִכְלַמְתִּי כִּי נִשְׂאֵתִי חֲרַפְתִּי
 נְעוּרָי

After having turned away, Ephraim regrets or repents (“I regret,” נִחַמְתִּי). Then, Ephraim acknowledges low status because of bearing the reproach of youth. The passage does not connect shame with repentance. Furthermore, repentance focuses on the individual and implies a turning from attitudes and behavior (Jer 4:28). Repentance is a theological form of self-evaluation that demonstrates that a change has taken place, but repentance is not the same as shame. Shame focuses on status within relationships with other people. Odell asserts that even when dishonor is the result of sin, the person is more concerned with the broken relationship than with his or her sin.⁹⁴ Shame often results from wrong attitudes and behavior. While one may argue that didactic

⁹² Odell, “Inversion,” 102–5. However, Odell is not focusing her description of shame on the didactic function of shame.

⁹³ Block, *Ezekiel: Chapters 25–48*, 358–59.

⁹⁴ Odell, “Inversion,” 107–8, 111.

shame is a sign that repentance has taken place, the focus of didactic shame is on an appropriate relationship between Yahweh and Israel. Acknowledgment of shame restores the social order.

Although there is certainly negative self-evaluation involved in shame, Lapsley puts unwarranted stress on the individual without adequately considering the relationship with Yahweh. Lapsley argues that in Ezekiel the Israelites are unable to evaluate their behavior negatively. She says that the solution is Yahweh's action which leads to Israel's growth in the area of self-knowledge. Lapsley states that this, "self-knowledge is equivalent to the acquisition of a new moral self, which is now capable of seeing behavior as it really is, and consequently feeling ashamed."⁹⁵

Lapsley's focus on the individual raises the complicated issue of the role that a scholar's culture plays in the interpretation of a biblical text. Interpreters may conclude that the shame terminology in Ezek 36:31–32 refers to guilt, repentance, or autonomous self-evaluation because such a conclusion agrees with their own cultural assumptions. These scholars have likely been influenced in some way by the views of Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead. In her 1946 work, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*, Benedict set forth her distinction between shame cultures and guilt cultures. "True shame cultures rely on external sanctions for good behavior, not, as true guilt cultures do, on an internalized conviction of sin."⁹⁶ In guilt cultures, Benedict says that people feel guilty over wrongdoing even if no one else

⁹⁵ Lapsley, "Shame and Self-Knowledge," 144.

⁹⁶ Benedict, *Chrysanthemum*, 222–23. See also Robert Redfield, *The Primitive World and Its Transformations* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1953). Redfield argues that, in a shame culture, humans and non-humans (gods and nature) are part of one moral order so that the universe cares and has moral significance. Redfield asserts that, in a guilt culture, nature is indifferent so that laws are impersonal norms established by culture. Paul Hiebert, *Transforming Worldviews: An Anthropological Understanding of How People Change* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 61–62, 111–12, uses the concepts of shame cultures and guilt cultures to help missionaries interact in a positive manner with cultures other than their own. See also E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951), 18; K. Van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria and Israel: Continuity and Change in the Forms of Religious Life* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 118; and Walton's discussion of Van der Toorn's conclusions in Walton, *Ancient*, 146–47.

knows about it, and they can get relief by confessing their sin. According to Benedict, people in shame cultures are concerned only with what others think of them and do not feel bad about wrongdoing as long as it is hidden.⁹⁷ Mead popularized the work of Benedict and maintained what many Westerners conclude: guilt cultures are preferable to shame cultures.

According to Cairns, however, Mead assumes that the post-Kantian understanding of the autonomous moral self is preferable when she identifies America as a guilt culture, and then treats guilt cultures as superior to shame cultures.⁹⁸ He states, “Remorse, on this view, is specific to guilt-cultures, in which the core of ethical evaluation is the agent’s subjective interpretation of the intrinsic moral character of his own actions, and is of little importance in shame-cultures, where what matters is the construction placed upon one’s conduct by other people.”⁹⁹ Westerners may conclude, as Mead does, that mature individuals evaluate their own motives and are somewhat independent of the opinions of others.

However, if such a view leads to the conclusion that Ezek 36:31–32 refers only to guilt, repentance, or autonomous self-evaluation, the crux of the passage remains unsolved. The thought progression of Ezek 36:24–31 does not drive the readers to focus upon themselves in isolation. Guilt, repentance, and autonomous self-evaluation are not natural results of undeserved

⁹⁷ Benedict, *Chrysanthemum*, 222–23.

⁹⁸ See Immanuel Kant, *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals* (Trans. James W. Ellington; 3d ed.; Indianapolis: Hackett, 1993). Kant has influenced Western thought on individuality by stressing the value of the reasons for action.

⁹⁹ Douglas Cairns, “Representations of Remorse and Reparation in Classical Greece,” in *Remorse and Reparation* (Forensic Focus 7; ed. M. Cox; London: Jessica Kingsley, 1999), 171. Cairns also states that Mead’s fieldwork on practices of rewarding and punishing children in so-called shame cultures actually suggests internalization, supposedly a distinguishing characteristic of guilt cultures. See Stiebert, *Construction*, 15; and Cairns, *Aidôs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 27–47. He notes on p. 40 that in the societies studied by Mead, “parents or others control the child by external sanctions of reward and punishment, pleasure and pain, until the child can reliably meet the requirements of society on its own; no convincing explanation is given as to why the application of external sanctions in early childhood gives rise to internalized moral standards in one society and not in another.” Cairns goes on to argue on p. 41 that “guilt should be possible in any circumstance in which the child is able to form an impression of parental values and preferences.”

kindness. Furthermore, the conclusion that shame in Ezek 36:31–32 refers to guilt or repentance does not agree well with Ezek 39:26. In this verse, the restored Israelites are shown bearing their shame (וְנָשׂוּ אֶת־כָּל־מִתָּתָם) because of their past behavior. Yahweh does not require his people to continue to feel guilty or to repent unceasingly over past wrongdoings.

Mead's approach is not helpful to this dissertation because it asserts—but fails to prove—that people who belong to so-called shame cultures will do wrong if no one from the culture is present to observe the wrongdoing. Her work is also problematic because it assumes that relationships are an inadequate means of guiding behavior. While the use of shame lexemes in the HB does focus upon what others think of the dishonored entity,¹⁰⁰ this does not preclude an individual awareness of right and wrong. Rather, it highlights the importance of relationships and the role of relationships in guiding behavior. When people evaluate their behavior, they evaluate it based upon the views of their peers.

The book of Ezekiel presents Yahweh as playing an active role in peer evaluation. Yahweh is Israel's covenant partner and, therefore, has a defined relationship with Israel. By speaking through the prophet, Yahweh relates to the Israelites in essentially the same way as a human covenant partner would relate to them. When the Israelites violate the Sinaitic covenant, Yahweh judges their behavior as wrong. In this way, Yahweh is an active participant in defining shame. At the same time, Yahweh works in the Israelites to create a society that upholds his values. Those Israelites who are striving to be obedient to the Sinaitic covenant supply substantial social pressure to trust in Yahweh and walk in his statutes. In this setting, behavior is considered shameful when it violates the Sinaitic covenant and thus breaks the relationship with Yahweh.

¹⁰⁰ Walton, *Ancient*, 105–6, 149, notes the exterior nature of one's self-identity in the HB and the ANE. Activity defines identity. Therefore, the HB is more concerned with acknowledging status in a relationship than it is with what a person is conscious of or how the person feels about it.

The same behavior also breaks relationships with Israelites who are working to be faithful to Yahweh.

Didactic shame discourse is related to reconciliation with Yahweh, not because individuals judge Yahweh's view of what is right and wrong as acceptable but because the individual admits to having offended Yahweh and submits to Yahweh's values. Behavior is bad because Yahweh says it is bad. Under these circumstances, the acknowledgment of shame based on behavior is an acknowledgment of allegiance to Yahweh and his worldview. Didactic shame allows for negative self-evaluation and bad feelings but focuses upon the relationship with Yahweh and his role in defining right and wrong. Yahweh pushes his followers to recognize wrongdoing as that which offends him and breaks or hinders the relationship with him. Such a definition of wrongdoing is not intrinsically inferior to a definition that stresses personal feelings of guilt after wrongdoing.

Shame and Other Status Discourse

Aside from making it possible to consider how other scholars interpret the dishonor language in Ezek 36:16–32, an understanding of the meaning and function of low-status communication is also necessary to relate it to other status discourse. The relationship between shame discourse and its antonyms and synonym will be described in general, and then applied specifically to the interpretation of Ezek 36:16–32.

Shame's Relationship with Honor and Pride

The shame discourse in Ezek 36:16–32 may be better understood by contrasting it with other status discourse. Nel argues that the antonyms of shame are honor and pride.¹⁰¹ While

¹⁰¹ Nel notes that shame is the opposite of pride and honor in *NIDOTTE* 3:924. Pedersen, *Israel*, 240–3, also

honor appears in strict contrast to shame,¹⁰² the relationship between pride and shame requires substantial explanation. Honor is high status while shame is low status (Hos 4:7; Prov 13:18). Joseph’s high rank is in view in Gen 45:13 when he says, “And declare to my father all my honor in Egypt” (וְהִגַּדְתָּם לְאָבִי אֶת־כָּל־כְּבוֹדִי בְּמִצְרַיִם). Wagner and HALOT both assert that the antonym to the shame lexeme כָּלֵם is כָּבֵד (honor).¹⁰³ Psa 4:3 demonstrates that the two are antonyms by saying, “How long (will) my honor (be turned) to shame?” Kutch uses Prov 14:31 to argue that כָּבֵד is also the antonym to חָרַף.¹⁰⁴ Proverbs 14:31 says, “(The) one who oppresses the poor challenges his maker, but the one who shows favor to the needy honors him” (עֲשֶׂק־דָּל (חָרַף עֲשֵׂהוּ וּמְכַבְּדוֹ חֲנֵן אָבִיוֹן)).

Shame as the opposite of honor focuses on status whether the people involved brought this low status upon themselves or not.¹⁰⁵ In this sense, shame may refer to a person who has low status because of perceived poverty. For example, Prov 12:9 says, “It is better to be a dishonored (man) and to have a servant than to be (a man who is) honoring himself but (is) lacking bread.” Shame may also refer to victims of abuse. For example, when Hanun shaves half of the beards and cuts away the lower part of the garments of David’s servants, the servants are shamed (2 Sam 10:4–5). In any context where shame deals with status in relation to a stated or implied observer, it is the opposite of honor.

states that shame is the opposite of honor.

¹⁰² Bechtel, “Biblical Experience,” 49–51, 53, 55–56. See also C. John Collins, “כָּבֵד,” *NIDOTTE* 2:577–87. The primary Hebrew lexeme for honor is כָּבֵד, but שָׁם is an important secondary lexeme for honor. It appears in Zeph 3:19 in an idiom that means renown. In Ezek 36:16–32, it is Yahweh’s name or reputation that reflects his concern with his honor. Holiness is another theme that is linked to honor in the book of Ezekiel. In Ezek 36:16–32, Yahweh vindicates his honor for the sake of his holy name.

¹⁰³ Wagner, *TDOT* 7:186. See also HALOT 2:480.

¹⁰⁴ Kutsch, *TDOT* 5:211.

¹⁰⁵ Shame may refer to the fear that status will be lost. In this case, shame as propriety may keep a person from behaving in a way that will bring about a loss of status. This use of shame is rare and is not strictly an antonym to honor.

However, shame lexemes may also be used when the shamed person has violated the social hierarchy in a way that has resulted in low status. In such cases, the text may still focus on low status as opposed to high status. But it is also possible for the text to focus on the attitude that brought about the violation of the social hierarchy. In this sense, shame is the opposite of pride or hubris.¹⁰⁶ Pride is marked by foolishness, stubbornness, and false claims to high status. It is not just an attitude; it is a way of relating to others. For example, the pride of Moab and Ammon comes through in their challenges against Yahweh's people (Zeph 2:10).¹⁰⁷ Whenever these characteristics appear in the broad context of a shame lexeme, shame refers to low status that brings an end to false claims of high status (Prov 11:2; Ezek 28:2, 19; Zeph 3:11). The relationship between pride and shame is clear in Prov 11:2, "Pride comes, then dishonor comes" (כָּאֵ־זָרוֹן וַיָּבֵא קָלוֹן). Pride results in a negative state of low status. The broad context of shame lexemes often reveals an attitude of pride that leads to low status.

The Relationship between Shame and Humility

Shame also has a unique relationship to humility that must be explored in order to bring clarity to Ezek 36:16–32.¹⁰⁸ Both terms refer to low status in society. However, while shame often focuses on the violation of the social hierarchy that resulted in low status, humility normally focuses on the low status itself. Shame lexemes are usually used where Yahweh

¹⁰⁶ The concept of pride reflects the following Hebrew lexemes: גָּבַהַּ (be high), רוּם (be high), גָּאָה (be proud), and זָיַד (act proudly). See Gary V. Smith and Victor P. Hamilton, "גָּבַהַּ," *NIDOTTE* 1:797–99; Gary V. Smith and Victor P. Hamilton, "רוּם," *NIDOTTE* 3:1078–80; Gary V. Smith and Victor P. Hamilton, "גָּאָה," *NIDOTTE* 1:786–89; and Gary V. Smith, "זָיַד," *NIDOTTE* 1:1094–96. For more detailed information on Hebrew lexemes for pride see also Donald E. Gowan, *When Man Becomes God: Humanism and Hybris in the Old Testament* (PTMS 6; Pittsburg: Pickwick, 1975), 19–29.

¹⁰⁷ Israel's enemies upset the social hierarchy when they put themselves above Yahweh and above his people.

¹⁰⁸ Lexemes relating to humility include עָנָה (be bowed down), כָּנַע (be humble), צָנַע (be humble), and שָׁפַל (be low). See Paul Wegner, "עָנָה," *NIDOTTE* 3:449–52; W. J. Dumbrell, "כָּנַע," *NIDOTTE* 2:667–68; W. J. Dumbrell, "צָנַע," *NIDOTTE* 3:822; Gary Alan Long, "שָׁפַל," *NIDOTTE* 4:224–26; and W. J. Dumbrell, "שָׁפַל," *NIDOTTE* 4:226–27.

punishes Israel's pride by lowering their status in the eyes of the nations (Ezek 5:14–15). On the other hand, humility is often presented as the opposite of pride in a positive sense. Proverbs 11:2 says, “Pride comes, then dishonor comes. But with the humble ones (is) wisdom” (בְּאִזְדוֹן וַיָּבֵא (תְּכֻמָּה קָלוֹן וְאֵת־צְנוּעִים). This verse says that pride leads to a negative result while the humble ones have the positive characteristic of wisdom. It presents humility as a desirable quality.

There are also passages that present Yahweh as having a positive attitude toward those who are humble. For example, Psa 18:28 says, “For you save a humble people” (כִּי־אֲתָהּ עִם־עֲנִי (תוֹשִׁיעַ). Shame normally has a negative connotation because of the negative attitude or behavior of the entity that is shamed while humility has a positive connotation because of the recognized need for help from Yahweh. Yahweh also responds positively when people humble themselves before him. 2 Chronicles 2:12 serves an example of this because Yahweh's wrath turned from King Rehoboam “when he humbled himself” (בְּהִכָּנְעוֹ).

However, the same humility lexemes may be used in a negative sense, with Yahweh lowering the status of a person or group against the entity's will. For example, 2 Chr 28:19 says, “For Yahweh humbled Judah” (כִּי־הִכְנִיעַ יְהוָה אֶת־יְהוּדָה). Here there is, essentially, total overlap with the most common use of shame discourse, the hierarchical function. What humbling does in 2 Chr 28:19, shaming does in Psa 44:8: “You shamed the ones who were hating us” (מִשְׁנֵאֵינוּ הַבִּישׂוֹת). The negative use of humility agrees well with the use of shame discourse to challenge and to establish low status. At the same time, the positive use of humility is very similar to didactic shame discourse. In Deut 8:3, Yahweh humbled (וַיַּעֲנֶד) Israel and forced them to depend upon him for food in order to teach them that man lives on everything that comes out of Yahweh's mouth. This verse presents humility as teaching the Israelites to trust Yahweh. Didactic shame also involves learning and reflects an awareness of weakness that leads to trust in Yahweh.

This relationship between shame and humility is important because it aids in deciphering difficult passages where Yahweh specifically mentions the humble as those who will not be put to shame (Zeph 3:11–13, Isa 66:2–5). These passages show the humble as having an appropriate attitude of respect for Yahweh’s high status, for his word, and for the behavior he requires. Those who are humble and low (Zeph 3:12) respect Yahweh’s status. Such people also tremble on account of Yahweh’s word (Isa 66:2) and behave as Yahweh wishes (Zeph 3:13). The humble are aware of their low state and seek refuge in the name of Yahweh because they recognize their need for help from him (Zeph 3:12). Yahweh ultimately protects those who recognize their low status before him and their need for his help to overcome low status among their peers. Humility in relation to Yahweh is also closely related to trust in Yahweh. Yahweh reacts to the mistreatment of the humble by defending them. Didactic shame expresses essentially the same posture toward Yahweh as humility does.

Honor, Pride, and Humility in Ezek 36:16–32

A familiarity with honor, pride, and humility makes it feasible to discern how shame terminology works with the other status discourse in Ezek 36:16–32. In Ezek 36:26, for example, Yahweh promises to remove Israel’s heart of stone and to give the Israelites a new heart—a heart of flesh. Israel’s heart of stone is an essential part of the problem in the relationship between Yahweh and Israel that reflects Israel’s pride. The Israelites are proud and stubborn and, therefore, refuse to admit that they have violated the Sinaitic covenant. Yahweh’s description of Israel’s wrongdoing (vv. 17–21) does not say that Israel acknowledges that they disobeyed the Sinaitic covenant. It is the pride and stubbornness of the Israelites that cause Yahweh to punish them with exile. This punishment lowers their status before the nations (Ezek 5:14) in order to force them to abandon their pride. The new heart that Yahweh gives to Israel in v. 26 should solve the problem, but Israel does not immediately manifest such a transformation.

In Ezek 36:30, Yahweh promises to protect Israel from low status before the nations even though they have not shown that their pride is gone. In this verse, shame is simply the opposite of honor—high status.

However, it is shame as the opposite of pride that is in sharp focus when Ezek 36:32 commands the Israelites to be ashamed and dishonored (בוֹשׁוּ וְהִכְלַמוּ). In this verse, shame is the opposite of honor in the sense that Israel does not have high status in relation to Yahweh. But the focus of the passage relates to the pride that brought about punishment from Yahweh. Israel was proud and claimed higher status in relation to Yahweh than was appropriate. This resulted in Israel's shame, that is, lower status against their will. Yahweh calls on Israel to acknowledge that this low status is right. When Yahweh tells Israel to be ashamed and dishonored, he is telling them not to be proud. When the Israelites acknowledge shame before Yahweh, they demonstrate that they have a new heart and are no longer proud. The problem of Israel's stone heart has been solved. Furthermore, this acknowledgment of low status has substantial overlap with the positive use of terms for humility. It shows that the Israelites recognize their weakness and their need for Yahweh's help. In this way, it gives Yahweh a positive attitude toward Israel.

Chapter Summary

Philological and sociological studies of shame lexemes highlight a strong connection between these terms and status in relationships where one entity evaluates another. The analysis of lexemes demonstrates that terms for dishonor refer to status. However, lexical analysis alone cannot address the social functions of shame, which, in turn, may be used to accomplish specific rhetorical goals. Low-status language may be used with a hierarchical goal, to challenge the status of another, or to refer to the high status of someone who practices propriety. However, these categories do not adequately account for a number of occurrences that are better described

as the didactic function of shame discourse—the major discovery of this dissertation. In the didactic use, the acknowledgment of low status shows that learning has taken place.

In Ezek 36:16–32, the concern with the status of the Israelites among the nations and in their relationship with Yahweh is consistent with the text’s concern for Yahweh’s status among the nations. Ezekiel 36:31–32 deals with the relationship between Yahweh and the Israelites. Both verses employ the didactic function of shame discourse in order to lead the Israelites to acknowledge low status before Yahweh because of their behavior. Under these circumstances, shame plays an important role in repairing the relationship and in restoration. While Israel’s dishonor before Yahweh certainly includes low status, the focus is on a turn from the pride and stubbornness that led Israel to behave contrary to Yahweh’s statutes. By acknowledging low status, the Israelites put themselves in the category of the humble—those who recognize their low status before Yahweh. Yahweh normally protects and blesses those who know that he is above them and that they need his help. Although Westerners may be inclined to take the shame language in Ezek 36:16–32 as referring to autonomous self-evaluation leading to repentance, the conclusions of the research presented in this chapter suggest that such language deals with status in relationships.

However, these insights alone do not fully solve the crux of this passage, which is the unusual order by which a command to be ashamed follows positive promises. Further, while this chapter raises the issue of status, it does not explain why Israel’s status before Yahweh is an important part of Yahweh’s sanctifying his holy name. It also does not explicate why Ezek 36:16–32 employs didactic shame discourse after promises of blessing. In order to respond to these issues, it will be necessary to employ sociological interpretation again but this time to investigate differences in Yahweh’s view of shame and the human view. This study will give a

broad view of the characteristics of the culture that are tied to shame and will bring them to bear on the logic of Ezek 36:16–32.

CHAPTER THREE

YAHWEH AND STATUS IN THE SOCIAL WORLD SURROUNDING EZEK 36:16–32

The goal of this dissertation is to discover why the command to be ashamed comes after positive promises in Ezek 36:16–32. Chapter 1 began this process by highlighting the importance of the covenantal relationship between Yahweh and Israel in the text. It went on to argue that Yahweh is making a logical argument that leads to the command for the Israelites to be ashamed immediately when they read the text. However, it was unclear what this command to be ashamed meant. Therefore, chapter 2 continued the study of the logical material in Ezek 36:16–32 by engaging in a philological and sociological analysis of the terms for dishonor in the passage. This investigation concluded that the shame lexemes in question relate to status, with one entity evaluating and ranking another entity. The social analysis then identified the rhetorical functions of shame within discourse. To the functions identified by previous studies was added a distinctive didactic use, where the acknowledgment of dishonor shows that learning has taken place. It is this didactic function that is at work in Ezek 36:31–32. Israel's acknowledgment of shame opens the way for reconciliation with Yahweh. But this conclusion does not explain how reconciliation between Israel and Yahweh sanctifies Yahweh's great name or why the command to be ashamed comes after positive promises.

Chapter 3 will respond to these issues by describing how Yahweh views and employs shame within the social world surrounding Ezek 36:16–32. In this way, it will supply the necessary information to complete the analysis of the logical material in the passage. This chapter begins with an explanation of how Yahweh's covenant relationship with Israel makes it possible for Israel to affect Yahweh's status. It goes on to discuss shame that may be honorable

in Yahweh's eyes and to argue that the low-status language in Ezek 36:31–32 deals with such honorable shame. The entire sociological study is then organized into two patterns for Yahweh's use of shame discourse in his relationship with Israel. Finally, this description of Yahweh's views on status is used to clarify the logic of Ezek 36:16–32.

The Impact of Yahweh's Relationship with Israel on His Status

In order to understand the status implications of Yahweh's relationship with Israel in Ezek 36:16–32, it is important to study the larger world in which shame plays a role, including the values of the nations. It is also necessary to analyze the relationship between status and the covenant to see how the covenant expresses Yahweh's values and how honor and shame are tied to the covenant.¹ Although the covenants that Yahweh made with Noah, Abraham, Moses, and David are all in view in this study, it is the covenant at Sinai that will get the most attention. This covenant stresses reciprocity and Yahweh's statutes for Israel. Therefore, it can be violated by Israel. Such a violation has substantial implications for the status of Yahweh and Israel, and these implications must be addressed. The analysis in this chapter will consider the entire HB, with the assumption that the entire HB is relevant for understanding Yahweh's view of status and his covenant relationship with Israel. This study will argue that the Israelites blame Yahweh for the fall of Jerusalem because they are following the values of the nations. The conclusions of this analysis will ultimately be brought to bear on the covenant language of Ezek 36:16–32.

¹ The term *covenant* is used in a general sense to refer to Yahweh's formal relationship with Israel. The covenant formula, "You will be my people, and I will be your God," is found in Ezek 36:28. This formula is closely linked to the covenant at Sinai and is normally taken to refer to the general covenantal relationship between Yahweh and Israel. See Martens, *God's Design*, 217.

Yahweh's Values and the Values of the Nations

Chapter 2 focused upon features of shame discourse where Yahweh's view and the view of the nations are similar. It is now necessary to analyze Yahweh's relationship with shame and honor when he disagrees with some of the fundamental assumptions of the nations. This section will demonstrate that Yahweh's use of shame discourse reflects his values and focuses on his own high status as he relates to human beings. The study of didactic shame in chapter 2 highlighted Yahweh's concern with behavior and his desire that his people trust in him and walk in his statutes. Chapter 3 will now broaden that conclusion to argue that Yahweh assigns low status to people based on their failure to trust in him and to obey to his commands. However, Yahweh's view stands in stark contrast to the human view, which is concerned with the honor of the individual or group and sees Yahweh or other gods as a means to an end. Rather than focusing on behavior, the nations hold to the human view and, therefore, tend to assign low status to people based on general failure and the inability to answer challenges.

As discussed previously, Chance and Domeris are critical of using modern sociological studies as keys to understanding the HB. However, Chance suggests a way of approaching the broad role of shame in society when he argues for an understanding of shame that takes international relations into account and recognizes groups within society that may disagree over what should result in shame.² Also, as Domeris points out, the HB describes a culture in which Yahweh must be recognized as playing an important role in deciding what causes shame and honor. He argues that Yahweh must not be marginalized, and he calls for an approach to the HB that organizes the study of status around Yahweh.³

² Chance, "Anthropology," 143–48.

³ Domeris, "Shame and Honour in Proverbs," 86–95.

Stiebert and Pedersen further describe the manner in which the status-oriented texts of the HB revolve around Yahweh. Stiebert's study of Isaiah is helpful for the present analysis of Ezekiel because both Isaiah and Ezekiel use a substantial amount of shame language, as they present Israel's violation of the Sinaitic covenant as the cause of the fall of Jerusalem. Stiebert considers Yahweh's interaction with humans and argues that Isaiah holds a view of honor and shame that sees Yahweh as central. She asserts that Isaiah's view of status is counter-cultural when compared to the views of the nations. According to Stiebert, honor normally applies to Yahweh and is contrasted with human shame in Isaiah. Yahweh possesses and bestows honor.

Stiebert argues that the status and wealth associated with human honor are portrayed as negative in the book of Isaiah. However, the texts she employs are limited to places where Yahweh judges pride.⁴ For example, both Isa 22:15–19 and Isa 23:9 speak of Yahweh's plan to shame those who receive human honor but who are arrogant. She concludes, "It might, therefore, be said that *if* the texts of Isaiah *were* produced in honour/shame societies they promulgate a counter-cultural set of values where honour is no longer the social ideal."⁵ Although Stiebert ultimately rejects honor and shame as a way of organizing societies, she does perceive the counter-cultural nature of Isaiah's presentation. However, she does not recognize that it is Yahweh's view of honor as opposed to the view of the nations that Isaiah presents as the social ideal. Pedersen echoes Stiebert's comments when he speaks of the perversion of honor that takes place when humans do not follow Yahweh's views on status.⁶

Taken with the concerns of Chance and Domeris, the insights of Stiebert and Pedersen support the conclusion that the divine definition of honor and shame is different from the human

⁴ Stiebert, *Construction*, 23, 84, 87–89.

⁵ Stiebert, *Construction*, 95.

⁶ Pedersen, *Israel*, 215–16.

one. This conclusion will now be tested against the biblical data by means of an analysis of the concept of status in the social world surrounding Ezek 36:16–32.

Power and Wealth in the Eyes of the Nations. Among the possible causes of shame listed in chapter 2, namely, failure, unanswered challenges, and behavior, the human view of status appears to focus upon failure and unanswered challenges. Both of these causes of dishonor reflect a lack of power and wealth. With this in mind, it is not surprising that human beings tend to attribute honor to those people who have substantial wealth and power. For example, Ezek 27:25 links commerce with being filled and greatly honored (וְהַמְלֵאֵי וְהַתְּכַבְּדֵי מְאֹד).⁷ In Isa 23:8, Tyre is referred to as “the one who bestows crowns, whose merchants (are) princes, whose tradesmen are honored of the earth.” (הַמַּעֲטִירָה אֲשֶׁר כֹּחֲרִיהָ שָׂרִים כְּנַעֲנִיָּה נִכְבְּדֵי-אָרֶץ). Tyre’s power is highlighted by the reference to bestowing crowns, while Tyre’s wealth is underlined by the reference to commerce. Jehoash recognizes that military success has given honor to Amaziah in 2 Kgs 14:10. He says, “You have surely smitten Edom. Your heart has lifted you up. Be honored.” (הִנֵּה הִבִּיתָ אֶת-אֲדוֹם וְנִשְׂאָה לְבָבְךָ הַכְּבֹד). According to these verses, human honor is based on power and wealth.

Yahweh’s View of Power and Wealth. Yahweh’s view associates power and wealth with status, but it highlights his own power and wealth. In fact, the HB presents Yahweh as possessing all wealth and power. For example, Deut 10:14 describes Yahweh’s wealth with the statement that heaven, the earth, and everything in the earth belong to him. The HB deals with Yahweh’s absolute power in Psa 33:16–20. The text states that the resources that humans normally think of as providing power do not save. On the contrary, it is Yahweh who saves and delivers from death. Isaiah 43:13 goes on to say that there is no deliverer from the hand of

⁷ See also Gen 31:1.

Yahweh and that no one can reverse what he does. It is, therefore, not surprising when Psa 113:4 declares that “Yahweh is high over all the nations; his honor over the heavens (**רָם עַל-כָּל-גּוֹיִם**) (יהוה על השמים כבודו). The next verse asks the question, “Who is like Yahweh, our God?” (מי כיהוה אלהינו) (Psa 113:5). The implied answer is, “No one.” This psalm goes on to highlight Yahweh’s ability to raise up the poor so that they sit with princes (Psa 113:7–8). Psalm 108:6–7 urges Yahweh to assert his honor and high position in order that his beloved ones may be saved (**לְמַעַן יִחַלְצוּן יְדִידֶיךָ**). This passage is imploring Yahweh to show his honor by demonstrating his power.

Although Yahweh’s status is challenged and may be considered low because of different understandings of status, none of the 391 appearances of shame lexemes in the HB concludes that Yahweh is lower than any human or god. According to the HB, Yahweh maintains the highest possible status (Psa 148:13). Furthermore, he is often presented as the one who causes low status, overcomes low status, or protects from low status. For example, Yahweh shames the one who pursues his follower in Psa 57:3. Even when Yahweh’s own honor is under consideration, he is seen as the one who is able to raise his status in the eyes of the nations (Psa 74:10–11).

According to the HB, Yahweh is the only source of the power and wealth that humans seek, and he gives these resources as he pleases. He gives wealth and honor to his follower, Jehoshaphat, in 2 Chr 17:5. According to 2 Chr 32:27, Hezekiah also had wealth and honor. David wisely recognizes Yahweh as the source of wealth, power, and honor in 1 Chr 29:12. He says, “Both wealth and honor (come) from before you. And you are ruling over all. In your hand (is) power, and strength. (It is) in your hand also to make great and to give strength to all.” (**וְהָעֶשֶׂר וְהַכְבוֹד מִלְּפָנֶיךָ וְאַתָּה מוֹשֵׁל בְּכָל וּבְיָדְךָ כֹּחַ וְגִבּוֹרָה וּבְיָדְךָ לְגַדֵּל וּלְחַזֵּק לְכָל**).

The evidence above affirms Domeris' assertion that Yahweh plays a dominant role in deciding the status of human beings.⁸

How Yahweh Evaluates the Status of People. While Yahweh recognizes the role of wealth and power in proving his own supreme status and in establishing status between people, he does not evaluate people based upon these resources. That is, Yahweh recognizes that humans evaluate each other, and that they evaluate him, based on power and wealth. However, Yahweh uses different criteria to evaluate people. That Yahweh recognizes the human view of honor is demonstrated by his willingness to give his followers the wealth and power that will result in honor in human terms. But he does not attribute high status to human beings because of power and wealth⁹ nor does he punish or think less of people for being poor or weak. For example, Yahweh recognizes Pharaoh's greatness (Ezek 31:1–2), but he does not honor Pharaoh. On the contrary, Yahweh brings Pharaoh down (Ezek 31:18). In a similar manner, Yahweh does not treat his people as having low status in their relationship with him because they are weak. In fact, he takes their shame away (Zeph 3:19).

Rather than focusing on power and wealth, Yahweh gives people high status when they have a justified relationship with him. This takes place when the problems that led to didactic shame are reversed. Yahweh punished Israel because the Israelites were prideful and, therefore, refused to trust Yahweh or to obey him. By means of didactic shame, Yahweh's people recognize their low status in comparison to him, show their trust in him, and demonstrate their desire to walk in his statutes. Such a relationship with Yahweh leads him to hold people in high esteem (Prov 22:4; Psa 1:1–3; Psa 31:24).¹⁰ A person cannot have high status in Yahweh's view

⁸ Domeris, "Shame and Honour in Proverbs," 86–95.

⁹ See Pedersen, *Israel*, 214–19.

¹⁰ See also Domeris, "Shame and Honour in Proverbs," 94–5.

without having a positive relationship with Yahweh. Yahweh specifically discourages anyone from boasting in his own wisdom, strength, or wealth in Jer 9:22. In the next verse, however, Yahweh presses even the wise, strong, or wealthy man to boast that he “understands and knows me, that I am Yahweh who practices steadfast love, justice, and righteousness on the earth, for I delight in these (things)” (הַשְׂכֵּל וַיֵּדַע אוֹתִי כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה עֹשֶׂה חֶסֶד מְשֻׁפֵּט וּצְדָקָה בְּאֶרֶץ) (כִּי־בְאֱלֹהִים חִפְצָתִי, Jer. 9:23).

Proverbs 3:5–8 also specifically discourages followers of Yahweh from leaning on their own understanding or being wise in their own eyes. Rather it commands them to trust Yahweh. Yahweh honors the one who honors him (1 Sam 2:30). Psalm 91:15 says, “He will call on me and I will answer him. I (will be) with him in distress. I will rescue him, and I will honor him” (יִקְרָאֵנִי וְאֶעֱנֶהוּ עִמּוֹ־אֲנִי בְצָרָה אֲחַלְצֶהוּ וְאֶכְבְּדֶהוּ). Calling on Yahweh implies trust. So, Yahweh honors the one who trusts in him. According to Isa 49:5, Yahweh honors his faithful Servant Israel. Prov 14:31 says, “(The) one who oppresses the poor challenges his maker, but the one who shows favor to the needy honors him” (עֹשֶׂה־דָּל חֲרָף עֹשֶׂהוּ וּמְכַבְּדוֹ חֲנִן אֶבְיֹן).¹¹ As Yahweh assigns status, he looks for behavior that serves as evidence of trust in him.

In fact, because trust is of such great significance to Yahweh, he focuses on producing and developing trust in his relationships with people. In order to make trust possible, Yahweh creates situations where his followers are not certain of his intervention. For example, Yahweh creates such opportunities in the narrative of the patriarchs. The HB presents trust as the desired outcome of these situations. Genesis 12:1–20 shows opportunities to trust that result in success in one case and failure in another. When Yahweh tells Abram to leave the house of his father and to go to the land that Yahweh will show him, Abram demonstrates trust by doing what Yahweh told

¹¹ Collins *NIDOTTE* 2:579.

him to do without proof that the promises will be fulfilled.¹² On the other hand, when Abram feels threatened by Pharaoh’s power later in the chapter, he resorts to deception rather than trusting in Yahweh. Still, Yahweh chooses to intervene. Yahweh also works in a hidden fashion when he promises Abram an heir but does not immediately give the heir (Gen 15:3). Genesis 15:6 states that Abram believed Yahweh. Yahweh “reckoned it to him as righteousness” (וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ לּוֹ צְדָקָה), showing the importance that Yahweh places on believing him. This trust is associated with status specifically in Gen 12:1–2, where Yahweh calls for trust by telling Abram to leave his home and extended family and promises to bless Abram and to make his name great. This is a reference to the good reputation that Abram will have as other people hold him in high esteem.¹³

This same approach appears in Yahweh’s relationship with the Israelites, with the goal of leading the Israelites to trust Yahweh under all circumstances. For example, Deuteronomy 8:15–18 says that the goal of Israel’s uncertain time in the desert was to humble and to test Israel with the ultimate plan of doing them good in the end. The text goes on to express the possibility that Israel will conclude that their own power has brought about their wealth. The passage corrects this misunderstanding by saying that it is Yahweh who is giving them power to make wealth. Psalm 42 expresses the attitude that a follower of Yahweh should have when Yahweh does not manifest his honor. In Ps 42:4 people are asking, “Where is your God?” because Yahweh has not manifested his power and wealth.¹⁴ In Ps 42:6 the appropriate response is given. The follower of Yahweh is expected to wait on him and to express confidence in his salvation.

¹² When Yahweh commands Abraham to sacrifice Isaac in Gen 22:1–19, he creates another opportunity for Abraham to trust him.

¹³ The reference to one’s name reflects Yahweh’s own concern for his name or reputation in Ezek 36:16–32. See BDB, 2 b for the meaning “reputation” for the Hebrew רִיבּוּ.

¹⁴ The same question is quoted in Joel 2:17 as part of the plea for Yahweh’s intervention. The Israelites live in the hope that Yahweh will take away their reproach (Isa 25:8).

Yahweh does not consistently manifest his wealth and power in an unmistakable manner because he wants to create these types of situations. This means that Yahweh does not always immediately protect the status or raise the status of his followers in relation to others. Still, Yahweh expects Israel to trust in him and hope in him. Yahweh has the same basic expectations for individual faithful followers among the Israelites when they suffer low status at the hands of unfaithful Israelites. There are thirteen appearances of shame lexemes in which the passage describes someone who trusts in Yahweh in the midst of low status or expresses confidence that those who trust in Yahweh will be saved from low status.¹⁵ Yahweh may also postpone judgment out of mercy and act according to his own timing. His involvement in human status is not simple. A person cannot necessarily be identified as having high status in Yahweh's eyes based only on that person's present status among other people.

On the other hand, low status in Yahweh's eyes is caused by a failure to trust him, to recognize his supreme status, and to walk in his statutes, as demonstrated in chapter 2 with the use of didactic shame. The clearest indicator of a failure to trust in Yahweh is idolatry. The HB makes a clear association between idolatry and shame (Psa 97:7; Isa 42:17). Human beings may also violate the social order and refuse to recognize Yahweh's supreme status by pridefully trying to take the highest place or by trying to put anything other than Yahweh at the highest place (Ezek 31:10). Problems in the relationship with Yahweh come as well when people reject his statutes and engage in behavior toward others that goes against them (Ezek 5:7).

When prideful people challenge Yahweh by thinking too much of themselves and putting their confidence in their own resources or in some false god, Yahweh punishes them. In Isa 23:9, Yahweh announces his plan to “defile the pride” of Tyre (לְחַלֵּל נְאֻן). He goes on to say that he

¹⁵ Isa 49:23; Psa 22:6; Psa 22:7 (see v. 9); Psa 25:2; Psa 25:3; Psa 25:20; Psa 34:6; Psa 69:7 (2); Psa 119:31; Psa 119:42; Psa 119:116; Lam 3:30 (see vv. 25, 29, 31–32).

will “make light the honored ones of the earth” (לְהַקִּיל כָּל־נִכְבְּדֵי־אָרֶץ).¹⁶ When those who have honor according to the human view challenge Yahweh by their pride, Yahweh lowers their status.¹⁷

In the relationship between Yahweh and Israel, Yahweh reacts to Israel’s stubborn sin and unbelief by punishing the Israelites and thus lowering their status before the nations. Ezra 9:7 illustrates this fact by establishing sin against Yahweh as the explicit cause of Yahweh’s punishment. This punishment results in hierarchical shame, where Israel has low status before the nations.

Human Efforts to Obtain Power and Wealth. The HB presents Yahweh as the only source of honor, but the human view fails to recognize Yahweh’s key role in granting high status. Instead of trusting in Yahweh as he wishes, human beings pursue wealth and power by other means because they associate these resources with safety. People may seek to increase wealth and power by joining themselves to gods or other people. These allegiances are pragmatic and are based on their ability to increase wealth and power and thus status and safety (Isa 36:6; 44:17). The psalmist corrects this view when he says, “a warrior is not delivered by great strength” (לֹא־יִנְצֵל בְּרֶב־כֹּחַ), Psa 33:16). According to the human view, however, people who have high status because of power and wealth must then be able to protect themselves.

As humans pursue wealth and power from sources other than Yahweh, they may seek help from gods, but these gods are seen as being different from Yahweh. According to the HB, Yahweh is the only God who is jealous and who insists that his people serve him alone (Exod 20:3; Deut 4:24). Other gods are often described in the plural (Deut 4:28; Deut 6:14; Isa 42:17),

¹⁶ Stiebert, *Construction*, 23, 84, 87–89, notes that the HB often portrays human wealth and status as negative.

¹⁷ Seebass, “בושׁ,” *TDOT* 2:52–55, also stresses the role of pride, false trust in other nations, and false self-confidence in turning Israel away from Yahweh so that Yahweh does not help Israel but allows their status to be lowered.

without any indication that people believe that these gods are upset by being one among many. The book of Ezekiel refers to them as idols rather than gods, but they are still described in the plural (Ezek 8:10). And it does not appear that people are concerned about offending one of the gods by worshipping others (Ezek 8:10–16).

The assertion that gods other than Yahweh were thought to accept polytheism receives substantial support from those who study ANE documents. According to Walton, ANE gods are not jealous of other gods as long as their needs are being met.¹⁸ The perceived lack of jealousy among ANE gods may be illustrated by the beginning of the first prayer of the *Plague Prayers of Muršili II*: “O [all of] you [male deities], all female deities, [all] male deities [of the oath]...O gods, my lords.”¹⁹ Muršili II’s willingness to address all of these gods at one time implies that he does not believe that such appeals will create jealousy. That is to say that he does not seem to think that one of these gods will be angry with him for appealing to the others.

The HB also presents Yahweh as having high standards for the behavior of his people, while it seems that other gods do not stress ethical behavior from their followers. According to Deut 4:6–8, people from other nations will be impressed by the righteous statutes that Yahweh has given to Israel. This implies that Yahweh’s statutes are better than those of the nations. But the Israelites are not cherishing Yahweh’s statutes in the book of Ezekiel. Rather than walking in Yahweh’s statutes, the Israelites are following the ordinances of the nations around them (Ezek 11:12). Although the text does not elaborate on the differences between Yahweh’s statutes and the ordinances of the nations, Ezek 23:37 states that the Israelites offered their children as food

¹⁸ Walton, *Ancient*, 112, 136–37, 143, 161.

¹⁹ “Plague Prayers of Muršili II,” translated by Gary Beckman (*COS* 1.60: 156).

for their idols. This practice is linked to the behavior of the nations in 2 Kgs 16:3. According to the book of Ezekiel, the Israelites have not walked in Yahweh's statutes (Ezek 11:12).

The accusation that ANE gods showed little concern for the lifestyle or ethics of their followers is reinforced to some degree by Walton.²⁰ He argues that although many ANE gods were thought of as playing a role in justice, it was difficult to know everything that might cause a god to punish a person.²¹ The ANE gods were often viewed as unpredictable. With this in mind, Bottéro notes also that people often received the punishment first and then tried to discover what they had done to offend the god.²² This situation led the followers to be concerned about pleasing the god in a particular set of circumstances rather than focusing on general ethical behavior. The resulting uncertainty is expressed in the Sumerian poem, *A Man and His God*. The pious sufferer says, "My god, ...after you will have let my eyes recognize my sins, I shall recount at the city (?) gate."²³ The translator, Jacob Klein, concludes that the man who is uttering this prayer is unaware of his sin.²⁴ The suppliant is ready to confess his offense, but he does not know what it is.²⁵ Bottéro states that the exorcistic liturgy called *Shurpu* also demonstrates uncertainty. He says that, "in order to cover everything that might have been omitted, the catalogue ended with the generalizing rubric 'or any other sin, whatever it may be.'"²⁶

²⁰ Walton, *Ancient*, 112, 136–37, 143, 161.

²¹ Walton, *Ancient*, 106–9.

²² Jean Bottéro, "How Sin Was Born," in *Everyday Life in Ancient Mesopotamia* (ed. Jean Bottéro; trans. Antonia Nevill; Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 251–53.

²³ "Man and His God," translated by Jacob Klein (*COS* 1.179: 574).

²⁴ "Man and His God," translated by Jacob Klein (*COS* 1.179: 573).

²⁵ Bottéro, "Sin," 255, recognizes the followers of Yahweh as distinctive from the followers of other ANE gods because they are personally committed to serving only Yahweh as God and because they engage in the specific ethical behavior he commands.

²⁶ Bottéro, "Sin," 252.

Misunderstandings Caused by Different Views of Status. The differences between the divine view of status and the human view make misunderstandings inevitable. Humans tend to think that it is good to have relationships with multiple gods in order to have many resources for achieving wealth and power. The Israelites appear to be developing such relationships as they engage in idolatry in Ezek 8:5–17. Although these efforts to seek help from gods other than Yahweh would likely seem logical to the surrounding nations, Yahweh condemns such an approach to seeking help in raising their status. He does this because he has established an exclusive relationship with Israel and expects the Israelites to trust in him alone.

The disagreement between the divine view and the human view of honor may also lead people to hold Yahweh in low esteem. In cases where Yahweh does not manifest his power and wealth quickly, people may conclude that he does not deserve honor and may look to other sources for power and wealth. For example, the nations conclude that Yahweh is weak because his people left his land (Ezek 36:20). The Israelites also seem to conclude that Yahweh is weak or indifferent. For example, the comment that Yahweh abandoned the land (Ezek 8:12) is used by some Israelites as justification for idolatry. In short, when people judge Yahweh by the human worldview, they are likely to find him wanting. The following table seeks to summarize some of the major ways in which Yahweh's view stands in distinction and conflict with the human view. These differences revolve around Yahweh's desire that people trust in him and walk in his statutes.

Table 1. Competing Shame

| Yahweh’s View | Human-Focused View |
|--|--|
| Weakness is Shameful Before People (Ezek 5:15) ²⁷ | Weakness is Shameful Before People (Ezek 34:29) ²⁸ |
| Trusting True God When He is not Visibly Active is Honorable (Psa 91:15) ²⁹ | Trusting Inactive God is Shameful (Psa 42:4; 74:10–11) |
| Failing to Walk in Yahweh’s Statutes is Shameful (Ezek 11:12; 36:32) | Power is More Important than Yahweh’s Statutes (Ezek 31:10–11) ³⁰ |
| Power is Honorable Before People (Psa 33:16–20; Psa 113:4) ³¹ | Power is Honorable Before People (2 Kgs 14:10) |

Summary. In summary, the HB presents a situation where Yahweh’s view of status is different from the view of any humans who are not trusting in him and walking in his statutes. In Yahweh’s view, he has all honor and bestows power and wealth upon human beings as he sees fit. He does not attribute honor to people based on their power and wealth, however, but rather focuses on their relationship with him. Those who recognize their low status before Yahweh, trust in him, and walk in his statutes have high status before Yahweh. On the other hand, Yahweh attributes low status to those who are prideful and refuse to trust in him and walk in his

²⁷ Yahweh recognizes that weakness causes shame before people. Therefore, he punishes Israel by allowing the Israelites to be defeated and thus showing their shameful weakness to the nations. When the Israelites acknowledge their weakness and trust in Yahweh, however, Yahweh treats their trust as honorable. Even though the Israelites are still weak in the eyes of the nations, Yahweh holds them in high esteem because they trust him.

²⁸ This observation does not exclude a positive role for humility. Both the HB and certain ANE writings portray humility in a good light. For example, Psa 18:28 notes that Yahweh saves a humble people. “The Instruction of Amenemope,” translated by Miriam Lichtheim (*COS* 1.47: 115–22), serves as an ANE example that considers humility a positive characteristic. At the time, people tend to think less of human beings and gods who lack wealth and power (Ezek 36:20; Isa 36:18–20).

²⁹ There is substantial overlap between Yahweh’s view and the view of the nations in regard to the role of weakness and power in human status. However, Yahweh’s criteria for evaluating people stands in stark contrast to those of the nations when he attributes high status to people who trust in him and walk in his statutes.

³⁰ The cedar that was Assyria became proud because of its greatness. Assyria was more concerned with power and honor than with Yahweh. That Assyria did not follow Yahweh’s statutes is expressed by the fact that it will be dealt with according to its injustice (Ezek 31:11).

³¹ Yahweh appears to accept the human habit of attributing high status to those people who have power. He also seems to be willing to show his power at times to prove that he deserves honor. However, Yahweh intends to show the nations that he possesses all power and distributes power as he wishes. He also wants to teach the nations that it is honorable to trust in him and to walk in his statutes.

ways. In the case of Israel, the sin of the Israelites leads Yahweh to punish them and thus to lower their status before the nations.

According to the human view of status, power and wealth result in honor for people. Those who hold this view see gods as a way of achieving and maintaining power and wealth and evaluate gods based upon their perceived success in these areas. An awareness of these different understandings of status will bring needed clarity to Ezek 36:16–32 and will explain why Yahweh, Israel, and the nations relate to each other the way that they do in this passage. Specifically, the contrast between Yahweh’s view of status and the human view explicates the decision of the nations to hold Yahweh in low esteem when his people leave his land. The Israelites are of course Yahweh’s people because of the covenant between them. This leads to a consideration of the role of the covenant in assigning status.

The Status Implications of the Covenant

It is now possible to investigate the role of Yahweh’s view of status and that of the nations in light of Israel’s covenant relationship with Yahweh. Yahweh describes this formal relationship in his covenants with Noah, Abraham, Moses, and David.³² However, the Mosaic covenant will receive the most attention in the following study because of its implications for status. The Mosaic covenant includes a description of what Yahweh expects of Israel as his covenant partner. Because this covenant expects something from Israel it can be and is violated by Israel. It is this violation of the Sinaitic covenant that is most germane to the present discussion. The

³² For more information concerning Yahweh’s covenant relationship with Israel see Delbert R. Hillers, *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982). Most important for the present study is Hillers’ distinction between covenants that do not include obligations for Israel and the covenant that does. Hillers asserts that Yahweh’s covenants with Noah, Abraham, and David are all based on promises from God, without any obligations for the Israelites. On the other hand, Hillers argues that the Mosaic Covenant does include obligations for the Israelites and is closely related to Hittite suzerainty treaties.

analysis in this section will use passages from the HB to investigate how the covenant affects the status of both Yahweh and Israel. It will consider shame and honor within the covenant relationship and with those outside of the covenant.

Yahweh uses the Sinaitic covenant to define his relationship with Israel, as he presents himself as Israel's father (Deut 32:6). The foundation of the covenant is Yahweh's grace and faithfulness. Yahweh forms a people for himself, distinct from the nations, and saves them. At the same time, the Sinaitic covenant does include obligations for the Israelites. Yahweh explains what he expects from Israel and also what Israel may expect from him in Deut 4:1–31 and Deut 29:1–31:29. Yahweh specifically mentions his requirement that Israel avoid idolatry (Deut 4:16–19) and that Israel behave according to his statutes (Deut 4:1). In Deut 30:16, Moses stresses the importance of walking in Yahweh's ways (לְלַכֵּת בְּדַרְכָיו) so that Israel may live.³³ In this way, the covenant formally obligates Israel to live according to the divine view of honor and shame by insisting that Israel trust Yahweh and walk in his statutes.³⁴

Deuteronomy 26:19 describes Israel's status when the covenant relationship is going well. In this verse, Yahweh announces his initial plan to make Israel, "high over all the nations which he made" (עָלִיּוֹן עַל כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה). He also mentions the renown he plans to give to Israel (וְלִשְׁמָם).³⁵ In an ideal situation, Yahweh increases the status of Israel before the nations and thus increases his own status as the nations see him. For example, Gen 22:17–18 highlights the military might that Yahweh will give to Abraham by saying that Abraham's seed will possess the

³³ See also Deut 26:18.

³⁴ That Yahweh requires Israel to obey him does not mean that the Israelites save themselves by doing this or that the Israelites are able to annul the covenant relationship with Yahweh by their disobedience.

³⁵ C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *The Pentateuch* (vol. 1 of *Commentary on the Old Testament*; 10 vols.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001), 958, conclude that Deut 26:19 means that Yahweh will make Israel, "an object of praise, and renown, and glorification of God...among all nations." They will have renown among the nations because the nations will think highly of them.

gate of his enemies. Deuteronomy 4:6–8 develops this thought, as Yahweh describes Israel’s future greatness. According to Deut 4:6, the peoples will say that Israel is a great nation. Deuteronomy 4:7–8 implies that there is no greater nation. As the passage explains Israel’s greatness, verse 7 stresses Yahweh’s nearness when the Israelites call upon him. This means that Yahweh will be present to help Israel when they need his help. In v. 6, however, the Israelites are exhorted to keep Yahweh’s statutes. Yahweh’s statutes lead the nations to the conclusion that Israel is wise. With these verses, Yahweh demonstrates his desire for the nations to recognize his power and wealth but also his intimate relationship with Israel and his righteous ordinances. If the covenant is functioning as planned, the Israelites are trusting Yahweh and walking in his statutes.

Under these circumstances, Israelite society applies pressure on its members to live according to the covenant. For example, as part of the Sinaitic Covenant Yahweh, commands the Israelites to honor their parents (Exod 20:12). In Deut 21:18–21, Yahweh instructs all of the Israelite men to take part in the stoning of a rebellious son who violates this command.³⁶ In this way, the society pressures its members to walk in Yahweh’s statutes by honoring their parents. Because of faithfulness to the covenant, the Israelites have high status in their relationship with Yahweh while holding Yahweh in the highest esteem. However, when Israel has high status in their relationship with Yahweh, Yahweh often gives them high status in the eyes of others (Deut 4:6; 26:19). This demonstrates that Yahweh is willing for his people to have high status before the nations.

³⁶ The community is also involved in stoning idolaters (Deut 17:2–5). According to Deut 17:2, these idolaters are transgressing the covenant. See also Exod 32:25–28, where the Levites represent the faithful portion of Israelite society by killing idolaters.

As Olyan has argued, however, shame discourse may signify that there is a problem with the covenant relationship.³⁷ Isaiah 65:7 says that Israel has engaged in idolatry, a violation of the covenant. Under these circumstances, Yahweh says that Israel, “insulted me on the hills” (וְעַל-הַגְּבוּעוֹת חָרְפוּנִי). In this example of the challenge function of shame discourse, Yahweh takes Israel’s idolatrous violation of the covenant as a personal insult that lowers his status. He announces his resolution to the problem in the previous verse when he says, “I will repay them in their bosom” (וְשָׁלַמְתִּי עַל-חֵיקָם). When Israel disobeys Yahweh by violating the covenant, they challenge him. In this way, the Israelites and other nations may conclude that the Israelites have lowered Yahweh’s status because he has not responded to the challenge. Such a view holds Yahweh in low esteem until he vindicates himself by punishing the Israelites.³⁸

Ultimately, Yahweh does punish Israel. But rather than destroying Israel or abandoning the Israelites definitively, he expects reconciliation. When Yahweh made the covenant with Israel, he knew that the Israelites would turn to other gods and serve them, as he says in Deut 31:20 (וַיִּפְנֶה אֶל-אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וַעֲבָדוּם). In this way, they would break his covenant (וַיִּהְפֹּךְ אֶת-בְּרִיתִי). Yahweh said that if the Israelites engaged in idolatry, they would perish. They would not prolong their days on the land (לֹא-תֵאָרִיכוּ יָמִים עַל-הָאָדָמָה, Deut 30:18). In Deut 4:27, Moses says that Yahweh will scatter Israel among the peoples (וַיִּהְפִּיץ יְהוָה אֶתְכֶם בְּעַמִּים) if they violate the covenant. But Yahweh will restore them and gather them from the

³⁷ Olyan, “Honor,” 217–18. See also Stiebert, *Construction*, 90, 108.

³⁸ The same situation occurs in strictly human covenants. When one party of a human covenant breaks the covenant, the other party must act to protect his honor. This is illustrated by 2 Kgs 17:3–6, where Shalmaneser punishes Hoshea’s conspiracy. Hoshea’s communication with Egypt and his failure to pay tribute violate the relationship. Such betrayal threatens Shalmaneser with low status, but he defends his honor with a show of force that shames the people, sends them into exile, and effectively destroys the Northern Kingdom. See Hobbs, “Reflections,” 501–3. Hoshea’s disobedience threatens Shalmaneser with low status until Shalmaneser vindicates himself by punishing Israel. See also 2 Sam 10:3–14 where shaming emissaries is an act of war. This action shames David until he fights back. Although this passage does not employ primary shame lexemes, it does serve as an example of how a challenge functions socially.

peoples (וְקִבְצָהּ מִכָּל־הָעַמִּים), Deut 30:3). He will have compassion on them because of his faithfulness. When Yahweh corrects Israel, this punishment brings shame to the Israelites. Jeremiah 9:18 illustrates this fact, as it says that the Israelites are shamed because they left the land. Jeremiah 44:8 states that Israelite idolaters will become a reproach among all the nations of the earth. (וּלְחִרְפָּה בְּכָל־גּוֹיֵי הָאָרֶץ). In these verses, Yahweh reacts to a violation of the covenant and the resulting threat to his honor by shaming the Israelites.

As Yahweh defends his honor against Israel, however, he must consider the issue raised by Moses in Num 14:12–16. When Yahweh wants to destroy Israel in v. 12, Moses draws attention to Yahweh’s reputation before the nations. He says that if Yahweh destroys Israel, “The Egyptians will hear, for you brought this people up with your power from their³⁹ midst” (וְשָׁמְעוּ מִצְרַיִם כִּי־הֵעֵלִיתָ בְּכֹחְךָ אֶת־הָעָם הַזֶּה מִמִּדְבָּרוֹ, v. 13). Moses is highlighting the positive effect that the Exodus had on Yahweh’s reputation. But if Yahweh destroys Israel, the Egyptians will hear of it and will tell others (וְאָמְרוּ אֶל־יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת), v. 14). Moses warns that the nations will come to this wrong conclusion: “Because Yahweh was not able to cause this people to enter into the land which he swore to them, he slaughtered them in the wilderness” (מִבְּלֹתֵי, v. 16). (וַיִּכְלֹת יְהוָה לְהַבְיֵא אֶת־הָעָם הַזֶּה אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר־נִשְׁבַּע לָהֶם וַיִּשְׁחַטֵּם בַּמִּדְבָּר, v. 16).

Yahweh responds to Moses’ argument by saying that he will not destroy Israel (Num 14:20), but he will punish the rebels. He makes an oath on his honor to stress the importance of having a positive reputation in the world: “But indeed, as I live, the honor of Yahweh will fill⁴⁰

³⁹ Literally, “his.”

⁴⁰ The context argues persuasively for a qal here. For כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה as the subject of the verb, see Baruch Levine, *Numbers 1–20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 4A; ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 360, 367. See also Jacob Milgrom, *Numbers: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (The JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990), 112. The reference to Yahweh’s honor may also be taken as circumstantial, “as the honor of Yahweh fills all the earth.” However, such a translation still stresses the importance of Yahweh’s reputation.

all the earth” (וְאֵלֶם חִי-אֲנִי וַיִּמְלֵא כְבוֹד-יְהוָה אֶת-כָּל-הָאָרֶץ, v. 21). He also says that he will punish those who have tested him (v. 22) so that those who spurned⁴¹ him will not see the Promised Land (וְכָל-מְנַאֲצֵי לֹא יֵרְאוּהָ, v. 23).⁴²

These passages demonstrate that the issue of status becomes complicated when Israel violates the covenant. If Yahweh does not punish the Israelites when they challenge him, his status remains low in relation to Israel and to some extent to the nations. This is so because Yahweh has not answered the challenge and because Israel is living in a manner contrary to his statutes. When Yahweh punishes Israel, he lowers their status in relation to the nations. But lowering Israel’s status before the nations also lowers Yahweh’s status in the eyes of the nations. The nations may believe wrongly that Israel lost power and wealth because Yahweh is weak. For example, Psa 74:10–11 expresses frustration that Yahweh does not act but instead allows the adversary to reproach and to mistreat his name.

To conclude this discussion on the status implications of the covenant, both Yahweh and Israel are in danger of having low status when the partnership between them is strained. When Israel violates the covenant through lack of faith in Yahweh, Yahweh may punish Israel in a way that gives them low status before the nations. However, the nations are likely to assign low status to Yahweh under these circumstances because he does not meet their expectations of a powerful god. With this in mind, it is logical for Yahweh to seek to be reconciled to the Israelites in Ezek 36:16–32 in order to raise his own status in the eyes of the nations.

⁴¹ Although נָאֵץ is not a primary shame lexeme, it obviously describes Israel’s disrespect for Yahweh.

⁴² See also Exod 32:33–35.

The Failed Covenant and Blame

In her special study of shame in Ezek 16:59–63, Odell argues persuasively that Yahweh and Israel blame each other for the failure of their partnership.⁴³ She highlights Yahweh's statement in Ezek 16:63 that Israel will never again open her mouth and concludes that Israel has opened her mouth recently to blame Yahweh for her predicament. This assertion fits well with the thought progression of Ezekiel 16. In this chapter, Yahweh appears to be defending himself from an accusation. As Odell notes, Yahweh refers to his many gifts to Israel and Israel's resulting renown among the nations (Ezek 16:14).⁴⁴ But Israel trusted in "her own beauty, her idols, and in her unreliable alliances with Egypt, Assyria, and Babylonia" rather than trusting in Yahweh.⁴⁵ The chapter is designed to stress Israel's unfaithfulness to Yahweh and Yahweh's faithfulness to Israel. Yahweh is proving that he is not to blame for Israel's painful situation. The Israelites are the ones who have been unfaithful and who brought judgment upon themselves.

Odell's argument receives support from the accusation of the Israelites that Yahweh's conduct is not right (Ezek 18:25, 33:17). The Israelites are accusing Yahweh of punishing them even though the circumstances do not warrant such punishment. This means that the Israelites believe that Yahweh is not being faithful to them and to his covenant with them. They blame Yahweh for the failure of the partnership with him. Such accusations seem misplaced since Yahweh has made a strong case that Israel has persisted in unbelief and idolatry (Ezek 8:5–17). However, Ezek 11:12 may bring added understanding to this situation. In Ezek 11:12, Yahweh states that the Israelites are following the ordinances of the nations around them rather than

⁴³ Odell, "Inversion," 102–5, 111. Also, according to Olyan, "Honor," 217–18, the culture of the ANE is concerned to assign blame when one partner is unfaithful to another. The dominant partner will normally try to destroy the weaker partner when that partner has been unfaithful. See also, Hobbs, "Reflections," 501–3.

⁴⁴ Odell, "Inversion," 105–6, 108.

⁴⁵ Odell, "Inversion," 108.

walking in Yahweh's statutes. The Israelites may be blaming Yahweh because they are judging him by the human view of honor and shame. They may be measuring him by comparing him to the human expectation of gods and expecting him to provide honor in human terms, as the nations do (Ezek 36:20). Meanwhile, Yahweh appears to be judging Israel based on his view of shame and honor. Therefore, he argues that the Israelites are to blame because they did not trust him or walk in his statutes. They violated the covenant, and he punished them as he had said that he would do (Deut 4:27).

Yahweh's description of Israel's behavior in Ezek 36:16–21 is consistent with the desire to place blame on Israel. It also possible that the good news in vv. 22–30 serves to defend Yahweh from Israel's accusations of blame and that this concern plays a role in the placement of the good news from Yahweh before the command to acknowledge shame.

Honorable Shame

The issue of blame between Yahweh and Israel may reflect the counter-cultural nature of the divine view of honor and shame. As discussed earlier in this chapter, Stiebert and Pedersen argue that Yahweh appears to see human status and wealth in a negative light and to judge people who would be considered honorable by other humans. In this sense, the divine view of honor and shame is counter-cultural.⁴⁶ However, the Israelites appear to be willing to do what Yahweh finds shameful in order to seek honor on their own terms (Ezek 8:5–17) rather than seeking honor on Yahweh's terms.

In the Sinaitic Covenant, Yahweh makes it clear how he wants his people Israel to behave. He wants his people to trust in him and thus to reject idolatry (Deut 4:16–19). He also desires

⁴⁶ Stiebert, *Construction*, 90, 108. See also Pedersen, *Israel*, 214–19, 224–25, 234–37, 244.

that they walk in his statutes (Deut 4:1).⁴⁷ Under these circumstances, it is likely that the Israelites will have honor in Yahweh's eyes and in the eyes of the nations because of Yahweh's blessings (Deut 4:6, 26:19). However, in the book of Ezekiel, the Israelites are willing to shame themselves before Yahweh by engaging in idolatry (Ezek 8:5–17) in order to seek help with their situation and thus their status before others. The Israelites appear to be willing to do what is shameful before Yahweh, as they seek honor in human terms. In contrast, Yahweh demands that the Israelites seek honor on his terms. This situation may play a role in explaining the placement of the command to be ashamed after good news.

The phenomenon where an entity is shamed before one observer but honored by another might be called honorable shame. This seemingly contradictory term reflects the fact that different definitions of honor and shame are at work. What is shameful in the view of some may be honorable before others, and vice versa. Under these circumstances, honorable shame refers to a situation where it is appropriate to say that an entity is shamed and honored at the same time. The didactic function of shame discourse deals with honorable shame in Ezek 36:16–32. In instances of honorable shame, people may find themselves evaluated by different sets of peers using different standards of evaluation. The conflict between Yahweh's view and the human view creates the possibility of honorable shame.

In order to understand the phenomenon of honorable shame fully, it is necessary to consider how it manifests itself in the HB. Honorable shame may create a paradox where an entity is honored in one sense but shamed in another sense. It may also be applicable because there are different observers who are using contrasting criteria to evaluate the entity. The most

⁴⁷ This is not to say that the Israelites save themselves by obedience to the Sinaitic covenant. As R. Reed Lessing, *Jonah* (Concordia Commentary; Saint Louis: Concordia, 2007), 155–57, explains, Yahweh's relationship with Israel is one of unconditional grace. Yahweh remains faithful to the covenant even when Israel is not, as will be demonstrated.

important issue for this dissertation, however, is the fact that Yahweh's view of status creates the possibility of shame that leads to a positive result.⁴⁸

The clash between the human view of status and Yahweh's view results in paradox. For example, a king who has low status in Yahweh's eyes because of his pride (Ezek 31:10) may have high status in the eyes of the nations because of great wealth and power. For this reason, he may ultimately find himself in a state of low status as Yahweh punishes him (Ezek 31:3–11). In the book of Ezekiel, the Israelites are more concerned with gaining honor through power and wealth according to the human view than they are with gaining honor in Yahweh's eyes through trust and good conduct. For example, Israel seeks help from Egypt rather than trusting in Yahweh (Ezek 17:15). In such situations, therefore, it is possible for shame before Yahweh to be honorable according to the human view. That is, if Israel seeks help from Egypt, and Egypt helps Israel to achieve military victory, human beings hold Israel in high esteem. However, regardless of Israel's good reputation among the nations, Yahweh still holds the Israelites in low esteem because they did not trust in him.

It is also possible for honorable shame to apply to people because of different observers. In this case, the same person or group may be in a state of high status in one relationship and a state of low status in another relationship. This can happen because the person is faithful to Yahweh and thus has high status in Yahweh's eyes while enduring low status in the eyes of another peer. Whenever a person suffers low status because of an appropriate relationship with Yahweh, Yahweh sees that shame (low status before people) as honorable (high status before Yahweh). Examples from Isaiah and the Psalms illustrate clearly the same phenomenon that is more subtle

⁴⁸ The use of the words *honorable shame* reflects Yahweh's view of honor and shame where an appropriate relationship with him is the key to honor even if shame plays a role in that appropriate relationship. The book of Ezekiel presents honor as an essential description of Yahweh's being as it refers to the **כְבוֹד** or honor of Yahweh and, therefore, presents an appropriate relationship with Yahweh as being an honorable situation.

in Ezekiel. For example, in Isa 50:5–7, Yahweh’s Servant does not hide his face from disgraces (לֹא נִכְלַמְתִּי, v. 6) but also declares that he has not been disgraced (לֹא הִסְתַּרְתִּי מִכְלָמוֹתַי, v. 7). While those who abused him would certainly say that he was disgraced, Yahweh would not agree because the Servant was obedient to him. This characteristic of shame is reinforced by Psa 69:8, where the psalmist says that he has borne reproach on account of Yahweh.

Although this situation is specifically mentioned in connection with shame lexemes only nine times,⁴⁹ it is often present in the broader context of the challenge function of shame discourse. This function may deal with an innocent victim who has high status in relation to Yahweh because of trust in Yahweh but has low status among peers because of an unanswered challenge. When Israel acknowledges low status after sinning against Yahweh and being punished by him, there is a shift toward this situation. Israel is still in a state of low status before the nations, but Yahweh moves to raise Israel’s status in the eyes of the nations. For example, after Ephraim acknowledges low status, Yahweh raises Ephraim’s status among the nations (Jer 33:9; Zeph 3:13).

The presence of honorable shame in the HB means that it possible to have a positive result of shame as Yahweh views the situation. The highest concern in the typical human view of status is maintaining and increasing honor. Therefore, it is impossible for shame (low status) to be truly honorable in the human view.⁵⁰ Low status is undesirable and may even be dangerous. However, Yahweh’s concern that his followers trust him and treat others well makes it possible for shame (low status) to lead to a positive result.

⁴⁹ 1 Sam 20:30; Isa 50:6–7 (4); Jer 6:10; Ezek 36:32 (2); Hos 4:7.

⁵⁰ The only time that the human view of status sees shame in a positive light is in the rare cases when shame refers to propriety—acting in a way that will not bring about low status.

Didactic shame is honorable shame because it lowers the status of the person involved in one way while raising it in another way. From the point of view of the Israelites, they stop trying to claim higher status than is appropriate and admit that they have low status in relation to Yahweh. This action repairs the social order and demonstrates that learning has taken place. As a result, Yahweh holds them in higher esteem and often raises their status before the nations. When the Israelites violate their relationship with Yahweh, it is honorable before Yahweh to acknowledge their low status.

To summarize, the phenomenon of honorable shame refers to any situation where Yahweh sees an entity as shamed or honored, while the human view comes to the opposite conclusion. Under these circumstances, Yahweh expects his followers to seek honor before him even if they must endure shame before other people. Didactic shame is a variation on honorable shame because it requires the Israelites to admit low status in their relationship with Yahweh, but it also allows reconciliation with Yahweh, with the result that he holds them in higher esteem.⁵¹ Understood in this positive way, it seems logical that didactic shame would be a part of a message of good news.

Basic Patterns of the Role of Shame Discourse in the Relationship between Yahweh and Israel

The studies of the social use of shame, the rhetorical functions of shame discourse, and the social world surrounding shame now make it possible to recognize patterns in the way that Yahweh uses shame discourse in his relationship with Israel, his covenant partner. Yahweh's view of status and honorable shame play significant roles, as Yahweh reacts to the disobedience

⁵¹ Didactic shame is unique because Yahweh himself considers Israel to be shamed and honored at the same time but in two different senses. Didactic shame fits this dissertation's description of honorable shame because Yahweh sees the acknowledgment of low status as honorable while the nations see such an admission as shameful.

and to the faithfulness of his covenant people. The patterns that Yahweh employs when using dishonor language with his people help to explain why the command to be ashamed comes after positive promises.

Laniak has argued for two general socio-literary patterns in the HB and has noted that both relate to status. He identifies these patterns as socio-literary because they appear in both the social relationship between Yahweh and Israel and in the literature of the HB in much the same way that the theme of shame reflects social relationships by means of a literary medium in Ezek 36:16–32. The first model of the two, what may be called the sin and reconciliation pattern, begins with Israel or individuals having the favor of Yahweh and the community. Then sin causes Yahweh to abandon Israel or the individuals so that they suffer some loss. In the case of Israel, their punishment is exile. After reconciliation with Yahweh, Israel or the individuals return to their initial state of favor before Yahweh and others.⁵² This model may be summarized in six steps: (1) favor, (2) sin, (3) abandonment, (4) loss, (5) reconciliation, and (6) return to favor.⁵³

Specific appearances of shame lexemes play several roles in this pattern, reflecting the functions of shame discourse. While the initial state is one where Israel or individuals have high status among peers, sin results in low status among peers because Yahweh punishes the sinners. The punishment puts the sinners in a state where the hierarchical function of shame discourse is at work, as others recognize the low status of the Israelites. For example, Ezra 9:7 establishes sin

⁵² Laniak, *Shame*, 7–8, 16. The sin and reconciliation pattern resembles the way that Yahweh uses law and Gospel in his interaction with Israel. However, the sin and reconciliation pattern specifically employs shame discourse.

⁵³ Although Laniak, *Shame*, 8, does not specifically identify the six steps, his visual representation does include five of them. He treats abandonment and loss together. However, it seems appropriate to distinguish between abandonment and loss in the present study because Yahweh's honor leaves the temple and thus shows that Yahweh has abandoned Israel. All six steps will be used to organize the model in this dissertation.

against Yahweh as the explicit cause of Yahweh's punishment which results in low status before the nations. Yahweh punishes sinners so that they will learn and seek reconciliation with him. The sinners may show that they have learned and seek reconciliation by acknowledging shame before Yahweh. This is the didactic function of shame discourse. It is also honorable shame because Yahweh raises the status of the Israelites in his eyes when they acknowledge shame before him. Although Laniak refers to reconciliation that causes a return to the former state of favor, this does not preclude a change in identity on the part of those who have acknowledged shame before Yahweh. Although some explanation is necessary, the sin and reconciliation pattern is the primary pattern that is at work in Ezekiel when Yahweh allows Jerusalem to fall and orders Israel to acknowledge shame.

Laniak's second pattern often uses the challenge function of shame discourse and may be called the challenge pattern. It deals with a victim of mistreatment who is in a good relationship with Yahweh and is essentially innocent. It appears that Yahweh has abandoned this victim and allowed the mistreatment to take place. However, Yahweh's intervention at a given time demonstrates that he has not abandoned the victim, as he reverses the situation and gives the victim a new, higher status.⁵⁴ When the challenge function of shame discourse is used with this model, the mistreatment lowers the victim's status and implies a lowering of Yahweh's status because the victim trusts in Yahweh. In reality, however, Yahweh has allowed the victim to be mistreated. When Yahweh reverses the situation, he lowers the status of the entity that has mistreated his follower. He also raises the status of the person who has trusted in him, thus raising his own status in the eyes of the observers.

⁵⁴ Laniak, *Shame*, 8–10. Laniak notes that there are instances in the HB that follow the general patterns without following every detail of those patterns.

David's life provides an example of the challenge pattern. David was the youngest of eight sons and did not come from a wealthy family (1 Sam 18:23). When Goliath mocked the army of Israel and lowered Israel's status,⁵⁵ David was not a natural choice to overcome the nation's shame. His own brother looked down on him (1 Sam 17:28) as did the king (1 Sam 17:33) and Goliath (1 Sam 17:42–44). Furthermore, he was not capable of using normal fighting implements (1 Sam 17:39). David had low status among the Israelites when the Israelites were relegated to low status in comparison to the Philistines. But David put his trust in Yahweh (1 Sam 17:45–47) and removed Israel's disgrace (1 Sam 17:26) by killing Goliath (1 Sam 17:50). In this way, Yahweh lowered Goliath's status and that of the Philistines while raising David's status and the status of the Israelites.⁵⁶

The HB includes a number of other general and specific examples that illustrate the challenge pattern. In the book of Esther, Mordecai's status is lowered only to be raised again. Psalm 22:6 uses shame discourse as it compares the psalmist's low status to that of a worm. At the same time, the psalmist recognizes that those who put their trust in Yahweh have not been put to shame (Psa 22:5). Psalm 22:25 acknowledges that Yahweh has come to the psalmist's aid. Other passages speak more clearly about the desire for a reversal. For example, Psa 70:30 asks Yahweh to shame those who seek the psalmist's life. Zephaniah 2:8–9 describes the reversal that takes place when Yahweh reacts to the taunt of Moab (הָרַפְתָּ מוֹאָב) by promising that Moab will be like Sodom and that Israel will possess Moab. In these cases, shame lexemes are used by people who trust in Yahweh as they express their confidence that Yahweh will ultimately protect them from shame.

⁵⁵ The text uses shame lexemes in 1 Sam 17:10, 25, 26, 36, and 45.

⁵⁶ Laniak, *Shame*, 10–15.

The sin and reconciliation pattern and the challenge pattern both serve Yahweh's goal of holding to his view of shame and honor and of leading Israel to do the same. As Yahweh asserts his view of status, he uses the covenant to clarify Israel's obligations and to press Israel to follow his values. Whether Israel is obeying the covenant or breaking the covenant, however, Yahweh calls the Israelites to practice honorable shame. The sin and reconciliation pattern demands that the Israelites acknowledge shame before Yahweh and thus affirm his values. The challenge pattern requires them to trust Yahweh and to cling faithfully to his view even when others count them as shamed.

In summary, the analysis in chapters 2 and 3 comes together to explain Yahweh's two basic patterns for dealing with his people, Israel: the sin and reconciliation pattern, and the challenge pattern. Both patterns require Israel to maintain Yahweh's values by following the covenant even if such action results in shame before others. At the same time, it is the sin and reconciliation pattern that applies most clearly to Ezek 36:16–32. In fact, this pattern may play a role in explaining why the command to be ashamed comes at the end of the passage. When Ezek 36:22–30 speaks of Israel's restoration to the initial state of favor before Yahweh, it is describing the situation that is normally the last step in the sin and reconciliation pattern. The part that appears to be missing is the actual reconciliation with Yahweh—the event that reconciles Israel to Yahweh. That reconciliation event finally takes place in Ezek 36:32.

A Sociological Study of the Logical Material of Ezek 36:16–32

The status implications of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel, the concept of honorable shame, and the sin and reconciliation pattern may now be applied fully to an analysis of Ezek 36:16–32. This study will explain why reconciliation with Israel is important for Yahweh's status and why the command to be ashamed follows positive promises.

Yahweh's values hold the key to understanding Israel's role in Ezek 36:16–32 and the order of promised blessings before shame. These values come through in Yahweh's covenant relationship with Israel as he employs shame to accomplish his ends. When Israel violates the covenant, Yahweh lowers Israel's status among the nations and commands Israel to acknowledge shame before him.

The organization and meaning of Ezek 36:16–32 depend upon shame discourse and follow the sin and reconciliation pattern. Yahweh lowers Israel's status among the nations in Ezek 36:16–19 but goes on to promise to raise their status among the nations in the following verses (Ezek 36:24–30). The part that appears to be missing from this pattern, however, is the actual reconciliation event. The reconciliation event is shrouded partly because of Yahweh's overarching concern for his own status in this passage. In Ezek 36:16–32, Yahweh overcomes the profanation of his name while maintaining his unique view of what constitutes high and low status and then brings Israel in line with his view. His challenge is to restore Israel in a way that shows that he does not condone their previous behavior. Yahweh establishes his right to judge the Israelites and demonstrates that they are to blame for the exile. He goes on to prove his faithfulness to the covenant. At the end of the passage, Yahweh uses Israel's acknowledgment of low status in a positive way in regard to his relationship with them, as they demonstrate that they have learned from their punishment.

As the oracle begins, the Israelites have already blamed Yahweh for punishing them in a way that lowers their status. They have said that Yahweh's conduct is not right (**לֹא יִתְּכֵן יְיָדָךְ** (**אֲדֹנָי**, Ezek 33:17). Israel has thus asserted that Yahweh is wrong to judge them for their alliances, idolatry, and failure to walk in his statutes. According to the human understanding of status, such activities should not bring about shame. As Yahweh recounts the history of Israel's sin and exile in vv. 17–20, there is no indication that Israel accepts fault or admits that they have

violated the covenant. In this way, Israel is saying that the exile and the low status that it brought are Yahweh's fault. He should have protected Israel from exile.

Yahweh responds to Israel's accusations by reminding the Israelites of the deeds by which they violated the covenant (Ezek 36:17–19). In the sin and reconciliation pattern, Ezek 36:17–18 describes Israel's sin. Israel has not trusted Yahweh or walked in his statutes. The Israelites have not done what the covenant requires of them or what would give them honor in Yahweh's eyes. On the contrary, they have sought honor in human terms by their behavior and by their attitude toward the land. When Yahweh refers to the land as their ground in Ezek 36:17, it creates a separation between Yahweh and the land. This movement away from the land implies that Israel is focusing on the land rather than being concerned for their relationship with him.⁵⁷

Israel is guilty of gross covenant violation, and even in the human view of status, a king will punish a servant who violates the relationship by betraying him. Israel's betrayal challenges Yahweh and lowers his status until he shames the Israelites. Yahweh shames the Israelites by allowing them to be defeated and thrown into a state of low status. Ironically, Israel's efforts to maintain or increase their status on their own terms by getting help from idols and foreign kings and by mistreating others led Yahweh to punish them with exile. While this state of dishonor likely involved internal feelings related to low status, it is essentially external, hierarchical shame. The people of the nations function as a peer group, and they hold Israel in low esteem because of the exile. They evaluate Israel based on their lack of power and wealth.

While Yahweh has followed the stipulations of the covenant by punishing Israel and has thus responded to Israel's challenge to his honor, this same act has given Yahweh low status in the eyes of the nations. The text specifically links the comment of the nations that the Israelites

⁵⁷ See Ezek 33:24.

left Yahweh's land with the profanation of his holy name in Ezek 36:20. In this same verse, the people from the nations refer to the land as Yahweh's land. Yahweh does not refer to the land as his because he is more concerned with his relationship with Israel and with their behavior than he is with the land.⁵⁸ However, both the Israelites and the nations are concerned with the land and consider it to be Yahweh's land. Yahweh's low status is based on the understanding of the ANE culture but is not deserved. The people from the nations appear to be assuming that Yahweh is like other ANE gods, so they judge him according to the same criteria that they would use for those gods (Ezek 36:20).⁵⁹ Yahweh has not given his people power and wealth. He has not kept his people on his land. Therefore, he must be a weak and insignificant god.⁶⁰ See table 2 below.

⁵⁸ Yahweh dealt with the land in a positive way and independently of his conversation with Israel in Ezek 36:1–15.

⁵⁹ See also Isa 36:18–20. In these verses, the Rabshakeh implies that Yahweh, like other gods in the region, will not be able to deliver Judah from the hand of the king of Assyria. He is assuming that Yahweh will not protect his people and evaluating Yahweh based on the expected defeat of Judah.

⁶⁰ Walton, *Ancient*, 106, notes that ANE gods were understood only in terms of what they did.

Table 2. Cycle of Conflict between Views of Status

| Yahweh's View | The Human-Focused View |
|---|--|
| Israel's Violation of the Covenant is Shameful (Ezek 36:32) | Israel Did Not Violate the Covenant Because They Met Yahweh's Needs for Formal Honor (Ezek 33:17) |
| Israel's Violation of the Covenant Challenges Yahweh (Ezek 6:3-7; 8:5-17) ⁶¹ | Israel is Right to Seek Power and Wealth from Sources Other than Yahweh and to Use Whatever Means Necessary to Get More Power and Wealth (Ezek 8:12) |
| Israel Tries to Shame Yahweh by Challenging Him (Ezek 6:3-7; 8:5-17) | Yahweh is Not Able to Provide all of the Wealth and Power that Israel Wants (Ezek 36:20) |
| Yahweh Judges the Israelites by Sending them into Exile (Ezek 39:23) | Yahweh is a Weak God Who is Not Able to Keep Israel on His Land (Ezek 36:20) |
| The Israelites are at Fault for the Exile Because They Violated the Covenant (Ezek 39:23) | Yahweh is at Fault for the Exile Because He was too Weak or Cruel to Prevent It (Ezek 33:17; 39:23) |

The people from the nations do not deal with the unique nuances of the situation. They do not consider the possibility that Yahweh wants his people to trust him as the one true God and that he is concerned with their behavior. Therefore, they miss the reality that Israel has gone into exile because of their unfaithfulness to the covenant, not because of Yahweh's weakness.⁶²

Furthermore, Yahweh's explanation of the exile does not resolve the misunderstanding definitively. Israelites or people from the nations could hear this explanation and conclude that it is not true. They could conclude that Yahweh is a weak god who blames his people when he is not powerful enough to keep them on his land (Ezek 33:17; 36:20). They could also conclude that the explanation is true and that it is proof of Yahweh's power to punish his people by

⁶¹ Isaiah 65:7 uses a shame lexeme to make the specific point that Israel's idolatry challenges Yahweh. In the book of Ezekiel, Yahweh reacts to Israel's idolatry by planning to punish the Israelites (Ezek 6:3-7). This is the same as his reaction to the challenge of the Israelites in Isa 65:7.

⁶² Yahweh knew that this would happen and mentioned it in Ezek 20:8-9, 13-14, and 21-23. Moses uses a similar argument in Exod 32:9-12 and Num 14:11-16.

sending them into exile when they do follow the covenant (Ezek 39:23).⁶³ Yahweh's explanation creates the opportunity for people to trust him or to doubt him (Ezek 36:17–19).⁶⁴

Israelites who judge Yahweh from the human view of status are likely to conclude that Yahweh is a weak God because giving him formal honor does not consistently result in an increase in power and wealth for them (Ezek 36:20). They are likely to ignore his concern with behavior (Ezek 18:25). They are also likely to feel justified in seeking help from other gods or from other nations because they believe that Yahweh has not given them the help they need (Ezek 8:12). And after all of these misunderstandings, they are likely to ignore their violation of the covenant altogether and to blame Yahweh for not increasing or protecting their wealth and power (Ezek 33:17).

Ultimately, however, Yahweh refuses to protect his own high status among the nations according to their understanding of high status. He does not allow Israel to stay on the land without having an appropriate relationship with him. Instead, he punishes Israel by sending the Israelites into exile and plans to vindicate his high status on his terms.

In the second half of the oracle, Yahweh resolves the problem of his status before the nations and of his relationship with Israel at the same time. He shows that he is a more faithful covenant partner than any human. Under normal circumstances among people, disobedience to a covenant would end that covenant (Ezek 17:16).⁶⁵ However, Yahweh does not follow the human way of managing covenants because he is unconditionally faithful to his covenant with Israel. He

⁶³ That Yahweh spoke through Ezekiel to foretell the fall of Jerusalem and his temple supports Yahweh's explanation of these events (Ezek 24:21).

⁶⁴ Yahweh has stated in Ezek 2:5 that the Israelites may hear or refuse to hear the message he is sending through Ezekiel.

⁶⁵ An example from a strictly human covenant appears in 2 Kgs 17:3–6. In this verse, Shalmaneser treats his covenant with Israel as broken because of Hoshea's conspiracy. Shalmaneser goes on to punish this conspiracy by effectively destroying the Northern Kingdom.

does not abandon the covenant or destroy Israel. Instead, Yahweh uses didactic shame discourse as he disciplines Israel as a father disciplines a child to bring Israel to a proper attitude of respect and a willingness to learn. He is unwilling to destroy his child. Therefore, Yahweh makes use of the situation in a way that fits his purposes.

Yahweh begins to overcome his low status by demonstrating his power and wealth in a way that meets the requirements for honor in the human view of status. In Ezek 36:23–24, Yahweh shows his power by bringing his people back from exile. He also proves his wealth by providing Israel with ample produce (Ezek 36:29–30). Under these circumstances, neither Yahweh nor Israel will have low status before the nations. Yahweh mentions the nations at the same time that he mentions power (Ezek 36:24) and wealth (Ezek 36:30) because he recognizes that the nations measure ANE gods by their ability to provide power and wealth.

However, Yahweh will do more to overcome his low status because he insists on repairing his relationship with Israel and making sure that the nations know him and his view of honor and shame. Yahweh will act so that the Israelites walk in his statutes and trust in him. Yahweh will give Israel a new heart and his Spirit and will thus cause the Israelites to walk in his statutes and to do his ordinances (Ezek 36:26–27).⁶⁶

Yahweh says in v. 28, “You will be my people, and *I*⁶⁷ will be your God.” This phrase is a standard way of referring to the covenant at Sinai⁶⁸ and is often understood as a basic summary of the covenant relationship.⁶⁹ That this is a formula is also highlighted by the pronoun *I*. Ezekiel

⁶⁶ Vieweger, “Die Arbeit,” 26, relates this verse in Ezekiel to Jer 31:34 and argues that walking in Yahweh’s statutes is linked to knowing Yahweh. Israel’s knowledge of Yahweh’s true identity is related to obedience to his statutes.

⁶⁷ This word is written in italics because it is emphatic.

⁶⁸ This formula appears in its classic form in Exod 6:7. See Martens, *God’s Design*, 217.

⁶⁹ See Hals, *Ezekiel*, 360. See also Lev 26:12, Deut 26:16–19, and Deut 29:12–13.

36:28 is the only place in the book of Ezekiel that uses the word אֲנֹכִי, the long version of the pronoun *I*. Block takes this as a conscious archaism from the covenant formula.⁷⁰ In this way, the verse presents the covenant as fully restored, with the Yahweh and the Israelites playing the roles designed for them. Yahweh is Israel’s God; he cares for the Israelites. Israel is Yahweh’s people; the Israelites trust in him. Yahweh is describing a situation where the covenant is functioning correctly and the Israelites are acting in a way that gives them high status in his eyes.⁷¹ Under these circumstances, the Israelites are dwelling on the land of their fathers. Yahweh did not allow the Israelites to stay on the land when they made it more important than their relationship with him. But he gives them the land when the covenant is functioning correctly.

Within a healthy covenant relationship, the Israelites will no longer assert that Yahweh’s conduct is not right (Ezek 33:17). Ezekiel 36:27 is the solution to the problem of Israel’s following the view of the nations as explained above. This problem is described in Ezek 11:12:

וַיִּדְעוּתֶם כִּי־אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר בָּחַקְתֶּם אֲשֶׁר לֹא הִלַּכְתֶּם וּמִשְׁפָּטֵי לֹא עָשִׂיתֶם וּכְמִשְׁפָּטֵי הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר
 כְּבִיבוֹתֵיכֶם עָשִׂיתֶם

(“And you will know that I am Yahweh, whose statutes you have not walked in and (whose) ordinances you have not done, but according to the ordinances of the nations that are around you, you have done.”) In this passage, the Israelites were acting according to the ordinances of the nations around them. The ordinances⁷² of the nations appear to have no place for Yahweh’s concern with being trusted as the one true God and his insistence that his people behave according to his statutes. In v. 27, Yahweh corrects this problem by replacing the ordinances of

⁷⁰ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 357. See also Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition*, 74.

⁷¹ At the same time, they will acknowledge low status in their relationship with Yahweh because of their previous behavior.

⁷² See BDB, s.v. מִשְׁפָּט, 6 b. וּכְמִשְׁפָּטֵי הַגּוֹיִם refers to the ordinances of the nations in the sense of customs and practices more than laws or commands. Cf. 2 Kings 17:26–33.

the nations with his ordinances and leading Israel to obey him. As Yahweh describes the future, Israel will agree with his ordinances and live according to them on an ongoing basis.

As Yahweh brings Israel in line with the covenant, he also demonstrates his own allegiance to it and thus to Israel (Ezek 36:28). Yahweh does not destroy or abandon the Israelites even though they have betrayed him. Instead, he returns them to the land, makes them faithful to the covenant, and gives them ample produce. Rhetorically, Yahweh does all of this unilaterally; Israel does not do anything to merit such gifts. Yahweh treats Israel well—like a father—in order to demonstrate that he can be trusted.⁷³ This verse also highlights the unconditional nature of the covenant that Yahweh made with David.⁷⁴

Yahweh continues to use the sin and reconciliation pattern in this second part of the oracle, but he does not follow the normal order of events. He has shifted to restoration without a reconciliation event. The Israelites have been passive as Yahweh has cleansed and transformed them. They have not done anything to reconcile themselves to Yahweh. This is unusual because, with the didactic use of shame discourse, the acknowledgment of low status normally comes before Yahweh's mercy and restoration of high status (Jer 31:19–20; 33:9). Ezekiel 36:31–32 finally deals with reconciliation between Yahweh and Israel.

The self-loathing described in v. 31 (וּנְקַטְתֶּם בְּפְנֵיכֶם) comes from Israel's remembering their conduct. Their conduct is a cause for low status that does not follow the view of the nations but rather follows Yahweh's view of what should cause low status. When the Israelites loathe themselves, it shows that they agree with Yahweh's judgment of their previous conduct. They

⁷³ Walton, *Ancient*, 109, notes that the idea that Yahweh is faithful is unfamiliar to the ANE conception of gods.

⁷⁴ Yahweh's plan to provide a Davidic king for Israel is clear from Ezek 34:23–24 and Ezek 37:24–25.

agree that such conduct not only should cause but, in fact, has caused a lowering of their status in the relationship.

Yahweh mentions the gift of self-loathing last in his description of how he will sanctify his great name because it solves the problem of Israel's relationship with him in a way that will allow him to overcome his low status (profanation of his name) and vindicate his high status (sanctify his great name) completely. Ezekiel 36:24–30 proves Yahweh's faithfulness and gives a logical progression that leads Israel to acknowledge their low status and to be willing to learn. The Israelites have accused Yahweh of conduct that is not right (Ezek 33:17) and of abandoning Israel. They have made this accusation in order to justify their idolatrous efforts to find high status without him (Ezek 8:11–12). In Ezek 36:24–30, Yahweh presents his complete, unilateral faithfulness to the covenant and thus to the well-being of Israel. Israel's conduct has merited only punishment, but Yahweh has promised to bless Israel anyway. Yahweh makes it clear that he is not acting for their sake and refuses to describe any independent positive act on their part before he blesses them with a return to the land, wealth, and protection from low status. Yahweh is demonstrating his own unconditional faithfulness to the house of David.

The logical conclusion is that Israel was utterly mistaken to blame Yahweh for their low status before the nations, and that they themselves are completely responsible for their shame. Yahweh did not bring about the exile because he enjoyed punishing Israel, because he had become their enemy, or because he chose to overemphasize irrelevant transgressions. On the contrary, Israel brought their sufferings upon themselves.⁷⁵

⁷⁵ In a similar passage, Ezek 16:59–63, Odell, "Inversion," 107–8, 111, concludes that Yahweh is proven to be faithful to Israel and that the reference to Israel's shame forces the people to look at their own role in the failure of their relationship with Yahweh. These insights also apply to Ezek 36:16–32. See Odell, *Ezekiel* (Macon, Ga: Smyth & Helwys, 2005): 440–46.

This is the moment when learning takes place. Israel realizes that Yahweh intended good for them from the beginning. Furthermore, they realize that they were acting as their own enemies by behaving in a way that ultimately brought low status upon them. This is why the Israelites loathe themselves.

Yahweh has an intense desire for Israel to be ashamed because Israel's acknowledgment of low status before Yahweh is an essential component in the successful use of shame discourse with a didactic goal. The acknowledgment of low status in the relationship with Yahweh proves the success of Yahweh's use of shame to teach Israel. For this reason, Israel's shame functions as the reconciliation event in the sin and reconciliation pattern. It is also necessary to complete Yahweh's plan to vindicate his high status.

As Yahweh struggles to protect his honor, he must get Israel to stop challenging him. The Israelites have been able to lower Yahweh's status in a sense because Israel, Yahweh's covenant partner, has been accusing him. When the Israelites stop accusing Yahweh, Yahweh is free to complete the sanctification of his great name. The Israelites are no longer trying to lower Yahweh's status by saying that he was wrong to send them into exile. Therefore, it is no longer necessary for Yahweh to punish Israel to defend his status.

In order for Yahweh to sanctify his name fully, the nations must know him and his view of what constitutes high status. By saying that the nations will know that he is Yahweh when he shows himself holy through the Israelites before the eyes of the nations (Ezek 36:23), Yahweh is making it clear that Israel is his chosen means of presenting his true identity to the nations. Yahweh will show his power and wealth through Israel, but Israel must also acknowledge shame in order for his plan to work. In this way, Yahweh demonstrates to the nations that Israel did not

leave the land because of his weakness but rather because they violated the covenant.⁷⁶ Israel's self-loathing shows that Yahweh's covenantal requirement that Israel trust him and walk in his statutes is valid. It also presents Yahweh's faithfulness to the covenant so that there are positive results possible even when his people violate the covenant. In this way, Yahweh will sanctify his great name without being reduced to being thought of as another ANE god.

The focus on Yahweh's identity and faithfulness in Ezek 36:16–32 draws attention to Yahweh's concern for Israel's well-being, even though that concern is hidden by the harshness of the text. Because of Yahweh's identity and Israel's nature, Yahweh's decision to enter into a relationship with the Israelites by making the initial covenant with them made the restoration found in this passage inevitable. Yahweh made a covenant with Israel and continued in his relationship with Israel because of his faithfulness rather than any merit in Israel. Because of this part of his identity, the restoration that he describes in Ezek 36:16–32 was certain. Yahweh holds himself to his own view of high and low status.

Within this context, the acknowledgment of low status plays a positive role in Israel's relationship with Yahweh. It demonstrates that a change has taken place within the Israelites. If they were satisfied placing their trust in other gods or kings, they would not acknowledge low status before Yahweh. They would simply leave the relationship with Yahweh broken. By acknowledging low status, Israel affirms a relationship with Yahweh on his terms. The Israelites recognize that they violated the covenant, caused the exile, and brought low status on Yahweh. They were wrong to violate the social order by placing themselves above Yahweh, to challenge him, and to betray him by seeking help from other gods and kings and acting in a way contrary to his statutes. Now they place themselves properly below Yahweh. They recognize that they

⁷⁶ See Ezek 39:23 for a clear statement that the nations will know that Israel went into exile because of their iniquity and because they were unfaithful to Yahweh.

should have trusted Yahweh and obeyed him. Now they will do that, and everything will be as it should be.

Yahweh's concern with Israel's acknowledgement of low status is made less harsh by the differences between Yahweh's understanding of high and low status and that of the nations. Among the nations, high status is based on power and wealth so that low status means danger to a person's well-being. It is not the same with Yahweh. All people have low status in relation to Yahweh (Psa 113:4–5). When people accept their low status in relation to Yahweh willingly, they are showing humility. But acknowledging such low status does not put Israel's well-being in jeopardy. On the contrary, Yahweh has linked the acknowledgment of low status with restoration, including manifestations of his power and wealth.

In the situation described in Ezek 36:16–32, acknowledging shame before Yahweh is the honorable thing for Israel to do. The need for Israel to acknowledge shame before Yahweh is not ideal, but it is the best choice after Israel's prideful violation of the covenant. Israel's acknowledgment of low status in their relationship with Yahweh is positive because it actually raises their status in Yahweh's eyes. But v. 31 speaks in the future rather than the present. It does not say that the Israelites loathe themselves presently. Furthermore, as was argued in chapter 1, self-loathing is not presented as the last chronological step in Yahweh's plan but as the logical conclusion of his progression of thought.

Therefore, it is appropriate to end the oracle with v. 32. When Yahweh commands the Israelites to be ashamed and dishonored (בוֹשׁוּ וְהִכָּלְמוּ), he is telling them emphatically to acknowledge low status in their relationship with him. In v. 32, Yahweh is ordering Israel to do what Ephraim does in Jer 31:19 and what Ezra does in Ezra 9:6. Yahweh commands Israel to act immediately on the logical progression of the oracle and his role in bringing about self-loathing.

The command to be ashamed in Ezek 36:32 unifies the passage. By acknowledging low status before Yahweh the Israelites are responding to the forensic characteristics of Ezek 36:16–32 described in chapter 1. The forensic element is concerned with passing judgment on the past. The Israelites are doing just that as they state that they are ashamed of their past behavior. The epideictic concerns of the passage have to do with the role of values in assigning present blame. By acknowledging shame the Israelites are accepting blame for the broken relationship with Yahweh and the fall of Jerusalem. They are also affirming Yahweh's values. The deliberative goal in the passage has to do with plans for the future. Israel's acknowledgment of low status before Yahweh signifies that the Israelites embrace his future plans for the nation.

In conclusion, this sociological study of Ezek 36:16–32 argues that Yahweh is using didactic shame discourse as the reconciliation event in the sin and reconciliation pattern. In this way, Yahweh solves the problem of his relationship with Israel and the problem of his low status among the nations at the same time. When Israel is reconciled with Yahweh, they stop blaming him for the exile. They also become a means that Yahweh uses to show the nations his true identity, including the requirement that his followers trust him and walk in his statutes. The command to acknowledge low status comes at the end of the oracle because the good news proves that Yahweh is not to blame for the exile.

Chapter Summary

Understood within the social context of Ezek 36:16–32, Israel's status is linked to Yahweh's status because Israel is Yahweh's covenant partner. In the eyes of the nations, Israel lowers Yahweh's status because Israel is in exile. But the Israelites also threaten Yahweh's status because they are challenging Yahweh's honor by blaming him for the exile. Therefore, Yahweh's conclusion that the Israelites will loathe themselves fits logically in a passage that

focuses upon Yahweh's sanctifying of his great name. When Israel acknowledges low status because of their behavior, they will stop challenging Yahweh's honor.

Yahweh's status is also linked to Israel's status because Yahweh completely vindicates his honor, as he shows his identity through the Israelites. Yahweh's concern with Israel's behavior demonstrates a difference between his view of shame and the standard human view. Yahweh assigns low status to people because of a poor relationship with him and because of poor behavior while the human view is primarily concerned with weakness and poverty as signs of low status. Yahweh works within this situation to prove to Israel and the nations that he does have power and wealth while also insisting upon the importance of Israel's trust and behavior. Yahweh insists on leading Israel to a faithful relationship with him in order to sanctify his great name fully.

Therefore, Yahweh uses the organization of the oracle to demonstrate his innocence and to bring Israel into an appropriate relationship with him. He refers to Israel's shame after his many positive promises to prove that he has been faithful to the covenant and is not at fault for the exile. The promises prove Yahweh's faithfulness and leave the Israelites with no one to blame but themselves. Then Yahweh turns the human view of honor and shame on its head by insisting that Israel acknowledge low status before him but by making such shame honorable. Yahweh raises the status of the Israelites as he deals with Israel according to the sin and reconciliation pattern. When they acknowledge low status before Yahweh, he is reconciled to them and restores them to their previous state of high status. The Israelites affirm Yahweh's values and apply social pressure to each other to maintain those values. However, Ezek 36:16–32 does not include a clear statement that the Israelites obeyed the imperatives and were ashamed before Yahweh. Furthermore, Yahweh's many visible promises have not yet taken place to convince Israel to be dishonored. Only a study of the ethical and emotional material and of the key rhetorical

techniques of the passage will explain how Yahweh is guiding his relationship with Israel and will clarify who is intended to respond to the shame discourse in Ezek 36:32.

CHAPTER FOUR

ETHICAL MATERIAL, EMOTIONAL MATERIAL, AND RHETORICAL TECHNIQUES USED FOR PERSUASION IN EZEK 36:16–32

This investigation is seeking to explain why the command to be ashamed follows good news in Ezek 36:16–32. Chapter 1 highlighted the prominence of the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel in the passage. It also concluded that Ezek 36:24–32 is making a logical rather than a chronological argument that ends when Yahweh orders the Israelites to be dishonored at the moment that they read the text. Chapter 2 took up the issue of what shame means and how it functions in the passage. It argued that dishonor language deals with status, where one entity ranks another entity. Of the four functions of shame discourse identified, it is the didactic function of shame discourse that is the key to solving the crux of the passage. In Ezek 36:32, Yahweh intends for the Israelites to acknowledge low status before him as a sign that they have learned from their punishment.

The issue of Yahweh's values was treated in chapter 3. Here, the differences between Yahweh's view of shame and honor and that of the nations were described. This chapter also took up the role of the covenant from chapter 1 and argued that Israel is able to lower Yahweh's status in the eyes of the nations because Yahweh and Israel are covenant partners. Yahweh's reputation may be damaged by Israel's defeat or by their blaming him for the failure of their partnership. Chapter 3 also analyzed the organization of the argument in Ezek 36:24–32, as it demonstrated that Yahweh is proving that he is not to blame for the exile. In this way, he is leading the Israelites to realize logically that they alone are at fault. The thought progression of

the passage is intended to bring them to acknowledge shame and thus to be reconciled to Yahweh. This is the reconciliation event, the fifth step in the so-called sin and reconciliation pattern as identified and described by Laniak,¹ and discussed in chapter 3. The sin and reconciliation model deals with the break in the relationship between Yahweh and Israel caused by Israel's sin. In this model, the Israelites fall from Yahweh's favor when they sin. In response to their sin, Yahweh abandons them, and they suffer a loss that lowers their status in the eyes of the nations. This loss is intended to push the Israelites to be reconciled with Yahweh and, consequently, to have his favor restored. As this description demonstrates, Laniak's sin and reconciliation pattern may be summarized in six steps in the following order: (1) favor, (2) sin, (3) abandonment, (4) loss, (5) reconciliation, and (6) return to favor.

In Ezek 36:16–32, however, positive promises describing the return to favor, step six, come before references to shame, step five, in order to prove that Yahweh has been faithful to Israel.² This unusual order raises two further issues. First, the text never states that the Israelites were ashamed in response to the imperatives. Although prophetic rhetoric is intended to accomplish some response from the readers,³ that response is not necessarily reported in prophetic books. This is so because prophetic books normally contain much prophecy and little narrative. However, as scholars such as Lapsley, Greenberg, and Davis have tried to explain Ezek 36:16–32, the lack of a response from Israel has allowed them to conclude that no Israelites responded

¹ Laniak, *Shame*, 7–8, 16, observes that the sin and reconciliation pattern is a general pattern found in many places in the HB.

² Odell, "Inversion," 102, has recognized this unusual order as a crux of interpretation. Ezekiel 16:59–63 is similar to Ezek 36:16–32 and includes the same problem of shame coming after good news.

³ Rhetorical criticism is useful in this dissertation because it analyzes the persuasive features of a prophetic text. As R. Reed Lessing, "Interpreting Discontinuity: Isaiah's Tyre Oracle" (Ph.D. Diss., Concordia Seminary, 2001), 148, notes, "The prophet will employ literary formulas and figures to make the speech persuasive." That the prophet is working to persuade demonstrates that prophetic communication expects some response even though it may not be reported in the text. See also Wuellner Wuellner, "Where ?", 448–63.

in the affirmative at the time when the text was first read.⁴ Second, the promises have not yet been fulfilled. Therefore, it is difficult to understand how they prove that Yahweh has been faithful to Israel.

This chapter, then, will respond to these issues by completing the third and fourth steps of a rhetorical study. It will complete the third step, i.e., the analysis of the choice and arrangement of the material, by examining the ethical and emotional material in Ezek 36:16–32.⁵ Chapter 4 will also accomplish the fourth step of a rhetorical study, an analysis of the rhetorical techniques used for persuasion in the passage.

It will be argued in this chapter that the rhetoric of Ezek 36:16–32 works within the sin and reconciliation pattern to push the readers to respond to the imperatives in Ezek 36:32. Those who are ashamed are distinguished from those who refuse to be ashamed, and that distinction begins to define the remnant.⁶ Those who acknowledge low status before Yahweh are reconciled to Yahweh, and, consequently, will return to Yahweh's favor. Those who are not ashamed fall away, but those who are returned to Yahweh's favor continue in a relationship with Yahweh and form a remnant that will be restored by him.

The analysis of Yahweh's effort to create a remnant that admits low status before him begins with the ethical and emotional material. Both the ethical material and the emotional material reinforce Yahweh's values, while pushing the implied readers⁷ to join the remnant. They

⁴ Lapsley, "Shame and Self-Knowledge," 155, 158–59; Greenberg, "Salvation," 267; and Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll*, 58.

⁵ The ethical material argues for the reliability of the author, while the emotional material appeals to the emotions of the readers. See Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 25.

⁶ The book of Ezekiel does not often use specific vocabulary, such as the standard Hebrew term for remnant, *שְׂאֵרִית*, to deal with the remnant. However, Yahweh is creating a faithful subset of Israel in a way that is consistent with the concept of a remnant used elsewhere in the HB.

⁷ Although the oral speech described in Ezek 36:16–32 was first spoken to hearers, the methodology of this dissertation highlights the intended original readers of the entire book of Ezekiel. This issue was addressed in the introduction.

reinforce Yahweh's values by affirming that it is honorable to recognize one's low status before Yahweh, to trust in him, and to walk in his statutes. In Yahweh's view, shame comes from stubbornness and a failure to trust in him and to walk in his statutes.⁸ By supporting Yahweh's values, the ethical material and the emotional material force readers to affirm or reject a relationship with Yahweh.

The rhetorical techniques employed in the passage work in tandem with the ethical and emotional material, as they drive the readers to confront the imperatives in v. 32 and either to join the group of those who acknowledge shame or to be excluded from Israel. Only those Israelites who acknowledge shame over Israel's past behavior and thus embrace Yahweh's values are reconciled with Yahweh. That is to say that the true Israel is recognized by a restored covenant relationship with Yahweh. With this in mind, chapter 4 will argue that the faithful remnant will form a society that maintains Yahweh's values and applies pressure on its members to agree with Yahweh's view of what causes shame.

Ethical Material

Classical rhetoric recognizes the ethical material as that part of a discourse designed to convince the audience that the author and the message are reliable.⁹ Ezekiel 36:16–32 uses the ethical material to reinforce Yahweh's values and thus to press the readers to affirm that Yahweh's definition of shame is correct. In this way, the ethical material supports Yahweh's use of the sin and reconciliation pattern. The passage argues for the reliability of the message by presenting it as coming from Yahweh through a prophet.¹⁰ The message of Ezek 36:16–32

⁸ See table 1 in chapter 3.

⁹ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 25.

¹⁰ Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 89, highlights the great degree to which Yahweh controls Ezekiel.

assumes that Yahweh's view of status is correct. Readers are thus encouraged to accept Yahweh's view and to agree with his evaluation of the situation at hand. Any readers who might question the reliability of the source or the accuracy of the message place themselves at odds with Yahweh.

Although somewhat self-evident, the fact that the prophecy is identified as that of the prophet Ezekiel provides a claim of its authority. In this way, the book of Ezekiel argues for the reliability of the human author of the book.¹¹ The fall of Jerusalem, which was announced in Ezek 33:21, has greatly increased Ezekiel's reliability in the eyes of his readers because Ezekiel foretold the fall of Jerusalem before it happened.¹² Therefore, when Ezekiel describes the exile that resulted from the fall of Jerusalem (Ezek 36:18–20), he is arguing in part for his reliability.¹³ Ezekiel really is speaking for Yahweh, as he describes Israel's sin and the resulting loss that come from violating Yahweh's values. Thus Ezekiel's credentials as a true prophet can be assumed as background to the conversation in Ezek 36:16–21. In these verses Yahweh speaks with Ezekiel in much the same way that a frustrated man may express his frustration to a friend. Ezekiel is Yahweh's confidant.¹⁴ He has a special relationship with Yahweh that reflects both his own trustworthiness and the reliability of his message from Yahweh.

The message that Ezekiel gives in Ezek 36:16–32 is reliable not only because Ezekiel speaks as a true prophet but also because it uses a number of authentication markers that explicitly identify the word as coming from Yahweh. For example, Ezekiel 36:16 states that the

¹¹ See Ezek 1:3 and Ezek 24:24.

¹² A true prophet is recognized by the fact that what he has foretold comes to pass. See Deut 18:22. Yahweh led Ezekiel to predict the fall of Jerusalem in Ezek 5:1–12 and to foretell the exile in Ezek 12:1–11. Ezekiel is contrasted with the many false prophets that were leading the Israelites astray (Ezek 13:1–12).

¹³ Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 976, states that the fall of Jerusalem vindicated the prophecies of judgment that Yahweh delivered through Ezekiel. See also Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 254–56.

¹⁴ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 246, observes that Yahweh addresses the prophet directly in Ezek 36:16–17.

word of Yahweh came to Ezekiel. In Ezek 36:22, Yahweh is also clear when he tells Ezekiel to, “say to the house of Israel.” That Yahweh is speaking is reinforced by the phrase, “declaration of the Lord Yahweh,” which appears in Ezek 36:23 and 32 and by his use of the first person. This oracle is the word of Yahweh.¹⁵ Ezekiel is only his messenger, and he is reliable. It is Yahweh himself who is speaking, and of course Yahweh is assumed to be reliable.

Both the fall of Jerusalem and the consistency of the covenant language serve to reinforce Yahweh’s reliability at a time when many in Israel were questioning it. When Yahweh refers to the Sinaitic Covenant in this oracle, his references are consistent with his previous description of that covenant. Specifically, Yahweh’s requirement that the Israelites trust him rather than serving idols and that they walk in his statutes is the same as elsewhere (e.g., Deut 4:1; 30:10; 30:16). Therefore, idolatry and other behavior that goes against Yahweh’s statutes is shameful (Ezek 36:31–32), reflecting Yahweh’s values. The punishment promised if they break the Sinaitic covenant is also consistent with Yahweh’s previous communication (Deut 4:25–27; 30:17–18). Yahweh is the same God speaking about the same covenant. Furthermore, as already noted, the fall of Jerusalem proved that Yahweh would punish Israel as he had said he would do and that he has the power to bring about the fall of the holy city and exile.¹⁶ The implied readers should believe what Yahweh says in this oracle and do what Yahweh tells them to do because Yahweh has been established as reliable.

In conclusion, the ethical material in Ezek 36:16–32 serves the rhetorical goal of the passage because the implied author is consistent with Yahweh’s values, especially his definition of shame, and because he presents those values in a positive light. The material in this passage

¹⁵ Hals, *Ezekiel*, 361, refers to the phrase, “declaration of the Lord Yahweh,” as the Prophetic Utterance Formula and says that it, “Labels a prophetic speech as the word of Israel’s God.”

¹⁶ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 256.

assumes that the relationship between Yahweh and Israel can only be understood from one point of view, and that is Yahweh's. There are no other possibilities given and no hint of uncertainty. Yahweh interprets Israel's actions and his own without any dissenting voice.¹⁷ In this way, the implied author makes it clear how Yahweh views the situation and what he expects from Israel. Anyone who disagrees with this passage disagrees with Yahweh. Those who agree with the conclusions of the text are being pushed to respond to Yahweh's command in Ezek 36:32. In the terms of the sin and reconciliation model, those who admit that they have sinned and suffered loss for that sin are ordered to be reconciled to Yahweh.¹⁸

Direct and Indirect Emotional Material

In the recognition that emotions play a role in decision-making, rhetorical analysis studies the part of a text that appeals to the emotions.¹⁹ Emotional material uses words and situations intended to incite emotions in the audience. Those feelings are guided by the author to lead the audience to the desired conclusion. In Ezek 36:16–32, the direct emotional material makes use of sociological concerns centered on status and relationships to create an emotional response in the audience that will push them to acknowledge low status, showing that they affirm Yahweh's values. The use of indirect emotional material works toward the same goal. Yahweh uses statements of fact to convey both accusations and promises, as he further influences the emotions of the readers. Like the ethical material, the emotional material drives the readers to the

¹⁷ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 144, refers to this as creating a theocentric narrative and says, "We could say that the creation of a theocentric narrative...serves to affirm the credibility of the implied author of the book. In the terms of traditional rhetorical analysis, it is an attempt to establish the *ethos* of the speaker."

¹⁸ The imperatives in Ezek 36:32 demonstrate that Yahweh is commanding the Israelites to be ashamed. The ethical material in the passage gives authority to this order so that the Israelites are expected to accept this command from Yahweh and to obey it.

¹⁹ Gitay, *Prophecy*, 37. See also Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 25.

reconciliation event of the sin and reconciliation model. It guides the readers to the desired conclusion while alienating any who may stray from the path that is provided.

Direct Emotional Rhetoric

The direct emotional material works within the sin and reconciliation pattern, as it presses the readers to identify with Yahweh's values concerning shame. It does this by using images and references that encourage the readers to recognize their low status and to be repulsed by their behavior. Ezek 36:16–32 also invites the readers to see the situation from Yahweh's point of view, further galvanizing their agreement with his values.

Uncleanness. In Ezek 36:17, Yahweh states that the Israelites made their land unclean (וַיִּטְמְאוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ). Yahweh is describing the sin part of the sin and reconciliation pattern. Although this statement may make the implied readers defensive, it is intended to lead them to acknowledge shame, as responsibility is placed on them. The term *unclean* is designed to encourage disgust in the reader. The emotion of disgust constitutes agreement that the behavior is shameful rather than innocuous.

Thus Ezekiel 36:17 introduces the theme of uncleanness and purification in the passage. This theme demonstrates Ezekiel's priestly background and his concern with purity. Ezekiel employs priestly terminology and stresses the importance of purity to support the goal of pushing the readers to acknowledge shame. The theme of uncleanness also reinforces the social aspect of the oracle's concern with shame. Those who remain unclean are separated from society (Lev 13:46; Num 19:13).²⁰ Uncleanness is linked to shame in Ezek 36:17 because it is shameful

²⁰ Leviticus 13:46 demonstrates that a person who is unclean and is expected to remain unclean must live alone outside of the camp. According to Num 19:13, a person who is unclean and does not cleanse himself before entering the tabernacle will be cut off from his people. Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1047, uses Lev 15:19–24 to understand Ezek 36:17, saying, "The point is...that menstrual uncleanness required separation or segregation from the community for a given period of time. In Ezek 36:16–32, Yahweh must intervene to bring the period of uncleanness to an end."

behavior that has made the land unclean.²¹ The next verse identifies the shameful behavior, as it mentions bloodshed and idolatry (Ezek 36:18).

The reference to uncleanness in Ezek 36:17 heightens the disgust²² with a particular example while pointing the readers to the relationship between shame and femininity. A person—even a man—who has engaged in such behavior is like a menstruating woman.²³ This is an insulting comparison intended to push the implied readers to take Israel's bad conduct seriously.

The reference to Israel's profaning Yahweh's holy name (Ezek 36:20) is also emotional terminology. As a priest, Ezekiel was concerned with the holiness of his God's name and was upset when his name was mistreated. Israel also thought of Yahweh and his name as holy. The idea that Yahweh's name could be made common was shocking, and it was shameful for Israel to profane his name.²⁴ Even though the text is speaking of Yahweh's low status in the eyes of the nations in vv. 20–22, it does not make use of the terminology of status. Instead, the passage reflects Ezekiel's concern with Yahweh's name by referring to Yahweh's poor reputation in the eyes of the nations as the profanation of his name. This terminology serves to heighten the emotional effect of the text.

Yahweh's View of Shame. The use of emotional terms works in tandem with Yahweh's aside to Ezekiel (Ezek 36:17–21). As Yahweh explains his frustrations to Ezekiel, the readers are invited to listen and to see the situation from Yahweh's point of view. They are thus encouraged

²¹ The theme of uncleanness plays a major role in the book of Ezekiel as a whole. It is primarily important to Ezek 36:16–32 because it is the result of shameful behavior.

²² Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 246, asserts that the reference to menstruation is offensive.

²³ Stiebert, *Construction*, 140, argues that feminine images in Ezekiel apply to women as well as men. "Men, too, are accused of harlotry and infidelity and the image of Jerusalem as a defiled and shameful woman is intended to be inclusive."

²⁴ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 348, asserts that the exile made a mockery of Yahweh's character and reputation.

to embrace Yahweh's view of shame as opposed to the human view. The readers overhear Yahweh's conversation with Ezekiel, Yahweh's confidant. In this way, the Israelites are encouraged to realize how disgusting Yahweh finds their behavior. They are pushed to feel his frustration, as he describes their violating his covenant and rendering the land unclean. Yahweh invites the readers to feel his sense of justice, as he punishes them in the way that they deserve. The Israelites are likely to understand Yahweh's concern for his name because each individual Israelite is concerned for his own name. And the Israelites know that exile shames the god as well as the people.²⁵ This point of view encourages the readers to agree with Yahweh and to judge Israel along with him even though they are judging themselves.

Seeing the situation from Yahweh's point of view also invites the readers to identify with Yahweh's sense of shame before the nations. According to the view of the nations, Yahweh is a weak god because his people left his land (Ezek 36:20). The Israelites understand Yahweh's dishonor, and they should be ashamed because they caused it. Israel was unfaithful to their God and shamed their God before the nations. At the same time, seeing the low status from Yahweh's point of view should encourage Israel to hope that Yahweh will act to overcome his shame before the nations.

By mentioning judgment, Yahweh reminds the implied readers of the fall of Jerusalem and of their own shameful state of exile. Yahweh is employing the second, third, and fourth steps of the sin and reconciliation pattern. The Israelites sinned, and Yahweh abandoned them so that they suffered a substantial loss. As a result of this loss, the nations now hold the Israelites in low esteem, adding to their sense of loss. This situation encourages the readers to acknowledge shame and to accept responsibility for the exile.

²⁵ See Ezek 20:8–9.

In Ezek 36:22, Yahweh addresses Israel directly and says that he is not going to act for their sake. This statement shows how frustrated Yahweh is with Israel, how serious their conduct is, and how serious the damage to Yahweh's name is. Israel's conduct is so serious and the damage to Yahweh's name is so intense that the Israelites do not deserve Yahweh's positive actions toward them. When Yahweh states that he is going to act, he also makes it evident that he is not motivated by any merit on Israel's part.²⁶ Yahweh's frustration with Israel creates a separation in the relationship and is intended to make the readers want Yahweh to see them in a better light.

Israel Encouraged to Hope. On the other hand, the readers are not left without hope. Ezekiel 36:22 engenders the hope that something will happen that will cause Yahweh to relate better to the readers. The readers are expected look to Yahweh to do something to vindicate his name.²⁷ The text answers this hope immediately by saying that Yahweh will act for his holy name. This statement encourages the implied readers to hope and to want to take part in Yahweh's vindication of his name.

The readers are also invited to hope in Ezek 36:23, when Yahweh says he will prove his holiness through Israel before the eyes of the nations. In this verse, Yahweh is using profanation and holiness to characterize low and high status respectively. The problem of the passage is Yahweh's low status before the nations or the profanation of his name. He solves the problem by raising his status in the eyes of the nations—an event he refers to as sanctifying his great name. It is at this point that the oracle makes a shift to positive emotional material. Even though the readers will play only a passive role in Yahweh's vindication of his name, this passive role is

²⁶ Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1049.

²⁷ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 351, highlights Yahweh's coming activity.

designed to give the readers relief. The readers play the passive role of spectators as Yahweh does what they are unable to do and unveils his plan to overcome the negative situation mentioned in Ezek 36:16–21.

Yahweh’s Plan for Restoration. Ezekiel 36:23–30 meets the readers in a state of weakness and hopelessness and works to give them hope. It follows the sin and reconciliation pattern, but here there is a shift to Yahweh’s plan to restore Israel. Yahweh deals with the uncleanness that resulted from Israel’s shameful behavior in v. 25. When Yahweh makes the Israelites clean, he makes it possible for them to be with him again.²⁸ The text also points the readers to the exodus and the original gift of the land to the Israelites by talking about the land in Ezek 36:24²⁹ and the covenant in v. 28. It reminds the readers that Yahweh has been faithful in the past and has done what seemed impossible to the Israelites. In Ezek 36:26–28, Yahweh also states that he will once again do what seems impossible to the Israelites. He will give them a new heart and will create a new people. In this way, the passage encourages the readers to hope that Yahweh will intervene to change their shameful circumstances.

In fact, the text responds to the shame situation presented in Ezek 36:16–21 by correcting the reasons for shame and by giving reasons for honor. Yahweh vindicates his honor and undoes the exile. Yahweh’s actions come entirely from his own initiative and are not based on any merit on the part of the Israelites. This fact is demonstrated by the phrase that begins and ends this section, “It is not for your sake that I am about to act” (Ezek 36:22, 32). Yahweh’s plan offers the readers relief from their international shame (Ezek 36:30), a role in the vindication of his

²⁸ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 355, states that this cleansing, “is a necessary precondition to normalizing the spiritual relationship between Yahweh and his people.” According to Lev 12:4–7, once a woman has been cleansed after giving birth, she may once again enter the sanctuary. Leviticus 14:8 describes a situation where a leper is made clean and may enter the camp. This example implies that the cleansing in Ezek 36:25 also makes it possible for the Israelites to be together in a community.

²⁹ Hummel, *Ezekeil 21–48*, 1051.

honor, and a certain degree of honor for themselves. Such a description is designed to give the readers hope in Yahweh's power to accomplish his plan. It is intended to urge the readers to look beyond their present situation and to believe that Yahweh will act in the near future.

The Push to Acknowledge Shame. Ezekiel 36:31 jolts the readers back to the present problem by talking about bad conduct and self-loathing. The readers have not acknowledged shame in their relationship with Yahweh even though Yahweh has offered proof that they are in the wrong. The reconciliation event from the sin and reconciliation pattern has not taken place. Yahweh has asserted that he is going to vindicate his honor and bless Israel in the process. The readers may want to receive the blessings without acknowledging shame, but Yahweh will not allow this to happen. His final word on the future is the assurance that the Israelites will loathe themselves on account of their iniquities. In this way, the text creates tension in the readers because they must admit low status to move on to thoughts of the restoration.

Yahweh uses accusation, relief, and hope to push the Israelites to acknowledge shame. The Israelites should feel shame because of the wrong they have done and the problems that they have caused. By acknowledging shame, the Israelites will affirm their relationship with Yahweh and have relief from the conflict and separation they have been experiencing with Yahweh. Admitting low status will also allow Israel to focus on a good relationship with Yahweh and the ideal future rather than focusing on conflict with Yahweh and Israel's negative past. Israel's bad conduct will become a part of an identity that includes Yahweh's gifts outlined in Ezek 36:23–30. Israel is pushed to acknowledge shame by the hope that the dishonor and an ideal future will go together. The text presents shame as an appropriate response to Israel's negative behavior and also as an essential part of Israel's positive future. There are rewards for acknowledging shame. There is hope in acknowledging shame.

After applying negative and positive pressure to acknowledge shame, Yahweh tells Israel to do just that in Ezek 36:32.³⁰ Now is the time for the readers to admit low status. Yahweh is telling Israel to admit dishonor in order to be reconciled to him. Yahweh's mention of Israel's undeserving state and negative conduct again in Ezek 36:32 increases the emotional intensity of the discourse while offering the readers a way out. If the readers refuse to acknowledge shame, they remain in conflict with Yahweh and in emotional turmoil. If the readers accept shame, they can move on to the rejoicing that comes from the anticipation of receiving gifts from Yahweh. Acknowledging shame is the way to hope and rejoicing.

To summarize, the direct emotional material in Ezek 36:16–32 seeks to stir up the feelings of the readers so that they agree with Yahweh's view of the situation and affirm his values. The oracle employs the theme of uncleanness to highlight the disgusting nature of Israel's behavior and the role of conduct in creating separation from Yahweh and from the community. But the passage also encourages trust in Yahweh, as he is shown solving the problems that Israel created. The direct emotional material builds up to Ezek 36:32, where Yahweh expects Israel to be ashamed.

Indirect Communication Revealed through Speech-Act Analysis³¹

Aside from using direct emotional means to guide the readers, Yahweh also employs indirect communication to influence their emotions. Speech-act analysis will reveal that Yahweh uses indirect communication to strengthen his message and to highlight the direct command in

³⁰ This study of the emotional material is interacting with the rhetoric of the passage and how that rhetoric is designed to affect the readers. The theological issue of personal responsibility and divine initiative will be dealt with in the section on rhetorical techniques.

³¹ See Kevin J. Vanhoozer, "The Semantics of Biblical Literature: Truth and Scripture's Diverse Literary Forms," in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon* (ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 86; and J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (2d ed., Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975).

Ezek 36:32. As Voelz notes, speech-act theory recognizes that “all linguistic utterances are ‘speech acts,’ i.e., that there is a purpose behind the words.”³² The analysis of speech-acts in Ezek 36:16–32 offers added proof that the passage is using emotional speech to push readers to affirm Yahweh’s values even as it drives them to the imperatives in v. 32. The study notes what individual statements in the passage are trying to accomplish in the implied readers and highlights a high frequency of indirect communication in the process. Through indirect communication, Yahweh uses primarily accusations and promises to increase the pressure on the implied readers to agree with his description of what causes shame and to accept his plan to sanctify his holy name and to repair his relationship with Israel. Then Yahweh’s purposes become jarringly clear as he abandons indirect communication in v. 32 and orders the Israelites to be ashamed.

The analysis of the speech acts in Ezek 36:16–32 will argue that the text uses direct and indirect communication³³ to influence the emotions of the readers. This study will be organized

³² James W. Voelz, *What Does This Mean?: Principles of Biblical Interpretation in the Post-Modern World* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1995), 276. Speech-act theory focuses on what individual statements in a text are trying to accomplish and includes features that are helpful for the present study. The illocutionary force, the indirect illocutionary force, and the perlocutionary force all reveal important details of this passage as the text applies pressure on the implied readers. The meaning of the utterances in this passage, the locutionary force, has been dealt with under the logical material. The illocutionary force and the perlocutionary force, however, are aimed at the emotions and the will in this text. The illocutionary force is what an utterance counts as. For example, the speech-act may be a warning, an ordering, or an undertaking. According to Austin, the perlocutionary force is what people achieve by saying something, such as convincing, surprising, or misleading. Austin, *Things*, 4–6, 10, 12, 109. Voelz, *What?*, 276–77.

Searle, *Expression*, vii–viii, 12–16, gives five possibilities for the illocutionary force of an utterance. An assertive illocutionary force is the most common illocutionary force in this text. It tells how things are. Directives intend to get others to do something. Commissives commit the speaker to doing something. Declaratives bring about changes in the world through utterances. Expressives express the speaker’s emotions and attitudes. See also Walter Houston, “What did the Prophets Think They were Doing?: Speech Acts and Prophetic Discourse in the Old Testament,” *Biblical Interpretation* 1 (1993): 167–88. Searle, *Expression*, viii, notes that a given utterance may take the form of one illocutionary force while communicating indirectly as another illocutionary force. For example, the statement, “Sir, you are standing on my foot,” is an assertive in form. It is making a statement about reality. At the same time, however, that statement functions as an indirect communication with a directive illocutionary force. It is a way of telling the man to move his foot. The presence of such indirect communication may often be discovered through the study of the perlocutionary force of an utterance.

³³ See Bob Caldwell, “‘Wait for Me’: Appreciating the Curious Juxtaposition of Zephaniah 3:8 and 9” (Ph.D.

by verse, going from v. 16 through v. 32. The illocutionary force, the perlocutionary force, and indirect communication will all be considered as is helpful. The analysis will focus upon what the speech acts are intended to accomplish in the implied readers, that is, readers who will acknowledge shame. However, the study will also address the potential impact of the speech acts on Israelites who refuse to trust in Yahweh. This approach highlights Yahweh's use of indirect communication to heighten the emotional impact of the passage. It also demonstrates that Yahweh is expressing himself in a way that speaks to two audiences at the same time. Ultimately, however, each reader is expected to affirm or reject a relationship with Yahweh.

Speech-Act Analysis of Ezek 36:16–21. The illocutionary force of Ezek 36:16–21 is primarily assertive in form, but these verses contain indirect communication accusing Israel. Yahweh does not speak in terms of what he thinks but rather in terms of how things are. Although these sentences sound like simple statements of fact, they are designed to accomplish indirect communication. Yahweh intends to accuse the Israelites in this part of the passage. He intends to place blame on Israel. This section focuses upon sin, abandonment, and loss from the sin and reconciliation pattern. Israel's sin (Ezek 36:17–18) caused Yahweh to abandon Israel so that they suffered the loss inherent in the fall of Jerusalem (Ezek 36:18–19).

Yahweh's goal in this part of the passage is for the readers to accept blame for the negative results described in these verses and to recognize that he was right to judge Israel. Accepting blame is expressed by the acknowledgment of shame. That is, readers who accept blame also acknowledge shame. Therefore, Yahweh's indirect illocutionary force in these verses is directive. He intends this communication to tell the readers to accept blame with the result that they do accept blame.

diss., Concordia Seminary, 2009), 34–53, for an in-depth survey of the literature along with a helpful discussion of potential application to biblical studies. He also gives a number of useful examples of indirect communication.

Yahweh begins by accusing Israel of being responsible for the exile (Ezek 36:17–19).³⁴ These verses force readers to agree or disagree with what Yahweh is saying. The text makes it clear that those who refuse to be moved by Yahweh's perlocutionary goal are disagreeing with Yahweh and thus separating themselves from him.

Ezekiel 36:20 is an accusation within an accusation. It was said of Israel that they are the people of Yahweh, but they left his land. With these words, Yahweh is portraying the nations as accusing him. The nations are accusing Yahweh of being a weak god.³⁵ At one moment, Yahweh argues that the nations are mistaken and that the Israelites are to blame for this misunderstanding. The nations are mistaken because the Israelites did not leave the land as a result of Yahweh's weakness. They left the land because Yahweh judged them and punished them for their conduct. Therefore, Israel is to blame for the profanation of Yahweh's holy name. Yahweh intends for Israel to accept blame for the exile and for the profanation of his name.

In Ezek 36:21, Yahweh begins with a simple expressive illocutionary force. He says that he was concerned for or felt pity for his holy name. His perlocutionary goal is to explain to his readers how he feels about the profanation of his name. He also intends for his readers to agree and to join in a concern for his name. By being concerned for Yahweh's name, the readers would agree that Yahweh's name is important. This concern for Yahweh's name is tied to a restatement of Israel's role in profaning Yahweh's name before the nations. In this way, the goal of convincing the readers to be concerned for Yahweh's holy name is tied to the goal of leading the readers to accept blame for the profanation of his name.

³⁴ Without mentioning speech-act analysis, Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1047, observes that in Ezek 36:17 Yahweh is explaining why he had to drive the Israelites out of their land and scatter them among the nations.

³⁵ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 348.

Speech-Act Analysis of Ezek 36:22–31. Yahweh uses an assertive force again in Ezek 36:22. However, his statement that he is not acting for Israel’s sake is an indirect accusation and an expression of his attitude. Yahweh accuses Israel of not deserving action for their sake. This is a statement concerning their unfaithfulness to the Sinaitic covenant. The perlocutionary goal is for Israel to admit that they have not been faithful to the Sinaitic covenant and that they do not merit Yahweh’s activity for their sake. Yahweh is also expressing his attitude of frustration toward Israel. This statement highlights the strain in the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. Yahweh wants the readers to agree that their status has been lowered in their relationship with him and to desire to affirm their relationship with him. Such affirmation would keep the relationship from being broken and would prevent Yahweh from turning against the Israelites definitively.

When Yahweh says that he is going to act, it is another case where an assertive form conceals a different function. This statement functions as a commissive. A commissive commits the speaker to doing something. Yahweh is making a promise. Because Yahweh controls history, when he makes a statement about the future—especially about his activity—he is making a promise about what will happen. The promise that Yahweh is going to act for his holy name is a positive promise. It is not a promise to judge or punish Israel. He has already judged Israel and has thus proven that his past promises were not in vain.³⁶ Furthermore, the use of the participle heightens the sense of immediacy in Yahweh’s statement. As Yahweh shifts to positive promises, he is describing the last step of the sin and reconciliation model, the return to favor. The perlocutionary goal of Yahweh’s statement is to convince the readers to trust that he will keep his promise and to be encouraged by this good news. Ezek 36:22 likely meets readers who

³⁶ See Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 976; and Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 254–56.

are overcome with despair and keenly aware of their own impotence and works to give them hope and the confidence that Yahweh will do what they are not able to do.

Ezekiel 36:23–31 continues to use an assertive form to mask primarily a commissive force. That is to say that Yahweh continues to make promises. Although the perlocutionary goals change within these verses, the passage tends to focus upon Israel's return to favor, the last step of the sin and reconciliation pattern. In Ezek 36:23, Yahweh accuses Israel again of profaning his name among the nations. His focus, however, is on the promise that he will sanctify his great name through Israel before the eyes of the nations. The perlocutionary goal of this promise is for the Israelite readers to be encouraged not only that Yahweh will act in a positive way but that he will also use Israel to do it. This statement urges the readers to believe that Yahweh will be faithful to Israel and that he is willing to use Israel to accomplish his positive goals. Furthermore, Yahweh's reputation as a powerful God reflects positively on Israel. It assures the readers that they will share in the honor of their God.

Yahweh states that the nations will know that he is Yahweh. He intends for the nations to recognize events in history as his activity. Furthermore, the statement that Yahweh will prove his holiness means that he will show that he is set apart from the normal concept of ANE gods. While a part of Yahweh's distinction from the ANE gods is his character and his standards, the focus in this verse is on his power. Yahweh will demonstrate that he is truly powerful.³⁷

In Ezek 36:24, Yahweh promises the Israelites the very gift they are hoping for. The exiles feel an intense need for land to call their own so that they can regain some honor among the nations. Yahweh responds to this need. The perlocutionary goal of this verse is to encourage the readers to have confidence in Yahweh. The verse seeks to achieve this goal by showing that the

³⁷ See Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 353–54.

strain in the relationship between Yahweh, Israel, and their different views of honor is not so great that Yahweh refuses to give the Israelites honor in a traditional ANE sense. On the contrary, Yahweh does just that.

In Ezek 36:25–27, Yahweh focuses on his relationship with Israel. He promises to do what is necessary to repair that relationship by making Israel clean, giving them a new heart and his Spirit, and by causing them to walk in his statutes. The perlocutionary goal of these verses is for the readers to be assured of Yahweh’s faithfulness in maintaining a good relationship with them. He promises to lead them to meet his own standards of behavior and to give them the cleanness necessary to enter into his presence.

In Ezek 36:28, Yahweh mentions the land again but focuses on the covenant relationship between him and Israel. He assures the readers that he is faithful to the covenant and that his faithfulness will bring good results for Israel. Furthermore, after accusing Israel of unfaithfulness to the Sinaitic covenant and punishing them for it, Yahweh promises that such unfaithfulness will not permanently break the covenant. On the contrary, Yahweh assures Israel that the covenant will function normally again.³⁸ Yahweh also mentions the land he gave to the fathers of the Israelites. This reminder of how Yahweh brought slaves out of Egypt and gave them wonderful land is more proof that Yahweh will do what seems impossible to the readers by bringing them back to the land.

Yahweh assures his readers of ongoing salvation from uncleanness in Ezek 36:29. He then goes on to promise abundance and protection from famine. This promise gives the Israelites further assurance that their needs will be met, that they will enjoy prosperity, and that they will

³⁸ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 249, asserts that Yahweh’s goal from the beginning has been for the covenant to function normally with Israel on the land.

have honor among the nations because of their wealth. It also connects with the needs the Israelites felt as exiles.

Ezekiel 36:30 strengthens Yahweh's promise to provide abundance and adds the result that Israel will never again experience the disgrace of famine among the nations. The absence of disgrace is a positive situation. Yahweh is responding to Israel's low status in comparison with surrounding nations by promising them higher status. He is assuring the Israelites that he will give them a certain amount of honor among the peoples.

Yahweh promises to bless Israel in Ezek 36:22–30. These verses are designed to encourage trust, but it is also possible for readers to refuse to trust Yahweh. Those readers who remain stubborn and refuse to believe Yahweh's promises are left without hope.

In Ezek 36:31, Yahweh continues to make promises, but the perlocutionary goals change substantially. He promises Israel memory of bad conduct and self-loathing. The promise serves as an accusation and as assurance at the same time. The promise makes it clear that the Israelites will agree with Yahweh's judgment of their past conduct. Yahweh wants Israel to accept blame and to acknowledge shame. In this verse, Yahweh moves from the last step of the sin and reconciliation pattern to the fifth step, reconciliation. He intends to accomplish his goal by promising that the Israelites will acknowledge shame. At the same time, the fact that Yahweh presents Israel's shame as a promise from their God gives them assurance that it will happen and that it will not ruin them.

The Israelites' concern for their difficult situation of exile and the shock of the fall of Jerusalem likely steal their attention from their unfaithfulness to Yahweh and the shame that they should acknowledge and feel. At the same time, the terrible results of Israel's unfaithfulness may make it seem impossible that Israel would change so that the Israelites recognize their past behavior as shameful. Also, the pain of the fall and the exile probably makes it difficult for the

Israelites to feel anything. In the face of these challenges, the promise from Yahweh that they will feel shame and that he will take responsibility for that feeling of shame is intended to give Israel assurance that Yahweh will reconcile them to himself. Yahweh promises to give the same shame that he is pushing for throughout this text. Yahweh's assurance also gives the readers confidence that their shame before him will not be part of more judgment that will bring about the end of Israel.

Yahweh puts Israel in a good position to admit fault. Israel has blamed Yahweh instinctively for the failure of their joint venture (Ezek 18:2, 25; 33:17)³⁹ even though the Israelites have little grounds for such an accusation. Yahweh creates a safe environment for Israel to acknowledge and feel shame by associating shame with a number of great gifts from him. Yahweh wants Israel to acknowledge shame in the confidence that he will maintain his relationship with them and will care for them.

Speech-Act Analysis of Ezek 36:32. In Ezek 36:32, there is a shift in the illocutionary force of the discourse. Yahweh shifts to a clear directive illocutionary force when he insists that Israel know why he is about to act and tells the Israelites to be ashamed and dishonored. The jussive gives a directive force to the statement, "Let it be known to you." Yahweh is insisting that Israel know that he is about to act, but not for their sake.

The main impact of the verse, however, comes at the end. After a great deal of indirect communication, Yahweh gives Israel a shockingly direct command. Ezekiel 36:32 contains two of only five occurrences of shame lexemes in the imperative in the HB. The third occurrence is found earlier in Ezekiel, and the other two are outside of Ezekiel.⁴⁰ The two imperatives in Ezek

³⁹ Odell, "Inversion," 107–8, 111.

⁴⁰ Aside from Ezek 36:32, shame lexemes in the imperative occur in Isa 23:4, Joel 1:11, and Ezek 16:52. The appearance in Isa 23:4 is the only case where Yahweh is not speaking to Israel. John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1–39* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 431, highlights Sidon's misplaced trust in Tyre as the

36:32 represent the only time that two shame lexemes are used in the imperative in the same verse. The two imperatives reflect the intensity of the verse and its important role in the book of Ezekiel, as the passage moves to direct communication. The shift from indirect communication to direct communication emphasizes the verse and intensifies the emotional pressure on the implied readers. There is nothing hidden in this statement. Yahweh's perlocutionary goal is for Israel to acknowledge shame. This is the overarching rhetorical goal of the passage. Yahweh has pushed the Israelites to acknowledge their shame because of their unfaithfulness. He has also given them assurance that he will care for them. He uses accusation and assurance to convince Israel to acknowledge shame. Yahweh intends for his readers to admit low status at the moment that they read this verse. The normal response of the reader is to acknowledge shame. This admission of low status before Yahweh is the reconciliation event in the sin and reconciliation pattern.

Israelites who do not trust in Yahweh likely react to this directive with refusal. The text makes it clear to them that refusing to acknowledge shame means breaking their relationship with Yahweh. Yahweh wants his readers to admit low status. If they refuse to acknowledge shame, however, they must know that they have rejected Yahweh.

reason why Yahweh tells Sidon to be ashamed. Tyre is telling Sidon to have low status because Sidon has depended upon Tyre and will now be let down and have low status as Tyre is destroyed. Lessing, "Interpreting Discontinuity," 290–91, focuses on the image of childbirth as he underlines the failure to have children as the cause for low social status. See p. 270 also for Lessing's comments on the pervasive and public role of shame in the context of the HB. Yahweh's use of shame in the passage is a good example of the hierarchical function of shame brought about by judgment.

Yahweh addresses Israel or a group of Israelites in the other four uses of shame lexemes in the imperative. In Joel 1:11, Yahweh tells the plowmen to have low status because the harvest of the field has perished. The reason for low status is failure that would normally cause public low status. Joel 1:13 talks about priests putting on sackcloth. These verses give a progression where failure causes low status, and the appropriate response is to highlight Israel's low status before Yahweh. The other three uses of the imperative appear in the book of Ezekiel. In Ezek 16:52, Yahweh orders Israel to acknowledge low status (בוֹשִׁי) because they justified their sisters, that is, they made them appear more righteous than Israel. This verse also uses the imperative of נָשָׂא twice, as Yahweh orders Israel to bear their low status (שָׂאִי כָּל־קִוְחֲךָ) because of their behavior. Furthermore, this passage speaks in a context of restoration, with Yahweh promising restoration in v. 53. Therefore, Ezek 16:52 is a didactic use of shame discourse.

To summarize, the study of speech acts in this passage reveals the use of indirect speech to influence the emotions of the readers so that they affirm Yahweh's values. The text uses statements of fact to act as accusations and promises, as it walks through the steps of the sin and reconciliation pattern. The accusations place blame on Israel, while the promises encourage the implied readers to trust in Yahweh. In terms of the sin and reconciliation pattern, the accusations focus upon Israel's sin, abandonment by Yahweh, and loss, while the promises describe Israel's return to favor. In this way, indirect speech allows the readers to draw the negative conclusion that they should acknowledge shame because of their behavior and the positive conclusion that Yahweh is going to solve every detail of the problem as a gift. The passage is designed to lead readers to accuse themselves and to trust Yahweh. Their feelings as they read the text are expected to confirm the accusation and the trust. The text is designed to put the readers in a good frame of mind for acknowledging shame, the reconciliation event from the sin and reconciliation pattern.

The emotional material of this text is also intended to influence doubting readers. Israelite readers who do not trust in Yahweh likely decide that neither the accusations nor the promises apply to them. After reading Ezek 36:16–32, their emotions almost certainly justify the refusal to acknowledge shame, the refusal to trust Yahweh, and the growing distance between themselves and Yahweh.

Rhetorical Techniques Used for Persuasion

Aside from the ethical and emotional material, a text may also use rhetorical techniques to influence readers. Rhetorical techniques present a text in a manner designed to persuade the readers without necessarily focusing upon the reliability of the author or the emotions of the readers. This section will demonstrate that the ethical material and emotional material work with the rhetorical devices employed in Ezek 36:16–32 in order increase the pressure on readers to

either affirm or reject a relationship with Yahweh. The passage uses all of these means within the sin and reconciliation pattern to create a faithful remnant that embraces Yahweh's values by acknowledging low status before him. The text drives readers to be reconciled to Yahweh, as they admit their shame before him. The unfulfilled promises and the lack of an Israelites response in Ezek 36:16–32 serve this end. Far from being a weak argument, the unfulfilled promises actually serve Yahweh's goal, as they create the opportunity for the readers to trust in Yahweh as he desires. The lack of an Israelite response makes it possible for each individual reader either to acknowledge shame and to join the faithful remnant or to refuse to admit dishonor and thus to remain estranged from Yahweh.

The Tension between Theology and Rhetoric

Rhetorically, Ezek 36:16–32 creates a paradox because it implies that Yahweh brings about Israel's shame and demands it at the same time. Yahweh takes responsibility for causing the Israelites to loathe themselves by making Ezek 36:31 part of his description of how he will sanctify his holy name. In this way, the Israelites are invited to hope that Yahweh himself will make it possible for them to acknowledge shame.

At the same time, however, Yahweh commands Israel to be ashamed in Ezek 36:32. The shift to the imperative makes Ezek 36:32 the only verse in this oracle where Yahweh tells Israel to do something without implying that he is behind the action. Rhetorically, this shift to the imperative makes it clear that now is the time for Israel to acknowledge shame. Yahweh is not describing what he is doing in Israel but rather is telling Israel to do something. He is ordering Israel to admit to the shame he just promised and associated with his gifts. At the same time, the

command gives the impression that the Israelites are expected to be ashamed on their own,⁴¹ raising the issue of individual responsibility and divine initiative.

In his study of Ezekiel, Joyce stands apart from other scholars by treating the topic of individual responsibility and divine initiative in Ezekiel in detail. He responds to this issue in the passage by pitting the two sides against each other and concluding that divine initiative weakens individual responsibility: “Ultimately, however, since obedience is guaranteed, it would seem that the responsibility of Israel has been subsumed in the overriding initiative of Yahweh.”⁴² He goes on to justify this view by stressing the importance of Yahweh’s intervention: “in the opinion of this writer, the insight that humankind is ultimately impotent without God remains one of the central truths about human existence.”⁴³ While this last statement is theologically correct, Joyce’s use of it in this context seems to highlight Israel’s impotence in a way that makes Yahweh responsible for any failure to intervene.

However, Ezek 36:16–32 presents individual responsibility as a reality that is not undermined by Yahweh’s gracious gifts which have already claimed Israel as his own. Ezekiel 36:32 should be taken as a literal command within a context that affirms that those who continue in their stubborn rejection of Yahweh are responsible for the punishment they will receive. Rhetorically, this verse is intended to push the implied readers to desire the help that Yahweh has promised.⁴⁴ Furthermore, although Joyce seems to assume that all Israelites will receive Yahweh’s grace, this passage paints a different picture. In fact, Ezek 36:32 makes it possible for some Israelites to reject Yahweh while other Israelites acknowledge shame before him.

⁴¹ Greenberg, “Salvation,” 267, takes the imperatives in v. 32 as a command by Yahweh for Israel to be contrite.

⁴² Joyce, *Divine*, 127.

⁴³ Joyce, *Divine*, 129. See also Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 23–27.

⁴⁴ The text uses rhetoric in a way that pushes the implied readers to desire what Yahweh gives as a gift so that Yahweh uses the rhetoric of the text to accomplish his goal of giving certain Israelites his gifts.

The theological content communicated by the text is consistent with the rest of biblical theology, while still applying rhetorical pressure. The passage encourages hope in Yahweh as it persuades. From Yahweh's point of view, those who agree with this oracle are showing themselves to have received a new heart, his Spirit, and self-loathing from him.⁴⁵ From the point of view of the readers, however, they are under intense rhetorical pressure to acknowledge low status. Yahweh uses the words of this oracle as a means of accomplishing his goal. The self-loathing comes as a gift from Yahweh but happens within the Israelites.⁴⁶ Those who are ashamed should recognize that this shame comes as a gift from Yahweh, while those who refuse to be ashamed have only themselves to blame.

The Creation of Trust

Ultimately, the acknowledgment of dishonor before Yahweh is an expression of trust in him. Those Israelites who admit shame trust that Yahweh is right to blame them for the exile. The oracle also uses unfulfilled promises to engender trust in Yahweh and to reinforce Yahweh's values. The passage uses these promises for persuasion. The most striking example of this is the promise in Ezek 36:24 that Yahweh will take Israel from the nations and return them to their

⁴⁵ Yahweh works through statements of individual responsibility rhetorically to accomplish his gracious goals. While the acknowledgment of shame may seem like it is accomplished by the individual when seen from the point of view of the individual, it is actually a gift from Yahweh. Hummel, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 546–47, presents the situation clearly by comparing the language of experience with theological language. “When we say ‘believe,’ ‘repent,’ and so on in the imperative, who else could possibly respond positively—humanly speaking—other than the person addressed?” He goes on to assert that, “theologically, we will stress increasingly that the decision was not really his—that a fallen sinner is by nature simply incapable of making that choice.”

⁴⁶ Yahweh's initial action shows that his is totally free and that admitting the shame of one's evil conduct is not a condition but rather a result of Yahweh's mercy. See Bernard Renaud, “L'alliance éternelle d'éz 16:59–63 et l'alliance nouvelle de jér 31:31–34,” in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation* (BETL74; ed. J. Lust; Louvain: Louvain University Press, 1986), 337–38.

ground. This promise is given to implied readers who are in exile,⁴⁷ with no indication that the exile will end soon.

By using this approach, Yahweh is hiding his power in order to create an opportunity for the readers to trust him.⁴⁸ It is not necessary for all of the promises described in Ezek 36:24–31 to happen in order for Israelites to draw the conclusion that they should acknowledge their low status before Yahweh. It is only necessary to read and believe those verses. Yahweh’s goal comes through most clearly in v. 28, where he says, “You will be my people, and *I* will be your God.” Yahweh is proclaiming his faithfulness to his covenant relationship with Israel.⁴⁹ In spite of Israel’s violation of the Mosaic covenant, Yahweh is still faithful to the Israelites because of the covenant. Those readers who believe this have the trust that Yahweh desires and finds honorable.

As the oracle creates trust, it also encourages the readers to realize that they are able to trust in Yahweh and walk in his statutes even though they are in exile. Yahweh shows the faithful that it is possible for him to be their God when they are separated from the land.⁵⁰ He commands these people to be ashamed of their previous behavior. Ezekiel 36:32 comes after Yahweh’s description of Israel’s ideal future because this description prepares the reader for the present imperatives of v. 32 by proving Yahweh’s faithfulness. This verse forces the readers to recognize whether trust has been produced or not. Hearing the promises before they have been fulfilled is intended to produce trust, and that trust should result in the acknowledgment of shame.

⁴⁷ See the description of the audience in chapter 1.

⁴⁸ This practice was described in chapter 3.

⁴⁹ See Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 356–57.

⁵⁰ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 234, argues convincingly that the book of Ezekiel is designed to help Israel to survive the exile as a distinct entity. In order to achieve this goal, it is necessary for the Israelites to be convinced that God is still their God in the exile.

Lack of an Israelite Response in the Text

However, the text does not say whether the Israelites obeyed or refused to obey v. 32. There is no specific statement in chapter 36 that any Israelites actually did acknowledge shame before Yahweh. This is a rhetorical technique designed to force the readers to interact with the text. Although this verse employs the plural, it intends to confront each reader⁵¹ with the command to be ashamed.⁵² Yahweh treats the Israelites as a group,⁵³ and each individual either becomes part of the group that is ashamed as Yahweh wishes or refuses to obey Yahweh. But it is impossible for any readers to hide from the text. After reading Ezek 36:32, each Israelite is either at odds with Yahweh because of refusing to be ashamed or is reconciled with Yahweh and is ashamed.

A Faithful Remnant

It is this acknowledgment of low status that Yahweh uses to create a remnant of faithful Israelites.⁵⁴ Those who do not acknowledge shame are not part of the house of Israel while those who do are.⁵⁵ This is clear from the tight connection between the restoration and shame. It is impossible to have one without the other. According to Ezek 36:16–32, one of the primary and lasting characteristics of true Israelites is that they acknowledge shame before Yahweh. This shame is not used as social sanction but rather as a means of reinforcing Yahweh's values. The

⁵¹ For details concerning the implied readers and the rhetorical situation, see chapter 1.

⁵² Concerning the persuasive nature of prophetic literature, see Lessing, "Interpreting Discontinuity," 148. See also Wuellner Wuellner, "Where?", 448–63.

⁵³ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 564, observes that Ezekiel, "sees the people of God as a whole." At the same time, Renz, *Rhetorical*, 221, argues that not every ethnic Israelite will be part of the group of Israelites that will be restored by Yahweh.

⁵⁴ As Renz, *Rhetorical*, 113, says, "Yahweh is not waiting for Israel's response, he is creating it."

⁵⁵ Those who fail to acknowledge shame are responsible for their fate, while those who do admit dishonor have been led to this point by Yahweh's activity for the sake of his name.

passage does not describe any situation under which this dishonor will disappear. It is a part of Israel's identity, and it demonstrates that Israel agrees with Yahweh's view of shame and honor.

Those who remain stubborn, however, will cease to be part of the house of Israel. They will not be part of the restoration because they are not ashamed. Only those who are ashamed before Yahweh are a part of the faithful remnant. In this way, Yahweh gives final resolution to the problem of his being challenged by his people. The faithful remnant will no longer challenge Yahweh, while those ethnic Israelites who continue to challenge Yahweh will no longer be a part of Yahweh's people.

As Yahweh uses Ezek 36:16–32 to create a faithful remnant, he intends for this faithful society to pressure its members to follow his values. Ezekiel 36:16–20 teaches the readers that it was behavior contrary to the Sinaitic covenant that resulted in the exile. According to Ezek 36:27, Yahweh will deal with this problem by leading his people to walk in his statutes. Yahweh is pushing the faithful Israelites to value such behavior and to encourage the members of Israelite society to follow the stipulations of the covenant. In Ezek 36:23–30, Yahweh demonstrates his faithfulness to his covenant relationship with Israel. He also shows that he wants the Israelites to trust him and to value such trust within their society. However, the key verse in this process is Ezek 36:32. Here Yahweh commands the Israelites to be ashamed. In this way, they will demonstrate a proper attitude toward their previous behavior and an appropriate posture in their relationship with Yahweh. Yahweh is teaching the faithful remnant to exclude from its society anyone who refuses to acknowledge shame before him.

In Ezek 36:16–32, Yahweh maintains the covenant and uses it to define his relationship with the faithful remnant in a way that reinforces his understanding of honor and shame. Even in the face of Israel's accusations (Ezek 18:2, 25; 33:17) and extreme disobedience (Ezek 36:17–18), Yahweh has not wavered from his insistence on being recognized as the only true God and

on Israel's walking in his statutes. He has remained faithful to the covenant and has persisted in using the covenant as the measure of his relationship with Israel. In Ezek 36:27–28, Yahweh promises to bring Israel back into an appropriate covenant relationship with him.⁵⁶ He maintains his covenant with the new Israel, which is characterized by the acknowledgment of shame in their relationship with him. Here, the relationship between shame and humility brings understanding to Yahweh's use of the covenant, as Lev 26:41–42 is in view. After describing a time when he will send Israel into exile in Lev 26:41, Yahweh stresses the importance of Israel's uncircumcised heart humbling itself and of Israel paying for their iniquities (**אוֹ-אֵז יִכְנַע לְבַבְכֶם** (**וְהָעֵרַל וְאֵז יִרְצוּ אֶת-עֵוֹנֵם**, Lev 26:41). In Ezek 36:16–32, everything is in place for Yahweh to remember the covenant (Lev 26:42). Jerusalem has fallen to pay for Israel's iniquities, Yahweh has replaced Israel's uncircumcised heart with a new heart, and Israel acknowledges shame. Israel's heart has humbled itself.

The faithful remnant that Yahweh creates in Ezek 36:16–32 is characterized by the admission that Israel's violation of the Sinaitic covenant was shameful.⁵⁷ This remnant forms a society where Yahweh's values are important, his covenant is followed, and everyone agrees with Yahweh that Israel's previous behavior was shameful. Those who have acknowledged their low status before Yahweh should pressure other ethnic Israelites to do the same.

The Timing of Shame in the Argumentation

An analysis of the rhetorical techniques employed in Ezek 36:16–32 highlights the priority of rhetoric over chronology and thus plays a role in responding to the crux of the passage. The

⁵⁶ The covenant formula (Lev 26:12, Deut 26:16–19, 29:12–13) identifies Yahweh as their God and Israel as his people. See Hals, *Ezekiel*, 360.

⁵⁷ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 222.

argument is logical rather than chronological, and the organization of the text is meant to aim the rhetorical energy of the passage at the last verse. After using v. 31 to tell the Israelites that they will loathe themselves in the future when they are restored to the land, Yahweh employs v. 32 to tell them to be ashamed right now. Ezekiel 36:16–32 seeks to accomplish the reconciliation event from the sin and reconciliation pattern. The passage uses the promise of Yahweh’s future gifts to lead the readers to trust Yahweh and to obey Ezek 36:32. Unfortunately, this approach creates the impression that shame comes after the fulfillment of all of the positive promises, including a return to the land.⁵⁸ In reality, Yahweh works in the Israelites to lead them to acknowledge shame as they read the text. Rhetorically, the command to be ashamed comes after positive promises in Ezek 36:32 for the purpose of persuasion. In the historical relationship between Yahweh and Israel, Yahweh’s promises and his gift of a new heart lead to Israel’s admission of low status. That acknowledgment opens the way for reconciliation with Yahweh and, eventually, restoration to the land.

To use the sin and reconciliation pattern as a guide, the reconciliation event between Yahweh and Israel actually takes place before Israel’s return to favor in Ezek 36:16–32. The reconciliation event comes at the end of the oracle rhetorically, but it is intended to take place before the restoration historically. The unusual order in the sin and reconciliation pattern is another way of referring to the crux of the passage. The command to be ashamed comes after the promises of blessing in order to accomplish the rhetorical goal of reconciliation.

⁵⁸Lapsley, “Shame and Self-Knowledge,” 155, 158–59; Greenberg, “Salvation .” 267; and Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll*, 58, all conclude that the shame cannot come before the restoration to the land.

Chapter Summary

The ethical material, the emotional material, and the rhetorical techniques used for persuasion in Ezek 36:16–32 all work within Ezekiel’s unique version of the sin and reconciliation pattern to create a faithful remnant. The sin and reconciliation model serves the rhetorical goal of the passage, as the text changes the pattern so that the return to favor is described before the reconciliation event. This takes place so that the unfulfilled promises of a return to favor may lead readers to acknowledge low status and thus to be reconciled to Yahweh.

The ethical material and the emotional material in Ezek 36:16–32 reinforce Yahweh’s values and thus press readers to agree with them. The ethical material presents Yahweh’s view of his relationship with Israel as fact without considering any other possibility. The emotional material maintains this approach and, as speech-act analysis demonstrates, forces the Israelite readers to affirm their relationship with Yahweh or to separate themselves from him.

The passage also employs a number of rhetorical devices that work with the ethical and emotional material to create a group of Israelites who trust in Yahweh as he desires. Ezekiel 36:16–32 includes both the theological promise that the Israelites will loathe themselves and the rhetorical command for them to be ashamed. The promise assures the readers that Yahweh will give them what he demands of them, while the command creates intense rhetorical pressure on the readers. In this way, Yahweh uses the rhetoric of the oracle to accomplish his goal. From the point of view of the readers it may seem that they decided to be ashamed when, in fact, Yahweh led them to acknowledge low status. At the same time, Yahweh makes positive promises without tangible fulfillment in order to create an opportunity for the Israelites to trust him or to doubt. The text intends for the promises to create trust in the readers.

Ezekiel 36:16–32 does not state clearly whether the Israelites were ashamed or not. This is a rhetorical technique that allows the implied readers to acknowledge low status before Yahweh

or to refuse to do so. At the same time, Yahweh uses the combination of blessings and shame to define the identity of the Israelites. The Israelites will loathe themselves as part of the ideal future. There is no restoration for Israel without an acknowledgment of shame. This means that ethnic Israelites who refuse to be ashamed are no longer part of Israel. Only those who acknowledge low status before Yahweh are part of the true Israel. This fact drives the faithful Israelites to define themselves by their attitude toward Israel's previous violation of the Sinaitic covenant and to pressure the members of this new society to affirm Yahweh's values.

This chapter has argued that the text intends the implied readers to be ashamed immediately after they read Ezek 36:32 so that they join the group of true Israelites. The passage deals with Israel's shame at the end of the oracle because the promises that come before push the Israelites to be ashamed in v. 32. However, Yahweh expects the Israelites to begin acknowledging low status before he returns them to the land. The references to Israel's shame come after the promises of restoration rhetorically but the actual shame will begin before the restoration chronologically.

If this argument is true, the book of Ezekiel should support it. It will be necessary to study the role of Ezek 36:16–32 within the structure and rhetorical strategy of the book to test this interpretation of Ezek 36:16–32 against the context of the book of Ezekiel. Such an analysis will make it possible to investigate whether or not the book of Ezekiel expects the readers to acknowledge low status before Yahweh in Ezek 36:32.

CHAPTER FIVE

EZEK 36:16–32 WITHIN THE STRUCTURE AND RHETORICAL STRATEGY OF THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL

This study is seeking to explain why the positive promises in Ezek 36:16–32 are followed by a command to be ashamed. Chapter 1 stressed the importance of the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel and argued that the progression of thought in Ezek 36:24–32 is logical rather than chronological. It contended that Yahweh intends for the Israelites to be ashamed right away when they read the text. However, the chapter drew attention to the passage's failure to define shame. In response to this concern, chapter 2 studied other occurrences of shame lexemes and concluded that these terms refer to low status in a ranked group. It also presented evidence that the didactic function of shame discourse is at work in Ezek 36:32. In this use of low-status language, Yahweh expects the Israelites to admit dishonor in their relationship with him in order to show that they have learned from being punished.

Chapter 3 began by detailing the differences between Yahweh's view of status and the view held by the nations. It then explained that Israel, Yahweh's covenant partner, may hurt Yahweh's reputation by failing or by saying that Yahweh is at fault for their failure. With this in mind, it appears that Yahweh describes his wonderful plans for Israel in Ezek 36:23–30 in order to prove that he is not at fault for the exile but that the Israelites should be ashamed because they brought this failure upon themselves. As chapter 3 argued, it is honorable for Israel to acknowledge low status before Yahweh. The analysis of shame discourse in chapter 3 went on to highlight the sin and reconciliation pattern that Yahweh uses in his covenant relationship with

Israel. In this pattern, Yahweh punishes Israel with a loss in order to drive the Israelites to be reconciled with him. When the Israelites acknowledge shame in Ezek 36:32, they are reconciled with Yahweh. This is the reconciliation event in the sin and reconciliation pattern.¹ In fact, the unusual order in Ezek 36:16–32 results from the intentional inversion of the sin and reconciliation pattern. The return to favor (step six) is presented before reconciliation (step five) in order to drive the Israelites to be reconciled with Yahweh in Ezek 36:32.

According to the analysis of chapter 4, the reason for the intentional inversion of the sin and reconciliation pattern is for the purpose of creating a faithful remnant of true Israelites. This chapter argued that the ethical material and the emotional material in Ezek 36:16–32 are intended to reinforce Yahweh's values, as they work within the sin and reconciliation model. The rhetorical devices also work within this pattern, with unfulfilled promises creating the opportunity for trust, as the passage drives the readers to the imperatives of v. 32. The book of Ezekiel does not say that any Israelites acknowledge shame, but it has been argued that the book does this so that all of the readers of v. 32 will be confronted with Yahweh's command. Those who refuse Yahweh's order to be ashamed cease to be part of Israel, while the Israelites who admit dishonor before Yahweh form the true Israel. This true Israel is reconciled with Yahweh and embraces his values. This group of Israelites then applies social pressure to its members to follow Yahweh's values.

The argument that Yahweh uses the sin and reconciliation pattern to create a faithful remnant will now be tested by analyzing Ezek 36:16–32 within the context of the book of Ezekiel, completing the fifth step of a rhetorical study. The goal of this chapter is to demonstrate that Yahweh is using the sin and reconciliation pattern throughout the whole book of Ezekiel in

¹ Laniak, *Shame*, 7–10.

order to create a faithful remnant of true Israelites, with the reconciliation event taking place at least by Ezek 36:32.² Ezekiel 36:32, then, is the key turning point of the rhetorical strategy of the book. It is the place where the book seeks to accomplish its rhetorical goal of giving Israel a new identity by creating a faithful remnant that acknowledges low status in their relationship with Yahweh.³ The readers who acknowledge low status have a positive relationship with Yahweh as they bear their shame even into the restoration. This analysis will thus bring the work in the previous chapters of the dissertation to bear on the entire book of Ezekiel.

To demonstrate the pervasive use of the sin and reconciliation model in Ezekiel, the entire book will be analyzed for features of this pattern. As already described, Laniak's sin and reconciliation model may be summarized in the following six steps: (1) favor, (2) sin, (3) abandonment, (4) loss, (5) reconciliation, and (6) return to favor.⁴ The assertion that the book of Ezekiel is using the sin and reconciliation pattern to create a remnant of true Israelites will be argued first by the way the book is structured, further by highlighting the role that shame discourse plays in the pattern, and finally by attention to Ezekiel's major themes.

With this in mind, chapter 5 will be organized around the structure of the book, offering a detailed analysis of the four major sections of Ezekiel as related to Ezek 36:16–32. The structure of the book of Ezekiel can be divided broadly into judgment and restoration, with the shift to

² As will be discussed below, Ezek 6:9, Ezek 16:52–63, and Ezek 20:43 are all similar to Ezek 36:32 and may lead some Israelites to acknowledge shame when they read these verses.

³ This assertion builds on Renz's rhetorical study of the book of Ezekiel. Renz, *Rhetorical*, 117, 249, argues that the rhetorical goal of the book of Ezekiel is to shape the self-understanding of the Israelites in exile. The Israelites are to realize that the exile took place because they sinned against Yahweh and that their identity as a people is found in Yahweh, rather than the land or the temple, even when Israel is in exile. I agree with his conclusions but wish to frame them in the cultural language of the text where both punishment and self-understanding are tied directly to shame discourse. The rhetorical goal of the book of Ezekiel as described by Renz is accomplished when Israel acknowledges shame before Yahweh.

⁴ The sin and reconciliation pattern was first described in chapter 3. See Laniak, *Shame*, 7–8, 16.

restoration taking place in Ezek 25:1.⁵ Most scholars recognize the use of judgment and restoration, or weal and woe, in the book of Ezekiel.⁶ Therefore, this dissertation is starting with a common view of the organization of the book. However, this chapter will argue that weal and woe may be described in more detail in the terms of the sin and reconciliation pattern.

The basic sin and reconciliation pattern is visible in the structure of Ezekiel, with Ezek 1:1–24:27 focusing on sin (2), abandonment (3), and loss (4).⁷ In this first section, Yahweh promises to judge Israel and to take responsibility for creating a remnant. Then there is a shift toward reconciliation (5) and a return to favor (6) in the next section, Ezek 25:1–32:32, where Yahweh asserts his own honor and power, as he judges the nations and shames them. In these verses, Yahweh implies a good relationship with Israel by treating Israel's enemies as his own enemies. When Yahweh judges these nations, he prepares for Israel's return to favor. Next, Ezek 33:1–39:29 constitutes a unit where the text seeks to achieve reconciliation (5) and thus to accomplish the book's goal in Ezek 36:32. This section then goes on to describe Israel's return to favor (6) in detail. Finally, Ezek 40:1–48:35 assumes that reconciliation (5) has taken place at least by Ezek 36:32, as it describes Israel's new and positive life (6).⁸

⁵ Cassuto, "The Arrangement of the Book of Ezekiel," in *Bible*, vol. 1 of *Biblical and Oriental Studies* (trans. I. Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1974), 227–40, breaks the book into three major sections: 1:1–24:27 Prophecies of Retribution that Preceded the Destruction of Jerusalem, 25:1–32:32 Prophecies against the Gentiles, and 33:1–48:35 Prophecies Concerning the Resuscitation of Israel and the Restoration of its National and Religious Life. However, the prophecies against the nations are clearly good news for Israel as Yahweh promises to punish their enemies and competitors. Furthermore, Yahweh asserts his honor as he promises to judge and punish the nations.

⁶ For example, see Hummel, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 12. See also Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 56–64.

⁷ The first step of the sin and reconciliation model, when Israel has favor before Yahweh and the nations, has already passed at the beginning of the book of Ezekiel. As discussed in chapter 1, the book is addressed to a people in exile, when their beloved city, Jerusalem is about to fall.

⁸ See Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, vii–ix; and Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, vii–viii. Block divides the book into small sections with the following headings: 1:1–3:27 The Call of Ezekiel; 4:1–11:25 Woe for Jerusalem/Judah; 12:1–24:27 Woe for Israel; 25:1–32:32 Oracles against Foreign Nations; 33:1–33 End of an Era; 34:1–48:35 Hope for Israel. Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 62, gives more detail to the final chapters: 34:1–37:28 Blessing upon Israel; 38:1–39:29 Gog; 40:1–48:35 The Temple Vision.

As this chapter demonstrates that the book is organized around the sin and reconciliation pattern, it will also highlight the manner in which the sin and reconciliation pattern engages shame discourse and the major themes of the book. Chapter 5 will contend that the book of Ezekiel uses hierarchical, challenge, and didactic shame discourse⁹ to serve the sin and reconciliation model. It will also argue that the sin and reconciliation pattern makes use of the major themes of the book, namely, theocentricity, the importance of Yahweh's name, personal responsibility, the departure and return of the **כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה** (honor of Yahweh), judgment, divine initiative, a remnant, and the covenant.¹⁰ In this way, chapter 5 will seek to demonstrate that the structure, the shame discourse, and the major themes of the book are all engaged by the sin and reconciliation model to accomplish the book's goal, with the rhetorical energy aimed at Ezek 36:32.

Ezekiel 1:1–24:27: Sin Described and Judgment Foretold

In this first major section, Yahweh argues that he is right to judge the Israelites because of their behavior, and he describes the punishment that will shame Israel before the nations. He also introduces his plan to create a new Israel that will acknowledge shame before him. To do this, Yahweh uses a loosely structured cyclical approach where he presents the same basic argument four times.¹¹ Each cycle focuses upon steps two and four of the sin and reconciliation model,

⁹ The hierarchical function denotes a situation where describing an entity's low position in the hierarchy is the primary goal of the use of shame discourse. With the propriety use, a person is faced with a situation that may bring low status. The person should exercise propriety in order to avoid low status. When the challenge function is employed, a person is challenged in order to force that person to fight back or to accept lowered status. The function of shame is didactic when the acknowledgment of dishonor shows a willingness to learn. For more information, see chapter 2 and appendix 1.

¹⁰ See Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 17–32.

¹¹ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 61–62, 89, asserts that each new cycle begins with a date (Ezek 1:1–3) or a statement about the elders approaching the prophet (Ezek 14:1) or both (Ezek 8:1; 20:1). He notes that there are no other instances of the elders approaching the prophet and only one other date in this first major section. That date is found in Ezek 24:1 because it is the day that the siege of Jerusalem begins.

Israel's sin and loss. However, each cycle also has at least a brief statement of hope. The first cycle implies the possibility of reconciliation, the fifth step of the sin and reconciliation pattern, while the last three cycles describe reconciliation and also restoration, the sixth step of the model. Ezekiel 1:1–24:27 depicts Israel's sin and Yahweh's abandonment of Israel as happening in the present. It also foretells Israel's loss, reconciliation, and restoration. However, in chapter 24, the siege of Jerusalem begins, showing that Israel's loss is coming soon. Yahweh uses the four cycles to batter the Israelites with talk of sin and judgment and to shape them with an occasional message of hope. In this way, he increases the pressure on the readers to agree that his judgment is just and prepares them for the siege in chapter 24 and the imperatives in Ezek 36:32.

The First Cycle: Ezek 1:1–7:27

During the first cycle, Yahweh presents his case against Israel.¹² In doing this, he employs specific elements of the sin and reconciliation pattern and introduces the major themes of theocentricity, personal responsibility, judgment, divine initiative, a remnant, and the covenant. He also employs shame discourse.

The first two chapters of the book of Ezekiel engage the themes of theocentricity, divine initiative, and the covenant, as Yahweh begins to deal with Israel's sin, the second step in the sin and reconciliation pattern. The vision in chapter 1 introduces the theme of theocentricity by depicting Yahweh's honor.¹³ In chapter 2, Yahweh continues to communicate in a theocentric manner, as he presents the problem and his solution from his point of view. The theme of divine initiative emerges in Ezek 2:3 as Yahweh sends his prophet Ezekiel to deliver his message to the

¹² Renz, *Rhetorical*, 63–68.

¹³ Honor is part of Yahweh's very essence. This is clear in the fact that when Yahweh's honor (כְּבוֹד יְהוָה) left the temple, Yahweh himself left the temple (Ezek 10:18–19; Ezek 3:12). See Collins, *NIDOTTE* 2:577–87.

Israelites. As he does this, Yahweh characterizes the Israelites as rebellious and stubborn in Ezek 2:3–6. The rebellion and the transgression of the Israelites (Ezek 2:3) remind the readers of the Sinaitic covenant with Yahweh because they have rebelled against and transgressed this covenant.¹⁴ The stubborn attitude of the Israelites and their sin both function as insults that challenge¹⁵ Yahweh and work against the honor of Yahweh that was described in chapter 1.¹⁶

Chapter 3 makes use of the theme of personal responsibility and intimates the theme of a remnant. Ezekiel 3:18–19 makes it clear that, once a wicked person has been warned by Ezekiel, that person is responsible for the punishment he will receive. Then, in Ezek 3:27, Yahweh refers to the one who hears and to the one who refuses (הַשְׁמִיעַ יִשְׁמַע וְהֶחֱדַל יֶחֱדַל).¹⁷ In this way, the text implies that some will hear, will be reconciled with Yahweh, and will form a remnant of faithful Israelites (Ezek 3:21). It also implies that others will refuse to hear and will be judged (Ezek 3:18–19). The readers will either be forced to give up their stubbornness or will be confirmed in their stubbornness and their conflict with Yahweh. These verses intimate that membership in the true Israel is based upon a relationship with Yahweh rather than being based upon ethnicity. In this way, the book of Ezekiel begins to express the concept of a remnant even though it does not employ the term *remnant*.¹⁸

¹⁴ The Sinaitic covenant is in view when Yahweh accuses Israel of violating the covenant and when he describes his plan to punish Israel for that violation. The general covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel is in focus when Yahweh proves his faithfulness to Israel by saving the Israelites without any merit on their part. In that case, Yahweh is being faithful to his covenants with Noah and Abraham, but also the covenant at Sinai and especially with David.

¹⁵ Isaiah 65:7 demonstrates that Yahweh's takes Israel's idolatry as a challenge.

¹⁶ See chapter 3 of this dissertation for details concerning the relationship between challenges and honor.

¹⁷ The jussive here constitutes a third person command and applies rhetorical pressure on the readers.

¹⁸ The book of Ezekiel does not use the standard Hebrew term for remnant, שְׁאֲרִית, often. The prophet uses it twice (Ezek 9:8; 11:13) to refer not to a faithful remnant, but to those Israelites who are still alive at that point in the text. Ezekiel 5:10 also refers to a group of survivors, but they will be scattered by Yahweh. In the book of Ezekiel, Yahweh is creating a faithful group from within Israel in a way that is consistent with the remnant motif elsewhere even though he does not employ the vocabulary. His approach can be confusing, however, because he does not employ special vocabulary for the remnant. He uses the terms *Israel* and *house of Israel* to refer both to the Old

In chapters 4 through 7, Yahweh focuses on judgment, the fourth step in the sin and reconciliation model, but also employs didactic shame discourse in a brief message of hope. These words of hope imply the possibility of reconciliation, the fifth step in the sin and reconciliation pattern.

After symbolizing the siege of Jerusalem in chapter 4, Yahweh goes on to describe the specific sin of the Israelites, namely, the failure to walk in Yahweh's statutes (Ezek 5:6) and idolatry (Ezek 5:11).¹⁹ These two sins show that the Israelites are not following the stipulations of the Sinaitic covenant (Deut 4:1, 16–19). They are not evaluating their behavior according to Yahweh's view of shame and honor. In response to this challenge,²⁰ Yahweh uses shame discourse in Ezek 5:14–15, as he describes his plan to assert his own honor in the covenant relationship by shaming Israel before the nations.

According to Ezek 5:14, Yahweh will make Israel “a reproach among the nations” (וְלִחְרָפָה בְּגוֹיִם). Ezekiel 5:15 mentions reproach and the nations as well while tying reproach to judgment by saying, “when I execute judgments upon you” (בְּעֲשׂוֹתִי בְךָ שְׁפָטִים). Yahweh is planning to punish Israel with famine to counter their wealth and the sword and wild animals to counter their power (Ezek 5:16–17). The stated goal of this punishment is to destroy Israel (Ezek 5:16).

In Ezek 6:9, however, the intense description of Yahweh's planned judgment gives way to a brief message of hope that employs didactic shame discourse. Ezekiel 6:8–9 describes the time after Yahweh has punished Israel, and the Israelites are scattered among the nations. In the midst

Israel that he is going to judge (Ezek 6:11) and the New Israel or the remnant that he is planning to save (Ezek 11:15–17). See Renz, *Rhetorical*, 163, 176–77.

¹⁹ See also Ezek 6:4–6, 9, and 13.

²⁰ According to Isa 65:7, Yahweh's takes Israel's idolatry as a challenge.

of this judgment, Yahweh uses Ezek 6:8–9 to mention escapees from the sword (פְּלִיטֵי הָרֶב)—the survivors that will be the house of Israel. This serves as a subtle and brief mention of hope.

There will be survivors, but these survivors will loathe themselves because they were unfaithful to Yahweh. While their behavior is the cause for their self-loathing, the impetus for their self-loathing is Yahweh’s brokenness over their unfaithfulness (וְשִׁבְרִתִּי אֶת־לְבָבְכֶם הַזֹּנֶה). The Israelites feel their low status keenly because they brought it upon themselves and hurt Yahweh in the process. The self-loathing described in Ezek 6:9 implies that these Israelites will agree with Yahweh that violating the Sinaitic covenant is shameful. It thus implies that they may be reconciled with Yahweh. Yahweh’s readers may and should loathe themselves even while they are still in exile.²¹ They are in the situation described in Ezek 6:8–9. Now is the time for them to acknowledge shame and to affirm their relationship with Yahweh and their membership in Israel.²²

Then Yahweh returns to the theme of judgment at the end of chapter 6 and in chapter 7. Once again Yahweh uses shame discourse to describe the result of that judgment (Ezek 7:18). Ezekiel 7:18 takes place within the context of the judgment mentioned in Ezek 5:14–17 but has a slight shift in focus to Israel’s feeling of low status. The verse deals with the state of the Israelites and says, “and on all faces shame” (וְאֵל כָּל־פְּנִים בּוֹשָׁה). Block concludes that this verse is talking about a facial response to shame.²³ It describes a situation where the Israelites

²¹ Klein, *Ezekiel*, 58, affirms that, according to Ezek 6:8–10, this self-loathing on the part of some Israelites takes place while they are still in exile.

²² Although Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 233, does not stress the role of low status discourse, he does recognize that Ezek 6:9 is sending a positive message to the implied readers that Ezekiel “foresees a remnant emerging, ready to acknowledge not only Yahweh as their covenant Lord, but also their own wretchedness before him for the evils of their past.”

²³ Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 262.

react to their low status emotionally in a way that can be seen on their faces. Here shame is associated with sackcloth and baldness, which are also visible to others.

In summary, Yahweh uses the first cycle to present his case against Israel. He argues that he is right to judge Israel because of Israel's rebellious behavior. At the same time, however, he gives a glimpse of a time when the Israelites will agree that their behavior was loathsome.

The Second Cycle: Ezek 8:1–13:23

Yahweh employs many of the same concepts in the second cycle as he did in the first, but here he approaches his topic in a way that counters the objections of the Israelites.²⁴ In order to do this, Yahweh uses present examples to illustrate the idolatry of the Israelites. In response to their sin, he acts out the third step of the sin and reconciliation pattern when his honor departs from the temple (Ezek 10:18–19; 11:22–23). Yahweh goes on to highlight the Israelites' obsession with the land before describing his plan for reconciliation and restoration, the fifth and sixth steps of the sin and reconciliation pattern respectively. After a brief respite, Yahweh returns to sin and judgment, as he argues that there are no faithful Israelites and presents his plan to purge Israel of rebels.

In chapters 8 and 9, Yahweh focuses on his just judgment. He begins to justify his plan to judge Israel and to counter any objections the Israelites may have by illustrating their extreme idolatry. Ezekiel 8:10–11 describes the elders of Israel in the act of worshipping countless idols. According to Ezek 8:12, the elders are not troubled about engaging in such sin because they conclude that Yahweh has forsaken the land. They seem to believe that Yahweh is not taking good care of Israel and is, therefore violating the covenant.²⁵ As the Israelites appear to see the

²⁴ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 68–71.

²⁵ Brownlee, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 134, argues that the Israelites conclude that Yahweh is not taking care of his people. This creates a sense of distress and a desire to seek help elsewhere. See also Hummel's comments in *Ezekiel 1–20*,

situation, Yahweh is obligated by the covenant to protect them and to maintain them on the land even when they violate the stipulations of the Sinaitic covenant.²⁶ The Israelites are seeking honor in human terms²⁷ rather than according to Yahweh's guidance. They are not focusing on their relationship with Yahweh but on the wealth and power they expect from him—in the form of land. The Israelites do not conclude that they are violating the Sinaitic covenant, and they do not repent. In fact, as Yahweh commands intense judgment (Ezek 9:6), the people agree with the elders that Yahweh has forsaken the land (Ezek 9:9).

After the Israelites justify their sinful behavior by saying that Yahweh has forsaken the land, Yahweh does just that in chapter 10. He uses the third step of the sin and reconciliation pattern, abandonment, to express the break in his relationship with the Israelites because of their sin. In Ezek 10:18–19, the *כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה* (honor of Yahweh) leaves the temple, as Yahweh responds to Israel's persistent sin by abandoning Israel. This departure highlights the importance of theme of the *כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה* in the book of Ezekiel and communicates Yahweh's plan to punish Israel. By abandoning Israel, Yahweh shows that he will no longer protect Jerusalem or the temple.

The departure of Yahweh's honor from the temple also reprises the theme of theocentricity in the book of Ezekiel by demonstrating that Yahweh is the source of Israel's honor. Without Yahweh Israel will be defeated and will have low status before the nations. At the same time, the

255–57. As Israel's God, Yahweh was obligated to care for his people (Deut 26:18–19). In Deut 26:19, Yahweh promised to give Israel a good reputation among the nations. In the book of Ezekiel, the Israelites conclude that he has broken his promise.

²⁶ The Israelites may be focusing on passages that promise land. For example, Yahweh promises a place in 2 Sam 7:10 (וּשְׁמִתִּי מְקוֹם לְעַמִּי לְיִשְׂרָאֵל). Also, in Gen 12:15, Yahweh says, “all the land that you are seeing, I will give it to you and to your offspring forever” (אֵת־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר־אַתָּה רֹאֶה לְךָ אֶחְנֶנּוּהּ וְלְזַרְעֶךָ עַד־עוֹלָם). In *ABD* 2:721, Boadt mentions 2 Sam 7 specifically when he argues that the Israelites have misunderstood Yahweh's promise of land. According to Deut 4:27, Yahweh's promise of land does not preclude the possibility that Yahweh will punish Israel with exile for breaking the Sinaitic covenant.

²⁷ See chapter 3 of this dissertation for details.

departure of the **כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה** reflects Yahweh's concern for his own honor. When the honor of Yahweh departs, this proves the seriousness of Yahweh's threat to punish Israel while distancing him from the personal shame of the fall of Jerusalem. When Jerusalem falls, it will not be because of Yahweh's weakness. Jerusalem will fall because the Israelites were unfaithful to Yahweh with the result that Yahweh abandoned Israel (Ezek 10:18–19). By leaving the temple in this way, Yahweh implies that some change must take place in Israel before his honor will return to the temple and before Israel may again have relatively high status among the nations.²⁸

Chapter 11 promises judgment before addressing Israel's obsession with the land and describing Yahweh's plan for restoration. Yahweh criticizes false counsel (Ezek 11:2) and describes the coming judgment (Ezek 11:9) before reiterating the reason for the judgment in Ezek 11:12. Yahweh states that the Israelites are following the ordinances of the nations around them rather than following Yahweh's statutes (Ezek 11:12). In this way, Yahweh makes it clear that the Israelites have violated the Sinaitic covenant (Deut 26:17) by failing to walk in Yahweh's statutes. As the Israelites follow the view of the nations concerning shame and honor, they define their identity and their relationship with Yahweh based upon the land.

In fact, the Israelites are so obsessed with the land that they ignore Yahweh's efforts to remind them of their covenant relationship with him (Ezek 11:12). This obsession is clear, as the inhabitants of Jerusalem urge the exiles to remove themselves from Yahweh because the land has been given to the people of Jerusalem as a possession (Ezek 11:14–15). These verses show that the inhabitants of Jerusalem equate exile from the land to a break with Yahweh.²⁹ Yahweh works

²⁸ The departure of Yahweh's honor from the temple also draws attention to his unique geographical freedom. He is not tied to the land or the temple as the Israelites seem to believe. See Hummel, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 318. Therefore, Yahweh is able to be with his people apart from the land or the temple—even in exile (Ezek 11:16).

²⁹ Hummel, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 318. Hummel notes that this view follows the view of paganism. "Paganism often linked worship of a national deity with residence in the land that supposedly was that deity's kingdom because the deity often was little more than a personification of that country."

to correct this misunderstanding by focusing on conduct rather than the land (Ezek 11:18–21), as he promises to bring the exiles back. He also says in Ezek 11:16, “I have become to them a sanctuary (for) a little (while)” (וַיֵּאָהֳרִי לָהֶם לְמִקְדָּשׁ מְעַט).³⁰ Yahweh is asserting that the identity of the Israelites is based upon the covenant relationship with him rather than upon presence on his land.

In Ezek 11:17–20, Yahweh invades the judgment section of the book with a salvation oracle that establishes his initiative in creating the faithful remnant. Yahweh will take action. He will gather the people and will give them the land of Israel, the sixth step in the sin and reconciliation pattern. He will also give Israel one heart of flesh and a new spirit so that the Israelites will walk in his statutes.³¹ The fact that the Israelites will walk in Yahweh’s statutes implies that they will be reconciled to Yahweh, the fifth step in the sin and reconciliation model. In Ezek 11:21, however, Yahweh promises judgment for those whose heart goes after abominations. It is Yahweh who gives a heart of flesh and a new spirit to those who receive these gifts, but those who keep a heart of stone are held responsible for their state.³² In this way, the text strikes a balance between divine initiative and personal responsibility.

Yahweh uses chapters 12 and 13 to return to the theme of judgment while also taking the initiative. Yahweh highlights the fact that there are no faithful Israelites and takes action by purging the house of Israel of rebels. After stressing Israel’s rebellious nature (Ezek 12:2), Yahweh uses Ezekiel to illustrate and then to explain the coming exile (Ezek 12:3–16). Yahweh

³⁰ The word מְעַט is a reference to length of time rather than the size of the sanctuary. See Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 155. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 190, focuses on the size of the sanctuary, but this undermines the positive thrust that Yahweh is giving to the passage.

³¹ Boadt. “Salvation,” 13–14, notes that much of this material is repeated in the salvation oracle in Ezek 36:16–32.

³² According to Renz, *Rhetorical*, 163, 176–77, the text in this major section uses the salvation oracles to pressure the implied readers to separate themselves from the Old Israel and to identify with the New Israel.

continues to express his disappointment with Israel's leaders, as he describes his plan to judge the unfaithful prince (Ezek 12:13). Ezekiel 12:16 explains that a few will remain after the judgment in order that they may recount their abominations among the nations where they go. Even among those who survive, Yahweh does not describe faithful Israelites. The book of Ezekiel describes a situation where no one from the house of Israel has been completely faithful to Yahweh.³³ Yahweh must act to make the survivors faithful.

In Ezek 13:9, Yahweh goes on to announce judgment on the false prophets. He also notes that they will not be in the register of the house of Israel. In this way, Yahweh continues his assertion that membership in the house of Israel is not a matter of ethnicity but rather a matter of a relationship with him. Yahweh then says that he will save his people from those who will be rejected (Ezek 13:21–23).³⁴ He is presenting his judgment of some Israelites as a purging that will purify the New Israel.

To conclude, by the end of the second cycle Yahweh has responded to any objections that the Israelites may have by highlighting their flagrant idolatry and their obsession with the land. The unfaithfulness of the Israelites drives Yahweh to abandon Israel. However, Yahweh also uses this section to describe his plan for reconciliation and restoration. This positive plan begins as Yahweh purges the rebels and acts to create a faithful remnant from within unfaithful Israel.

³³ Ezekiel 9:4 does talk about making marks on the foreheads of those who grieve over the terrible things that are committed in Jerusalem. These people are to be spared from death (Ezek 9:6). Hummel, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 279, refers to those who are spared as the repentant remnant. However, the text does not deal with the faith of this group. Survivors who grieve over Israel's sins certainly trust in Yahweh in spite of their own sins. But the book of Ezekiel holds all Israelites to the full requirement of walking in Yahweh's statutes and trusting in him—and finds them wanting. The survivors are not described as a faithful group upon which Yahweh may rebuild the people of Israel. They appear as a group that must be transformed by Yahweh. They are a remnant, but they are not faithful.

³⁴ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 175, n. 116, summarizes Yahweh's activity by saying, "He will restore his people by eliminating some and transforming all others."

The Third Cycle: Ezek 14:1–19:14

As Renz argues convincingly, the third cycle focuses upon challenging the readers to respond to Yahweh's judgment in the appropriate manner.³⁵ This cycle makes it clear that the exiles are also guilty before going on to describe the importance of shame in the past and the future of Yahweh's relationship with Israel. Yahweh then deals with the accusations of the Israelites and commands them to repent.

Yahweh begins chapter 14 by highlighting the sinfulness of the Israelites who are in exile with Ezekiel. It is not just the inhabitants of Jerusalem who are guilty of violating the Sinaitic covenant. Those in exile with Ezekiel are also explicitly included in the sin of idolatry (Ezek 14:1–5). In Ezek 14:5, Yahweh says that all of the members of the house of Israel have been involved with idols.³⁶ No one has been completely faithful to the Sinaitic covenant.³⁷

Yahweh reacts to this situation of complete unfaithfulness by commanding repentance, judging, and purging. In Ezek 14:6, Yahweh commands the house of Israel to repent. He then goes on to assert that those he rejects are separated from his people (Ezek 14:8). Those who remain constitute the house of Israel.³⁸ Ezekiel 14:8–9 also talks about a purging that cuts some

³⁵ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 62, 72–82.

³⁶ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 307–8, notes the use of the words *all of them* in reference to the Israelites in exile who have been involved in idolatry according to Ezek 14:5. He says, “Further consideration here must lead to the conclusion that the whole of Israel stands condemned by the law.” The text does not address the prophet Ezekiel's success at walking in Yahweh's statutes and trusting in him. Ezekiel is not presented as the foundation of a faithful remnant. However, he must have a relationship of trust and forgiveness with Yahweh so that he can serve as Yahweh's prophet (Ezek 2:5; 33:33).

³⁷ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 73, argues persuasively that the remnant comes from exiles, but he does not base his argument on the faithfulness of the exiles. He says in regard to Ezek 14:1–11, “This passage makes it evident that Ezekiel knows nothing about a ‘pious remnant,’ not even in Babylon. The obedience of the exilic community is not something to be presupposed, but something to be sought.” Rather than arguing for faithfulness, on p. 221 he stresses the ultimate willingness of the exiles to dissociate themselves from Israel's sinful past. He says, “The inhabitants of Jerusalem are the ‘Israel of the past,’ because they are heirs of Israel's sinful history as well as participants in it. The events around 587 BC have made an end to this ‘Israel of the past.’ The exiles are destined to become the ‘Israel of the future.’”

³⁸ I take the reference to a righteous man in Ezek 13:22 as a rhetorical feature rather than a statement of fact.

Israelites off from Yahweh's people. The result of this purging punishment will be that Israel will never stray again (Ezek 14:11).³⁹ At the same time, Yahweh continues to affirm that there are no faithful Israelites. Ezekiel 14:22–23 says that there will be survivors but their conduct will only serve to confirm that Yahweh's judgment was right.⁴⁰ They will not be saved because of any merit or desirability on their part.

After promising judgment again in chapter 15 (Ezek 15:8), Yahweh uses chapter 16 to describe the past and the future of his covenant relationship with Israel. As he does this, he focuses first upon his own innocence. Israel had been an abandoned child kicking in her blood with no one to show her pity and compassion. Yahweh's response to her, however, can only be taken as showing pity and compassion when he commanded her to live and took her as his own by making a covenant with her (Ezek 16:3–9). Yahweh also took fine care of Israel (Ezek 16:10–13)⁴¹ and even gave her high status among the nations (Ezek 16:14).⁴²

But the Israelites rebelled against Yahweh (Ezek 16:15–36) and committed abominations by looking to idols and to other nations for help (Ezek 16:21, 24–29) rather than trusting in

Yahweh is not saying that there are righteous people in the house of Israel; he is characterizing the message given as one that would discourage righteous people. This is similar to chapters 18 and 33 where the references to righteous people are for rhetorical argument. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 298, appears to share this view when he says, "The presumptuous actions of the women, who think that they can dispense life and death at their own will, disrupt the order which Yahweh has in his command, and according to which life is promised to the righteous, but death to whoever is not prepared to turn from his wickedness (ch. 18)." In Ezek 13:23, Yahweh promises to deliver his people from the hand of these deceivers. Presumably, such deliverance will make it possible for some Israelites to have life.

³⁹ As Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 437, discusses the theological implications of this passage, he notes that Yahweh's, "responses to human sin are consistent with his immutable character and have as their goal the transformation of sinful human beings into a covenant people, pure and exclusive in their devotion to him."

⁴⁰ In his commentary on Ezek 18:21–25, Carley, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, 121, notes Ezekiel's "belief that all deserved the punishment that had come upon the nation."

⁴¹ Taylor, *Ezekiel*, 135–37, highlights the relationship between the adornment of Israel described in Ezek 16:10–14 and the historical blessings that Yahweh gave to the nation of Israel.

⁴² These verses give a brief description of the first step in the sin and reconciliation pattern when Israel was in Yahweh's favor.

Yahweh. Yahweh is making the point that the failure in his partnership with Israel happened because Israel was not faithful to the covenant at Sinai.

As Yahweh describes Israel's sin, he employs the hierarchical function of shame discourse, which focuses on describing an entity's low status, to highlight Israel's atrocious behavior. Ezekiel 16:27 refers to "the daughters of the Philistines, who were ashamed because of your way of wickedness" (בְּנוֹת פְּלִשְׁתִּים הַנִּכְלָמוֹת מִדֶּרֶךְ זָמָה). The daughters of the Philistines held Israel in low esteem because they themselves would have had low status if they had behaved the way the Israelites behaved. Zimmerli confirms this basic understanding of the passage when he refers to such behavior as "a way of conduct of which even the 'heathen' Philistine women would be ashamed."⁴³ While this verse stresses behavior, it begins with the punishment from Yahweh that reduced Israel's land. So, there is a close link between behavior and punishment.

This verse has tremendous rhetorical effect, as a reversal takes place between the Israelites and the surrounding nations. Block says, "No doubt Ezekiel's audience would have been shocked, if not offended, at the implication that, in Yahweh's eyes, his wife Jerusalem was so depraved that even her pagan neighbors were ashamed."⁴⁴

After highlighting Israel's sin and the coming judgment (Ezek 16:15–51), Yahweh urges the Israelites to acknowledge shame before him and stresses his faithfulness to the covenant between them in Ezek 16:52–63. Ezekiel 16:52 contains three shame lexemes as Yahweh commands Israel to, "bear your dishonor" (שָׂאֵי כָל־מִתְהַדָּר).⁴⁵ But this didactic shame is before

⁴³ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 345.

⁴⁴ Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 496.

⁴⁵ Daniel L. Smith-Christopher, *A Biblical Theology of Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 120, says, "These prophetic calls to shame in the context of history are not calls to a paralyzing personal guilt or humiliation. It is a call to recognize the constant failures of living according to alternative ideals and values—universally identified in the penitential prayers as the Mosaic laws."

Yahweh alone, as demonstrated by the promise of restoration for Israel in the following verse.⁴⁶ In fact, the restoration is intended to be the impetus for Israel's shame. Yahweh uses two more shame lexemes as he says that he will restore the Israelites, "so that you will bear your disgrace and be ashamed" (לְמַעַן תִּשְׂאִי כָל־מַתְּיָד וְנִכְלַמְתִּי) (Ezek 16:54). There is a clear correlation between Israel's acknowledgment of shame before Yahweh and restoration.⁴⁷ This acknowledgment of didactic shame is not social sanction but rather a way of reinforcing Yahweh's values. There is no plan for this didactic shame to end. The Israelites should always acknowledge low status before Yahweh because of their past failure to walk in his statutes and trust in him. In this way, they will always demonstrate their agreement with Yahweh's values.

In Ezek 16:57, Yahweh shifts to hierarchical shame discourse in order to link behavior closely with low status before other nations, as he had done in Ezek 16:27. This text speaks of Israel's evil being uncovered and Israel being "the reproach of the daughters of Edom" (תִּקְרַפְתִּי בְּנֹת־אֲרָם). It is unclear from the text whether the daughters of Edom and the daughters of the Philistines hold Israel in low esteem simply because they know about Israel's wickedness or because Yahweh has punished Israel's behavior by causing weakness and poverty. However, the next verse says that the Israelites bear their wickedness and abomination and thus implies that low status before these nations is intended as punishment for Israel's behavior. Block says, "this public derision is added to the direct judgment of God."⁴⁸

⁴⁶ See Hummel's helpful discussion of the idiom in this verse in *Ezekiel 1–20*, 453–55.

⁴⁷ The book of Ezekiel puts Israel's acknowledgment of shame and the restoration together. It does not describe a restored Israel that has not acknowledged shame. At the same time, the text does not state clearly that one must come before the other. Rather, it says that an Israelite remnant will loathe themselves while in exile (Ezek 6:9) and that the true Israelites will bear their shame after the restoration when they are safe (Ezek 39:26). The acknowledgment of shame spans the entire life of the remnant.

⁴⁸ Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 514. One could argue that this shame lexeme is used in a challenge rather than simply to establish the social order. However, there is no indication of a response in this passage. The focus appears to be on Israel's low status before the surrounding nations.

After assuming the presence of the covenant in his relationship with Israel for fifteen chapters, Yahweh finally mentions the covenant by name in chapter 16. He mentions the covenant first in Ezek 16:8 but then deals with it in more detail here at the end of the chapter. In Ezek 16:59, Yahweh states specifically that Israel has broken the covenant.⁴⁹ He also stresses the coming judgment by announcing that he will deal with Israel according to what they have done.⁵⁰ Yahweh will punish Israel with exile as covenant breakers.⁵¹

But in the next verse, Ezek 16:60, Yahweh establishes his covenant faithfulness to Israel by saying that he will remember his covenant.⁵² Then, in Ezek 16:61, the text asserts that Yahweh's faithfulness and blessing will be the impetus for Israel to remember their behavior and to be ashamed (וְנִכְלְמוּ). This call for shame takes place within a context of Yahweh's faithfulness and his restoration of Israel. Because Yahweh remembers his covenant, Israel will remember their bad behavior and will be ashamed when they receive their sisters. In v. 61, Yahweh talks about giving Israel her sisters as daughters⁵³ and makes the difficult statement, "but not because of your covenant" (וְלֹא מִבְּרִיתְךָ). Greenberg's understanding of this phrase seems to fit the context well. He takes it to mean that Yahweh will give Sodom and Samaria as daughters of

⁴⁹ See also Ezek 44:7. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 352–53, highlights this clear statement of Israel's past disloyalty to her covenant partner.

⁵⁰ Hummel, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 420, 491, treats this as a question that Yahweh answers in the negative. He is demanding more of the text than necessary.

⁵¹ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 352–53, states, "This shows that Yahweh's punishment is, in reality, simply the righteous judgement foreseen in the covenant which imposes obligations on both parties. Yahweh does in judgement what his covenant partner has done in disloyalty."

⁵² Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 252, notes that Yahweh acts in his relationship with Israel because he keeps his word.

⁵³ Hummel, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 493, argues that Sodom and Samaria will be Israel's daughters with the meaning that they will be dependent upon Israel in a religious sense because Yahweh is the only true God. Implicit in this statement is Yahweh's desire that the nations come to him.

Israel even though Israel did not keep the covenant. This gift, then, comes from Yahweh's gracious faithfulness rather than Israel's obedience.⁵⁴

Yahweh goes on to tie his faithfulness in establishing the covenant to Israel's knowledge of him in v. 62. Then they will know that he is Yahweh, so that, according to Ezek 16:63, the Israelites will remember, be ashamed (רָבִישָׁתָּהּ), and never again open their mouth because of their disgrace (כָּל־מִתְהַדָּה) when Yahweh atones for all that Israel has done. The Israelites will never open their mouth again because Yahweh's faithfulness will keep them from accusing him. The Israelites will know that they were wrong to believe that he would not care for them and to seek help from other gods and nations. Yahweh's faithfulness to the covenant demonstrates that the Israelites were wrong to doubt him. Israel's shame testifies that Yahweh is faithful to the covenant.⁵⁵ Yahweh's faithfulness to the covenant should drive the Israelites to acknowledge shame before him.

In chapter 17, Yahweh continues to speak of covenants but shifts to the covenant between Babylon and Israel. Rather than accepting this covenant, King Zedekiah sought assistance from Egypt (Ezek 17:15) in the name of helping Israel to fend for themselves and to stay on the land. This rebellion, however, only proves Israel's lack of trust in Yahweh. Yahweh will judge the king (Ezek 17:16) and will cause a different king to flourish (Ezek 17:22–24).

⁵⁴ Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 292. Hummel, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 495, concludes that this interpretation fits the context well and may be related to Israel's shame. However, he prefers to take the יָדָּה as privative and translates the phrase, "and not outside my covenant with you." He prefers this translation, "because it makes the explicit statement that Samaria and Sodom will not be second-class citizens but will be fully incorporated into the people of the new covenant." While this is a fascinating translation, it takes the text in a new direction. So far, the text has said little about equality for Samaria and Sodom but has had much to say about Israel's violation of the covenant (Ezek 16:59).

⁵⁵ Victor H. Matthews, *101 Questions and Answers on the Historical Books of the Bible* (101 Questions & Answers Series; Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2009), 112, takes these verses as punishment. He says, "God chooses to forgive her, establishing an 'everlasting covenant' with her as a final means of shaming and silencing her (16:59–63). This is not the tender and loving return to the proper married state described in Hosea 2:14–20." Matthews does not explain how the covenant and the forgiveness are negative. On the contrary, they are positive. And the shame is positive to the degree that Israel misjudged Yahweh and found him to be more faithful than they had believed.

After promising to judge the unfaithful king in chapter 17, Yahweh deals with the direct accusations of the Israelites in chapter 18. He does this by demonstrating his own innocence and showing that the Israelites are personally responsible for their sins. According to Ezek 18:2, the Israelites are repeating the proverb, “Fathers eat sour grapes, and the teeth of the sons are set on edge.” This proverb is asserting that Yahweh is in the wrong because he punishes the children for the sins of the father (Ezek 18:4). In response to this charge, Yahweh argues that he is innocent because he judges individuals and punishes them for their own sins based on violation of his statutes (Ezek 18:4, 19–20). As Yahweh continues to threaten judgment, he stresses the fact that he holds individuals responsible and punishes them for their own sins (Ezek 18:5–18).

Yahweh goes on to quote the Israelites’ most direct accusation that “the Lord’s conduct is not right” (לֹא יִתְּכֵן דְּרָךְ אֲדֹנָי, Ezek 18:25).⁵⁶ Behind this accusation is the assertion on the part of the Israelites that their sins are not serious.⁵⁷ The key characteristic of this allegation against Yahweh is that the Israelites have not sinned, or that they have not committed serious enough sin to deserve the punishment that Yahweh gives them. This conclusion implies that the Israelites are judging from a human rather than a divine view.

Yahweh responds to the accusations of the Israelites by pointing to their bad conduct, saying that they deserve the punishment he will give them, and ordering them to repent (Ezek 18:30). He also orders them to, “throw away from upon yourselves all your rebellions” (הַשְׁלִיכוּ אֶת־כָּל־פְּשָׁעֵיכֶם, Ezek 18:31) and to, “make for yourselves a new heart and a new spirit” (וַעֲשׂוּ לָכֶם לֵב חָדָשׁ וְרוּחַ חֲדָשָׁה). Yahweh speaks as if the Israelites are able to make a

⁵⁶ This verb could also be translated *unpredictable* as Hummel has done in *Ezekiel 1–20*, 923. However, the context seems to call for stronger language.

⁵⁷ Wevers, *Ezekiel*, 145, makes this point as he argues that Yahweh’s judgment is just—and the argument of the Israelites is countered— because of the wickedness of the Israelites.

change on their own. It would appear that he is using this statement for rhetorical effect.⁵⁸ The words themselves are intended to serve Yahweh as tools to create the desire for a new heart and a new spirit in the readers. At the same time, any Israelites who reject Yahweh know that they are personally responsible for the punishment that they receive from him.

Having defended himself from the accusations of the Israelites, Yahweh turns his attention to Israel's princes in chapter 19. He offers a lament for the line that will end with Zedekiah. To accept that this line will end is to agree with Yahweh's plan for Israel's political future.⁵⁹

To summarize, this third cycle explicitly includes the exiles as part of unfaithful Israel before asserting that Israel's behavior has been shameful and that the Israelites should acknowledge shame before Yahweh. Yahweh responds to the accusations of the Israelites and pushes them to agree that their behavior merits punishment.

The Fourth Cycle: Ezek 20:1–24:27

The fourth and last cycle within this first major section of the book summarizes Yahweh's argument, as it leads up to the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem.⁶⁰ Yahweh stresses the importance of his name and his plan to create a New Israel, as he again recounts the past and the future of his relationship with Israel. Yahweh then goes on to state that he is turning the world of the Israelites upside down before turning his attention to the siege of Jerusalem.

In chapter 20, Yahweh describes the history of his covenant relationship with Israel and his plans for the future. In the past, the Israelites rebelled repeatedly against Yahweh, worshiped idols, and refused to walk in Yahweh's statutes (Ezek 20:8, 13, 16, 21, and 24). Yahweh states

⁵⁸ Block, *Ezekiel*, 145, says, "The command *create a new heart and a new spirit for yourselves* is a rhetorical device, highlighting the responsibility of the nation for their present crisis and pointing the way to the future."

⁵⁹ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 82.

⁶⁰ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 82–93.

that he decided not to punish this rebellious group of Israelites in order to keep his name from being profaned among the nations (Ezek 20:9, 14, 22). In this way, Yahweh stresses the theme of his own name and status.⁶¹ Although Yahweh decided not to punish Israel in the past in order to protect his name, it appears that Yahweh now accepts the profanation of his name as a necessary step toward accomplishing his overall plan.⁶² He will allow Jerusalem to fall and his people to be exiled and will accept the profanation of his name in order to accomplish his ultimate plan with Israel.

The theocentricity of the book of Ezekiel is again affirmed, as Yahweh reiterates his plans to create a faithful remnant⁶³ through his own intervention.⁶⁴ According to Ezek 20:38, Yahweh will judge this stubborn people in a way that will purge the group of rebels and thus purify the survivors.⁶⁵ In Ezek 20:39, Yahweh talks about each man going to his idol, showing that there is no remnant in Israel that behaves appropriately until Yahweh intervenes.

Through a process of purging and transformation Yahweh will bring a faithful remnant out of an utterly unfaithful group.⁶⁶ Yahweh's judgment will kill the rebels, and Yahweh will change the survivors so that they acknowledge shame and serve him in an acceptable manner (Ezek

⁶¹ References to Yahweh's name are found in Ezek 20:9, 14, 22, and 39; Ezek 36:20, 21, and 23; Ezek 39:7 and 25, and Ezek 43:7–8.

⁶² The text does not explain why Yahweh is willing to put his reputation in jeopardy at this point in history.

⁶³ As described above, Ezekiel uses the concept of a remnant without using specific terminology to talk about a subset of Israel that he is creating.

⁶⁴ The theocentricity of the book and the stress on divine initiative have convinced Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 26, that the Israelites are utterly passive. See also Mein, *Ezekiel*, 215. However, the text's intense focus on Yahweh does not preclude a rhetorical goal that calls for a real response from the Israelites—albeit provided by Yahweh.

⁶⁵ In a similar vein, Isa 28:1–5 and Zeph 3:11 both talk about removing the proud from the midst of Israel. In reference to Ezek 20:38, Hummel, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 607, states that, “like most of the original exodus generation, and also like the false prophets of 13:9, the rebels will not be allowed to enter the promised land.”

⁶⁶ In his summary of the message of the book of Ezekiel, Boadt, *ABD* 2:721, notes that Ezekiel does not speak as though repentance is a possibility for the Israelites. Rather, Yahweh must act to bring about a change. As Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 53, discusses Ezekiel's view of Israel, he notes that, “the people of God are rendered such by the sovereign choice and gracious redemption of God. The call to be his people is not based on prior qualifications.”

20:38–44). He will use the didactic function of shame discourse to accomplish his goal. The acknowledgement of shame, the reconciliation event in the sin and reconciliation model, functions as a key characteristic of those taking part in the remnant. In Ezek 5:16, Yahweh announced his plan to destroy Israel. In Ezek 20:43, he reaffirms his plan to bring Israel back to life with a new identity.⁶⁷

Ezekiel 20:39–44 develops the theme of a remnant that acknowledges shame. Ezekiel 6:9 described a small group of survivors who loathe themselves because of their behavior while they are still in exile. Ezekiel 20:39–44 presents a larger group, as it creates a context of restoration, the sixth step of the sin and reconciliation pattern. Yahweh will gather the whole house of Israel in the land.⁶⁸ Consequently, they loathe themselves there. Although Israel’s behavior is still the cause of the self-loathing, in this setting, the impetus appears to be the return to the land. Yahweh gives Israel better treatment than they deserve for his name’s sake (Ezek 20:44).

The didactic shame discourse in Ezek 20:39–44 is important for establishing the exclusive nature of the house of Israel. It is the whole house of Israel that will engage in self-loathing. There are no members of the house of Israel who do not loathe themselves. Being part of Israel is not a matter of ancestry; it is a matter of a relationship with Yahweh that is characterized by the acknowledgment of shame. As Yahweh depicts his plan to create a faithful remnant, the book of Ezekiel associates his view of honor and shame so closely with the identity of Israel that it

⁶⁷ Jacques Pons, “Le vocabulaire d’*Ézéchiel* 20: Le prophète s’oppose à la vision deutéronomiste de l’histoire,” in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation* (ed. J. Lust; BETL 74 Louvain: Louvain University, 1986), 224, 232, sees Ezekiel as consciously opposing Deuteronomistic history because the book of Ezekiel makes it clear that Israel cannot just start over in their relationship with Yahweh. Yahweh insists on death and resurrection for Israel—and a new heart.

⁶⁸ Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 655, notes that the reference to the land in Ezek 20:40 means that the covenant will be restored. “The expression signals the normalization of all covenantal relationships: deity, nation, and land are finally reunited.” This is a development from Ezek 6:9 where no such covenant restoration is mentioned. See Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 232–33. Such a message urges the readers to join this group in their present.

becomes impossible for readers to consider themselves a part of Israel or to apply the salvation oracles to themselves without agreeing with Yahweh's view.⁶⁹

One of the chief characteristics of the New Israel as described in Ezek 20:43 is self-loathing. Yahweh is using the text to make didactic shame part of the true Israel's identity.⁷⁰ Israel's self-loathing over their past behavior demonstrates their agreement with Yahweh's values. This is not social sanction but rather a way of reinforcing Yahweh's values, and, therefore, should continue into the future. In these ways, the didactic shame discourse and the theme of the remnant push the implied readers to acknowledge shame.

Yahweh's description of the true Israel is designed to create a society that pressures its members to follow his view of honor and shame. This first section of the book of Ezekiel has argued repeatedly that Israel's poor behavior is leading to the fall of Jerusalem. It has also made it clear that Yahweh wants the Israelites to acknowledge shame, to trust in him, and to walk in his statutes. In this way, the text encourages true Israelites to reject any who defend Israel's previous behavior and to affirm those who acknowledge shame. By describing a situation where all Israel acknowledges dishonor, Ezek 20:40–43 further encourages the Israelites to exclude those who do not admit low status before Yahweh.

At the same time, Yahweh is giving hope to the New Israel. The Israelites have not yet returned to the land, but Ezek 20:39–44 urges them to believe that they are Yahweh's people. The text is asserting that the relationship between Yahweh and Israel is more important than the

⁶⁹ In his study of the theology of exile, Smith-Christopher, *Biblical Theology*, 121, concludes that references to shame are not concerned with emotions but with one's view of history and one's identity. He says, "The issue is not 'feelings' but behavior and identity."

⁷⁰ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 117, 249.

land. Yahweh is promising to prepare the Israelites to survive the exile as they trust in him even though they are separated from the land.⁷¹

Although Yahweh is planning to allow Jerusalem to fall and his name to be profaned, Ezek 20:39–44 also makes it evident that he also has a plan to use Israel to raise his status. According to Ezek 20:41, Yahweh will show himself holy through Israel before the eyes of the nations (וַיִּקְדֹּשְׁתִּי בְּכֶם לְעֵינֵי הַגּוֹיִם). He will raise his status before the nations by creating a New Israel and leading this New Israel to be reconciled with him. Yahweh makes it possible for the Israelites to acknowledge their shame before him and to change their behavior (Ezek 20:40; 20:43).⁷² He will treat Israel for his name’s sake and because of his faithfulness to the covenant rather than treating them according to their conduct (Ezek 20:41–44).

After an encouraging reference to Yahweh’s positive future plans for Israel, he returns to judgment at the end of chapter 20 and in chapter 21. As Yahweh describes his plan for judgment, he recognizes that his view of status is clashing with the view held by the Israelites and, consequently, that he is turning the world as the Israelites know it upside down. Ezekiel 21:31 (ET 21:26) makes this point. The prince of Israel (Ezek 21:30, ET 21:25) is not exempt from judgment because of his high position among the people. On the contrary, Yahweh judges him based on his faithfulness to the covenant and his obedience to Yahweh’s statutes—Yahweh’s criteria for honor—and removes the crown because of his failure. The text summarizes the change by saying in v. 31 (ET 26), “This (will) not (be) this” (זֹאת לֹא-זֹאת). Cooke refers to these words and the following phrase as, “proverbial expressions for a complete upset of the

⁷¹ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 249–51, discusses Yahweh’s transformation of Israel as a way of preparing Israel to survive the exile but does not address the role of the acknowledgment of shame.

⁷² This situation does not prevent the text from applying rhetorical pressure to acknowledge shame.

familiar order: this is not more this; everything is turned topsy-turvy.”⁷³ Yahweh’s view of status is decidedly counter-cultural.⁷⁴

The following words in Ezek 21:31 (ET 21:26) give some detail of what sort of change is taking place: “Make high the low, and make low the high”⁷⁵ (הַשְּׁפִילָה הַגְּבוּהָ וְהַגְּבוּהָ הַשְּׁפִילָה). Not only does Yahweh make the prince of Israel low, he insists on more changes like this. Yahweh judges honor and shame differently from the way that human beings judge. Consequently, Yahweh makes low that which humans consider high—often because of pride in the attitude toward Yahweh. At the same time, Yahweh raises that which is considered low by human beings because of trust in Yahweh and obedience to his statutes. Having removed the prince’s crown in v. 31 (ET 26), Yahweh announces his plan to give it to the one to whom judgment belongs (Ezek 21:32, ET 21:27). Based on the context, this good ruler must share Yahweh’s counter-cultural view of status.

After promising to turn the world upside down and to establish a good ruler, Yahweh shows a positive attitude toward the New Israel he is creating by defending her. In Ezek 21:33 (ET 21:28), Yahweh speaks “concerning the sons of Ammon and concerning their taunt” (אֶל-בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן וְאֶל-חֲרָפָתָם). This shame lexeme is used to express a challenge to Israel and thus to Yahweh. Hummel notes that the construction could be ambiguous but obviously refers to taunting aimed at Israel in this context.⁷⁶ Yahweh treats the taunt of the sons of Ammon as a personal challenge and responds with judgment (Ezek 21:34–37, ET vv. 29–32).⁷⁷ His reaction to

⁷³ Cooke, *Critical*, 235.

⁷⁴ Stiebert, *Construction*, 90, 108.

⁷⁵ Hummel, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 640, notes that it is necessary to take the infinitive constructs הַשְּׁפִילָה as imperatives in this context.

⁷⁶ Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 642.

⁷⁷ Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37*, 436, argues that the reference to the Ammonites is intentionally deceiving in a passage that deals with the Babylonians. He states, “It was dangerous to speak explicitly of Babylonia’s ultimate

this taunt gives a strong indication that the new Israel will have his favor. In this way, Yahweh shows that he has a positive attitude toward the new Israel that he is creating.

Chapter 22 focuses once again on Israel's sin and the coming judgment. Ezekiel 22:4 uses shame discourse to highlight Israel's coming low status before others as a result of Yahweh's judgment. Like Ezek 5:14, Ezek 22:4 describes Israel as a reproach to the nations. This takes place within a context of judgment with stress on Israel's guilt because of bloodshed and idolatry.

The Israelites have already shamed themselves by their behavior according to Yahweh's understanding of shame; now Yahweh will punish them and shame them before the nations according to the ANE understanding of shame. The Israelites are so concerned with the nations and being like the nations that only being shamed before the nations will shock some of them into acknowledging low status before Yahweh. Ezekiel 22:4 employs hierarchical shame discourse. That is to say that the ultimate goal is to establish Israel's low status in relation to others. The nations will evaluate Israel based on their weakness and poverty and will treat them as shamed. Yahweh is making it clear that the nations will hold Israel in low esteem because of the punishment the Israelites will receive for their poor behavior in their relationship with him.

destruction at the height of its power; we recall the threatened fates of the two exilic prophets whose weal-prophecy was subversive to the foreign empire (Jer 29:21ff)." Julius A. Bewer, "Textual and Exegetical Notes on the Book of Ezekiel," *JBL* 72 (1953): 158–68, also argues that the text refers to the Babylonians and goes on to say on p. 163 that, "If this interpretation is correct, the verses...give Ezekiel's oracle against Babylon which had always been missed." He notes that this oracle, "is inserted here very cleverly so as not to arouse the suspicion of the Babylonians." Following Greenberg, Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 659–61, notes that the idea that the Ammonites serve as a coded reference to the Babylonians is compelling but "too daring." In defense of his view he argues that Ezek 21:33 (ET 21:28) seems to deal with an Ammonite attack on Jerusalem that is unattested. However, the text clearly refers to the Ammonites, making it difficult to develop a conclusive argument. Although I accept the view that Ezek 21:33 (ET 21:28) uses the Ammonites as a code for the Babylonians, I take the references to the Ammonites in Ezek 25:1–7 to refer to the Ammonites. Their first place in the oracles against the nations comes from their history with Israel, their proximity to Israel, and the sense of betrayal that comes from joy at Israel's difficulties. As Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 787–89, says, "The special attention paid to Ammon is undoubtedly related to the long history of conflict between it and Israel." At the same time, the identity of the enemy does not change the expression of Yahweh's positive orientation toward the Israelites in the text.

Yahweh is using shame as social sanction.⁷⁸ In other words, he is punishing the Israelites for their bad behavior in order to alter their behavior.

In chapter 23, Yahweh again takes up much of the language from chapter 16, as he compares Samaria and Jerusalem to adulterous wives. He stresses the sin of his people by referring to the adulterous desire for the support of other nations (Ezek 23:11–21). Yahweh promises to judge the Israelites for their sins (Ezek 23:46–49).

Chapter 24 brings this first major section of the book of Ezekiel to a close, as it announces the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem. In Ezek 24:2, Yahweh instructs Ezekiel to note the day that the king of Babylon began the siege of Jerusalem. Yahweh is finally carrying out the punishment that he has threatened because Israel has not responded to his calls for repentance. The Israelites have refused to be cleansed, and now cleansing will only take place after the judgment (Ezek 24:13).

In the second half of chapter 24, Yahweh goes on to clarify his relationship with the land and to instruct the Israelites not to mourn. The way that Yahweh characterizes the coming fall of Jerusalem and the desecration of the temple in Ezek 24:20–26 creates a strong distinction between him and the land and demonstrates that Israel's obsession with the land reflects the human standards for honor and shame rather than Yahweh's standards. Hummel states, "The problem, to which Ezekiel has alluded many times before, was that the people had come to regard the temple as a bit of magic, a talisman that should retain its power to protect them apart from faith and a life of faith"⁷⁹ So Yahweh abandons the temple. The sanctuary is Yahweh's sanctuary, but he refers to it as their stronghold (Ezek 24:25). It is the desire of their eyes and the

⁷⁸ See chapter 2 for details.

⁷⁹ Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 765. The Israelites believe that giving Yahweh formal honor is sufficient to assure their protection as surrounding nations believe that formal honor to their gods will protect them. The Israelites overlook Yahweh's desire that they trust him as the one true God and walk in his statutes.

yearning of their soul. He also says that the sanctuary is “the pride of your might” (נָאוֹן עֲזָבֶם), Ezek 24:21).⁸⁰ It appears that the temple has become an impediment in the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. Yahweh uses the same Hebrew term for sanctuary as he did in Ezek 11:16 to say in Ezek 24:21, “Lo, I am about to desecrate my sanctuary” (הֲנִי מְחַלֵּל אֶת־מִקְדָּשִׁי). Yahweh promises to desecrate the temple but has already stated that he himself is the sanctuary of the exiles (Ezek 11:16).⁸¹ As Block says, Ezekiel’s role is, “to point his compatriots away from the temple, the object of their affections, to God himself.”⁸²

As Yahweh separates himself from the temple and the land, he also teaches the Israelites to have the appropriate attitude toward the coming judgment. He does this by comparing the desecration of the temple to the death of Ezekiel’s wife. When the blow of judgment falls, the Israelites will not engage in traditional mourning (Ezek 24:22). Instead, they will wear their turbans and sandals (Ezek 24:23). Block notes that the turban is a festive article of clothing that refers to the headgear of the Zadokite priest in Ezek 44:18.⁸³ The refusal to mourn will demonstrate that the Israelites agree that Yahweh’s judgment is just and that they accept his view of shame and honor. As Renz says, “Realising [*sic*] that Yahweh has rightly administered the death penalty to Jerusalem, the community is not to mourn over Jerusalem, but to know Yahweh and to groan about their own iniquities.”⁸⁴ In this way, Yahweh intends for the Israelites to identify with the sins of the Old Israel and thus to admit their iniquity. By accepting that

⁸⁰ The Hebrew term here could be taken as arrogance. Yahweh does refer to the city as his treasure in Ezek 7:22, but he proves to be willing to give it up for a time because Israel has become obsessed with it.

⁸¹ When Yahweh’s honor (כְּבוֹד יְהוָה) abandoned the temple in Ezek 10:18–19, this also created a separation between his being and the building that had carried his name.

⁸² Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 794.

⁸³ Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 790. He goes on to say that the turban signifies joy in Isa 61:10 and luxury in Isa 3:20.

⁸⁴ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 92.

Yahweh's judgment is right, however, the Israelites will make a break with the Old Israel and will form a New Israel that will affirm Yahweh's values by acknowledging shame before him.

Ezekiel 24:25–27 marks the end of this first major section. With the siege of Jerusalem already begun (Ezek 24:1–2), Yahweh focuses the attention of the readers on the day when Jerusalem will fall⁸⁵ and Ezekiel's tongue will be loosed (Ezek 24:26–27).

In conclusion, Yahweh uses this fourth cycle to summarize his argument while also highlighting the importance of his name, describing his plan to turn the world of the Israelites upside down, and telling the Israelites not to mourn the coming fall of Jerusalem. At this point in the book of Ezekiel, the readers should be convinced that the fall of Jerusalem is deserved and should not be mourned.

Summary

In this first major section, Yahweh returns repeatedly to Israel's sin and coming judgment, the second and the fourth steps of the sin and reconciliation model respectively. In this way, he uses all four cycles to argue that he is right to judge the Israelites because of their rebelliousness against the Sinaitic covenant. Although Yahweh certainly focuses on sin and judgment in this first section, he also announces his plan to accomplish the last two steps of the sin and reconciliation pattern, reconciliation and restoration. Yahweh argues that the Israelites are personally responsible for their sins and that there are no faithful Israelites. But, in faithfulness to the covenant, he will take the initiative by purging Israel of rebels and creating a new, faithful Israel that will acknowledge shame before him. At the end of chapter 24, Israel is under siege (Ezek 24:2), and Yahweh has commanded the Israelites not to mourn over the fall of Jerusalem

⁸⁵ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 504, 508.

(Ezek 24:22). In this way, Yahweh expects the Israelites to acknowledge the shameful sin of Old Israel, while trusting in him to make them into the New Israel.

Ezekiel 25:1–32:32: Judging Israel’s Enemies⁸⁶

After describing Yahweh’s plan to judge Israel and to create a remnant that acknowledges shame in Ezek 1:1–24:27, the book of Ezekiel uses the next major section to make the transition from judgment to salvation. As Yahweh promises to judge the nations that Old Israel tried to emulate, he continues to press the Israelites to reject the Old Israel’s behavior as shameful and to embrace his plan for the New Israel.⁸⁷ In doing this, he also promises to save the Israelites from their enemies.

In Ezek 25:1–32:32, Yahweh maintains an essentially positive attitude toward Israel by asserting his own honor and power to judge Israel’s enemies. This section marks a turn toward restoration and reconciliation, as Yahweh asserts his power over the nations and thus his honor, and as he treats Israel’s enemies as his enemies. Yahweh is employing Laniak’s challenge pattern, as he describes his future plans to punish Israel’s enemies. In the challenge pattern, Yahweh begins by allowing his people to be mistreated. Then he intervenes and reverses the situation so that the status of the tormentor is lowered while the status of the victim—and his own status—is raised.⁸⁸ Ezekiel 25:1–32:32 uses shame discourse to focus on the low status that Yahweh has planned for Israel’s enemies and the high status for Yahweh implied by his ability to judge the enemies of his people.

⁸⁶ The analysis of this section will be relatively brief because it includes substantial repetition of the main points that are relevant for this study. The main points are that Yahweh is judging the same behavior as the behavior of the Old Israel and that this is good news—steps five and six of the sin and reconciliation pattern—for the New Israel.

⁸⁷ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 176–77.

⁸⁸ Laniak, *Shame*, 8–10.

The oracles against the nations demonstrate that Yahweh treats attacks against Israel as personal challenges and responds accordingly by promising to punish and to shame the nations involved. These oracles are good news to Israel because they mark a movement away from Yahweh's punishing them and toward restoration. In this way, Yahweh begins to encourage the Israelites with the hope that he will avenge them and will vindicate his honor and theirs. For example, Yahweh promises to punish Ammon for rejoicing over Israel's woes (Ezek 25:6). Moab and Seir said that the house of Judah was like the other nations (Ezek 25:8). The implication is that Yahweh is not protecting Judah. The result of such treatment of Israel is that the land of the Ammonites will be lost and they will not be remembered among the nations. The idea of not being remembered among the nations means that they will have no honor at all.

As Yahweh promises to save Israel, he also plans to correct the wrong view of the nations concerning honor and shame by showing that earthly power is no match for his power and that pride is an affront to him. Yahweh speaks of the king of Tyre who, because of arrogance, says that he is a god. Yahweh intends to judge the king of Tyre with death in order to silence his boasting (Ezek 28:9–10). As a result of Yahweh's intervention, the Israelites will have no one to hurt them but will be gathered and returned to the land to live there securely (Ezek 28:24–26). Yahweh will also destroy Egypt's pride (Ezek 32:12) in order to prove again that pride leads to shame before him. As Renz says, "the judgement [*sic*] against Tyre and Egypt is very much a judgement [*sic*] against attitudes found in Old Israel itself."⁸⁹

The text also uses shame lexemes as Yahweh shames the nations and shows that he is more powerful than they are. For example, Yahweh notes that those he judges become impotent as they bear their shame with those who go down into the pit (Ezek 32:24, 25, 30). These verses use

⁸⁹ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 176–77.

the hierarchical function of shame discourse to establish the low status of the dead leaders. Yahweh's enemies are described as bearing their dishonor (וַיִּשְׂאוּ כָּל־מָתָם) in death. These verses speak of the strength⁹⁰ of Israel's enemies as implied by the terror they caused. However, this strength is contrasted with the inability of Israel's enemies to prevent the judgment of Yahweh that sent them to death. In death, they bear their shame and have low status before all of the living who used to fear them. Death is a shameful state. Those who are dead do not have wealth or power.

Ezekiel 32:30 employs a second shame lexeme that describes Yahweh's enemies as being "ashamed because of their strength" (מִגְבוּרַתָּם בּוֹשִׁים). This use of shame discourse describes the low status of Yahweh's enemies, but it does so with a nuance of false trust and disappointment. Hummel goes so far as to translate this phrase, "Let down by their strength."⁹¹ The text is describing a situation where the enemies put their trust in their strength, but their strength was insufficient and left them in a state of low status before all.

The leaders of the nations Yahweh judges will be forced to see that Yahweh is able to avenge Israel after all. Furthermore, Yahweh will lower the proud in the shame of death. Their lot is to bear their shame from that time on as testimony to the failure of their pride.

In summary, the oracles against the nations are good news for the Israelites, as Yahweh moves toward the moment when he expects them to acknowledge shame before him. Yahweh asserts that he is still willing and able to overcome Israel's enemies. At the same time, he corrects the views of the nations concerning honor and shame that Israel has accepted as accurate

⁹⁰ Verse 29 specifically mentions strength.

⁹¹ Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 926.

and replaces it with his own counter-cultural view. In this way, Yahweh is preparing for Israel's acknowledgment of low status.

Ezekiel 33:1–39:29: Reconciliation Achieved

After the promises to judge and shame Israel's enemies because of their poor behavior are described in Ezek 25:1–32:32, Ezek 33:1–39:29 now completes the transition from judgment to reconciliation (Ezek 36:32). Although Ezek 33:1–39:29 does use the steps of the sin and reconciliation pattern out of order for rhetorical impact, these steps serve the basic movement from Israel's loss (step four) in Ezek 33:21 to reconciliation (step five) in Ezek 36:32. These two steps, loss and reconciliation, take place in the present time of the implied readers. As will be argued, references to the other steps in the verses before Ezek 36:32 are intended to drive the reader to acknowledge shame before Yahweh and thus to be reconciled to him, the fifth step of the sin and reconciliation model, in Ezek 36:32. After the reconciliation event in Ezek 36:32, Yahweh describes his future plan to restore Israel, the sixth step in the sin and reconciliation pattern.

The first half of this section presents Yahweh as punishing and purging, while he prepares for restoration. The second half of this part of the book of Ezekiel describes Yahweh's activity to create and defend a faithful remnant that instinctively pressures its members to maintain Yahweh's values. Ezekiel 36:16–32 is the turning point in the middle section. After the command to acknowledge low status in Ezek 36:32, Yahweh stops the purging and focuses on rebuilding and blessing his people. He does this because the text expects the readers to acknowledge shame and to join the remnant in v. 32 or to exclude themselves from a relationship with Yahweh. This second half of the section undoes the judgment and builds a remnant that finds its identity in Yahweh, his promises, and his gifts. In the process of building the remnant, Yahweh presents his own identity.

Israel's Sin against Yahweh and Individual Judgment

Ezekiel 33:1–39:29 uses the second step of the sin and reconciliation pattern, Israel's sin, to argue that Yahweh is right to punish the Israelites. At the same time, the text argues that the Israelites are personally responsible for the punishment they are receiving.

In chapter 33, Yahweh states again⁹² that he judges individuals for their own sins and urges individuals to turn to him. In Ezek 33:10, the Israelites admit for the first time in the book that their conduct is the cause of their suffering.⁹³ As they speak of rotting away because of their iniquities, they are doing just as Ezek 24:23 said that they would do. But they do not acknowledge shame. They also do not admit that their conduct merits the punishment that Yahweh is about to give them. Their focus is not on their relationship with Yahweh but on the land (Ezek 33:24). Their great discouragement does not come from their conduct itself but rather from the result of their conduct, that is, the loss of the land. The Israelites appear to recognize that they have rebelled against Yahweh while believing that his ways are not right and that he intends to destroy them. They do not respond to his command to turn from their evil ways (Ezek 33:11) but continue to accuse him (Ezek 33:17, 20).

Ezekiel 33 demonstrates that Yahweh is correct to judge Israelites who continue in their obsession with the land while ignoring their relationship with him. The Israelites do not acknowledge shame in their relationship with Yahweh in Ezekiel 33. What is more, Yahweh judges each one according to his conduct (Ezek 33:20).

⁹² He delivered the same message in Ezek 18:4, 19–20, 30.

⁹³ Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 973.

Abandonment: The כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה Has Not Returned

Yahweh's abandonment of Israel, the third step of the sin and reconciliation pattern, maintains a sense of tension in Ezek 33:1–39:29. After leaving the temple in Ezek 10:18–19, the כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה has not returned. Although Yahweh is certainly interacting with the Israelites in this section, his honor is not portrayed as being physically present in the temple. Yahweh has abandoned Jerusalem.⁹⁴ Yahweh's abandonment of Israel means that there is an ongoing break in his relationship with the Israelites.

Israel's Loss: The Fall of Jerusalem

The fall of Jerusalem, the fourth step of the sin and reconciliation model, is reported in this major section in order to demonstrate Yahweh's power to respond to the sins of his people. This punishment shames Israel before the nations and thus pushes the Israelites to acknowledge dishonor before Yahweh. At the same time, however, the exile lowers Yahweh's status in the eyes of the nations.

Punishment. In Ezek 33, Yahweh refuses to fight for Israel because Israel refuses to repent, and Jerusalem falls. In v. 21, an escapee from Jerusalem announces to Ezekiel that the city has fallen. In the sin and reconciliation pattern, this is the loss that occurs when Yahweh's judgment for sin lowers Israel's status before the nations. Ezekiel 5:14 has made it clear that this punishment will make Israel a reproach among the nations and Ezek 7:18 has said that it will put shame on all faces. Yahweh underlines the low status that will come from the fall of Jerusalem when he says in Ezek 33:28 that Israel's "proud might will cease" (וְנִשְׁבַּת גְּאוֹן עֲזָתָהּ). This

⁹⁴ Although Ezek 33:1–39:29 does not say that Yahweh's honor has returned to the temple, it does clarify the meaning of Yahweh's departure. Ezekiel 39:23–24 states that Israel went into exile when Yahweh hid his face from the Israelites because of their sin. See Block, "Divine Abandonment," 42.

punishment is social sanction. According to the didactic function, it is intended to lead Israel to acknowledge shame in their relationship with Yahweh and to repent, but Israel does not repent in chapter 33.⁹⁵

Even though the Israelites do not acknowledge dishonor in chapter 33, Yahweh's attitude toward them seems to change. The blow has fallen. Before this time, Yahweh only threatened exile (Ezek 20:8–9). From this time on, Yahweh has carried out the threat. Already Yahweh's wrath begins to subside as he said it would in Ezek 16:42, even though no one has acknowledged shame.⁹⁶ As the fall of Jerusalem is announced in Ezek 33:21, Yahweh's words from Ezek 24:25–27 are fulfilled, and Ezekiel is again able to speak (Ezek 33:22). The fall of Jerusalem marks the end of the end of judgment and the beginning of Yahweh's mercy. Yahweh's attitude toward Israel changes from rare words of encouragement, such as Ezek 16:59–63, to more frequent words of encouragement beginning in chapter 34.

Yahweh's Low Status before the Nations. As described in Ezekiel 20, Yahweh knew that judging Israel would result in low status for him before the nations (Ezek 20:9, 14, 21–22). Now that Jerusalem has fallen, Yahweh has low status before the nations.⁹⁷ Yahweh's action may be understood as suffering vicarious shame for Israel. Although the Israelites certainly suffer substantial low status before the nations, they do not endure the complete shame of total destruction. Rather, Yahweh suffers undeserved shame for Israel so that Israel may ultimately

⁹⁵ Before the fall of Jerusalem, Yahweh urges Israel to turn from their evil ways so that they may live. He appears to be focusing on the change that would be necessary to avert disaster. After the fall of Jerusalem, however, Yahweh switches to status language as he deals with his real plan to restore Israel. He deals with Israel's proud might in Ezek 33:28 and later commands Israel to be ashamed (Ezek 36:32).

⁹⁶ The fall of Jerusalem is a decisive point in the book of Ezekiel. After Yahweh has judged Israel, he moves toward the salvation of the Israelites. See Rendtorff, "Ez 20," 261.

⁹⁷ Ezekiel 36:20 affirms that Yahweh has low status before the nations because of the fall of Jerusalem.

have high status before the nations.⁹⁸ Yahweh is bearing undeserved shame because of Israel. But he has a plan to overcome his low status before the nations.

Reconciliation Achieved

In Ezek 33:1–39:29, Yahweh uses Israel’s acknowledgment of shame, step five of the sin and reconciliation pattern, to achieve reconciliation with Israel. He leads up to this important moment in Ezek 36:32 by planning to purge some Israelites while gathering others. The land then receives Yahweh’s attention, as he promises to prepare it for habitation. In the verses before Ezek 36:32, Yahweh also highlights the positive implications of Israel’s acknowledgment of dishonor before him.

Yahweh’s Initiative in Purging Some and Gathering Others. As Yahweh executes judgment on Israel, he begins to distinguish between those Israelites who will be excluded from the New Israel and those who will form the New Israel. In chapter 34, Yahweh announces his plan to remove the leaders who have treated the people of Israel poorly (Ezek 34:1–10). He also promises to judge the strong when they mistreat the weak (Ezek 34:17–22). At the same time, Yahweh is planning to search for the lost himself (Ezek 34:11). Rather than treating the Israelites as an unfaithful wife, as he did in chapter 16, he refers to them as his flock (Ezek 34:22)⁹⁹ Yahweh treats Israel as weak and in need of help. As he tells Israel that he will bring a portion of them back to the land (Ezek 34:11–16), he uses the tender image of a good shepherd caring for his sheep. The shame discourse in the passage makes it evident that Yahweh will keep the Israelites from bearing the shame of the nations (Ezek 34:29). They are his people, and he is their God (Ezek 34:31). Yahweh will be their shepherd. David will be their shepherd. They will have

⁹⁸ See Ezek 34:29.

⁹⁹ Yahweh refers to Israel as his flock only in chapter 34 (Ezek 34:6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 31).

one shepherd (Ezek 34:15, 23–24).¹⁰⁰ These clearly messianic passages remind the readers of Yahweh's gracious faithfulness to the covenant with David. They also point to the divinity of the Messiah, as they treat both Yahweh and David as Israel's one shepherd. This Messiah shares Yahweh's view of status (Ezek 34:29). His activity continues as he creates a faithful remnant.

Preparing the Land. In Ezek 35:1–36:15, Yahweh shifts his attention from establishing the remnant's membership and leadership to preparing the land.¹⁰¹ Yahweh clears and protects the land and prepares it for positive habitation.¹⁰² According to Ezek 36:6, the land has borne the insult of the nations (כְּלִמָּת גּוֹיִם). Ezek 36:2–5 details the mistreatment that the land has received at the hands of the surrounding nations. In v. 7, Yahweh responds to the challenges by promising a reversal so that those who caused the land of Israel to bear shame will bear shame themselves (כְּלִמָּתָם יִשְׂאוּ). Yahweh employs low-status language again in Ezek 36:15, as states that he will protect the land from the insult of the nations.

Positive Implications of the Remnant's Shame. As Yahweh prepares for reconciliation with Israel, he highlights the positive implications of didactic shame and the enduring nature of the remnant's shame before him. Yahweh shows that acknowledging shame in the relationship with him is linked to restoration (Ezek 36:24–32). It is also related to protection from disgrace among the nations, that is, hierarchical shame (Ezek 34:29; 36:15, 30–32). This didactic use of shame is not social sanction; rather, it reinforces Yahweh's values. The Israelites are to continue to be ashamed because of their past behavior. Ongoing acknowledgment of shame means ongoing identification with Yahweh's worldview.

¹⁰⁰ See also Ezek 37:24–25.

¹⁰¹ Although Yahweh abandoned the land because the Israelites were more concerned with the land than with their relationship with him, he still intends to return Israel to the land after the Israelites are reconciled to him.

¹⁰² Garscha, *Studien*, 217.

The New Israel Created in Ezek 36:32. As the book of Ezekiel uses the positive characteristics of didactic shame discourse to entice the implied readers to acknowledge low status before Yahweh, it points to Ezek 36:16–32¹⁰³ as the moment when the new Israel is established and those Israelites who do not acknowledge their low status in their relationship with Yahweh are left behind. This is the reconciliation event. Yahweh has presented his case, attached positive promises to such an acknowledgment, and even promised that such an acknowledgment will take place. If readers have not already acknowledged low status before Yahweh, now is the time for them to do it.¹⁰⁴

Ezekiel 36:16–32 is designed to push the Israelites to acknowledge shame before Yahweh. This text is a brief summary of the book of Ezekiel.¹⁰⁵ Yahweh is addressing a whole people who have not acknowledged shame. The rhetoric of the passage creates a situation where a reader who refuses to acknowledge shame does not move beyond Ezek 36:16–21 while a reader who does admit low status moves on to Ezek 36:22–31. Those who do not acknowledge shame are still engaging in the bad conduct of Ezek 36:16–21.

For those who admit low status, however, the past conduct is only a bad memory. They have begun to receive the promises of the restoration. In Ezek 33:10, the Israelites recognized that their sins were the cause of the suffering, but in Ezek 36:31–32, the true Israelites finally agree with Yahweh that their conduct was serious and loathsome. The readers who acknowledge low status before him constitute the true Israel.

¹⁰³ The thought progression of this passage was dealt with in detail in chapter 1.

¹⁰⁴ Although Ezek 6:9, Ezek 16:52–63, and Ezek 20:43 are all similar to Ezek 36:32 and may lead some Israelites to acknowledge shame, Ezek 36:32 is the most likely place for this transformation to happen because it comes after the judgment of the fall of Jerusalem in Ezek 33:21.

¹⁰⁵ Martin-Achard, “Brèves remarques,” 104, testifies to the comprehensive nature of the oracle by referring to it as a compendium of Yahweh’s plan.

Ezekiel 36:16–32 is the key turning point in the book of Ezekiel because it creates the possibility of the readers applying the salvation oracles—including atonement, cleansing, and restoration (Ezek 16:63; 36:24–25)—to themselves. It also confronts those who refuse to acknowledge shame with Yahweh’s insistence that there is no way for the salvation oracles to apply to them. There is no way to be a part of Israel without getting a new identity. From Ezek 36:32 forward, Yahweh never again mentions Israelites who have not acknowledged shame.¹⁰⁶ They are not a part of Israel or a part of the restoration. Ezekiel 36:32 is also the last time Yahweh speaks to the house of Israel in the imperative telling them to do something to resolve the problem of their unfaithfulness.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶ The text mentions Israelites who do acknowledge shame in Ezek 39:26, Ezek 43:10–11, and Ezek 44:13.

¹⁰⁷ The conclusion that, rhetorically, Yahweh expects the implied readers to acknowledge shame in Ezek 36:32 is further supported by the fact that Yahweh does not speak to the whole house of Israel in the imperative after Ezek 36:32. Yahweh tells Israel to repent (שוב) repeatedly within a context of judgment in Ezek 14:6–11. In Ezek 16:52, Yahweh tells Israel to bear their shame and to be ashamed. This passage includes some judgment (v. 58) but focuses on restoration (v. 63). Yahweh uses another flurry of imperatives in Ezek 18:30–32. He tells the Israelites to repent, to turn from their rebellions, to throw off their rebellions, to get for themselves a new heart and a new spirit, to repent, and to live. Yahweh was speaking to an earlier generation of Israelites in Ezek 20:7, 19–20. He told them to throw off their detestable things and not to defile themselves with dung idols. Then he ordered them to walk in his statutes, to keep his ordinances, and to keep his Sabbaths holy. Yahweh tells Israel to bear her lewdness and whoring in a context of judgment in Ezek 23:35. Ezekiel 33:11 urges Israel to repent and reminds the Israelites that Yahweh does not delight in the death of the wicked but wants the wicked to turn and live. Then he repeats the imperative twice as he orders the Israelites to “turn, turn” (שובו שובו). The last time that Yahweh uses the imperative to address the whole house of Israel is in Ezek 36:32. This verse is the only place in the HB where Yahweh uses two shame lexemes to speak to Israel emphatically in the imperative, as he orders them to be ashamed and to be dishonored.

There are two other passages that require attention because they may appear to address the whole house of Israel in the imperative after Ezek 36:32. The first verb in Ezek 43:9 could be parsed as a jussive or an imperfect. The ESV, the KJV, and the NIV all take it as a jussive and thus as a third person command from Yahweh to the house of Israel. However, it is best taken as an imperfect based upon the clear imperfect in v. 7, “The house of Israel will never again defile my holy name,” (ולא יטמאו עוד בית־ישראל שם קדשי). The use of לא to negate the verb makes it clear that this verb is an imperfect. Therefore, the text in v. 9 should read as an imperfect rather than a jussive. “Now they will send their whoring far away” (עתה ירחקו את־זנותם). See Alan Ludwig, “Ezekiel 43:9: Prescription or Promise?” in *Hear the Word of Yahweh: Essays on Scripture and Archaeology in Honor of Horace D. Hummel* (ed. Dean O. Wenthe, Paul L. Schrieber, and Lee A. Maxwell; St. Louis: Concordia, 2002), 67–78. Secondly, in Ezek 45:9, Yahweh uses imperatives to order the princes to take away violence, to do justice, and to lift (the burden of) expulsions. This verse is speaking only to the princes rather than to all of Israel. Furthermore, v. 8 makes it clear that Yahweh’s princes will never again oppress his people. These two passages take place in a context of restoration.

Return to Favor: Restoration Foretold

Plans of Restoration for the Remnant after Ezek 36:32. The role of shame discourse and the major themes of the book in the structure of Ezek 33:1–39:29 highlight the change that is expected in Ezek 36:16–32. It is in Ezek 36:16–32 that the book abandons its concern with purging and shifts clearly and definitively to the restoration phase of the sin and reconciliation pattern. In this way, Ezek 36:33–39:29 describes Yahweh’s plan for restoration, as it shows Yahweh restoring the land, resurrecting the people, unifying Israel, and fighting a cosmic battle for the Israelites.¹⁰⁸

In Ezek 36:33–38, Yahweh begins to deal only with the remnant, as he describes a time when the land will be fully prepared for habitation. Although Yahweh is addressing the transformed Israel, the remnant, he is talking about the land.¹⁰⁹ The reference to cleansing from iniquities in Ezek 36:33 makes it clear that Yahweh is dealing with the remnant.¹¹⁰ But Yahweh’s focus is on the land, as he promises that the cities will be resettled and the ruins rebuilt and that the land will be cultivated (Ezek 36:33–34). Yahweh is transforming Israel. He will also do the work necessary to transform the land. The nations will see the rebuilding, will praise the land, and will know that Yahweh is Yahweh (Ezek 36:34–36). Those who served as observers to the land of Israel’s shame will now serve as observers to its honor.¹¹¹ The role of the Israelites in this passage is only to populate the land (Ezek 36:37–38).¹¹²

¹⁰⁸ See Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, viii; Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 957, 1059; and Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, vi. Although Block, Hummel, and Zimmerli organize these chapters in a way that is similar to the organization given in this dissertation, they do not allow the fall of Jerusalem to dominate chapter 33 or make the distinction between Yahweh’s treatment of the land and his treatment of the people in Ezek 36:16–38. Therefore, they do not describe the same pattern that is described here.

¹⁰⁹ Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 179, states that Ezek 36:33–36 focuses on the land.

¹¹⁰ I do not take “on the day” literally. I believe that this is a prophetic way of talking that links the two ideas but is not saying that it is impossible for Yahweh to cleanse Israel before they have returned to the land.

¹¹¹ As Yahweh describes his plans for the future, he demonstrates that he intends to give Israel honor even

As a further indication that Yahweh expected a change among the Israelites in Ezek 36:32, Yahweh suddenly seems to accept and to respond to their prayers in Ezek 36:33–38. Odell notes that earlier in the book of Ezekiel Yahweh refuses to hear Israel’s inquiries (Ezek 20:1–3), but that he is willing to hear their petition for the first time in Ezek 36:37.¹¹³ Just a few verses after the command to acknowledge shame, Yahweh is willing to hear Israel’s inquiries because he expects that they have acknowledged shame in Ezek 36:32.

In Ezek 37:1–14, Yahweh deals directly with the Israelites again. He deals with their spiritual renewal because a change has taken place in Israel. Ezekiel 37:11 presents Israel as having no hope. The difference from chapter 33 is that Israel no longer blames Yahweh or says that his conduct is not right. The Israelites simply express their lack of hope and say that they think of themselves as dried up bones (Ezek 37:11). They are talking about their very bones. Their identity is one of weakness and death. They are no longer able to be proud, stubborn, or rebellious. They think of themselves as dead and in the grave (Ezek 37:12, קִבְרוֹ). And, as Ezek 32:25 demonstrates, the grave is a place where people bear their shame.

The purging described in chapter 34 and the harsh language of 36:16–32 are gone in Ezek 37:1–14. Yahweh deals with the present situation of the New Israel. By dealing with the present, he creates a link that runs from the fall of Jerusalem to the command to acknowledge shame to the spiritual state of the new Israel. The fall of Jerusalem and Yahweh’s intervention have

according to the view of the nations. However, Ezek 39:23 makes it clear that the nations will know that Yahweh has acted in the world and that his understanding of shame and honor is different from that of the nations.

¹¹² The importance of Yahweh’s name and identity in this major section comes through in the statement that Israel or the nations will know, “that I am Yahweh” (וַיֵּדְעוּ כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה), which is found in Ezek 36:38, 37:14, 37:28, 38:23, and 39:28, for example. This statement highlights the importance of Yahweh’s reputation and the theocentricity of the book. The works that he accomplishes will show his power to the nations but they will also show his true identity to the nations. The result will be that Yahweh will establish his honor among the nations (Ezek 39:21).

¹¹³ Odell, *Ezekiel*, 443. See also Ezek 14:7–8.

brought about a change. Unlike Ezek 33:10, the helplessness and hopelessness that the new Israel feels is something that Yahweh can work with. When sinners justify themselves (Ezek 33:20) Yahweh can only punish them, but when they are helpless and dead (Ezek 37:11) Yahweh can resurrect them.

Yahweh's response to Israel's attitude is to bring the Israelites back from the dead. Yahweh uses strong imagery in Ezek 37:12–13 when he promises to open the graves of the Israelites and raise them from their graves. He is not talking about healing the sick; he is talking about raising the dead. As the creator of life, only Yahweh can raise the dead. By saying that he will bring Israel back from the dead, he is providing further proof that he alone is active since only he as God can resurrect the dead. He finds the Israelites at a low level of status and raises them up. Readers who have this same sense of low status, as acknowledged in Ezek 36:32, know that this passage is talking about them.

Yahweh develops Ezek 36:27 and plays out the idea of receiving his Spirit in images in Ezek 37:7–10. He does this to convince Israel that he is able to do what he promised in Ezek 36:16–32. Ezekiel 37:1–14 is further linked to Ezek 36:16–32 by the progression from an unidentified spirit to Yahweh's Spirit (Ezek 37:5, 14, Ezek 36:26–27). Those who acknowledged shame in Ezek 36:32 receive the Spirit of Yahweh in Ezek 37:14. Yahweh is giving his gifts to his people.

In Ezek 37:15–28, Yahweh deals with Israel's community and leaders again, as he did in chapter 34. Yahweh describes his plan to turn the new Israel into an ideal community. He will combine the two kingdoms into one nation with one King. David will be their ideal King and Shepherd (Ezek 37:19–24), demonstrating Yahweh's faithfulness to his covenant with David. As described in Ezek 21:31–32 (ET 21:26–27), this faithful messianic King will shepherd Israel

according to Yahweh's counter-cultural view of status. In chapter 37, there are no selfish rulers to be cleared away as there were in chapter 34. Here Ezekiel is dealing only with the new Israel.

As Ezek 37:15–28 describes the new Israel, it also describes the restored covenant with Yahweh. Yahweh has employed the theme of the covenant to demonstrate his faithfulness to Israel (Ezek 16:60) and thus to push the Israelites to acknowledge shame before him (Ezek 34:25, 30–31; 36:28). Now he uses the same theme to encourage the New Israel. These Israelites followed the teaching of the covenant by admitting that their violation of the Sinaitic covenant was shameful (Ezek 36:32). These people who have acknowledged shame are the ones who continue in a covenant relationship defined by Yahweh's understanding of honor and shame.

Yahweh uses the covenant formula¹¹⁴ to express the intimate and positive relationship that he has with the New Israel (Ezek 37:23, 27). They are his people, and he is their God (Ezek 37:23). Furthermore, Yahweh will save them from their sins and keep them from defiling themselves (Ezek 37:23). According to Ezek 37:24, they will also walk in his statutes. This means that the Israelites no longer follow the judgments of the nations. They follow Yahweh's judgments.

Yahweh refers to his covenant with Israel as a covenant of peace, making it evident that this covenant is positive for Israel (Ezek 37:26).¹¹⁵ Peace does not refer to an absence of war but rather to a broad state of well-being that precludes the possibility of being overwhelmed by feelings of shame. As Block observes, **שְׁלוֹמ** “speaks of wholeness, harmony, fulfillment, humans at peace with their environment and with God.”¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ This formula is closely linked to the Sinaitic covenant and is usually understood to refer to the general covenantal relationship between Yahweh and Israel. See Martens, *God's Design*, 217.

¹¹⁵ See also Ezek 34:25.

¹¹⁶ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 303. See also John I. Durham, “*šālôm* and the Presence of God,” in *Proclamation and Presence* (ed. J. I. Durham and J. R. Porter. London: SCM, 1970), 272–93.

Chapters 38–39 also argue for a change in Israel. In chapter 33, Yahweh did not fight for Israel, and Jerusalem fell (Ezek 33:21). In Ezek 38–39, Yahweh does fight for Israel,¹¹⁷ and he wins a cosmic battle for the Israelites.¹¹⁸ In this section, the way Yahweh fights for the new Israel is diametrically opposed (Ezek 38:4, 39:3–4) to the way Yahweh treats the stubborn Israel of chapter 33 (Ezek 33:21).¹¹⁹ Furthermore, the Israelites do not have to fight for themselves. They are only spectators as Yahweh fights for them. Their role is to gather the weapons after the battle (Ezek 39:9) and to make the land clean by burying the corpses (Ezek 39:12, 14, 16). This is a striking reversal of the previous situation where Israel made the land unclean by their conduct (Ezek 36:17). In the ideal state of the new Israel, the fall and everything leading to it are reversed. Ezekiel 38:12 refers to resettled ruins where people are living again in prosperity. This shows that Israel has been restored from Ezek 33:24 and 27. The text responds to the profanation of Yahweh’s name in Ezek 36:20–23 when it says that Yahweh will establish his **קְבוֹר** among the nations (Ezek 39:21).¹²⁰

Hierarchical Shame Prevented and Didactic Shame Commanded. Both hierarchical and didactic shame discourse play key roles in the restoration part of the sin and reconciliation

¹¹⁷ This section illustrates the role that divine warrior imagery and the exodus can play in the sin and reconciliation pattern. The divine warrior imagery comes through as Yahweh describes his plan to fight for Israel and to show his honor through a demonstration of power. The concept of the exodus comes through after Yahweh is reconciled with the Israelites because he then plans to lead them out of the nations and into their land and to maintain them on the land. See Boadt, *ABD* 2:720–21.

¹¹⁸ See Lawrence Boadt, “Mythological Themes and the Unity of Ezekiel,” in *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible* (ed. L. J. de Regt, J. de Waard, and J. P. Fokkelman; Winona Lak, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 229. According to Boadt, as Yahweh wins this cosmic battle for Israel, the text, “rejects the claims of Babylon and of Israel’s immediate small neighbors that their gods are stronger than Israel’s god, who was humiliated and shown to be powerless by the defeat and exile of 587.”

¹¹⁹ The pattern of the structure of Ezek 33–39 along with Yahweh’s concern to present Israel’s transformation before he fights for Israel responds to Lust’s assertion that there is little or no link between chapter 37 and chapters 38–39 and that the original order of the chapters was 38–39 before 37 (Lust, “Ezekiel,” 530).

¹²⁰ Yahweh’s name causes Yahweh to delay judgment in Ezek 20:9 and to grant salvation in Ezek 36:16–32. See Martin-Achard, “Ezéchiel,” 328. The theme of Yahweh’s concern with his name is closely related to the theme of shame because it is a status theme.

pattern. As the book of Ezekiel describes the situation, Yahweh will protect Israel from hierarchical shame but will insist upon didactic shame in the restoration. In this major section, he uses both of these types of shame language to urge the Israelites to acknowledge low status before him and to describe the future role that didactic shame will play for them.

The use of shame lexemes in this major section demonstrates that Yahweh expects the Israelites to continue to be ashamed before him in the restoration. In Ezek 34:28–29, Yahweh promises Israel “a renowned plantation” (מִטָּע לְשֵׁם) and protection from famine. Israel is described as living securely with no one to make them afraid (וַיֵּשְׁבוּ לְבִטָּח וְאֵין מִחְרִיד). Under these circumstances, Israel will never again bear the shame of the nations (וְלֹא־יִשְׂאוּ עוֹד כְּלָמַת (הַגּוֹיִם). Yahweh promises to protect Israel from the hierarchical function of shame before the nations.

The nations also serve as observers of shame in Ezek 36:15 and 36:30. Yahweh addresses the land of Israel in Ezek 36:15 as he says, “I will never again cause you to hear the insult of the nations, and you will never again bear the disgrace of the peoples” (וְלֹא־אֲשָׁמִיעַ אֶלְיָךְ עוֹד (כְּלָמַת הַגּוֹיִם וְחָרַפַת עַמִּים לֹא תִשְׁאֵי־עוֹד). This passage also identifies the nations as the audience that would attribute low status to Israel. But Yahweh promises to prevent it. The same sentiment comes through in Ezek 36:30, as Yahweh tells Israel, “you will never again suffer the disgrace of famine among the nations” (לֹא תִקַּחוּ עוֹד חָרַפַת רָעֵב בְּגוֹיִם). These passages demonstrate Yahweh’s strong positive commitment to Israel.

Ezekiel 39:26, however, describes Israel living under the same conditions as in Ezek 34:28–29 but with a different result. In Ezek 34:29, Yahweh protects Israel from shame. But Ezek 39:26 says that the Israelites are bearing their shame (וְנָשׂוּ אֶת־כְּלָמָתָם).¹²¹ The text

¹²¹ The translation problem presented by this verse will be dealt with below.

presents Yahweh as protecting the remnant from shame before the nations while the remnant acknowledges shame before him.

Now that Yahweh has led the Israelites through the reconciliation event (Ezek 36:32), he makes it clear that didactic shame will be an integral part of their relationship with him during the restoration. In Ezek 39:25–26, Yahweh describes the ideal situation where he has restored Jacob and had compassion on the whole house of Israel.¹²² Yahweh’s compassion on Israel reflects his positive attitude toward the Israelites. They will live securely in their land and will not have anyone to make them afraid. The text uses a shame term to say that it is under these circumstances that Israel will bear their shame just as Yahweh commanded them to do in Ezek 36:32 and Ezek 16:52.

The idea of bearing shame under such ideal circumstances is so troubling that English versions such as the ESV, the NIV, and the RSV choose an easier reading and say that Israel will forget their shame.¹²³ Such a translation does not agree well with Ezekiel’s use of shame

¹²² This is a rare statement of Yahweh’s compassion toward Israel. In “Dim,” 66, n. 70, Schwartz argues that Yahweh does not express emotional attachment to Israel. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 247, has also noted a lack of positive emotional terminology directed toward Israel. Schwartz, “Dim,” 63, argues that this verse, Ezek 39:25 is secondary. However, Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 478, 485, does not agree. Furthermore, the textual apparatus of the *BHS* does not offer any variant readings to support its omission.

¹²³ The first word of this verse, *וְנָשָׂא*, poses a problem because the *aleph* has been dropped. The ESV, the RSV, and the NIV may employ the translation given because the translators think that the root is *נָשָׂא*. On the contrary, this is a defective writing of *נָשָׂא*. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 295, argues against *נָשָׂא* by noting that this root does not appear in Ezekiel. “But since the phrase *נָשָׂא כָּל־מָוֶה* occurs very frequently in Ezekiel (16:52, 54; 32:24f, 30; 34:29; 36:6f, cf. 36:15; 44:13) and since the phrase both here and in 16:54 follows immediately on *שׁוֹב שְׁבוֹת*, all the comparative material argues against the emendation” of the Masoretic text. The Hebrew words *שׁוֹב שְׁבוֹת* refer to the restoration of Israel’s fortune. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 320, adds to this argument by saying that all of the versions agree with the Masoretic text, even the LXX and the Syriac, “which otherwise happily smooth out awkward parts of the text.” A number of modern commentaries have followed Zimmerli. See Hummel *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1126, 1144; Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 486; Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 199; and Hals, *Ezekiel*, 280. Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 199, retains the basic sense while trying to smooth the message with the gloss, “They will take seriously their humiliation.” The translation given by the ESV, the NIV, and the RSV may be influenced by Isa 54:4, where Yahweh promises Israel, “you will forget the shame of your youth” (*בִּשְׁתַּחֲוֹת עַל־מִוֶּנֶה תִשְׁכַּחֲוּ*). However, Isa 54:4 is dealing with shame before the nations that reflects Israel’s state, as demonstrated by the comparison with widowhood that follows in the text. Isaiah 54:4 does not deal with didactic, relational shame before Yahweh.

discourse or with his unwillingness for Israel to forget their past unfaithfulness to Yahweh.¹²⁴ Just a few verses earlier, Yahweh makes the point that even the nations will know that Israel went into captivity on account of their iniquity (Ezek 39:23).¹²⁵ So, it would seem unusual for the Israelites to forget their shame. Such a translation also does not agree well with Yahweh's promise that Israel will remember their conduct after the restoration and will loathe themselves (Ezek 36:31) or with the text's other uses of shame discourse in the last major section of the book (Ezek 43:10–11; 44:13).¹²⁶ Therefore, וְנָשָׂו is best translated, "And they will bear," both because this translation follows the MT and because it is the most convincing translation within the context given by Ezekiel.

Rather than forgetting their shame, Ezekiel 39:26 demonstrates that bearing shame is a part of the true Israel's new identity. It is an intimate part of the ideal situation that Yahweh provides for Israel. The ongoing acknowledgment of shame is Yahweh's means of assuring that his relationship with Israel continues in good order because it demonstrates that Israel still agrees with his understanding of honor and shame and his evaluation of their past behavior. Under these

¹²⁴ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 320, argues that the idea of past sins being forgotten is unheard of in Ezekiel. See also Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 486. According to Even-Shoshan, 751, 1141, Ezekiel does not use נָשָׂו and employs שָׁכַח only two times and each time to say that Israel has forgotten Yahweh (Ezek 22:12, 23:35). Yahweh does not talk about Israel's forgetting their unfaithfulness in the book of Ezekiel. Furthermore, נָשָׂו is a rare word that, according to Even-Shoshan, 751, appears only seven times in the entire HB and never in Ezekiel.

¹²⁵ The translators who read "forget" (נָשָׂו) instead of "bear" (נָשָׂו) may be trying to harmonize with Ezek 34:29 and Ezek 36:15 because these verses say that Israel will no longer bear the reproach of the nations. Ezekiel 34:29 is the most similar to Ezek 39:26 as it employs the words "and they will no longer bear the shame of the nations" (וְלֹא יִשָּׂאוּ עוֹר כְּלַמַּת הַגּוֹיִם). However, the nations are clearly the observers of this shame, and this shame is taken away by good crops and prosperity. On the other hand, the shame described in Ezek 39:26 is between Yahweh and Israel and is caused by Israel's unfaithfulness to Yahweh. The book of Ezekiel describes a situation where Yahweh takes away Israel's shame before the nations but does not remove Israel's shame in their relationship with him. Also, Ezek 39:23 does not encourage the nations to hold Israel in low esteem. It focuses instead on making sure that the nations know why Israel went into exile and that it was not because of Yahweh's weakness.

¹²⁶ The emendation in Ezek 39:26 is also difficult to support because translators must turn a *sin* into a *shin* in order to justify their translation.

circumstances, Yahweh is free to demonstrate his power and wealth through Israel and thus to give them the land and many other blessings, which brings honor among the nations.

Summary

The book of Ezekiel expects the implied readers to acknowledge shame before Yahweh in the middle of this major section that forms the transitional moment of the entire book. Leading up to the reconciliation event, Yahweh uses the fall of Jerusalem to judge Israel and then continues to purge Israel of its unfaithful leaders. He moves the implied readers toward reconciliation by promising to gather them and by his faithfulness to the covenant. He even announces his plan to protect Israel from shame before the nations while expecting the Israelites to be ashamed before him in order to repair the relationship. This didactic shame before Yahweh is associated with restoration and shown in a positive light before Yahweh commands the Israelites to be ashamed in v. 32. One of the strongest arguments that the text expects the Israelites to acknowledge shame in Ezek 36:32 is the change that takes place after this verse, as Yahweh describes his positive plans for the remnant that he has created. Yahweh populates the land with Israelites (Ezek 36:33–38), resurrects Israel (Ezek 37:1–14), makes Israel one people with one faithful king (Ezek 37:15–28), and finally wins a cosmic battle for Israel (chapters 38–39). Yahweh promises to protect Israel from shame before the nations (Ezek 36:30) while expecting the Israelites to acknowledge shame before him during the restoration (Ezek 39:26).

Ezekiel 40:1–48:35: Bearing Shame in the Restoration

Although it is possible to read the shame lexemes in this section of Ezekiel as referring negatively to Israel's transgressions, this dissertation argues that they may also be understood in a manner consistent with the concept of didactic shame discourse and reconciliation that has been demonstrated throughout the rest of the book. That is to say that bearing shame is linked to

reconciliation in a positive way. While this understanding is strikingly different from common interpretations,¹²⁷ it offers a fresh perspective that is informed by the holistic study of shame discourse throughout the book, especially the climactic imperatives of Ezek 36:32.

Such an approach leads to the conclusion that this final major section of the book of Ezekiel presents a nearly perfect future where the sin and reconciliation pattern is resolved in restoration because the remnant has acknowledged shame. Yahweh's judgment of Israel is a memory. The covenant is functioning properly, as Yahweh's **קְבוּרָה** returns to the temple and lives with his people. In this section, the proper acknowledgment of low status before Yahweh on the part of Israel is also a clear part of the identity of the Israelites.

Sin, Abandonment, and Loss as Part of Israel's Past

In Ezek 40:1–48:35, sin, abandonment, and loss, the second, third, and fourth steps of the sin and reconciliation pattern, are presented as part of Israel's past. Even though the Israelites are still in exile (Ezek 40:1), the text directs their attention to Yahweh's future plans for them. This major section mentions Israel's sin and judgment only as a way of characterizing Israel's past.

The judgment and purging that played a prominent role in Ezek 1:1–24:27 and Ezek 33:1–39:29 are part of Israel's past because the remnant has acknowledged shame before Yahweh.¹²⁸

There are a few places where Yahweh speaks harshly to Israel in the rest of the book, but these

¹²⁷ Although unusual, this view is not without support. Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1243, 1276; and Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 632, both see the shame in this last section of Ezekiel in a positive light. However, they do not develop the positive view of shame as this dissertation has done.

¹²⁸ The new identity of the Israelites does not mean that they no longer sin. In fact, this last section contains references to sins and sin offerings among the faithful remnant (Ezek 40:39; 42:13; 45:20). It is not presenting a situation that is so ideal that Israel does not sin. However, Israel's sin does not destroy their relationship with Yahweh because they acknowledge shame. The text describes the Israelite acknowledgment of shame in Ezek 43:10–11 and 44:13. Ezekiel 36:33 was the point where Yahweh stopped addressing stubborn Israelites. Although Yahweh does speak frankly about Israel's past conduct in this final section, his focus is on giving the remnant hope and lavishing gifts upon them.

cases normally refer to a past wrongdoing of Israel that will be corrected. For example, Yahweh urges the Israelites to put their unfaithfulness far away in Ezek 43:9. In Ezek 44:6–9, Yahweh refers to the house of Israel as rebellion—part of the present identity based on past action—before giving the details of a past failure on Israel’s part and explaining how this failure will be corrected. However, Yahweh treats the purging and the judgment as part of Israel’s past.

Reconciliation Confirmed

The Return of Yahweh’s כְּבוֹד to the Temple. After Yahweh’s judgment through the fall of Jerusalem has had its desired effect and the true Israelites have acknowledged shame, Yahweh is willing to return to the temple. In Ezek 43:4–5, the honor of Yahweh (כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה) returns to the temple. The text appears to assume that the implied readers have acknowledged low status before Yahweh. Such a change in Yahweh’s relationship with Israel would explain why Yahweh is willing to return to the temple and to continue in a restored relationship with Israel.¹²⁹ After the return of his honor to the temple, Yahweh goes on to describe the ideal temple as he reorganizes Israelite society into what it should be. Yahweh restores Israel. He puts back together what has fallen apart. It is within this progression of thought that Yahweh uses shame discourse to define Israel’s identity.

Israel’s New Identity Marked by the Acknowledgment of Shame. Yahweh’s honor returns to the temple because the new and lasting identity of Israel, including the acknowledgment of shame before him, has been established. Immediately after the כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה returns to the temple, Yahweh addresses explicitly the importance of Israel’s acknowledgment of low status to their identity in Ezek 43:10–11. This part of Israel’s identity shows the attitude of

¹²⁹ This is a reversal of Yahweh’s departure from the temple. See Boadt, “Mythological,” 230.

humility of the Israelites in their relationship with Yahweh, as Yahweh gives gifts to his people. Ezekiel 43 begins with the return of Yahweh's כְּבוֹד to the temple (Ezek 43:4–5). At this point, Yahweh uses shame discourse to tell Ezekiel to describe the temple to the house of Israel so that “they may be ashamed because of their iniquities” (וַיִּכְלְמוּ מֵעוֹנוֹתֵיהֶם). The description of the temple reinforces Yahweh's assertion that Israel misjudged him. Yahweh's conduct is right after all. He does treat Israel well and does give Israel wonderful gifts. Furthermore, the temple highlights Yahweh's holiness and his intimate relationship with Israel.

The next verse says that Ezekiel should teach the Israelites the design of the temple if they acknowledge shame. The text says, “And if they are ashamed because of all that they did” (וְאִם-נִכְלְמוּ מִכָּל-אֲשֶׁר-עָשׂוּ).¹³⁰ This is explicit confirmation of what was done with rhetorical subtlety in Ezek 36:32. As with Ezek 36:32, the acknowledgment of low status shows an appropriate attitude toward past behavior and is linked to reconciliation—in this case, the restoration of the temple. Those who acknowledged shame in Ezek 36:32 also acknowledge shame here, indicating membership in the true Israel, and thus meeting the prerequisite for hearing the details of the temple. Therefore, Ezekiel does go on to describe the design of the temple. The text assumes that the readers have acknowledged low status before Yahweh.¹³¹

Ezekiel 43:10–11 also teaches the true Israelites to apply social pressure that reinforces Yahweh's values. According to this passage, any ethnic Israelites who might not acknowledge

¹³⁰ By making this sentence conditional I follow Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1244, rather than Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 2, 410; and Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 586–87. I also follow the MT rather than the LXX and the Vulgate. Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 586–87, translates, “and they themselves will be humiliated for everything they have done.”

¹³¹ This proves that the rhetorical goal of the book of Ezekiel has been achieved and a faithful remnant that acknowledges shame has been created. See Renz, *Rhetorical*, 229–31, for details concerning the effectiveness of the communication. Ezra 9:6 also affirms that there is a faithful remnant that acknowledges shame. The book of Ezra describes a situation where a group of exiled Israelites returns to the land decades after the fall of Jerusalem. In Ezra 9:6, Ezra speaks on behalf of this group of Israelites and says, “O my God, I am ashamed and dishonored” (אֶלֹהֵי בְּשָׁפְתִי וְנִכְלַמְתִּי). It is likely that this group of Israelites who acknowledged shame before Yahweh did so because Yahweh had used the book of Ezekiel to create and sustain the true Israel and because they knew that shame before Yahweh is a characteristic of true Israelites.

dishonor before Yahweh are not allowed to learn the design of the temple. Although Yahweh does not instruct true Israelites to exclude others, the conclusion is obvious. They should require others to admit to low status in their relationship with Yahweh before hearing the details of the design of the temple. Furthermore, since shame is a prerequisite for learning the design of the temple, the Israelites will urge each other to continue to say that their previous behavior was shameful.

Didactic shame discourse appears again in Ezek 44:13. According to this verse, the Levites “will bear their dishonor and their abominations that they did” (וְנִשְׂאוּ כָּל־מִתְהַוָּתָם וְתוֹעֲבוֹתָם אֲשֶׁר) (עָשׂוּ). This verse could be understood negatively, especially in light of Ezek 44:10 and Ezek 44:13. Ezekiel 44:10 says that the Levites will bear their iniquity (וְנִשְׂאוּ עֲוֹנָם) and Ezek 44:13 says, “They will not come near to me to be priests to me” (וְלֹא־יִגְשׁוּ אֵלַי לְכַהֵן לִי).

However, Block offers another possible way of interpreting the passage, noting that these verses are best understood in relation to Num 18:21–23.¹³² Numbers 18:1 gives Aaron and his sons responsibility for the priesthood. According to Num 18:2, those Levites who were not sons of Aaron were responsible to support the work of the priests. They were also required to keep the people from drawing near to the tent of meeting (Num 18:22). In reference to the Levites and their service at the tent of meeting, Num 18:23 says that “they will bear their iniquity” (וְהִם יִשְׂאוּ עֲוֹנָם). The verse does not mention any sin on the part of the Levites for which they would bear their own iniquity. Rather, it says that this bearing of iniquity is an eternal statute (חֻקַּת עוֹלָם).

¹³² This interpretation is also taken by Iain M. Duguid, *Ezekiel and the Leaders of Israel* (VTSup 56; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 75–80; Kalinda Rose Stevenson, *Vision of Transformation: The Territorial Rhetoric of Ezekiel 40–48* (SBLDS 154; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 72; and Rodney K. Duke, “Punishment or Restoration: Another Look at the Levites of Ezekiel 44:6–16,” *JSOT* 40 (1988): 61–81.

The same terms appear in Num 18:1 in reference to the priesthood. Here, however, these words appear in construct in a way that clarifies the meaning. Aaron and his sons will bear the iniquity of the sanctuary (תִּשְׂאוּ אֶת־עוֹן הַמִּקְדָּשׁ). They will also bear the iniquity of their priesthood (תִּשְׂאוּ אֶת־עוֹן כֹּהֲנֵיכֶם). Again, there is no wrongdoing described in the surrounding verses. In this way, the text gives the impression that this is a reference to service rather than to specific sin. According to Baruch Levine, the text is saying that Aaron and his sons will, “bear the *consequences* of the defilement of the Sanctuary.”¹³³ That is, if the sanctuary is defiled by the activity of Aaron and his sons, they will be punished.

While Aaron and his sons are responsible for what goes on inside the sanctuary, the Levites are responsible to make sure that only the right people enter it. The idea appears to be that, according to Num 18:1–23, the Levites were required to keep other Israelites from violating the holiness of the sanctuary (Num 18:21–22). This responsibility was referred to as bearing the iniquity of the people because the Levites would be held responsible if the people violated the sanctuary. Ezekiel 44:10 seems to use the same sense as Num 18:23.¹³⁴ It confirms that Yahweh is employing the plan for the Levites as described in Num 18:21–23.¹³⁵

The context of Ezek 44:10 supports this view. After mentioning the entrances and exits of the sanctuary in v. 5, Yahweh uses vv. 6–7 to confront the Israelites with their abomination of allowing foreigners to enter there. In Ezek 44:9, Yahweh insists that no foreigner will enter into

¹³³ Levine, *Numbers 1–20*, 437–40.

¹³⁴ Duke, “Punishment,” 65–67. See also Milgrom, *Numbers*, 19–33. Duguid, *Ezekiel and the Leaders*, 77, asserts that this phrase refers to the Levites bearing their own iniquity for their own failure to do their duty. However, it is certainly possible for one person or group to bear the iniquity of another as the text demonstrates explicitly in Ezek 4:5. Here Ezekiel is called upon to bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. See Stevenson, *Vision of Transformation*, 71.

¹³⁵ Duke, “Punishment,” 67. Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 626–29, says that in Ezek 44:10 the iniquity of the people falls on the Levites as intended in Num 18:23. However, the context of restoration makes such a conclusion unlikely.

his sanctuary. This verse is linked to Ezek 44:10 by **כִּי אִם**, often translated “except” or “rather,” showing by contrast that the Levites will enter into his sanctuary even though they have been unfaithful. Duke gives this translation, “but, rather, the Levites [will enter], who went far from me when Israel went astray from me after their idols. And they [the Levites] will be responsible for their [the people’s] guilt.”¹³⁶

In fact, Ezekiel 44:11 makes it clear that the Levites are reinstated, because it describes their service in the sanctuary. They have oversight over the gates. In this way, the text resolves the problem of foreigners entering the sanctuary and creates a strong link with Num 18:21–23. Block even argues that this verse signifies a promotion because the Levites are now authorized to slaughter the sacrificial animals¹³⁷

Ezekiel 44:12 mentions the sins of the Levites again and notes that the idols that they served were a stumbling block to Israel. This verse begins, “Because they used to minister to them before their dung idols, and they became to the house of Israel a stumbling block of iniquity” (**יַעַן אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁרְתוּ אוֹתָם לְפָנַי גְּלוּלֵיהֶם וְהָיוּ לְבֵית־יִשְׂרָאֵל לְמַכְשׁוֹל עֹוֹן**). Then Yahweh speaks of lifting up his hand against them in punishment and employs the signatory formula, which implies a break before the next statement.¹³⁸ He says, “therefore I raised my hand against them—declaration of the Lord Yahweh—” (**עַל־כֵּן נִשְׁאַתִּי יָדִי עַל־יָהִם נְאֻם אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה**). This part of the verse is saying that Yahweh raised his hand in punishment because of the unfaithfulness of the Levites. It refers to past judgment.¹³⁹ The next statement, then, is in the future: “And they will bear their iniquity” (**וְנִשְׂאוּ עֹוֹנָם**). Block translates this sentence, ““They

¹³⁶ Duke, “Punishment,” 71.

¹³⁷ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 630.

¹³⁸ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 631.

¹³⁹ Stevenson, *Vision of Transformation*, 72.

shall bear their responsibility,”¹⁴⁰ and asserts that it highlights, “the responsibility that Yahweh places on the Levites for the preservation of the temple’s sanctity.”¹⁴¹ The Levites will bear their iniquity just as they did in Num 18:23. This is restoration to their former post.

Block goes on to argue that v. 13 is not a demotion: “Treating the conjunction at the beginning as a disjunctive *waw*, this statement reaffirms their status one rung below the priests.”¹⁴² Taken this way, the verse begins, “But they may not come near to me to act as priests for me and to come near any of my holy things (or) to the most holy offerings”¹⁴³ (וְלֹא-יִגְשׁוּ אֵלַי (לְכַהֵן לִי וְלִגְשׁוֹת עַל-כָּל-קֳדָשַׁי אֶל-קֳדָשַׁי הַקְּדָשִׁים). At the end of v. 12, Yahweh states that the Levites retain their previous role as guards, but here at the beginning of v. 13, he makes it evident that they have not been promoted all the way to full equality with priests. Block notes that the reference to acting as priests for Yahweh is the key to understanding what is meant by the idea of coming near to Yahweh (Ezek 44:13). He then adds, “The Mosaic Torah had reserved the privilege reflected in the phrase exclusively for the Aaronic priests.”¹⁴⁴

Explicit shame discourse then appears in the second half of the verse: “They will bear their dishonor and their abominations that they did” (וְנָשְׂאוּ כָל-מַתָּם וְתוֹעֲבוֹתָם אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ). As with other instances of didactic shame discourse (e.g., Ezek 36:32; 39:26), past behavior is the cause of the Levites’ low status before Yahweh rather than before the nations. Bearing their dishonor and the abominations that they perpetrated in the past appears to mean that the Levites admit that their past behavior was shameful and resulted in shame before Yahweh. This appropriate attitude toward past behavior is closely linked to the reconciliation and restoration to their previous post.

¹⁴⁰ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 631.

¹⁴¹ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 631.

¹⁴² Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 631. See also Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1276.

¹⁴³ Literally, “holy things of holy things.”

¹⁴⁴ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 631, references Exod 28:1, 3, 4, 41.

Block also sees the shame discourse in this verse as positive. He says that the reference to shame in Ezek 44:13, “is to be interpreted here as it had been used in the salvation oracles,”¹⁴⁵ and cites Ezek 16:53–54, 60–63; 20:39–44; 36:31–32; 39:25–26; and 43:10–11.¹⁴⁶ Hummel notes that here and elsewhere in the salvation oracles, Ezekiel is using shame in the context of salvation rather than judgment.¹⁴⁷

This is another example where shame becomes part of identity. By bearing their shame, the Levites acknowledge their past unfaithfulness and demonstrate an appropriate attitude toward it. Under these circumstances, Yahweh treats them well. Ezekiel 44:14 states again Yahweh’s intention to reinstate the Levites. What appears to be judgment is, in fact, restoration. With no mention of the apparent paradox, Block says, “This means that the Levites will be reinstated as *honorable* (italics mine) guardians of the sanctuary, functioning faithfully as Yahweh’s temple servants.”¹⁴⁸

The use of shame discourse in this last section of the book of Ezekiel supports the conclusion that the implied readers were expected to acknowledge shame in their relationship with Yahweh in Ezek 36:32. The shame discourse in this part of the book is all didactic,¹⁴⁹ and it describes Israelites who recognize the shamefulness of their past behavior. In this way, the Israelites affirm their allegiance to Yahweh and to his view of shame and honor.

Israel’s One and Only Covenant God. Now that Israel’s appropriate identity has been firmly settled, the covenant functions smoothly in the relationship between Yahweh and his people even though they are in exile. As explained in chapter 3 of this dissertation, the Sinaitic

¹⁴⁵ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 632.

¹⁴⁶ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 632.

¹⁴⁷ Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1243, 1276. See also Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 632.

¹⁴⁸ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 629.

¹⁴⁹ See appendix 6.

covenant formalizes Yahweh's view of honor and shame. This means that Yahweh, the God of Israel, lives with his people (Ezek 43:2; 44:2; 48:35) and the Israelites follow his statutes (Ezek 44:24). Ezekiel 40:1–48:35 continues to use divine warrior imagery, as the conquering warrior builds his temple on a mountain (Ezek 43:12).¹⁵⁰ Ezekiel 40:1 makes it clear that this vision takes place well after the fall of Jerusalem so that the Israelites who have acknowledged shame have been living in exile while trusting in Yahweh and his promises for some time. Israelites who have not acknowledged shame are left behind, as Yahweh proves through this vision to be everything Israel had hoped for in their covenant God. Yahweh depicts a time when the exile will be over and the second exodus and conquest will be completed. As he describes Israel living in an ideal situation with him, he works out the details of the temple (Ezek 40:1–42:20), the land (Ezek 45:1–8; 47:13–48:29), and the community (Ezek 45:7–46:18). Israel's God gives the people instructions for living with each other and orders the princes to remove violence and to practice righteousness (Ezek 45:9–10).¹⁵¹

Return to Favor: Visions of Future Restoration

Focusing on Restoration. Although the Israelites are still in exile (Ezek 40:1), Ezek 40:1–48:35 depicts a time when the temple, the land, and the community will be restored, as just noted. The text describes the temple that was desecrated when Jerusalem fell as being fully rebuilt (Ezek 40:2–42:20). Yahweh's **קְבוֹר** enters this temple (Ezek 43:4–5), provisions are made for a benevolent prince (Ezek 45:7–8), and the land is allotted appropriately (Ezek 47:13–

¹⁵⁰ The temple is Yahweh's palace. See Boadt, "Salvation," 17.

¹⁵¹ Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1301, notes that this command shows that not all of Ezek 40–48 is made up of completely realized eschatology. Yahweh is still active, keeping the community healthy.

48:29). In this last major section, the book of Ezekiel spends so much time on the restoration that the reality of Israel's exile is all but forgotten.

Yahweh's Relationship with the Nations. Yahweh's relationship with the nations as presented in this final section also undergirds the argument that Yahweh expects the Israelites to acknowledge shame in Ezek 36:32. In contrast to earlier sections, Ezek 40:1–48:35 scarcely mentions the nations. This situation reflects the theocentricity of the text where the focus is on Yahweh and his relationship with Israel. The Israelites are no longer obsessed with the land or the temple as status symbols, and, therefore, the text no longer refers to what the nations think of Israel.¹⁵² When people from the nations are mentioned, however, it is assumed that they have a positive view of Yahweh. Far from holding Yahweh in low esteem, members of the nations will join Israel and will be treated well. Ezekiel 47:22–23 says that those aliens who have settled among the Israelites will be treated as native-born people (Ezek 47:22–23).¹⁵³

Surviving the Exile. In this last section of the book of Ezekiel, Yahweh gives the new Israel the resources necessary to survive the exile. The Israelites know that they went into exile because they were unfaithful to Yahweh (Ezek 39:23). They have acknowledged that their past behavior was shameful and that it put them in a state of shame before Yahweh (Ezek 36:32; 39:26; 43:10–11). They know who they are but, more importantly, they know who Yahweh is. They have learned that Yahweh is faithful to the covenant and thus to them. Yahweh has taught the Israelites that he is able to be with them and to be their sanctuary even when they are in exile and the temple has been desecrated (Ezek 11:16).

¹⁵² The issue of status before the nations was resolved in the previous section (Ezek 36:30; 39:7, 21–24).

¹⁵³ Paul R. Raabe, "Why Prophetic," 240–41, has given guidelines that, although intended for oracles against the nations, are also useful for understanding the way that the book of Ezekiel relates to non-Israelites.

As Yahweh depicts the restoration, he encourages the Israelites to trust that these promises will come true because they have been reconciled with him, and he is with them. Although Yahweh describes a return to the land, a new temple, and a society where honor and shame function as they should, the focus is still on Yahweh himself. The last verse makes this fact clear as it gives the name of the city as Yahweh is there (Ezek 48:35). While this prophecy encourages the Israelites to look forward to the restoration, it also focuses on Yahweh's presence. It does this at a time when Yahweh is already with the Israelites even though they are in exile. Yahweh is not tied to the land. He is with Israel in the present time of the readers and promises a time when they will live in the city, and he will still be with them.

Summary

This final section of the book of Ezekiel provides substantial evidence that the book expects readers to acknowledge shame in response to the imperatives in Ezek 36:32, as it describes the new Israel reconciled to Yahweh and still admitting dishonor. Such a situation reflects the positive outcome of didactic shame discourse. These chapters depict Israel's return to Yahweh's favor in the sin and reconciliation pattern. Although full restoration to the land has not yet taken place, Yahweh's attitude toward Israel has changed. He no longer speaks of punishing Israel; punishment is part of Israel's past. Because Israel is reconciled to Yahweh and the shame of the fall of Jerusalem is behind them, the honor of Yahweh (כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה) returns to the temple. Only didactic shame discourse is used in this part of the book, and it is used to show that the Israelites continue to acknowledge the shame of their previous conduct and thus to affirm Yahweh's view of status. The Israelites have a good relationship with Yahweh where Yahweh's view of status works through the Sinaitic covenant. Yahweh lives with his people, and they walk in his statutes (Ezek 43:7–9).

Chapter Summary

In seeking to solve the crux of Ezek 36:16–32, chapter 4 concluded that these verses expect the readers to be ashamed when they read v. 32 so that they form a group of faithful Israelites. Chapter 5 has supported this conclusion arguing that the entire book of Ezekiel intends for the implied readers to acknowledge shame at least by Ezek 36:32. The book of Ezekiel follows the sin and reconciliation pattern, with both the shame discourse and the major themes of the book serving this model. Ezekiel's goal is to drive the readers to Ezek 36:32. It is in this verse that the book intends to create a remnant that acknowledges low status before Yahweh.

In the first major section of the book, shame discourse highlights Israel's bad behavior as the reason that Yahweh is going to judge the Israelites. Yahweh will punish the Israelites with exile in order to shame them before the nations. Yahweh's honor leaves the temple so that his name will not be injured by the fall of Jerusalem. Yahweh also presents the Israelites as utterly sinful and receiving complete judgment. There are no faithful Israelites, but Yahweh creates a group that forms the true Israel. In this way, Yahweh intends to give Israel a new identity. The Israel that Yahweh creates is not the same Israel that existed before the judgment. At the same time, the text uses didactic shame discourse to urge the Israelites to acknowledge low status before Yahweh, and it links such an admission to restoration. Yahweh has a positive attitude toward the remnant and will be faithful to his covenant with them.

It is also evident that Yahweh is faithful, as he uses shame discourse to describe his plan to judge the nations in the second section of the book of Ezekiel. Yahweh shows his power and his positive attitude toward Israel by promising to punish those nations that have mistreated Israel. As Yahweh plans to shame the powerful leaders of the earth, he shows his own honor.

At the beginning of the third section of the book, Yahweh allows Jerusalem to fall. He then continues to purge Israel of rebels while treating those who will become the remnant well. After

Ezek 36:32, however, the rebels have been dealt with and any ethnic Israelites who have not acknowledged shame before Yahweh have been left behind. Ezekiel 36:32 is the reconciliation event that leads to Yahweh's restoration of Israel. He rebuilds the land, resurrects the people, establishes his government over a united Israel, and wins a cosmic battle for his people. Under these circumstances, he reinforces the identity of the Israelites by saying that they will bear their shame in the restoration (Ezek 39:26) and that the nations will know that they went into exile because of their poor behavior (Ezek 39:23–24).

In the final section of Ezekiel, Yahweh has judged Israel for their bad behavior and has been reconciled to the remnant. Therefore, his honor returns to the temple and he commands Ezekiel to describe the design of the temple to the Israelites who acknowledge low status. Those who recognized their dishonor in Ezek 36:32 trust Yahweh to provide the restoration that he describes in Ezek 40:1–48:35. They will survive the exile because Yahweh is with them.

This analysis of the book of Ezekiel demonstrates that Ezek 36:16–32 is a microcosm of the entire book. In both the book of Ezekiel and Ezek 36:16–32,¹⁵⁴ the sin and reconciliation model is used to press the implied readers to be formed into a group of true Israelites with a new identity. This new identity is based upon trust in Yahweh even under the most difficult of circumstances and upon the acknowledgment that Israel is shamed in their relationship with Yahweh because of their previous behavior. This acknowledgment of shame is expected to take place at least by Ezek 36:32. The salvation oracles that follow then apply to the remnant of faithful Israelites that Ezek 36:32 sought to establish.

¹⁵⁴ See chapter 3 for a detailed description of the role of the sin and reconciliation pattern in Ezek 36:16–32.

CONCLUSION

A SOCIOLOGICAL-RHETORICAL STUDY OF EZEK 36:16–32

The goal of this study has been to solve the crux created by the reintroduction of shame after the proclamation of good news in Ezek 36:16–32. As noted at the very outset, the shift from positive promises in Ezek 36:22–30 to the command to be ashamed in Ezek 36:32 is jarring. This dissertation has completed a sociological-rhetorical study of the passage in an attempt to explain why the text uses this strange order. The sociological interpretation¹ was employed in order to reveal the meaning and function of the shame discourse in the passage, while rhetorical analysis² was intended to explicate what the text is trying to accomplish in the readers.³

Summary of the Chapters

The introduction described the unusual order employed in Ezek 36:16–32, where the command to be ashamed comes after positive promises. It then went on to summarize how other scholars have sought to resolve this crux. In response, a fresh approach was proposed, based on a sociological interpretation within the framework of a typical rhetorical study of this text.

Chapter 1 addressed the first two steps of a rhetorical study by analyzing the rhetorical unit and the rhetorical situation in Ezek 36:16–32. It then initiated a study of the choice and

¹ Martin, “Social-Scientific Criticism,” 125–42; and Elliott, *What*.

² Gitay, *Prophecy*, 36–41; Renz, *Rhetorical*, 22–26; and Wuellner, “Where ?” 455–60.

³ The five steps of a rhetorical study are (1) determination of the rhetorical unit that will be studied, (2) determination of the rhetorical situation in order to understand the circumstances of the communication, (3) study of the choice and arrangement of the material, (4) study of the rhetorical devices employed for persuasion, and (5) study of the role of the material in its greater context. See Gitay, *Prophecy*, 36–41; Renz, *Rhetorical*, 22–26; and Wuellner, “Where ?” 455–60.

arrangement of the material by analyzing the logic of the passage, the first step in such a study. This initial investigation concluded that the text highlights the importance of the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel. At the same time, chapter 1 argued that it is necessary to investigate the meaning and function of shame discourse in order to understand the logic of the passage fully.

Chapter 2, then, continued the analysis of the choice and arrangement of the material by focusing on the meaning and function of shame discourse. This began with the necessary philological study intended to yield an understanding of the basic and nuanced meanings of shame lexemes. To this was then added a sociological analysis to determine the function of dishonor in society, within which the low-status vocabulary was used. This chapter highlighted the relationship between social function and rhetorical function, concluding that the role that dishonor plays in society gives shame discourse the ability to accomplish specific rhetorical goals.

Sociological interpretation was employed again, as chapter 3 continued to study the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel in order to bring greater understanding to the choice and arrangement of the material in Ezek 36:16–32. Sociological interpretation was used to analyze the key issue of Yahweh’s view of honor and shame and to compare it to the view of the nations. It was also used to investigate the important role of shame in the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel and to argue that Yahweh employs a pattern called the sin and reconciliation pattern when Israel violates the stipulations of the Sinaitic covenant.

According to the analysis in chapter 4, the ethical material, the emotional material, and the rhetorical techniques in Ezek 36:16–32 all work within the sin and reconciliation model. Chapter 4 completed the study of the choice and arrangement of the material by analyzing the ethical material and the emotional material in the passage. While studying the emotional material,

chapter 4 employed speech-act analysis to investigate the text's use of indirect communication for persuasion. The chapter then went on to complete the fourth step of a typical rhetorical study, as it analyzed the rhetorical techniques used for persuasion in Ezek 36:16–32. The chapter concluded that the ethical material, the emotional material, and the rhetorical techniques were aimed at creating a faithful remnant in Ezek 36:32.

In accomplishing the fifth step of a rhetorical study, an inquiry into the role of Ezek 36:16–32 within the context of the entire book of Ezekiel, chapter 5 asserted that Ezek 36:16–32 is the key turning point in the book. This chapter analyzed the role of shame discourse, the structure of the book, and the major themes in Ezekiel within the context of the sin and reconciliation pattern. It was argued that Yahweh works within the sin and reconciliation pattern to drive the readers to acknowledge shame at least by Ezek 36:32.

Conclusions

This study has sought to explain why shame comes after positive promises in Ezek 36:16–32. Scholars such as Schwartz,⁴ Carley,⁵ Klopfenstein,⁶ Ortlund,⁷ Lapsley,⁸ Block,⁹ and Hummel¹⁰ have offered solutions to this crux. Their work provides numerous helpful insights into this difficult passage, but it does not fully analyze the text from the perspective of shame discourse. In response, this dissertation employed a sociological-rhetorical approach in order to bring fresh understanding to the oracle in Ezek 36:16–32.

⁴ Schwartz, "Dim," 60–61.

⁵ Carley, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, 108.

⁶ Klopfenstein, *Scham*, 72.

⁷ Ortlund, "Shame and Restoration," 165–68.

⁸ Lapsley, "Shame and Self-Knowledge," 146, 148, 150, 154, 157, 159.

⁹ Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 358–59.

¹⁰ Hummel, *Ezekiel 21–48*, 1058–59.

According to Ezek 36:16–32, the Israelites violated the stipulations of the Sinaitic covenant and thus brought Yahweh’s judgment upon themselves (Ezek 36:17–19). When Yahweh exiled Israel, however, the nations responded by holding Yahweh in low esteem (Ezek 36:20). Yahweh reacts to this situation by describing his plan to sanctify his great name and to reconcile the Israelites to himself (Ezek 36:22–32). The text presents Yahweh’s plan in a logical order rather than a chronological order. Therefore, Ezek 36:32 is best taken as a command for the Israelites to be ashamed when they read the text even if they are still in exile. But the text does not explicate what Yahweh means when he orders the Israelites to be dishonored.

A study of shame lexemes concluded that these words deal with status and are used to describe rank within relationships. This dissertation identified didactic shame discourse as the key to understanding Ezek 36:16–32. In the didactic use, the admission of low status shows that learning has taken place as a result of punishment. Yahweh is employing the didactic function of shame discourse in Ezek 36:32, as he orders the Israelites to acknowledge shame. The admission of low status before Yahweh plays an important role in repairing the relationship with Yahweh. By acknowledging dishonor, the Israelites reject their stubbornness and pride and demonstrate that they recognize Yahweh’s high status and their own low status.

The shame terminology in Ezek 36:16–32 plays such an important role in the relationship between Yahweh and Israel because it is related to the covenant relationship between them. In the chapters leading up to Ezek 36:16–32, the Israelites are described as seeking wealth and power and thus following the nations’ view of status rather than Yahweh’s view. Because they are imitating the nations, the Israelites refuse to trust in Yahweh and to walk in his statutes as the Sinaitic covenant requires. However, they still expect Yahweh to keep them on the land. Therefore, the Israelites are able to hurt Yahweh’s reputation in the eyes of the nations both by being exiled for their disobedience and by blaming Yahweh for the failure of their partnership.

In response to this situation, Yahweh describes his positive plans for Israel in Ezek 36:23–30 in order to prove that he has been faithful to the Israelites and that they should be ashamed because their disobedience alone brought failure upon them. Then, when the Israelites acknowledge low status before Yahweh, they stop challenging his honor by blaming him for the exile. In this way, Yahweh sanctifies his great name and accomplishes reconciliation with the Israelites. This manner of interacting with the Israelites may be called the sin and reconciliation pattern. As it begins, Israel has the favor of Yahweh and the community. Then the sins of the Israelites cause Yahweh to abandon them so that they suffer a loss. After being reconciled with Yahweh, the Israelites return to their initial state of favor before Yahweh and others.¹¹ When the Israelites acknowledge dishonor before Yahweh in Ezek 36:32, this act functions as the key reconciliation event in the sin and reconciliation pattern.

Not only does the logic of Ezek 36:16–32 drive the Israelites to the reconciliation event in v. 32, the ethical material and the emotional material work to accomplish the same goal. He does this by presenting his view of status as the only view and pushing readers to agree with him. Those readers who accept Yahweh's authority agree with his view of status and affirm a covenant relationship with him by acknowledging the shame of their previous behavior. The rhetorical devices used for persuasion work in a similar way. Yahweh's unfulfilled promises create the opportunity for each ethnic Israelite to trust in him, as the entire oracle drives the readers to the imperatives of Ezek 36:32. In Ezek 36:32, each Israelite either refuses to be dishonored and breaks away from Yahweh or acknowledges shame and is reconciled with Yahweh. Those ethnic Israelites who do acknowledge shame before Yahweh do so as a matter of faith. They are moved to admit shame because Yahweh has created confidence in them so that

¹¹ Laniak, *Shame*, 7–8, 16.

they trust that Yahweh is working in their situation and that he will accomplish all that he has promised.

In this way, Yahweh creates a remnant of true Israelites who embrace his values and create a society that requires its members to affirm his view of status. Israel's trust in Yahweh and his invisible promises constitutes a reversal in the worldview of the remnant. They no longer seek honor according to the judgments of or by the means of the nations. The remnant does not seek power and wealth by means of idolatry or military alliances. Yahweh's understanding of what shame and honor are has become their understanding of the same. The remnant is concerned with Yahweh's honor and with Yahweh's attitude toward them. They acknowledge their low status before Yahweh in the confidence that he will be reconciled to them and will give them honor before the nations. These faithful Israelites know that they are weak and are in desperate need of Yahweh's help. They also know that Yahweh has demonstrated that he is faithful to Israel. This understanding of Ezek 36:16–32 responds further to the crux of the passage. The return to favor, the sixth step of the sin and reconciliation pattern appears before reconciliation, the fifth step, for rhetorical reasons. However, the Israelites are expected to acknowledge shame in their relationship with Yahweh and thus to be reconciled to him before the return to favor.

The analysis of the shame discourse in the book of Ezekiel, its structure, and the major themes in the entire book affirmed that Ezekiel is using the sin and reconciliation model to create a faithful remnant. Although some scholars may argue that no Israelites actually acknowledged shame before Yahweh in Ezek 36:32 because the text does not show the Israelites' acknowledgment of shame,¹² the book of Ezekiel gives subtle support for such a transformation. Both Yahweh's change in attitude toward Israel after Ezek 36:32 and his strikingly positive use

¹² Lapsley, "Shame and Self-Knowledge," 155, 158–59; Greenberg, "Salvation," 267; and Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll*, 58.

of shame discourse in the rest of the book (Ezek 39:26; 43:10–11; 44:13) intimate that a change has occurred in the implied readers. The text does not treat the implied readers as spectators who are called upon to watch what other Israelites are doing. On the contrary, Yahweh calls on them to participate in the rhetoric and goal of the text. He does this even while recognizing that some Israelites may remain stubborn and others may acknowledge shame.

Those who refuse to acknowledge low status before Yahweh separate themselves from him and are not addressed again in the rest of the book. However, those Israelites who acknowledge shame in their relationship with Yahweh after reading Ezek 36:32 form a remnant of faithful Israelites who are reconciled to Yahweh. Then, following Ezek 36:32, Yahweh goes on to describe the restoration he has planned for these true Israelites who will continue to bear their shame. This analysis of the book of Ezekiel demonstrates that Ezek 36:16–32 is a key turning point in the book of Ezekiel. Ezekiel 36:16–32 plays such a role because Yahweh uses this text to create a faithful remnant. This faithful remnant continues in a covenant relationship with Yahweh, as it trusts in him to fulfill his promises of restoration.

The true Israelites have acknowledged didactic shame, which is honorable shame in more than one sense. The shame of the remnant before Yahweh is honorable shame because it raises their status in their relationship with Yahweh and because it is linked to Yahweh's promise to raise their status before the nations. At the same time, the text assumes that the implied readers are still in exile and thus calls them to a classic stance of honorable shame that follows the challenge pattern as described by Laniak.¹³ The Israelites are able to have honor before Yahweh even though they are in the shameful state of exile in the eyes of the nations.¹⁴ While they are in exile and are measured by the nations as having low status and a weak God, the text invites them

¹³ Laniak, *Shame*, 8–10.

to confess that they are right to trust in Yahweh and that he will ultimately give them high status even before the nations. They confess their confidence to the nations by maintaining their trust in Yahweh. This confession confirms Yahweh's transformation of the remnant.

The remnant knows Yahweh's true identity and agrees with his view of honor and shame even as Yahweh shows his own dedication to that view. When Yahweh's desire for Israel to trust him and walk in his statutes puts him in a situation where people might conclude that he has been shamed, he accepts the shame rather than changing his identity. He even bears vicarious shame as the nations look down on him in spite of the fact that Israel is ultimately at fault (Ezek 36:20). Yahweh reacts in a way that will restore his honor, but he does not avoid the possibility that others will think that he has been shamed altogether. In fact, Ezek 36:16–32 only promises a demonstration of power, it does not offer visible proof. Yahweh remains open to accusations of weakness and the accompanying low status from all readers. At the same time, Yahweh creates the possibility of trust. His concern with accurately presenting his identity prevents human ideas of honor from being the organizing factor in his activities.

Yahweh's concern with his own identity leads him to strengthen the faith of the Israelites rather than ending the exile immediately. Although Yahweh does not return Israel to the land right away, he does give the remnant a means of making sense of the exile and of surviving it. The exile happened because Israel violated the Sinaitic covenant. The exile is proof of Yahweh's power to punish Israel. The solution to the problem of the exile is Yahweh's faithfulness to the covenant. Yahweh wants the faithful Israelites to be confident that he gives them a new heart and his Spirit so that they walk in his statutes and trust in him as their one true God. At the same time, Yahweh is correcting the remnant's misunderstandings about his character and about his

¹⁴ See Isa 50:5–7.

relationship with them. He is teaching the remnant that he is their God even if they are not on the land.¹⁵

In summary, Yahweh commands the Israelites to be ashamed after promising them restoration in order to accomplish the rhetorical goal of the book of Ezekiel, which ultimately results in the salvation of the faithful remnant that Yahweh is creating. Yahweh's promise of restoration, the sixth step in the sin and reconciliation pattern, proves that Yahweh is faithful to the covenant and that the Israelites alone are to blame for the exile. Yahweh uses the logical material, the ethical material, and the emotional material along with the rhetorical techniques in Ezek 36:16–32 to drive the Israelites to agree with his values concerning status and the Sinaitic covenant. Those Israelites who acknowledge shame in v. 32 are reconciled with Yahweh, the fifth step in the sin and reconciliation model. In this way, Yahweh forms a remnant that affirms his values and prepares these faithful Israelites to survive the exile.

While those Israelites who continue in their stubbornness are left to lose their identity because they are no longer on the land (Ezek 11:15), those who acknowledge shame have a new identity that is not dependent upon the land. The prideful Israelites are likely to become part of the nations because they share a similar worldview. But the lowly Israelites trust that Yahweh is with them even when they are not on the land. They also know Yahweh; they know that Yahweh maintains his own view of honor and shame. Yahweh himself is faithful to the covenant even when it hurts his reputation among the nations. In a similar fashion, it is honorable for the remnant to acknowledge shame before Yahweh while trusting in him to give them honor in spite of their low circumstances.

¹⁵ Renz, *Rhetorical*, 249–51.

The use of didactic shame in this text demonstrates that Yahweh alone has indeed created a faithful remnant. He has taught this remnant and brought them to understand the proper relationship between the people of Yahweh and their God. He has shown himself as one who understands the role of shame in the culture in which his people live and has engaged the culture in order to restore his people. Yahweh shamed them before the nations in order to push them to acknowledge shame before him. He then used their acknowledgment of low status to restore the covenant relationship within which they would continue to live under his blessing. In this way, the command to be ashamed is actually honorable, indicative of Israel's restored, proper, and salvific relationship with Yahweh.

EPILOGUE

EZEKIEL 36:16–32 AND THE THEOLOGY OF THE CROSS

The way that Yahweh relates to Israel and the nations in Ezek 36:16–32 fits well with what Luther referred to as the theology of the cross.¹ In the book of Ezekiel, Yahweh refuses to manifest his wealth and power consistently, with the goal of creating the possibility that people will trust in him. That is to say that Yahweh hides his power in the book of Ezekiel. When Yahweh conceals his power in Ezekiel, however, this is only part of a larger pattern of the way that Yahweh relates to people. The crucifixion of God serves as the ultimate example of Yahweh's willingness to hide his power. Yahweh does not want to be a God who attracts people to his riches and strengthen, but he does possess all wealth and power. So, Yahweh hides his riches and strength and reveals himself in ambiguous circumstances that could be believed or doubted by people. Ezekiel 36:16–32 uses this hidden approach where the exile could be taken as proof of Yahweh's weakness or proof of his strength at a time when the promise of restoration has not been accomplished. This situation creates the possibility that the readers will trust Yahweh. Such an approach also continues the historical march toward the cross as Yahweh's means of self-revelation.

The death of Jesus Christ is a similar example of Yahweh's faithfulness that can be understood in terms of status. The Christ shows his willingness to be submitted to low status even to the point of death in order to demonstrate his trust in his God and his desire to obey him.

¹ Gerhard O. Forde, *On Being a Theologian of the Cross: Reflections on Luther's Heidelberg Disputation, 1518* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).

The high status of Jesus clearly comes from his relationship with his God rather than from manifestations of wealth and power. At the same time, however, the resurrection of Jesus does manifest power in an emphatic although somewhat hidden manner. Furthermore, Jesus as God incarnate demonstrates that God himself is willing to bear low status in the place of others. This act is honorable even though dying on a cross is not honorable by its nature. As God reveals himself by dying on a cross and rising again, he shows that high status is not ultimately a matter of manifesting wealth or power for him any more than it is for his followers. He demonstrated this fact in Ezek 36:16–32 when he did not avoid at all cost the low status that exile brought upon him but rather corrected that low status in the process of establishing his true identity. God's fundamental claim to high status is that he is trustworthy to the point of suffering low status—even the low status of death—for human beings.

Jesus Christ's willingness to follow Yahweh's counter-cultural view of status points to his role as the messianic Shepherd of the book of Ezekiel. Both Yahweh and the faithful King are presented as Israel's one Shepherd in Israel's ideal future. Yahweh has borne vicarious shame for the Israelites in order to protect them from a broken relationship with him and permanent low status before the nations. This same God sends his messianic Shepherd to lead his people according to his view of status and forms a remnant of faithful, true believers who regularly affirm the basis of their relationship with Yahweh through humble confession, repentance, and *shame*.

APPENDIX ONE

בוש IN THE HEBREW BIBLE ORDERED BY FORM¹

The column below entitled Citation gives the citation of the text in the HB. The heading Root refers to the three letter root of the Hebrew noun or verb. The column with the heading Conj/Noun gives either the conjugation if the lexeme is a verb or the base form if the lexeme is a noun. When the conjugation Hiphil is followed by the symbol *, it refers to an alternate form. The heading Notes highlights when appearances are ambiguous (**Amb**) and could be argued to refer to more than one function, when they are complicated (**Comp**) in a way that creates confusion over the role of the shame discourse, or important (**Imp**) to the argument of this dissertation. The orientation of shame may be external (**Ext**), internal (**Int**), or relational (**Rel**). External shame focuses on how others view the shamed person. Internal shame focuses on the shamed person's negative emotions that flow out of low status. Relational shame deals with the positive role that the acknowledgment of shame plays in the relationship. The cause of shame may be a **request**, **possible** shame, **failure**, **behavior**, or an unanswered **challenge**. A request may cause shame when it is strong or repeated. Possible shame may lead a person to employ the type of shame that is the same as propriety and prevents people from doing things that will shame them socially. Failure is any sort of defeat, weakness, or other failure that lowers a person's status. Behavior that goes against the norms of the peer group also causes shame. A challenger may challenge another person with insults or by trying to undermine their success. A person who has been challenged but fails to rebuff the challenger is shamed. The function of shame may be **request**, **propriety**, **hierarchical (hierarch)**, **challenge**, or **didactic**. With request shame, a person makes a strong or repeated request in the hope that shame will lead to the request being granted. When a person is faced with a situation that may bring low status, fear of low status should push that person to exercise propriety. The function is hierarchical when the role of shame is to establish a person's rank in a group without any other goal in view. This designation is used when Yahweh punishes someone. The function of shame may also be to challenge a person in order to force the person who has been challenged to fight back or to accept lowered status. The function of shame is didactic when the acknowledgment of shame shows a willingness to learn. This designation is used when the offended partner expresses a desire for such acknowledgment of shame or when the offending partner gives such an acknowledgment. The different functions of shame may appear with an N (negative) as the first letter when that function is used with a negative particle. For example, this designation is used in Psa 22:6, which notes that those who trusted in Yahweh were not ashamed.

¹ This appendix is not ordered by citation but rather by grouping the same verb conjugations and base noun forms together. Within these groupings, the entries are organized by book order in the HB and then by chapter and verse.

| | Citation | Root | Conj/Noun | Notes | Orientation | Cause | Function |
|----|-------------------------|------|-----------|-------|-------------|----------|------------|
| 1 | Judg 3:25 ² | בוש | Qal | Amb | Int | Possible | Propriety |
| 2 | 2 Kgs 2:17 ³ | בוש | Qal | Amb | Int | Request | Request |
| 3 | 2 Kgs 8:11 ⁴ | בוש | Qal | Amb | Int | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 4 | 2 Kgs 19:26 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 5 | Isa 1:29 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 6 | Isa 19:9 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 7 | Isa 20:5 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 8 | Isa 23:4 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 9 | Isa 24:23 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 10 | Isa 26:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 11 | Isa 29:22 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Int | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 12 | Isa 37:27 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 13 | Isa 41:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 14 | Isa 42:17 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 15 | Isa 44:9 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 16 | Isa 44:11 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

² HALOT translates עַד־בוֹשׁ literally with the words *as far as shaming*, but goes on to equate this translation with the term *excessively*. HALOT 1:117. Unfortunately, such a translation overlooks the normal meaning of the shame lexeme involved as well as the function of shame discourse. On the other hand, Bechtel is correct to recognize that this formula refers to self-consciousness in all of its appearances (Judg 3:25, 2Kgs 2:17, and 2 Kgs 8:11). Bechtel, “Biblical Experience,” 45–46. I agree with Bechtel but also seek to discern a function of shame even while recognizing that these are ambiguous examples. For example, the servants in Judg 3:25 clearly feel self-conscious because their lord has not come out from relieving himself for such a long time. However, it worth considering what causes this self-consciousness. One could argue that the servants are embarrassed for their lord because he is behaving strangely. But it seems most likely that the servants are concerned because it would be a violation of propriety for them to open the door while their lord is relieving himself. The servants are afraid of shaming themselves by opening the door. That is why they feel self-conscious.

³ See note under Judg 3:25.

⁴ See note under Judg 3:25.

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------|-----|-----|------|-----|----------|------------|
| 17 | Isa 44:11 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 18 | Isa 45:16 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 19 | Isa 45:17 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 20 | Isa 45:24 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 21 | Isa 49:23 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 22 | Isa 50:7 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Rel | Failure | Hierarch |
| 23 | Isa 54:4 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 24 | Isa 65:13 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 25 | Isa 66:5 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 26 | Jer 2:36 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 27 | Jer 2:36 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 28 | Jer 6:15 | בוש | Qal | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 29 | Jer 6:15 | בוש | Qal | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 30 | Jer 8:12 | בוש | Qal | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 31 | Jer 8:12 | בוש | Qal | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 32 | Jer 9:18 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 33 | Jer 12:13 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 34 | Jer 14:3 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 35 | Jer 14:4 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 36 | Jer 15:9 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 37 | Jer 17:13 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 38 | Jer 17:1 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 39 | Jer 17:18 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 40 | Jer 20:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 41 | Jer 22:22 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 42 | Jer 31:19 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 43 | Jer 48:13 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 44 | Jer 48:13 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 45 | Jer 48:39 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 46 | Jer 49:23 | בוש | Qal | | Int | Failure | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|------------|-----|-----|------|-----|----------|------------|
| 47 | Jer 50:12 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 48 | Jer 51:47 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 49 | Jer 51:51 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 50 | Ezek 16:52 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 51 | Ezek 16:63 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 52 | Ezek 32:30 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 53 | Ezek 36:32 | בוש | Qal | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 54 | Hos 4:19 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failur | Hierarch |
| 55 | Hos 10:6 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 56 | Hos 13:15 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 57 | Joel 2:26 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 58 | Joel 2:27 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 59 | Mic 3:7 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 60 | Mic 7:16 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ex | Failure | Hierarch |
| 61 | Zeph 3:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 62 | Zech 13:4 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 63 | Psa 6:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 64 | Psa 6:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 65 | Psa 22:6 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 66 | Psa 25:2 | בוש | Qa | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 67 | Psa 25:3 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 68 | Psa 25:3 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 69 | Psa 25:20 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 70 | Psa 31:2 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 71 | Psa 31:18 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 72 | Psa 31:18 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 73 | Psa 35:4 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 74 | Psa 35:26 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 75 | Psa 37:19 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failur | Hierarch |
| 76 | Psa 40:15 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-----|--------|------|-----|----------|-------------|
| 77 | Psa 69:7 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 78 | Psa 70:3 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 79 | Psa 71:1 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 80 | Psa 71:13 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 81 | Psa 71:24 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 82 | Psa 83:18 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 83 | Psa 86:17 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 84 | Psa 97:7 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failur | Hierarch |
| 85 | Psa 109:28 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 86 | Psa 119:6 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 87 | Psa 119:46 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 88 | Psa 119:78 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 89 | Psa 119:80 | בוש | Qa | Imp | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 90 | Psa 127:5 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 91 | Psa 129:5 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 92 | Job 6:20 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 93 | Job 19:3 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Int | Possible | N Propriety |
| 94 | Ezra 8:22 | בוש | Qal | | Int | Possible | Propriety |
| 5 | Ezra 9:6 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 96 | Exod 32:1 | בוש | Polel | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 97 | Judg 5:28 | בוש | Polel | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 98 | Psa 14:6 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 99 | Psa 44:8 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 100 | Psa 53:6 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 101 | Psa 119:31 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 102 | Psa 119:116 | בוש | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 103 | Prov 10:5 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 104 | Prov 12:4 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 105 | Prov 14:35 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 106 | Prov 17:2 | בוש | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-----|----------|------|-----|----------|------------|
| 107 | Prov 19:26 | בוש | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 108 | Prov 29:15 | בוש | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 109 | 2 Sam 19:6 | בוש | Hiphil* | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 110 | Isa 30:5 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failur | Hierarch |
| 111 | Jer 2:26 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failur | Hierarch |
| 112 | Jer 6:15 | בוש | Hiphil* | Imp | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 113 | Jer 8:9 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 114 | Jer 8:12 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 115 | Jer 10:14 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 116 | Jer 46:24 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 117 | Jer 48:1 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 118 | Jer 48:1 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 119 | Jer 48:20 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 120 | Jer 50:2 | בוש | Hiphil* | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 121 | Jer 50:2 | בוש | Hiphil* | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 122 | Jer 51:17 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 123 | Hos 2:7 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 124 | Joel 1:10 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 125 | Joel 1:11 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 126 | Joel 1:12 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 127 | Joel 1:12 | בוש | Hiphil* | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 128 | Joel 1:17 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 129 | Zech 9:5 | בוש | Hiphil* | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 130 | Zech 10:5 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 131 | Gen 2:25 | בוש | Hithpael | Amb | E t | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 132 | 1 Sam 20:30 | בוש | בָּשָׁת | Amb | Rel | Behavior | Challenge |
| 133 | 1 Sam 20:30 | בוש | בָּשָׁת | Amb | Rel | Behavior | Challenge |
| 134 | Isa 30:3 | בוש | בָּשָׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 135 | Isa 30:5 | בוש | בָּשָׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 136 | Isa 42:17 | בוש | בָּשָׁת | Amb | Ex | Failure | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|-------------|
| 137 | Isa 54:4 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 138 | Isa 61:7 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 139 | Jer 2:26 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 140 | Jer 3:24 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 141 | Jer 3:25 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | Comp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 142 | Jer 7:19 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 143 | Jer 11:13 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 144 | Jer 20:18 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 145 | Hos 9:10 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 146 | Mic 1:11 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 147 | Hab 2:10 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 148 | Zeph 3:5 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Int | Possible | N Propriety |
| 149 | Zeph 3:19 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 150 | Psa 35:26 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 151 | Psa 40:16 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 152 | Psa 44:16 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 153 | Psa 69:20 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 154 | Psa 70:4 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 155 | Psa 109:29 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 156 | Psa 132:18 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 157 | Job 8:22 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 158 | Dan 9:7 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 159 | Dan 9:8 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | Comp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 160 | Ezra 9:7 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Rel | Failure | Hierarch |
| 161 | 2 Chr 32:21 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 162 | Ezek 7:18 | בוש | בוֹשָׁה | Comp | Int | Failure | Hierarch |
| 163 | Obad 1:10 | בוש | בוֹשָׁה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 164 | Mic 7:10 | בוש | בוֹשָׁה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 165 | Psa 89:46 | בוש | בוֹשָׁה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 166 | Hos 10:6 | בוש | בְּשֹׁנָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

APPENDIX TWO

חפר IN THE HEBREW BIBLE ORDERED BY FORM¹

| Citation ² | Root | Conj/Noun | Notes | Orientation | Cause | Function |
|-----------------------|------|-----------|-------|-------------|----------|------------|
| 1 Isa 1:29 | חפר | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 2 Isa 24:23 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 3 Jer 15:9 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 4 Jer 50:12 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 5 Mic 3:7 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 6 Psa 34:6 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 7 Psa 35:4 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 8 Psa 35:26 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 9 Psa 40:15 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 10 Psa 70:3 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 11 Psa 71:24 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 12 Psa 83:18 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 13 Job 6:20 | חפר | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 14 Isa 33:9 | חפר | Hiphil | Amb | Int | Failure | Hierarch |
| 15 Isa 54:4 | חפר | Hiphil | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 16 Prov 13:5 | חפר | Hiphil | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 17 Prov 19:26 | חפר | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

¹ This appendix is not ordered by citation but rather by grouping the same verb conjugations and base noun forms together. Within these groupings, the entries are organized by book order in the HB and then by chapter and verse.

² See the footnote in appendix 1 for a description of each column heading.

APPENDIX THREE

כִּלְם IN THE HEBREW BIBLE ORDERED BY FORM³

| Citation ⁴ | Root | Conj/Noun | Notes | Orientation | Cause | Function |
|-----------------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| 1 Num 12:14 | כִּלְם | Niphal | Amb | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 2 2 Sam 10:5 | כִּלְם | Niphal | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 3 2 Sam 19:4 | כִּלְם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 4 Isa 41:11 | כִּלְם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 5 Isa 45:16 | כִּלְם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 6 Isa 45:17 | כִּלְם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 7 Isa 50:7 | כִּלְם | Niphal | Amb | Rel | Failure | Hierarch |
| 8 Isa 54:4 | כִּלְם | Niphal | | Int | Failure | Hierarch |
| 9 Jer 3:3 | כִּלְם | Niphal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 10 Jer 8:12 | כִּלְם | Niphal | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 11 Jer 22:22 | כִּלְם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 12 Jer 31:19 | כִּלְם | Niphal | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 13 Ezek 16:27 | כִּלְם | Niphal | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 14 Ezek 16:54 | כִּלְם | Niphal | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 15 Ezek 16:61 | כִּלְם | Niphal | Comp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |

³ This appendix is not ordered by citation but rather by grouping the same verb conjugations and base noun forms together. Within these groupings, the entries are organized by book order in the HB and then by chapter and verse.

⁴ See the footnote in appendix 1 for a description of each column heading.

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|-----|----------|------|-----|-----------|------------|
| 16 | Ezek 36:32 | כלם | Niphal | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 17 | Ezek 43:10 | כלם | Niphal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 18 | Ezek 43:11 | כלם | Niphal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 19 | Psa 35:4 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 20 | Psa 40:15 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 21 | Psa 69:7 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 22 | Psa 70:3 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 23 | Psa 74:21 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 24 | Ezra 9:6 | כלם | Niphal | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 25 | 1 Chr 19:5 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 26 | 2 Chr 30:15 | כלם | Niphal | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 27 | Judg 18:7 | כלם | Hiphil | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 28 | 1 Sam 20:34 | כלם | Hiphil | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Challenge |
| 29 | 1 Sam 25:7 | כלם | Hiphil | Comp | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 30 | Jer 6:15 | כלם | Hiphil | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 31 | Psa 44:10 | כלם | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 32 | Job 11:3 | כלם | Hiphil | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 33 | Job 19:3 | כלם | Hiphil | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 34 | Prov 25:8 | כלם | Hiphil | Comp | Ext | Failure | Challenge |
| 35 | Prov 28:7 | כלם | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 36 | Ruth 2:15 | כלם | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 37 | 1 Sam 25:15 | כלם | Hophal | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 38 | Jer 14:3 | כלם | Hophal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 39 | Isa 30:3 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 40 | Isa 45:16 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 41 | Isa 50:6 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Hierarch |
| 42 | Isa 61:7 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 43 | Jer 3:25 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 44 | Jer 20:11 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 45 | Jer 51:51 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|------------|-----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|------------|
| 46 | Ezek 16:52 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 47 | Ezek 16:52 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 48 | Ezek 16:54 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 49 | Ezek 16:63 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 50 | Ezek 32:24 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 51 | Ezek 32:25 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 52 | Ezek 32:30 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 53 | Ezek 34:29 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | Imp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 54 | Ezek 36:6 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 55 | Ezek 36:7 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 56 | Ezek 36:15 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 57 | Ezek 39:26 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 58 | Ezek 44:13 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | Comp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 59 | Mic 2:6 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 60 | Psa 4:3 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 61 | Psa 35:26 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 62 | Psa 44:16 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 63 | Psa 69:8 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 64 | Psa 69:20 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 65 | Psa 71:13 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 66 | Psa 109:29 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 67 | Job 20:3 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 68 | Prov 18:13 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 69 | Jer 23:40 | כלם | כְּלָמוֹת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

APPENDIX FOUR

חרף IN THE HEBREW BIBLE ORDERED BY FORM¹

| | Citation ² | Root | Conj/Noun | Notes | Orientation | Cause | Function |
|----|-----------------------|------|-----------|-------|---------------|-----------|------------|
| 1 | Psa 69:10 | חרף | Qal | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 2 | Psa 119:42 | חרף | Qal | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 3 | Job 27:6 | חרף | Qal | Imp | Int | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 4 | Prov 27:11 | חרף | Qal | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 5 | Judg 5:18 | חרף | Piel | | Idiomatic use | | |
| 6 | Judg 8:15 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 7 | 1 Sam 17:10 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 8 | 1 Sam 17:25 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 9 | 1 Sam 17:26 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 10 | 1 Sam 17:36 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 11 | 1 Sam 17:45 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 12 | 2 Sam 21:21 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 13 | 2 Sam 23:9 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 14 | 2 Kgs 19:4 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 15 | 2 Kgs 19:16 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 16 | 2 Kgs 19:22 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 17 | 2 Kgs 19:23 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 18 | Isa 37:4 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |

¹ This appendix is not ordered by citation but rather by grouping the same verb conjugations and base noun forms together. Within these groupings, the entries are organized by book order in the HB and then by chapter and verse.

² See the footnote in appendix 1 for a description of each column heading.

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|-----|----------|------|-----|-----------|-------------|
| 19 | Isa 37:17 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 20 | Isa 37:23 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 21 | Isa 37:24 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 22 | Isa 65:7 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 23 | Zeph 2:8 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 24 | Zeph 2:10 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 25 | Psa 42:11 | חרף | Piel | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 26 | Psa 44:17 | חרף | Piel | Amb | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 27 | Psa 55:13 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 28 | Psa 57:4 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 29 | Psa 74:10 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 30 | Psa 74:18 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 31 | Psa 79:12 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 32 | Psa 89:52 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 33 | Psa 89:52 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 34 | Psa 102:9 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 35 | Prov 14:31 | חרף | Piel | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 36 | Prov 17:5 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 37 | Neh 6:13 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 38 | 1 Chr 20:7 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 39 | 2 Chr 32:17 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 40 | Gen 30:23 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 41 | Gen 34:14 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | Amb | Ext | Behavior | Propriety |
| 42 | Josh 5:9 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 43 | 1 Sam 11:2 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 44 | 1 Sam 17:26 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | N Challenge |
| 45 | 1 Sam 25:39 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | N Challenge |
| 46 | 2 Sam 13:13 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | Imp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 47 | Isa 4:1 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 48 | Isa 25:8 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|------------|-----|---------|------|-----|-----------|------------|
| 49 | Isa 30:5 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 50 | Isa 47:3 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 51 | Isa 51:7 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 52 | Isa 54:4 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 53 | Jer 6:10 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 54 | Jer 15:15 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 55 | Jer 20:8 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 56 | Jer 23:40 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 57 | Jer 24:9 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 58 | Jer 29:18 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 59 | Jer 31:19 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 60 | Jer 42:18 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 61 | Jer 44:8 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 62 | Jer 44:12 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 63 | Jer 49:13 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 64 | Jer 51:51 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 65 | Ezek 5:14 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 66 | Ezek 5:15 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 67 | Ezek 16:57 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 68 | Ezek 21:33 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 69 | Ezek 22:4 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 70 | Ezek 36:15 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 71 | Ezek 36:30 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Imp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 72 | Hos 12:15 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 73 | Joel 2:17 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 74 | Joel 2:19 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 75 | Mic 6:16 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 76 | Zeph 2:8 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 77 | Zeph 3:18 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Comp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 78 | Psa 15:3 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----|----------|------|-----|-----------|-------------|
| 79 | Psa 22:7 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 80 | Psa 31:12 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 81 | Psa 39:9 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | Amb | Ext | Challenge | N Challenge |
| 82 | Psa 44:14 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 83 | Psa 69:8 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 84 | Psa 69:10 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 85 | Psa 69:11 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 86 | Psa 69:20 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 87 | Psa 69:21 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 88 | Psa 71:13 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 89 | Psa 74:22 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 90 | Psa 78:66 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 91 | Psa 79:4 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 92 | Psa 79:12 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 93 | Psa 89:42 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 94 | Psa 89:51 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 95 | Psa 109:25 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 96 | Psa 119:22 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | Imp | Ext | Challenge | N Challenge |
| 97 | Psa 119:39 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | Comp | Ext | N Failure | Hierarch |
| 98 | Job 16:10 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 99 | Job 19:5 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 100 | Prov 6:33 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 101 | Prov 18:3 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 102 | Lam 3:30 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 103 | Lam 3:61 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 104 | Lam 5:1 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 105 | Dan 9:16 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 106 | Dan 11:18 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 107 | Dan 11:18 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 108 | Dan 12:2 | חרף | תְּרָפָה | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-----|---------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| 109 | Neh 1:3 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 110 | Neh 2:17 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 111 | Neh 3:36 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Ext | Challenge | N Challenge |
| 112 | Neh 5:9 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Comp Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |

APPENDIX FIVE

קלה IN THE HEBREW BIBLE ORDERED BY FORM³

| Citation ⁴ | Root | Conj/Noun | Notes | Orientation | Cause | Function |
|-----------------------|------|-----------|-------|-------------|----------|------------|
| 1 Deut 25:3 | קלה | Niphal | | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 2 1 Sam 18:23 | קלה | Niphal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 3 Isa 3:5 | קלה | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 4 Isa 16:14 | קלה | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 5 Psa 38:8 | קלה | Niphal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 6 Prov 12:9 | קלה | Niphal | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 7 Deut 27:16 | קלה | Hiphil | | Ext | Behavior | Challenge |
| 8 Isa 22:18 | קלה | קלון | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 9 Jer 13:26 | קלה | קלון | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 10 Jer 46:12 | קלה | קלון | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 11 Hos 4:7 | קלה | קלון | Imp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 12 Hos 4:18 | קלה | קלון | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 13 Nah 3:5 | קלה | קלון | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 14 Hab 2:16 | קלה | קלון | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 15 Psa 83:17 | קלה | קלון | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 16 Job 10:15 | קלה | קלון | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 17 Prov 3:35 | קלה | קלון | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 18 Prov 6:33 | קלה | קלון | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 19 Prov 9:7 | קלה | קלון | Amb | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 20 Prov 11:2 | קלה | קלון | Imp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 21 Prov 12:16 | קלה | קלון | Comp | Int | Behavior | Challenge |

³ This appendix is not ordered by citation but rather by grouping the same verb conjugations and base noun forms together. Within these groupings, the entries are organized by book order in the HB and then by chapter and verse.

⁴ See the footnote in appendix 1 for a description of each column heading.

| | | | | | | | |
|----|------------|-----|------|-----|-----|----------|-----------|
| 22 | Prov 13:18 | קלה | קלון | Imp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 23 | Prov 18:3 | קלה | קלון | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 24 | Prov 22:10 | קלה | קלון | | Ext | Behavior | Challenge |

APPENDIX SIX

SHAME LEXEMES IN THE HEBREW BIBLE ORDERED BY CITATION⁵

| Citation ⁶ | Root | Conj/Noun | Notes | Orientation | Cause | Function |
|--------------------------|------|-----------|-------|---------------|-----------|-------------|
| 1 Gen 2:25 | בוש | Hithpael | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 2 Gen 30:23 | חרף | חֲרַףָּה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 3 Gen 34:14 | חרף | חֲרַףָּה | Amb | Ext | Behavior | Propriety |
| 4 Exod 32:1 | בוש | Polel | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 5 Num 12:14 | כלם | Niphal | Amb | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 6 Deut 25:3 | קלה | Niphal | | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 7 Deut 27:16 | קלה | Hiphil | | Ext | Behavior | Challenge |
| 8 Josh 5:9 | חרף | חֲרַףָּה | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 9 Judg 3:25 ⁷ | בוש | Qal | Amb | Int | Possible | Propriety |
| 10 Judg 5:18 | חרף | Piel | | Idiomatic use | | |
| 11 Judg 5:28 | בוש | Polel | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 12 Judg 8:15 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 13 Judg 18:7 | כלם | Hiphil | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 14 1 Sam 11:2 | חרף | חֲרַףָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 15 1 Sam 17:10 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 16 1 Sam 17:25 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 17 1 Sam 17:26 | חרף | חֲרַףָּה | | Ext | Challenge | N Challenge |
| 18 1 Sam 17:26 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 19 1 Sam 17:36 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 20 1 Sam 17:45 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |

⁵ This appendix is ordered by citation. The entries are organized by book order in the HB and then by chapter and verse.

⁶ See the footnote in appendix 1 for a description of each column heading.

⁷ See note under Judg 3:25 in appendix 1.

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------|-----|----------|------|-----|-----------|-------------|
| 21 | 1 Sam 18:23 | קלה | Niphal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 22 | 1 Sam 20:30 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | Amb | Rel | Behavior | Challenge |
| 23 | 1 Sam 20:30 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | Amb | Rel | Behavior | Challenge |
| 24 | 1 Sam 20:34 | כלם | Hiphil | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Challenge |
| 25 | 1 Sam 25:7 | כלם | Hiphil | Comp | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 26 | 1 Sam 25:15 | כלם | Hophal | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 27 | 1 Sam 25:39 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | N Challenge |
| 28 | 2 Sam 10:5 | כלם | Niphal | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 29 | 2 Sam 13:13 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | Imp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 30 | 2 Sam 19:4 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 31 | 2 Sam 19:6 | בוש | Hiphil* | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 32 | 2 Sam 21:21 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 33 | 2 Sam 23:9 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 34 | 2 Kgs 2:17 ⁸ | בוש | Qal | Amb | Int | Request | Request |
| 35 | 2 Kgs 8:11 ⁹ | בוש | Qal | Amb | Int | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 36 | 2 Kgs 19:4 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 37 | 2 Kgs 19:16 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 38 | 2 Kgs 19:22 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 39 | 2 Kgs 19:23 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 40 | 2 Kgs 19:26 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 41 | Isa 1:29 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 42 | Isa 1:29 | חפר | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 43 | Isa 3:5 | קלה | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 44 | Isa 4:1 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 45 | Isa 16:14 | קלה | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 46 | Isa 19:9 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

⁸ See note under Judg 3:25 in Appedix One.

⁹ See note under Judg 3:25 in Appedix One.

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------|-----|----------|-----|-----|-----------|------------|
| 47 | Isa 20:5 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 48 | Isa 22:18 | קלה | קלון | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 49 | Isa 23:4 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 50 | Isa 24:23 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 51 | Isa 24:23 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 52 | Isa 25:8 | חרף | חֲרַףָּה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 53 | Isa 26:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 54 | Isa 29:22 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Int | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 55 | Isa 30:3 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 56 | Isa 30:3 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 57 | Isa 30:5 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 58 | Isa 30:5 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 59 | Isa 30:5 | חרף | חֲרַףָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 60 | Isa 33:9 | חפר | Hiphil | Amb | Int | Failure | Hierarch |
| 61 | Isa 37:4 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 62 | Isa 37:17 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 63 | Isa 37:23 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 64 | Isa 37:24 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 65 | Isa 37:27 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 66 | Isa 41:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 67 | Isa 41:11 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 68 | Isa 42:17 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 69 | Isa 42:17 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 70 | Isa 44:9 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 71 | Isa 44:11 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 72 | Isa 44:11 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 73 | Isa 45:16 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 74 | Isa 45:16 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 75 | Isa 45:16 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 76 | Isa 45:17 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|----------|------|-----|-----------|------------|
| 77 | Isa 45:17 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 78 | Isa 45:24 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 79 | Isa 47:3 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 80 | Isa 49:23 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 81 | Isa 50:6 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Hierarch |
| 82 | Isa 50:7 | כלם | Niphal | Amb | Rel | Failure | Hierarch |
| 83 | Isa 50:7 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Rel | Failure | Hierarch |
| 84 | Isa 51:7 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 85 | Isa 54:4 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 86 | Isa 54:4 | כלם | Niphal | | Int | Failure | Hierarch |
| 87 | Isa 54:4 | חפר | Hiphil | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 88 | Isa 54:4 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 89 | Isa 54:4 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 90 | Isa 61:7 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 91 | Isa 61:7 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 92 | Isa 65:7 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 93 | Isa 65:13 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 94 | Isa 66:5 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 95 | Jer 2:26 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 96 | Jer 2:26 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 97 | Jer 2:36 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 98 | Jer 2:36 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 99 | Jer 3:3 | כלם | Niphal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 100 | Jer 3:24 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 101 | Jer 3:25 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | Comp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 102 | Jer 3:25 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 103 | Jer 6:10 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 104 | Jer 6:15 | בוש | Hiphil* | Imp | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 105 | Jer 6:15 | בוש | Qal | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 106 | Jer 6:15 | בוש | Qal | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|------------|
| 107 | Jer 6:15 | כלם | Hiphil | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 108 | Jer 7:19 | בוש | בַּשֵּׁת | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 109 | Jer 8:9 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 110 | Jer 8:12 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 111 | Jer 8:12 | בוש | Qal | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 112 | Jer 8:12 | בוש | Qal | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 113 | Jer 8:12 | כלם | Niphal | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 114 | Jer 9:18 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 115 | Jer 10:14 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 116 | Jer 11:13 | בוש | בַּשֵּׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 117 | Jer 12:13 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 118 | Jer 13:26 | קלה | קָלוֹן | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 119 | Jer 14:3 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 120 | Jer 14:3 | כלם | Hophal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 121 | Jer 14:4 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 122 | Jer 15:9 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 123 | Jer 15:9 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 124 | Jer 15:15 | חרף | חָרַףָה | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 125 | Jer 17:13 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 126 | Jer 17:18 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 127 | Jer 17:18 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 128 | Jer 20:8 | חרף | חָרַףָה | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 129 | Jer 20:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 130 | Jer 20:11 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 131 | Jer 20:18 | בוש | בַּשֵּׁת | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 132 | Jer 22:22 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 133 | Jer 22:22 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 134 | Jer 23:40 | חרף | חָרַףָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 135 | Jer 23:40 | כלם | כָּלְמוֹת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 136 | Jer 24:9 | חרף | חָרַףָה | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|----------|------|-----|----------|----------|
| 137 | Jer 29:18 | חרף | חֲרַפָּה | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 138 | Jer 31:19 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 139 | Jer 31:19 | כלם | Niphal | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 140 | Jer 31:19 | חרף | חֲרַפָּה | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 141 | Jer 42:18 | חרף | חֲרַפָּה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 142 | Jer 44:8 | חרף | חֲרַפָּה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 143 | Jer 44:12 | חרף | חֲרַפָּה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 144 | Jer 46:12 | קלה | קָלוֹן | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 145 | Jer 46:24 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 146 | Jer 48:1 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 147 | Jer 48:1 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 148 | Jer 48:13 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 149 | Jer 48:13 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 150 | Jer 48:20 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 151 | Jer 48:39 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 152 | Jer 49:13 | חרף | חֲרַפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 153 | Jer 49:23 | בוש | Qal | | Int | Failure | Hierarch |
| 154 | Jer 50:2 | בוש | Hiphil* | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 155 | Jer 50:2 | בוש | Hiphil* | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 156 | Jer 50:12 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 157 | Jer 50:12 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 158 | Jer 51:17 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 159 | Jer 51:47 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 160 | Jer 51:51 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 161 | Jer 51:51 | חרף | חֲרַפָּה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 162 | Jer 51:51 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 163 | Ezek 5:14 | חרף | חֲרַפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 164 | Ezek 5:15 | חרף | חֲרַפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 165 | Ezek 6:9 | קוט | Niphal | | Int | Behavior | Didactic |
| 166 | Ezek 7:18 | בוש | בוֹשָׁה | Comp | Int | Failure | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----|---------|------|-----|-----------|------------|
| 167 | Ezek 16:27 | כלם | Niphal | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 168 | Ezek 16:52 | כלם | קְלָמָה | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 169 | Ezek 16:52 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 170 | Ezek 16:52 | כלם | קְלָמָה | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 171 | Ezek 16:54 | כלם | קְלָמָה | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 172 | Ezek 16:54 | כלם | Niphal | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 173 | Ezek 16:57 | חרף | חָרְפָה | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 174 | Ezek 16:61 | כלם | Niphal | Comp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 175 | Ezek 16:63 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 176 | Ezek 16:63 | כלם | קְלָמָה | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 177 | Ezek 20:43 | קוט | Niphal | | Int | Behavior | Didactic |
| 178 | Ezek 21:33 | חרף | חָרְפָה | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 179 | Ezek 22:4 | חרף | חָרְפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 180 | Ezek 32:24 | כלם | קְלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 181 | Ezek 32:25 | כלם | קְלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 182 | Ezek 32:30 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 183 | Ezek 32:30 | כלם | קְלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 184 | Ezek 34:29 | כלם | קְלָמָה | Imp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 185 | Ezek 36:6 | כלם | קְלָמָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 186 | Ezek 36:7 | כלם | קְלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 187 | Ezek 36:15 | כלם | קְלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 188 | Ezek 36:15 | חרף | חָרְפָה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 189 | Ezek 36:30 | חרף | חָרְפָה | Imp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 190 | Ezek 36:31 | קוט | Niphal | | Int | Behavior | Didactic |
| 191 | Ezek 36:32 | בוש | Qal | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 192 | Ezek 36:32 | כלם | Niphal | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 193 | Ezek 39:26 | כלם | קְלָמָה | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 194 | Ezek 43:10 | כלם | Niphal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 195 | Ezek 43:11 | כלם | Niphal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 196 | Ezek 44:13 | כלם | קְלָמָה | Comp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|---------|------|-----|-----------|------------|
| 197 | Hos 2:7 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 198 | Hos 4:7 | קלה | קלון | Imp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 199 | Hos 4:18 | קלה | קלון | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 200 | Hos 4:19 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 201 | Hos 9:10 | בוש | בשת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 202 | Hos 10:6 | בוש | בשנה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 203 | Hos 10:6 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 204 | Hos 12:15 | חרף | חרפה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 205 | Hos 13:15 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 206 | Joel 1:10 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 207 | Joel 1:11 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 208 | Joel 1:12 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 209 | Joel 1:12 | בוש | Hiphil* | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 210 | Joel 1:17 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 211 | Joel 2:17 | חרף | חרפה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 212 | Joel 2:19 | חרף | חרפה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 213 | Joel 2:26 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 214 | Joel 2:27 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 215 | Obad 1:10 | בוש | בושה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 216 | Mic 1:11 | בוש | בשת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 217 | Mic 2:6 | כלם | כלמה | | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 218 | Mic 3:7 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 219 | Mic 3:7 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 220 | Mic 6:16 | חרף | חרפה | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 221 | Mic 7:10 | בוש | בושה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 222 | Mic 7:16 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 223 | Nah 3:5 | קלה | קלון | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 224 | Hab 2:10 | בוש | בשת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 225 | Hab 2:16 | קלה | קלון | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 226 | Zeph 2:8 | חרף | חרפה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|---------|------|-----|-----------|-------------|
| 227 | Zeph 2:8 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 228 | Zeph 2:10 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 229 | Zeph 3:5 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Int | Possible | N Propriety |
| 230 | Zeph 3:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 231 | Zeph 3:18 | חרף | חָרַףָה | Comp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 232 | Zeph 3:19 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 233 | Zech 9:5 | בוש | Hiphil* | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 234 | Zech 10:5 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 235 | Zech 13:4 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 236 | Psa 4:3 | כלם | קָלַמָה | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 237 | Psa 6:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 238 | Psa 6:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 239 | Psa 14:6 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 240 | Psa 15:3 | חרף | חָרַףָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 241 | Psa 22:6 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 242 | Psa 22:7 | חרף | חָרַףָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 243 | Psa 25:2 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 244 | Psa 25:3 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 245 | Psa 25:3 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 246 | Psa 25:20 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 247 | Psa 31:2 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 248 | Psa 31:12 | חרף | חָרַףָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 249 | Psa 31:18 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 250 | Psa 31:18 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 251 | Psa 34:6 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 252 | Psa 35:4 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 253 | Psa 35:4 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 254 | Psa 35:4 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 255 | Psa 35:26 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 256 | Psa 35:26 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|----------|------|-----|-----------|-------------|
| 257 | Psa 35:26 | בוש | בַּשָּׂת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 258 | Psa 35:26 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 259 | Psa 37:19 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 260 | Psa 38:8 | קלה | Niphal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 261 | Psa 39:9 | חרף | חָרַף | Amb | Ext | Challenge | N Challenge |
| 262 | Psa 40:15 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 263 | Psa 40:15 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 264 | Psa 40:15 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 265 | Psa 40:16 | בוש | בַּשָּׂת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 266 | Psa 42:11 | חרף | Piel | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 267 | Psa 44:8 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 268 | Psa 44:10 | כלם | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 269 | Psa 44:14 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 270 | Psa 44:16 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 271 | Psa 44:16 | בוש | בַּשָּׂת | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 272 | Psa 44:17 | חרף | Piel | Amb | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 273 | Psa 53:6 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 274 | Psa 55:13 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 275 | Psa 57:4 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 276 | Psa 69:7 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 277 | Psa 69:7 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 278 | Psa 69:8 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 279 | Psa 69:8 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 280 | Psa 69:10 | חרף | חָרַף | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 281 | Psa 69:10 | חרף | Qal | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 282 | Psa 69:11 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 283 | Psa 69:20 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 284 | Psa 69:20 | בוש | בַּשָּׂת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 285 | Psa 69:20 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 286 | Psa 69:21 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----|-----------|------|-----|-----------|-----------|
| 287 | Psa 70:3 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 288 | Psa 70:3 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 289 | Psa 70:3 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 290 | Psa 70:4 | בוש | בִּשַׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 291 | Psa 71:1 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 292 | Psa 71:13 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 293 | Psa 71:13 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 294 | Psa 71:13 | כלם | כָּלַמָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 295 | Psa 71:24 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 296 | Psa 71:24 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 297 | Psa 74:10 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 298 | Psa 74:18 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 299 | Psa 74:21 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 300 | Psa 74:22 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 301 | Psa 78:66 | חרף | חָרַף | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 302 | Psa 79:4 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 303 | Psa 79:12 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 304 | Psa 79:12 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 305 | Psa 83:17 | קלה | קָלוֹן | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 306 | Psa 83:18 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 307 | Psa 83:18 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 308 | Psa 86:17 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 309 | Psa 89:42 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 310 | Psa 89:46 | בוש | בִּוְשָׁה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 311 | Psa 89:51 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 312 | Psa 89:52 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 313 | Psa 89:52 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 314 | Psa 97:7 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 315 | Psa 102:9 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 316 | Psa 109:25 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-----|---------|------|-----|-----------|-------------|
| 317 | Psa 109:28 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 318 | Psa 109:29 | כלם | קְלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 319 | Psa 109:29 | בוש | בְּשֵׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 320 | Psa 119:6 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 321 | Psa 119:22 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Imp | Ext | Challenge | N Challenge |
| 322 | Psa 119:31 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 323 | Psa 119:39 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Comp | Ext | N Failure | Hierarch |
| 324 | Psa 119:42 | חרף | Qal | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 325 | Psa 119:46 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 326 | Psa 119:78 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 327 | Psa 119:80 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 328 | Psa 119:116 | בוש | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 329 | Psa 127:5 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 330 | Psa 129:5 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 331 | Psa 132:18 | בוש | בְּשֵׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 332 | Job 6:20 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 333 | Job 6:20 | חפר | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 334 | Job 8:22 | בוש | בְּשֵׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 335 | Job 10:15 | קלה | קָלוֹן | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 336 | Job 11:3 | כלם | Hiphil | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 337 | Job 16:10 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 338 | Job 19:3 | כלם | Hiphil | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 339 | Job 19:3 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Int | Possible | N Propriety |
| 340 | Job 19:5 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 341 | Job 20:3 | כלם | קְלָמָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 342 | Job 27:6 | חרף | Qal | Imp | Int | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 343 | Prov 3:35 | קלה | קָלוֹן | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 344 | Prov 6:33 | קלה | קָלוֹן | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 345 | Prov 6:33 | חרף | חֲרָפָה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 346 | Prov 9:7 | קלה | קָלוֹן | Amb | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----|----------|------|-----|-----------|------------|
| 347 | Prov 10:5 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 348 | Prov 11:2 | קלה | קלון | Imp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 349 | Prov 12:4 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 350 | Prov 12:9 | קלה | Niphal | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 351 | Prov 12:16 | קלה | קלון | Comp | Int | Behavior | Challenge |
| 352 | Prov 13:5 | חפר | Hiphil | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 353 | Prov 13:18 | קלה | קלון | Imp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 354 | Prov 14:31 | חרף | Piel | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 355 | Prov 14:35 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 356 | Prov 17:2 | בוש | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 357 | Prov 17:5 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 358 | Prov 18:3 | קלה | קלון | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 359 | Prov 18:3 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 360 | Prov 18:13 | כלם | כְּלָמָה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 361 | Prov 19:26 | בוש | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 362 | Prov 19:26 | חפר | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 363 | Prov 22:10 | קלה | קלון | | Ext | Behavior | Challenge |
| 364 | Prov 25:8 | כלם | Hiphil | Comp | Ext | Failure | Challenge |
| 365 | Prov 27:11 | חרף | Qal | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 366 | Prov 28:7 | כלם | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 367 | Prov 29:15 | בוש | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 368 | Ruth 2:15 | כלם | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 369 | Lam 3:30 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 370 | Lam 3:61 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 371 | Lam 5:1 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 372 | Dan 9:7 | בוש | בָּשָׂת | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 373 | Dan 9:8 | בוש | בָּשָׂת | Comp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 374 | Dan 9:16 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 375 | Dan 11:18 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 376 | Dan 11:18 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-----|----------|------|-----|-----------|-------------|
| 377 | Dan 12:2 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 378 | Ezra 8:22 | בוש | Qal | | Int | Possible | Propriety |
| 379 | Ezra 9:6 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 380 | Ezra 9:6 | כלם | Niphal | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 381 | Ezra 9:7 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Rel | Failure | Hierarch |
| 382 | Neh 1:3 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 383 | Neh 2:17 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 384 | Neh 3:36 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | N Challenge |
| 385 | Neh 5:9 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 386 | Neh 6:13 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 387 | 1 Chr 19:5 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 388 | 1 Chr 20:7 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 389 | 2 Chr 30:15 | כלם | Niphal | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 390 | 2 Chr 32:17 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 391 | 2 Chr 32:21 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

APPENDIX SEVEN

SHAME LEXEMES IN THE HEBREW BIBLE ORGANIZED BY FUNCTION¹⁰

| | Citation ¹¹ | Root | Conj/Noun | Notes | Orientation | Cause | Function | |
|----|------------------------|------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | Deut 27:16 | קלה | Hiphil | | Ext | Behavior | Challenge | |
| 2 | Judg 8:15 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 3 | 1 Sam 17:10 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 4 | 1 Sam 17:25 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 5 | 1 Sam 17:26 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 6 | 1 Sam 17:36 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 7 | 1 Sam 17:45 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 8 | 1 Sam 20:30 | בוש | | בִּשְׁתָּ | Amb | Rel | Behavior | Challenge |
| 9 | 1 Sam 20:30 | בוש | | בִּשְׁתָּ | Amb | Rel | Behavior | Challenge |
| 10 | 1 Sam 20:34 | כלם | Hiphil | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Challenge | |
| 11 | 2 Sam 10:5 | כלם | Niphal | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 12 | 2 Sam 21:21 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 13 | 2 Sam 23:9 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 14 | 2 Kgs 19:4 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 15 | 2 Kgs 19:16 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 16 | 2 Kgs 19:22 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 17 | 2 Kgs 19:23 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 18 | Isa 37:4 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 19 | Isa 37:17 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 20 | Isa 37:23 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |
| 21 | Isa 37:24 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge | |

¹⁰ This appendix is ordered by function with the functions listed in alphabetical order. Each function is followed by the instances where that function is negated. Within these groupings, the entries are organized by book order in the HB and then by chapter and verse.

¹¹ See the footnote in appendix 1 for a description of each column heading.

| | | | | | | | |
|----|------------|-----|----------|------|-----|-----------|-----------|
| 22 | Isa 51:7 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 23 | Isa 65:7 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 24 | Jer 6:10 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 25 | Jer 15:15 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 26 | Jer 20:8 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 27 | Jer 20:18 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 28 | Ezek 21:33 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 29 | Ezek 36:6 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 30 | Hos 12:15 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 31 | Zeph 2:8 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 32 | Zeph 2:8 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 33 | Zeph 2:10 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 34 | Psa 15:3 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 35 | Psa 22:7 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 36 | Psa 42:11 | חרף | Piel | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 37 | Psa 44:17 | חרף | Piel | Amb | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 38 | Psa 55:13 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 39 | Psa 69:8 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 40 | Psa 69:8 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 41 | Psa 69:10 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 42 | Psa 69:10 | חרף | Qal | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 43 | Psa 69:11 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 44 | Psa 69:21 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 45 | Psa 74:10 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 46 | Psa 74:18 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 47 | Psa 79:4 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 48 | Psa 79:12 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 49 | Psa 79:12 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 50 | Psa 89:51 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 51 | Psa 89:52 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|-----|--------|------|-----|-----------|-------------|
| 52 | Psa 89:52 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 53 | Psa 102:9 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 54 | Psa 109:25 | חרף | חרפה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 55 | Psa 119:42 | חרף | Qal | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 56 | Job 11:3 | כלם | Hiphil | Comp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 57 | Job 16:10 | חרף | חרפה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 58 | Job 19:3 | כלם | Hiphil | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 59 | Job 20:3 | כלם | כלמה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 60 | Prov 12:16 | קלה | קלון | Comp | Int | Behavior | Challenge |
| 61 | Prov 14:31 | חרף | Piel | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 62 | Prov 17:5 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 63 | Prov 22:10 | קלה | קלון | | Ext | Behavior | Challenge |
| 64 | Prov 25:8 | כלם | Hiphil | Comp | Ext | Failure | Challenge |
| 65 | Prov 27:11 | חרף | Qal | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 66 | Lam 3:30 | חרף | חרפה | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 67 | Lam 3:61 | חרף | חרפה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 68 | Dan 11:18 | חרף | חרפה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 69 | Dan 11:18 | חרף | חרפה | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 70 | Neh 6:13 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 71 | 1 Chr 19:5 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 72 | 1 Chr 20:7 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 73 | 2 Chr 32:17 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Challenge | Challenge |
| 74 | 1 Sam 17:26 | חרף | חרפה | | Ext | Challenge | N Challenge |
| 75 | 1 Sam 25:39 | חרף | חרפה | | Ext | Challenge | N Challenge |
| 76 | Psa 39:9 | חרף | חרפה | Amb | Ext | Challenge | N Challenge |
| 77 | Psa 119:22 | חרף | חרפה | Imp | Ext | Challenge | N Challenge |
| 78 | Neh 3:36 | חרף | חרפה | | Ext | Challenge | N Challenge |
| 79 | Jer 3:25 | בוש | בשת | Comp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 80 | Jer 3:25 | כלם | כלמה | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 81 | Jer 31:19 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----|----------|------|-----|----------|------------|
| 82 | Jer 31:19 | כלם | Niphal | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 83 | Jer 31:19 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 84 | Ezek 6:9 | קוט | Niphal | | Int | Behavior | Didactic |
| 85 | Ezek 16:52 | כלם | קָלְמָה | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 86 | Ezek 16:52 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 87 | Ezek 16:52 | כלם | קָלְמָה | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 88 | Ezek 16:54 | כלם | קָלְמָה | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 89 | Ezek 16:54 | כלם | Niphal | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 90 | Ezek 16:61 | כלם | Niphal | Comp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 91 | Ezek 16:63 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 92 | Ezek 16:63 | כלם | קָלְמָה | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 93 | Ezek 20:43 | קוט | Niphal | | Int | Behavior | Didactic |
| 94 | Ezek 36:31 | קוט | Niphal | | Int | Behavior | Didactic |
| 95 | Ezek 36:32 | בוש | Qal | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 96 | Ezek 36:32 | כלם | Niphal | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 97 | Ezek 39:26 | כלם | קָלְמָה | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 98 | Ezek 43:10 | כלם | Niphal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 99 | Ezek 43:11 | כלם | Niphal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 100 | Ezek 44:13 | כלם | קָלְמָה | Comp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 101 | Dan 9:7 | בוש | בָּשָׂת | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 102 | Dan 9:8 | בוש | בָּשָׂת | Comp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 103 | Ezra 9:6 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 104 | Ezra 9:6 | כלם | Niphal | | Rel | Behavior | Didactic |
| 105 | Jer 3:3 | כלם | Niphal | Imp | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 106 | Jer 6:15 | בוש | Hiphil* | Imp | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 107 | Jer 6:15 | בוש | Qal | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 108 | Jer 6:15 | בוש | Qal | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 109 | Jer 6:15 | כלם | Hiphil | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 110 | Jer 8:12 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 111 | Jer 8:12 | בוש | Qal | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|-----|----------|------|-----|----------|-------------|
| 112 | Jer 8:12 | בוש | Qal | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 113 | Jer 8:12 | כלם | Niphal | | Rel | Behavior | N Didactic |
| 114 | Gen 34:14 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | Amb | Ext | Behavior | Propriety |
| 115 | Judg 3:25 ¹² | בוש | Qal | Amb | Int | Possible | Propriety |
| 116 | Ezra 8:22 | בוש | Qal | | Int | Possible | Propriety |
| 117 | Zeph 3:5 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Int | Possible | N Propriety |
| 118 | Job 19:3 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Int | Possible | N Propriety |
| 119 | Exod 32:1 | בוש | Polel | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 120 | Num 12:14 | כלם | Niphal | Amb | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 121 | Judg 5:28 | בוש | Polel | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 122 | 1 Sam 11:2 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 123 | 1 Sam 18:23 | קלה | Niphal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 124 | 1 Sam 25:15 | כלם | Hophal | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 125 | 2 Sam 13:13 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | Imp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 126 | 2 Sam 19:4 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 127 | 2 Sam 19:6 | בוש | Hiphil* | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 128 | 2 Kgs 8:11 ¹³ | בוש | Qal | Amb | Int | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 129 | 2 Kgs 19:26 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 130 | Isa 1:29 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 131 | Isa 1:29 | חפר | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 132 | Isa 3:5 | קלה | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 133 | Isa 4:1 | חרף | חִרְפָּה | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 134 | Isa 16:14 | קלה | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 135 | Isa 19:9 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 136 | Isa 20:5 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 137 | Isa 22:18 | קלה | קָלוֹן | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

¹² See note under Judg 3:25 in Appedix One.

¹³ See note under Judg 3:25 in Appedix One.

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|----------|-----|-----|-----------|----------|
| 138 | Isa 23:4 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 139 | Isa 24:23 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 140 | Isa 24:23 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 141 | Isa 26:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 142 | Isa 30:3 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 143 | Isa 30:3 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 144 | Isa 30:5 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 145 | Isa 30:5 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 146 | Isa 30:5 | חרף | חָרְפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 147 | Isa 33:9 | חפר | Hiphil | Amb | Int | Failure | Hierarch |
| 148 | Isa 37:27 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 149 | Isa 41:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 150 | Isa 41:11 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 151 | Isa 42:17 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 152 | Isa 42:17 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 153 | Isa 44:9 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 154 | Isa 44:11 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 155 | Isa 44:11 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 156 | Isa 45:16 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 157 | Isa 45:16 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 158 | Isa 45:16 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 159 | Isa 45:24 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 160 | Isa 47:3 | חרף | חָרְפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 161 | Isa 50:6 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | Imp | Ext | Challenge | Hierarch |
| 162 | Isa 50:7 | כלם | Niphal | Amb | Rel | Failure | Hierarch |
| 163 | Isa 50:7 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Rel | Failure | Hierarch |
| 164 | Isa 54:4 | כלם | Niphal | | Int | Failure | Hierarch |
| 165 | Isa 54:4 | חפר | Hiphil | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 166 | Isa 54:4 | חרף | חָרְפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 167 | Isa 65:13 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|----------|------|-----|----------|----------|
| 168 | Isa 66:5 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 169 | Jer 2:26 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 170 | Jer 2:26 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 171 | Jer 2:36 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 172 | Jer 2:36 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 173 | Jer 3:24 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 174 | Jer 7:19 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 175 | Jer 8:9 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 176 | Jer 9:18 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 177 | Jer 10:14 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 178 | Jer 11:13 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 179 | Jer 12:13 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 180 | Jer 13:26 | קלה | קָלוֹן | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 181 | Jer 14:3 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 182 | Jer 14:3 | כלם | Hophal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 183 | Jer 14:4 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 184 | Jer 15:9 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 185 | Jer 15:9 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 186 | Jer 17:13 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 187 | Jer 17:18 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 188 | Jer 20:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 189 | Jer 20:11 | כלם | קָלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 190 | Jer 22:22 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 191 | Jer 22:22 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 192 | Jer 23:40 | חרף | חָרְפָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 193 | Jer 23:40 | כלם | קָלְמוֹת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 194 | Jer 24:9 | חרף | חָרְפָה | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 195 | Jer 29:18 | חרף | חָרְפָה | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 196 | Jer 42:18 | חרף | חָרְפָה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 197 | Jer 44:8 | חרף | חָרְפָה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----|----------|------|-----|----------|----------|
| 198 | Jer 44:12 | חרף | חָרַףָּה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 199 | Jer 46:12 | קלה | קָלוֹן | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 200 | Jer 46:24 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 201 | Jer 48:1 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 202 | Jer 48:1 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 203 | Jer 48:13 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 204 | Jer 48:13 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 205 | Jer 48:20 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 206 | Jer 48:39 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 207 | Jer 49:13 | חרף | חָרַףָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 208 | Jer 49:23 | בוש | Qal | | Int | Failure | Hierarch |
| 209 | Jer 50:2 | בוש | Hiphil* | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 210 | Jer 50:2 | בוש | Hiphil* | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 211 | Jer 50:12 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 212 | Jer 50:12 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 213 | Jer 51:17 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 214 | Jer 51:47 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 215 | Jer 51:51 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 216 | Jer 51:51 | חרף | חָרַףָּה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 217 | Jer 51:51 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 218 | Ezek 5:14 | חרף | חָרַףָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 219 | Ezek 5:15 | חרף | חָרַףָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 220 | Ezek 7:18 | בוש | בוּשָׁה | Comp | Int | Failure | Hierarch |
| 221 | Ezek 16:27 | כלם | Niphal | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 222 | Ezek 16:57 | חרף | חָרַףָּה | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 223 | Ezek 22:4 | חרף | חָרַףָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 224 | Ezek 32:24 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 225 | Ezek 32:25 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 226 | Ezek 32:30 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 227 | Ezek 32:30 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|-----------|------|-----|----------|----------|
| 228 | Ezek 36:7 | כלם | קְלָמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 229 | Hos 2:7 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 230 | Hos 4:7 | קלה | קָלוֹן | Imp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 231 | Hos 4:18 | קלה | קָלוֹן | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 232 | Hos 4:19 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 233 | Hos 9:10 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 234 | Hos 10:6 | בוש | בָּשָׁנָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 235 | Hos 10:6 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 236 | Hos 13:15 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 237 | Joel 1:10 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 238 | Joel 1:11 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 239 | Joel 1:12 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 240 | Joel 1:12 | בוש | Hiphil* | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 241 | Joel 1:17 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 242 | Obad 1:10 | בוש | בוּשָׁה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 243 | Mic 1:11 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 244 | Mic 3:7 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 245 | Mic 3:7 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 246 | Mic 6:16 | חרף | חָרְפָה | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 247 | Mic 7:10 | בוש | בוּשָׁה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 248 | Mic 7:16 | בוש | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 249 | Nah 3:5 | קלה | קָלוֹן | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 250 | Hab 2:10 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 251 | Hab 2:16 | קלה | קָלוֹן | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 252 | Zech 9:5 | בוש | Hiphil* | Amb | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 253 | Zech 10:5 | בוש | Hiphil* | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 254 | Zech 13:4 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 255 | Psa 4:3 | כלם | קְלָמָה | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 256 | Psa 6:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 257 | Psa 6:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|----------|------|-----|---------|----------|
| 258 | Psa 14:6 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 259 | Psa 25:3 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 260 | Psa 31:12 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 261 | Psa 31:18 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 262 | Psa 35:4 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 263 | Psa 35:4 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 264 | Psa 35:4 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 265 | Psa 35:26 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 266 | Psa 35:26 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 267 | Psa 35:26 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 268 | Psa 35:26 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 269 | Psa 37:19 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 270 | Psa 38:8 | קלה | Niphal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 271 | Psa 40:15 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 272 | Psa 40:15 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 273 | Psa 40:15 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 274 | Psa 40:16 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 275 | Psa 44:8 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 276 | Psa 44:10 | כלם | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 277 | Psa 44:14 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 278 | Psa 44:16 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 279 | Psa 44:16 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 280 | Psa 53:6 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 281 | Psa 57:4 | חרף | Piel | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 282 | Psa 69:20 | חרף | חַרְפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 283 | Psa 69:20 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 284 | Psa 69:20 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 285 | Psa 70:3 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 286 | Psa 70:3 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 287 | Psa 70:3 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----|----------|------|-----|-----------|----------|
| 288 | Psa 70:4 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 289 | Psa 71:1 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 290 | Psa 71:13 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 291 | Psa 71:13 | חרף | חֲרַפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 292 | Psa 71:13 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 293 | Psa 71:24 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 294 | Psa 71:24 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 295 | Psa 74:21 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 296 | Psa 74:22 | חרף | חֲרַפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 297 | Psa 78:66 | חרף | חֲרַפָּה | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 298 | Psa 83:17 | קלה | קָלוֹן | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 299 | Psa 83:18 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 300 | Psa 83:18 | חפר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 301 | Psa 86:17 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 302 | Psa 89:42 | חרף | חֲרַפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 303 | Psa 89:46 | בוש | בוּשָׁה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 304 | Psa 97:7 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 305 | Psa 109:28 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 306 | Psa 109:29 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 307 | Psa 109:29 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 308 | Psa 119:39 | חרף | חֲרַפָּה | Comp | Ext | N Failure | Hierarch |
| 309 | Psa 119:78 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 310 | Psa 129:5 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 311 | Psa 132:18 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 312 | Job 6:20 | בוש | Qal | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 313 | Job 6:20 | חפר | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 314 | Job 8:22 | בוש | בִּשְׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 315 | Job 10:15 | קלה | קָלוֹן | Comp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 316 | Job 19:5 | חרף | חֲרַפָּה | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 317 | Prov 3:35 | קלה | קָלוֹן | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-----|----------|------|-----|----------|------------|
| 318 | Prov 6:33 | קלה | קָלוֹן | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 319 | Prov 6:33 | חרף | חָרְפָּה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 320 | Prov 9:7 | קלה | קָלוֹן | Amb | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 321 | Prov 10:5 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 322 | Prov 11:2 | קלה | קָלוֹן | Imp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 323 | Prov 12:4 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 324 | Prov 12:9 | קלה | Niphal | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 325 | Prov 13:5 | חפר | Hiphil | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 326 | Prov 13:18 | קלה | קָלוֹן | Imp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 327 | Prov 14:35 | בוש | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 328 | Prov 17:2 | בוש | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 329 | Prov 18:3 | קלה | קָלוֹן | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 330 | Prov 18:3 | חרף | חָרְפָּה | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 331 | Prov 18:13 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 332 | Prov 19:26 | בוש | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 333 | Prov 19:26 | חפר | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 334 | Prov 28:7 | כלם | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 335 | Prov 29:15 | בוש | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 336 | Lam 5:1 | חרף | חָרְפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 337 | Dan 9:16 | חרף | חָרְפָּה | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 338 | Dan 12:2 | חרף | חָרְפָּה | Imp | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 339 | Ezra 9:7 | בוש | בָּשָׁת | | Rel | Failure | Hierarch |
| 340 | Neh 1:3 | חרף | חָרְפָּה | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 341 | Neh 5:9 | חרף | חָרְפָּה | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 342 | 2 Chr 30:15 | כלם | Niphal | Comp | Ext | Behavior | Hierarch |
| 343 | 2 Chr 32:21 | בוש | בָּשָׁת | | Ext | Failure | Hierarch |
| 344 | Gen 2:25 | בוש | Hithpael | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 345 | Gen 30:23 | חרף | חָרְפָּה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 346 | Deut 25:3 | קלה | Niphal | | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 347 | Josh 5:9 | חרף | חָרְפָּה | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----|----------|------|-----|----------|------------|
| 348 | Judg 18:7 | כלם | Hiphil | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 349 | 1 Sam 25:7 | כלם | Hiphil | Comp | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 350 | Isa 25:8 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 351 | Isa 29:22 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Int | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 352 | Isa 45:17 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 353 | Isa 45:17 | כלם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 354 | Isa 49:23 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 355 | Isa 54:4 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 356 | Isa 54:4 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 357 | Isa 61:7 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 358 | Isa 61:7 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 359 | Jer 17:18 | בוש | Qal | Amb | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 360 | Ezek 34:29 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | Imp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 361 | Ezek 36:15 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 362 | Ezek 36:15 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 363 | Ezek 36:30 | חרף | חָרַף | Imp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 364 | Joel 2:17 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 365 | Joel 2:19 | חרף | חָרַף | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 366 | Joel 2:26 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 367 | Joel 2:27 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 368 | Mic 2:6 | כלם | כָּלְמָה | | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 369 | Zeph 3:11 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 370 | Zeph 3:18 | חרף | חָרַף | Comp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 371 | Zeph 3:19 | בוש | בָּשַׁת | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 372 | Psa 22:6 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 373 | Psa 25:2 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 374 | Psa 25:3 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 375 | Psa 25:20 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 376 | Psa 31:2 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 377 | Psa 31:18 | בוש | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|--------|----------|------|-----|---------------|------------|
| 378 | Psa 34:6 | חָפַר | Qal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 379 | Psa 69:7 | בוֹשׁ | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 380 | Psa 69:7 | כָּלַם | Niphal | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 381 | Psa 119:6 | בוֹשׁ | Qal | Imp | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 382 | Psa 119:31 | בוֹשׁ | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 383 | Psa 119:46 | בוֹשׁ | Qal | Comp | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 384 | Psa 119:80 | בוֹשׁ | Qal | Imp | Ext | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 385 | Psa 119:116 | בוֹשׁ | Hiphil | Imp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 386 | Psa 127:5 | בוֹשׁ | Qal | Comp | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 387 | Job 27:6 | חָרַף | Qal | Imp | Int | Behavior | N Hierarch |
| 388 | Ruth 2:15 | כָּלַם | Hiphil | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 389 | Neh 2:17 | חָרַף | חָרַפָּה | | Ext | Failure | N Hierarch |
| 390 | 2 Kgs 2:17 ¹⁴ | בוֹשׁ | Qal | Amb | Int | Request | Request |
| 391 | Judg 5:18 | חָרַף | Piel | | | Idiomatic use | |

¹⁴ See note under Judg 3:25 in Appedix One.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abou-Zeid, Ahmed. "Honour and Shame Among the Bedouins of Egypt." Pages 243–59 in *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. Edited by J. G. Peristiany. The Nature of Human Society Series. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Allen, Leslie. *Ezekiel 1–19*. Word Biblical Commentary 28. Edited by David Hubbard and Glenn Barker. Dallas: Word, 1994.
- . *Ezekiel 20–48*. Word Biblical Commentary 29. Edited by David Hubbard and Glenn Barker. Dallas: Word, 1990.
- . "Structure, Tradition and Redaction in Ezekiel's Death Valley Vision." Pages 127–42 in *Among the Prophets: Language, Image and Structure in the Prophetic Writings*. Edited by Philip R. Davies and David J. A. Clines. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 144. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- . "Structuring of Ezekiel's Revisionist History Lesson (Ezekiel 20:3–31)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54 (1992):448–62.
- Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. New York: Modern Library, 1954.
- Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things with Words*. 2d ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Ball, Ivan Jay. *A Rhetorical Study of Zephaniah*. Berkeley, Calif.: BIBAL, 1998.
- Baltzer, Dieter. "Literarkritische und Literarhistorische Anmerkungen zur Heilsprophetie im Ezechiel-Buch." Pages 166–81 in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*. Edited by J. Lust. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 74. Louvain: Louvain University Press, 1986.
- Bartelmus, Rüdiger. "Menschlicher Misserfolg und Jahwes Initiative: Beobachtungen zum Geschichtsbild des deuteronomistischen Rahmens im Richterbuch und zum geschichtstheologischen Entwurf in Ez 20." *Biblische Notizen* 70 (1993): 28–47.
- Bartelt, Andrew H. *Fundamental Biblical Hebrew*. St. Louis: Concordia, 2000.
- Bavelas, Janet B., Christine Kenwood, and Bruce Philips. "Discourse Analysis." Pages 102–29 in *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication*. Edited by Mark L. Knapp and John A. Daly. 3d ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2002.
- Bechtel, Lyn. "The Biblical Experience of Shame/Shaming: The Social Experience of Shame/Shaming in Biblical Israel in Relation to its Use as Religious Metaphor." Ph.D. diss., Drew University, 1983.

- . “The Perception of Shame within the Divine-Human Relationship in Biblical Israel.” Pages 79–92 in *Uncovering Ancient Stones: Essays in Memory of H. Neil Richardson*. Edited by Lewis M. Hopfe. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1994.
- . “Shame As a Sanction of Social Control in Biblical Israel: Judicial, Political, and Social Shaming.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 49 (1991): 47–76.
- Benedict, Ruth. *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*. New York: New American Library, 1946.
- Bergant, Dianne. “My Beloved Is Mine and I Am His (Song 2:16): The Song of Songs and Honor and Shame.” *Semeia* 68 (1994): 23–40.
- Berlin, Adele. *Zephaniah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Edited by William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. Anchor Bible 25A. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Bewer, Julius A. “Textual and Exegetical Notes on the Book of Ezekiel.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72 (1953): 158–68.
- Bird, Phyllis. “‘To Play the Harlot’: An Inquiry into an Old Testament Metaphor.” Pages 76–94 in *Gender and Difference in Ancient Israel*. Edited by Peggy L. Day. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Ezekiel*. Edited by James Luther Mays, Patrick D. Miller Jr., and Paul J. Actemeier. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville: John Knox, 1990.
- Block, Daniel I. *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1–24*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- . *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25–48*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . “Divine Abandonment: Ezekiel’s Adaptation of an Ancient Near Eastern Motif.” Pages 15–42 in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong. SBL Symposium Series Number 9. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.
- Boadt, Lawrence. “Ezekiel, Book of.” Pages 711–22 in vol. 2 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . “The Function of the Salvation Oracles in Ezekiel 33 to 37.” *Hebrew Annual Review* 12 (1990): 1–21.

- . “Mythological Themes and the Unity of Ezekiel.” Pages 211–31 in *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by L. J. de Regt, J. de Waard, and J. P. Fokkelman. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1996.
- . “Rhetorical Strategies in Ezekiel’s Oracles of Judgment.” Pages 182–200 in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*. Edited by J. Lust. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 74. Louvain: Louvain University Press, 1986.
- Bode, Richard Paul. “The New Testament Concept of Shame.” S.T.M. Thesis, Concordia Seminary, 1969.
- Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice. “Le témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l’étude de la tradition des Septante Ézéchiél et Daniel dans le Papyrus 967.” *Biblica* 59 (1978): 384–95.
- Botha, P. J. “The ‘Enthronement Psalms’: A Claim to the World-Wide Honour of Yahweh.” *Old Testament Essays* 11 (1998): 24–39.
- . “Honour and Shame as Keys to the Interpretation of Malachi.” *Old Testament Essays* 14 (2001): 392–403.
- . “The Honour of the Righteous Will Be Restored: Psalm 75 in its Social Context.” *Old Testament Essays* 15 (2002): 320–34.
- . “To Honour Yahweh in the Face of Adversity: A Socio-Critical Analysis of Psalm 131.” *Skriften Kerk* 19 (1998): 525–33.
- . “Isaiah 37:1–35: Sennacherib’s Siege of Jerusalem as a Challenge to the Honour of Yahweh.” *Old Testament Essays* 13 (2000): 269–82.
- . “‘No King Like Him...’: Royal Etiquette According to the Deuteronomistic Historian.” Pages 36–49 in *Past, Present, and Future: The Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets*. Edited by Johannes C. De Moor and Harry F. van Rooy. Oudtestamentische Studiën 44. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . “The Poetic Structure and Strategy of Psalm 79.” *Verbum et Ecclesia* 25 (2004): 357–77.
- . “Psalm 118 and Social Values in Ancient Israel.” *Old Testament Essays* 16 (2003): 195–215.
- . “Shame and the Social Setting of Psalm 119.” *Old Testament Essays* 12 (1999): 389–400.
- . “A Social-Scientific Reading of Psalm 129.” *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 58 (2002): 1401–14.

- . “The Socio-Cultural Background of Ezekiel 19.” *Old Testament Essays* 12 (1999):249–65.
- Bottéro, Jean. “How Sin was Born.” Pages 246–66 in *Everyday Life in Ancient Mesopotamia*. Edited by Jean Bottéro. Translated by Antonia Nevill. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- . *Religion in Ancient Mesopotamia*. Translated by Teresa Lavender Fagan. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Botterweck, G. J., and H. Ringgren, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley, and D. E. Green. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1906. Repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Brownlee, William H. *Ezekiel 1–19*. Edited by David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Word Biblical Commentary 28. Waco, Tex.: Word, 1986.
- Buss, Martin J. “Potential and Actual Interactions between Speech Act Theory and Biblical studies.” *Semeia* 41 (1988): 125–34.
- Cairns, D. L. *Aidôs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- . “Representations of Remorse and Reparation in Classical Greece.” Pages 171–78 in *Remorse and Reparation*. Edited by M. Cox. Forensic Focus 7. London: Jessica Kingsley, 1999.
- . “Shame and Self-Knowledge: The Positive Role of Shame in Ezekiel’s View of the Moral Self.” Pages 143–73 in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong. SBL Symposium Series Number 9. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.
- Caldwell, Bob. “‘Wait for Me’: Appreciating the Curious Juxtaposition of Zephaniah 3:8 and 9.” Ph.D. diss., Concordia Seminary, 2009.
- Callender, Dexter E. Jr. “The Primal Man in Ezekiel and the Image of God.” Pages 606–25 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 37. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Calvin, John. *Commentaries on the First Twenty Chapters of the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*. Translated by Thomas Myers. Vol. 20 of *Calvin’s Commentaries*. 22 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005.

- Camp, Claudia V. "Honor, Shame, and the Hermeneutics of Ben Sira's MS C." Pages 157–71 in *Wisdom, You are My Sister*. Edited by Michael L. Barré. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 29. D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1997.
- . "Understanding a Patriarchy: Women in Second Century Jerusalem Through the Eyes of Ben Sira." Pages 1–39 in *Women Like This: New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Campbell, Barth L. "Honor, Hospitality and Haughtiness: The Contention for Leadership in 3 John." *Evangelical Quarterly* 77 (2005): 321–41.
- . *Honor, Shame, and the Rhetoric of 1 Peter*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Campbell, J. K. *Honour, Family and Patronage: A Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1964.
- Carley, Keith W. *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd, A. R. Leaney, and J. W. Packer. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- . "From Harshness to Hope: The Implications for Earth of Hierarchy in Ezekiel." Pages 109–26 in *Ezekiel's Hierarchical World: Wrestling with a Tiered Reality*. Edited by Stephen L. Cook and Corrine L. Patton. SBL Symposium Series Number 31. Atlanta: SBL, 2004.
- Cassuto, Umberto. "The Arrangement of the Book of Ezekiel." Pages 227–40 in *Bible*, vol. 1 of *Biblical and Oriental Studies*. Translated by I. Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1974.
- Chalcraft, David J., ed. *Social-Scientific Old Testament Criticism*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Chance, J. K. "The Anthropology of Honor and Shame: Culture, Values, and Practice." *Semeia* 68 (1994): 139–51.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. "Sex, Shame, and Rhetoric: En-gendering Early Christian Ethics." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 59 (1991): 221–45.
- Clines, David J. A., ed. *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993–2007.
- Clines, David J. A., David M. Gunn, and Alan J. Hauser, eds. *Art and Meaning: Rhetoric in Biblical Literature*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982.
- Cody, Aelred. *Ezekiel, with an Excursus on Old Testament Priesthood*. Edited by Carroll Stuhlmueller and Martin McNamara. Vol. 11 of *Old Testament Message: A Biblical-Theological Commentary*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1984.

- Cooke, G. A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. Edited by S. R. Driver, A. Plummer, and C. A. Briggs. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1936.
- Craigie, Peter C. *Ezekiel*. Edited by John C. L. Gibson. The Daily Study Bible. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983.
- Craven, Toni. *Ezekiel-Daniel*. Collegeville Bible Commentary. Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1986.
- Crook, Zeba A. "Honor, Shame, and Social Status Revisited." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128 (2009): 591–611.
- . "Method and Models in New Testament Interpretation: A Critical Engagement with Louise Lawrence's Literary Ethnography." *Religious Studies Review* 32 (2006): 87–97.
- Crown, Stewart. "The Significance of the Phrase אֲדָמַת יִשְׂרָאֵל in Ezekiel." S.T.M. thesis, Concordia Seminary, 1995.
- Cutting, Joan. *Pragmatics and Discourse*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Darr, Katheryn Pfisterer. "Ezekiel's Justifications of God: Teaching Troubling Texts." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 55 (1992): 97–117.
- Davis, Ellen. *Swallowing the Scroll: Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel's Prophecy*. Edited by David J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* 78. Sheffield: Almond, 1989.
- Day, Peggy L. "Adulterous Jerusalem's Imagined Demise: Death of a Metaphor in Ezekiel xvi." *Vetus Testamentum* 50 (2000): 285–309.
- . "The Bitch Had It Coming to Her: Rhetoric and Interpretation in Ezekiel 16." *Biblical Interpretation* 8 (2000): 231–53.
- Dempsey, Carol J. "The 'Whore' of Ezekiel 16: The Impact of Ramifications of Gender-Specific Metaphors in Light of Biblical Law and Divine Judgment." Pages 57–78 in *Gender and Law in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Victor H. Matthews, Bernard M. Levinson and Tikva Frymer-Kensky. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* 262. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- DeSilva, David A. *Bearing Christ's Reproach: The Challenge of Hebrews in an Honor Culture*. North Richland Hills, Tex.: BIBAL, 1999.
- . *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2000.

- . “The Noble Contest: Honor, Shame and the Rhetorical Strategy of 4 Maccabees.” *Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha* 13 (1995): 31–57.
- Dijk-Hemmes, Fokkeli van. “The Metaphorization of Woman in Prophetic Speech: An Analysis of Ezekiel xxiii.” *Vetus Testamentum* 43 (1993): 162–70.
- Dille, Sarah J. “Honor Restored: Honor, Shame and God as Redeeming Kinsman in Second Isaiah.” Pages 232–50 in *Relating to the Text: Interdisciplinary and Form-Critical Insights on the Bible*. Edited by Timothy J. Sandoval and Carleen Mandolfo. London: T & T Clark International, 2003.
- Dodds, E. R. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951.
- Domeris, W. R. “Honour and Shame in the New Testament.” *Neotestamentica* 27 (1993): 283–97.
- . “Shame and Honour in Proverbs: Wise Women and Foolish Men.” *Old Testament Essays* 8 (1995): 86–102.
- Duguid, Iain M. *Ezekiel and the Leaders of Israel*. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 56. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Duke, Rodney K. “Punishment or Restoration: Another Look at the Levites of Ezekiel 44:6–16.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 40 (1988): 61–81.
- Durham, John I. “šālôm and the Presence of God.” Pages 272–93 in *Proclamation and Presence*. Edited by J. I. Durham and J. R. Porter. London: SCM, 1970.
- Eichrodt, Walther. *Ezekiel: A Commentary*. Translated by Cosslett Quin. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970.
- Elliott, John H. “Disgraced Yet Graced: The Gospel According to 1 Peter in the Key of Honor and Shame.” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 25 (1995): 166–78.
- . *What is Social-Scientific Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Fisch, S. *Ezekiel*. Edited by A. Cohen. Soncino Books of the Bible. London: The Soncino Press, 1950.
- Fishbane, Michael. “Sin and Judgment in the Prophecies of Ezekiel.” *Interpretation* 38 (1984): 131–50.
- Forde, Gerhard O. *On Being a Theologian of the Cross: Reflections on Luther’s Heidelberg Disputation, 1518*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

- Fox, Michael V. "The Rhetoric of Ezekiel's Vision of the Valley of the Bones." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 51 (1980): 1–15.
- Franzmann, Majella. "The City as Woman: The Case of Babylon in Isaiah 47." *Australian Biblical Review* 43 (1995): 1–19.
- Frei, Hans W. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Fretheim, Terence E. "The Repentance of God: A Key to Evaluating Old Testament God-Talk." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 10 (1988): 47–70.
- Galambush, Julie. *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: the City as Yahweh's Wife*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 130. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Garscha, Jörg. *Studien zum Ezechielbuch: Eine Redaktionskritische Untersuchung von Ez 1–39*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1974.
- Geyer, John B. "Ezekiel 27 and the Cosmic Ship." Pages 105–26 in *Among the Prophets: Language, Image and Structure in the Prophetic Writings*. Edited by Philip R. Davies and David J. A. Clines. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 144. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Gilmore, David D. ed., *Honor and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean*. Special Publication of the American Anthropological Association no. 22. Washington, D. C.: American Anthropological Association, 1987.
- Gitay, Yehoshua. "The Projection of the Prophet: A Rhetorical Presentation of the Prophet Jeremiah." Pages 41–56 in *Prophecy and Prophets: The Diversity of Contemporary Issues in Scholarship*. Edited by Yehoshua Gitay. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- . *Prophecy and Persuasion*. Forum Theologicae Linguisticae 14. Bonn: Linguistica Biblica, 1981.
- . "A Study of Amos's Art of Speech." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42 (1980): 293–309.
- Glatt-Gilad, David A. "Yahweh's Honor at Stake: A Divine Conundrum." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 98 (2002): 63–74.
- Gosnell, Peter W. "Honor and Shame Rhetoric as a Unifying Motif in Ephesians." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 16 (2006): 105–28.
- Gosse, Bernard. "Le livre d'Ezéchiel et Ex 6,2–8 dans le cadre du Pentateuque." *Biblische Notizen* 104 (2000): 20–25.

- . “La nouvelle alliance et les promesses d’avenir se référant à David dans les livres de Jérémie, Ezéchiel et Isaïe.” *Vetus Testamentum* 41 (1991): 419–28.
- Gowan, Donald E. *Ezekiel*. Edited by John H. Hayes. *Knox Preaching Guides*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1985.
- . *When Man Becomes God: Humanism and Hybris in the Old Testament*. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 6. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1975.
- Greenberg, Moshe. “The Design and Themes of Ezekiel’s Program of Restoration.” *Interpretation* 38 (1984): 181–208.
- . *Ezekiel 1–20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 22. Edited by William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- . “Ezekiel 16: A Panorama of Passions.” Pages 143–50 in *Love & Death in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John H. Marks and Robert M. Good. Guilford, Conn.: Four Quarters, 1987.
- . *Ezekiel 21–37: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 22A. Edited by William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1964.
- . “Salvation of the Impenitent *Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam*: Ezek 36:16–32.” Pages 263–71 in *Transformations of the Inner Self in Ancient Religions*. Edited by Jan Assmann and Guy G. Stroumsa. *Studies in the History of Religions: Numen Book Series*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Guest, Deryn. “Hiding Behind the Naked Women in Lamentations: A Recriminative Response.” *Biblical Interpretation* 7 (1999): 413–48.
- Hallo, William W., and K. Lawson Younger Jr., eds. *Context of Scripture*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Hals, Ronald M. *Ezekiel*. Vol. 19 of *The Forms of the Old Testament Literature*. Edited by Rolf P. Knierim and Gene M. Tucker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Hellerman, J. H. “Challenging the Authority of Jesus: Mark 11:27–33 and Mediterranean Notions of Honor and Shame.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theology Society* 43 (2000): 213–28.
- . “The Humiliation of Christ in the Social World of Roman Philippi, Part 1.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 160 (2003): 321–36.
- . “The Humiliation of Christ in the Social World of Roman Philippi, Part 2.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 160 (2003): 421–33.

- Hernadi, Paul. "Literary Theory: A Compass for Critics." *Critical Inquiry* 3 (1976): 369–86.
- Herzfeld, Michael. "Honour and Shame: Problems in the Comparative Analysis of Moral Systems." *Man* 15 (1980): 339–51.
- Hiebert, Paul. *Transforming Worldviews: An Anthropological Understanding of How People Change*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Hillers, Delbert R. *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1969.
- Hobbs, T. R. "Reflections on Honor, Shame and Covenant Relations." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116 (1997): 501–3.
- Holladay, William L. *Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1–25*. Edited by Paul D. Hanson. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- House, Paul R. *Zephaniah, a Prophetic Drama*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 69. Sheffield: Almond, 1988.
- Houston, Walter. "What did the Prophets Think They were Doing?: Speech Acts and Prophetic Discourse in the Old Testament." *Biblical Interpretation* 1 (1993): 167–88.
- Howard, David M. Jr. "Rhetorical Criticism in Old Testament Studies." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 4 (1994): 87–104.
- Hummel, Horace D. *Ezekiel 1–20*. Concordia Commentary. St. Louis: Concordia, 2005.
- . *Ezekiel 21–48*. Concordia Commentary. St. Louis: Concordia, 2007.
- Ince, Gwen. "Judge for Yourselves: Teasing out Some Knots in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16." *Australian Biblical Review* 48 (2000): 59–71.
- Jenni, E., and C. Westermann, eds. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. 3 vols. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Joüon, Paul. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2000.
- Joyce, Paul. *Divine Initiative and Human Response in Ezekiel*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 51. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- . *Ezekiel: A Commentary*. Edited by Claudia V. Camp and Andrew Mein. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 482. New York: T & T Clark, 2007.

- Kant, Immanuel. *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals: On a supposed Right to Lie because of Philanthropic Concerns*. Translated by James W. Ellington. 3d ed. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1993.
- Kautzsch, E. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by A. E. Cowley. 2d rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.
- Kee, Howard C. "The Linguistic Background of 'Shame' in the New Testament." Pages 133–47 in *On Language, Culture, and Religion: In Honor of Eugene A. Nida*. Edited by Matthew Black and William A. Smalley. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.
- Keil, C. F., and F. Delitzsch. *Ezekiel-Daniel*. Vol. 9 of *Commentary on the Old Testament*. Translated by James Martin and M. G. Easton. 10 vols. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001.
- . *The Pentateuch*. Vol. 1 of *Commentary on the Old Testament*. Translated by James Martin and M. G. Easton. 10 vols. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001.
- Kennedy, George Alexander. *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- Kessler, Martin. "A Methodological Setting for Rhetorical Criticism." *Semitics* 4 (1974): 22–36.
- Klein, Ralph W. *Ezekiel: The Prophet and His Message*. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1988.
- Klopfenstein, Martin A. *Scham und Schande nach dem Alten Testament*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 62. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972.
- Knight, Leonard C. "I Will Show Him My Salvation: The Experience of Anxiety in the Meaning of Psalm 91." *Restoration Quarterly* 43 (2001): 280–92.
- Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited by M. E. J. Richardson. 5 vols. New York: Brill, 1995.
- Kressel, Gideon M. "An Anthropologist's Response to the Use of Social Science Models in Biblical Studies." *Semeia* 68 (1994): 153–61.
- Kruger, Paul. "On Emotions and the Expression of Emotions in the Old Testament." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 48 (2004): 213–28.
- . "The Psychology of Shame and Jeremiah 2:36–37." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 22 (1996): 79–88.
- Kutsko, John F. *Between Heaven and Earth: Divine Presence and Absence in the Book of Ezekiel*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

- . “Will the Real *selem ’elohim* Please Stand Up?: The Image of God in the Book of Ezekiel.” Pages 55–85 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 37*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Laniak, Timothy S. *Shame and Honor in the Book of Esther*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 165. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Lapsley, Jacqueline E. *Can These Bones Live?: The Problem of the Moral Self in the Book of Ezekiel*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 301. New York: de Gruyter, 2000.
- . “Shame and Self-Knowledge: The Positive Role of Shame in Ezekiel’s View of the Moral Self.” Pages 143–73 in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong. SBL Symposium Series Number 9. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.
- Lawrence, Louise Joy. *An Ethnography of the Gospel of Matthew: A Critical Assessment of the Use of the Honour and Shame Model in New Testament Studies*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.165. Tübingen: Molar Siebeck, 2003.
- Leeb, Carolyn S., and Richard E. DeMaris. “Judges-(Dis)Honor and Ritual Enactment: The Jephthah Story: Judges 10:16–12:1.” Pages 177–90 in *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in its Social Context*. Edited by Philip F. Esler. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
- Leene, Hendrik. “Ezekiel and Jeremiah: Promises of Inner Renewal in Diachronic Perspective.” Pages 150–75 in *Past, Present, and Future: The Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets*. Edited by Johannes C. De Moor and Harry F. van Rooy. Oudtestamentische Studiën 44. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Lemche, N. P. “Kings and Clients: On Loyalty between the Ruler and the Ruled in Ancient ‘Israel.’” Pages 119–32 in *Ethics and Politics in the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by D. A. Knight. *Semeia* 66. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Lemos, T. M. “Shame and Mutilation of Enemies in the Hebrew Bible.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125 (2006): 225–41.
- Lessing, R. Reed. “Interpreting Discontinuity: Isaiah’s Tyre Oracle.” Ph.D. Diss., Concordia Seminary, 2001.
- . *Jonah*. Concordia Commentary. Saint Louis: Concordia, 2007.
- Levine, Baruch. *Numbers 1–20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 4A. Edited by William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

- Lewis, Helen Block. *Shame and Guilt in Neurosis*. New York: International Universities Press, 1971.
- Lewis, Michael, and Jeannette M. Haviland-Jones, eds. *Handbook of Emotions*. 2d ed. New York: The Guilford Press, 2000.
- Ludwig, Alan. "Ezekiel 43:9: Prescription or Promise?" Pages 67–78 in "*Hear the Word of Yahweh*": *Essays on Scripture and Archaeology in Honor of Horace D. Hummel*. Edited by Dean O. Wenhe, Paul L. Schrieber, and Lee A. Maxwell. St. Louis: Concordia, 2002.
- Lust, J. "Ezekiel 36–40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43 (1981): 517–33.
- Malina, Bruce. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. 3d rev. and exp. ed. Louisville: Westminster, 2001.
- Marshall, Peter. "A Metaphor of Social Shame: *Thriambeuein* in 2 Cor. 2:14." *Novum Testamentum* 25 (1983): 302–17.
- Martens, Elmer. *God's Design: A Focus on Old Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.
- Martin, Dale B. "Social-Scientific Criticism." Pages 125–42 in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. Louisville: Westminster, 1999.
- Martin-Achard, Robert. "Brèves remarques sur la signification théologique de la loi selon l'Ancien Testament." *Cahiers de la Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse* 11 (1984): 90–106.
- . "Ezéchiel, Témoin de l'Honneur de YHWH." *Cahiers de la Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse* 11 (1984): 323–32.
- Matthews, Victor H. *101 Questions and Answers on the Historical Books of the Bible*. 101 Questions & Answers Series. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2009.
- . "Honor and Shame in Gender-Related Legal Situations in the Hebrew Bible." Pages 97–112 in *Gender and Law in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Victor H. Matthews, Bernard M. Levinson and Tikva Frymer-Kensky. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 262. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- . "The King's Call to Justice." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 35 (1991): 204–16.
- . *Manners and Customs in the Bible*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1988.
- . *Social World of the Hebrew Prophets*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001.

- Matthews, Victor H., and Don C. Benjamin, eds. *Honor and Shame in the World of the Bible*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Matthews, Victor H., and Don C. Benjamin. *Old Testament Parallels: Laws and Stories from the Ancient Near East*. 3d rev. and exp. ed. New York: Paulist Press, 2006.
- . *Social World of Ancient Israel, 1250–587 BCE*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1993.
- Matthews, Victor H., and James C. Moyer. *The Old Testament: Text and Context*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997.
- McKeating, Henry. *Ezekiel*. Edited by R. N. Whybray. Old Testament Guides. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- McVann, Mark. “Reading Mark Ritually: Honor-Shame and the Ritual of Baptism.” *Semeia* 67 (1994): 179–98.
- Meer, Michaël N. van der. “A New Spirit in an Old Corpus? Text-Critical, Literary-Critical and Linguistic Observations Regarding Ezekiel 36:16–38.” Pages 147–58 in *The New Things: Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy*. Edited by F. Postma, K. Spronk, and E. Talstra. Amsterdam Notebook Supplement Series 3. Maastricht: Uitgeverij Shaker 2002.
- Mein, Andrew. *Ezekiel and the Ethics of Exile*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Numbers: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990.
- Mitchell, Christopher W. *The Meaning and Significance of BRK “To Bless” in the Old Testament*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 95. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Moxnes, Halvor. “Honor and Shame.” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 23 (1993): 67–176.
- Muenchow, Charles “Dust and Dirt in Job 42:6.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989): 597–611.
- Muilenburg, James. “Form Criticism and Beyond.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 1–18.
- Murray, Donald. “The Rhetoric of Disputation: Re-examination of a Prophetic Genre.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 38 (1987): 95–121.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. “Despising the Shame of the Cross: Honor and Shame in the Johannine Passion Narrative.” *Semeia* 68 (1994): 113–37.
- . *Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew*. Louisville: Westminster, 1998.

- . “Questions, Chreiai, and Challenges to Honor: The Interface of Rhetoric and Culture in Mark’s Gospel.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 60 (1998): 657–81.
- . *Render to God: New Testament Understandings of the Divine*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.
- Nicholls, Bruce. “The Role of Shame and Guilt in a Theology of Cross-Cultural Mission.” *Evangelical Review of Theology* 25 (2001): 231–41.
- . “The Servant Songs of Isaiah in Dialogue with Muslims.” *Evangelical Review of Theology* 20 (1996): 168–77.
- Odell, Margaret S. “An Exploratory Study of Shame and Dependence in the Bible and Selected Near Eastern Parallels.” Pages 217–33 in *The Biblical Canon in Comparative Perspective: Scripture in Context IV*. Edited by K. Lawson Younger Jr., William W. Hallo, and Bernard F. Batto. Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies 11. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1991.
- . *Ezekiel*. Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary, Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2005.
- . “Genre and Persona in Ezekiel 24:15–24.” Pages 626–48 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 37. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- . “The Inversion of Shame and Forgiveness in Ezekiel 16:59–63.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 56 (1992): 101–12.
- Ohnesorge, Stefan. *Jahwe Gestaltet Sein Volk Neu: Zur Sicht der Zukunft Israels nach Ez 11,14–21; 20,1–44; 36,16–38; 37,1–14.15–28*. Forschung zur Bibel 64. Würzburg: Echter, 1991.
- Olyan, Saul M. “Honor, Shame, and Covenant Relations in Ancient Israel and Its Environment.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 201–18.
- Ortlund, Eric Nels. “Shame and Restoration: An Exegetical Exploration of Shame in Ezekiel’s Restoration Prophecies.” M.A. thesis, Trinity International University, 2003.
- Parunak, H. van Dyke. “Structural Studies in Ezekiel.” Ph.D. diss., Harvard, 1978.
- Patrick, Dale, and Allen Scult. *Rhetoric and Biblical Interpretation*. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1990.
- Patton, Corrine L. “Should our Sister Be Treated Like a Whore?: A Response to Feminist Critiques of Ezekiel 23.” Pages 221–38 in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong. SBL Symposium Series Number 9. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.
- Pedersen, Johannes. *Israel: Its Life and Culture*. Translated by Aslaug Moller. 4 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1926.

- Peristiany, J. G., ed. *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. The Nature of Human Society Series. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Pilch, John J., and Bruce J. Malina, eds. *Biblical Social Values and Their Meaning: A Handbook*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1993.
- Pitt-Rivers, Julian. *The Fate of Shechem or the Politics of Sex: Essays in the Anthropology of the Mediterranean*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Pons, Jacques. "Le vocabulaire d'ézéchiél 20: Le prophète s'oppose à la vision deutéronomiste de l'histoire." Pages 214–33 in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*. Edited by J. Lust. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 74. Louvain: Louvain University Press, 1986.
- Prinsloo, G. T. M. "Lions and Vines: The Imagery of Ezekiel 19 in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Descriptions and Depictions." *Old Testament Essays* 12 (1999): 339–59.
- . "Reading Proverbs 3:1–12 in Its Social and Ideological Context." *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 58 (2002): 1375–1400.
- . "Sennacherib, Lachish and Jerusalem: Honour and Shame." *Old Testament Essays* 13 (2000): 348–63.
- Pritchard, James B., ed. *The Ancient Near East: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures*. 2 vols. London: Princeton University Press, 1975.
- Raabe, Paul R. "Look to the Holy One of Israel, All You Nations: The Oracles about the Nations Still Speak Today." *Concordia Journal* 30 (2004): 336–349.
- . *Obadiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 24D. Edited by William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1996.
- . "Transforming the International *status quo*: Ezekiel's Oracles against the Nations." Pages 187–207 in *Transforming Visions: Transformations of Text, Tradition, and Theology in Ezekiel*. Edited by William A. Tooman and Michael A. Lyons. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 127. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010.
- . "Why Prophetic Oracles Against the Nations?" Pages 236–57 in *Fortunate the Eyes that See*. Edited by Astrid B. Beck et al. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Rabichev, Renata. "The Mediterranean Concepts of Honour and Shame As Seen in the Depiction of the Biblical Women." *Religion & Theology* 3 (1996): 51–63.
- Redfield, Robert. *The Primitive World and Its Transformations*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1953.

- Renaud, Bernard. "L'alliance éternelle d'éz 16:59–63 et l'alliance nouvelle de jér 31:31–34." Pages 335–39 in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*. Edited by J. Lust. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 74. Louvain: Louvain University Press, 1986.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. "Ez 20 und 36,16ff im Rahmen der Komposition des Buches Ezekiel." Pages 260–65 in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*. Edited by J. Lust. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 74. Louvain: Louvain University Press, 1986.
- Renz, Thomas. *The Rhetorical Function of the Book of Ezekiel*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 76. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Retzinger, Suzanne M. "Identifying Shame and Anger in Discourse." *American Behavioral Scientist* 38 (1995): 1104–13.
- Rice, Frank D. "An Old Testament Concept of Shame." MDiv thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, 1985.
- Ridgway, John K. "'Worthy' Households but 'Unworthy' Invitees? The Matthean Uses of Axios." *Irish Biblical Studies* 26 (2004): 2–31.
- Roberts, J. J. M. *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Know Press, 1991.
- Rooker, Mark F. *Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of Ezekiel*. JSOTSup 90. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Rukundwa, S. L. "The Banyamulenge People: Their Angst, Honour and Shame in the Light of the Matthean Community." *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 60 (2004): 385–409.
- Scheetz, Betty L. "Reclaiming Unity in the Letter to the Ephesians." *New Theology Review* 15 (2003): 53–61.
- Scheff, Thomas J. *Microsociology: Discourse, Emotion, and Social Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- . "Self-Defense against Verbal Assault: Shame, Anger, and the Social Bond." *Family Process* 34 (1995): 271–86.
- . "Shame and Conformity: The Difference-Emotion System." *American Sociological Review* 53 (1988): 401.
- Scheff, Thomas J., and Suzanne M. Retzinger. *Shame and Rage in Destructive Conflicts*. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Health, 1991.

- Schröder, F. W. J. *Ezekiel*. Translated by Patrick Fairbairn and William Findlay. *Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1950.
- Schwartz, Baruch J. "Ezekiel's Dim View of Israel's Restoration." Pages 43–67 in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong. SBL Symposium Series Number 9. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.
- Searle, John R. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Sherwood, Y. *The Prostitute and the Prophet: Hosea's Marriage in Literary-Theoretical Perspective*. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement* 212. Gender, Culture, Theory 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Shields, Mary E. "An Abusive God? Identity and Power/Gender and Violence in Ezekiel 23." Pages 129–51 in *Postmodern Interpretations of the Bible*. Edited by A. K. M. Adam. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2001.
- . "Gender and Violence in Ezekiel 23." Pages 86–105 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 37. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- . "Multiple Exposures: Body Rhetoric and Gender Characterization in Ezekiel 16." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 14 (1998): 5–18.
- Simkins, Ronald A. "Return to Yahweh: Honor and Shame in Joel." *Semeia* 68 (1994): 41–54.
- Smith, W. Robertson. *The Religion of the Semites: The Fundamental Institutions*. Rev. ed. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1894. Repr., New York: Schocken, 1972.
- Smith-Christopher, Daniel L. *A Biblical Theology of Exile*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.
- Soulen, Richard N. and R. Kendall Soulen. *Handbook of Biblical Criticism*. 3d rev. and exp. ed. Louisville: Westminster John Know Press, 2001, 176.
- Sprinkle, Preston. "Law and Life: Leviticus 18:5 in the Literary Framework of Ezekiel." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31 (2007): 275–93.
- Stansell, Gary. "Honor and Shame in the David Narratives." *Semeia* 68 (1994): 55–79.
- . "Wealth: How Abraham Became Rich." Pages 92–110 in *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in its Social Context*. Edited by Philip F. Esler. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
- Steenkamp, Y. "Violence and Hatred in Psalm 137: The Psalm in Its Ancient Social Context." *Verbum et Ecclesia* 25 (2004): 294–310.

- Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington: Ind. University Press, 1985.
- Stevenson, Kalinda Rose. *Vision of Transformation: The Territorial Rhetoric of Ezekiel 40–48*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 154. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Stiebert, Johanna. *The Construction of Shame in the Hebrew Bible: The Prophetic Contribution*. Edited by David J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 346. London: Sheffield, 2002.
- . “Shame and Prophecy: Approaches Past and Present.” *Biblical Interpretation* 8 (2000): 255–75.
- . “The Woman Metaphor of Ezekiel 16 and 23: A Victim of Violence, or Symbol of Subversion.” *Old Testament Essays* 15 (2002): 200–208.
- Striblen, Cassie. “Guilt, Shame, and Shared Responsibility.” *Journal of Social Philosophy* 38 (2007): 469–85.
- Swanepoel, M. G. “Ezekiel 16: Abandoned Child, Bride Adorned or Unfaithful Wife.” Pages 84–104 in *Among the Prophets: Language, Image and Structure in the Prophetic Writings*. Edited by Philip R. Davies and David J. A. Clines. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 144. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Sweeney, Marvin A. “Metaphor and Rhetorical Strategy in Zephaniah.” Pages 120–30 in *Relating to the Text: Interdisciplinary and Form-Critical Insights on the Bible*. Edited by Timothy J. Sandoval and Carleen Mandolfo. London: T & T Clark International, 2003.
- . *The Prophetic Literature*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2005.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu, and M. Fishbane. “The Structuring of Biblical Books: Studies in the Book of Ezekiel.” *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 10 (1976): 129–53.
- Taylor, John B. *Ezekiel*. Edited by D. J. Wiseman. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1969.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. “Supposed Power of Words in the Biblical Writings.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 25 (1974): 283–99.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2d rev. ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Trible, Phyllis. *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah*. Edited by Gene M. Tucker. Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Old Testament Series. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.

- Tucker, W. Dennis Jr. "Is Shame a Matter of Patronage in the Communal Laments?" *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31 (2007): 465–80.
- Tuell, Steven. *Ezekiel*. Edited by Robert L. Hubbard Jr. and Robert K. Johnston. New International Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2009.
- Tull, Patricia K. "Rhetorical Criticism and Intertextuality." Pages 156–80 in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. Louisville: Westminster, 1999.
- Van der Toorn, K. *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria and Israel" Continuity and Change in the Forms of Religious Life*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- VanGemeren, W. A., ed. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin J. "The Semantics of Biblical Literature: Truth and Scripture's Diverse Literary Forms." Pages 49–104 in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon*. Edited by D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
- Vawter, Bruce, and Leslie J. Hoppe. *A New Heart: A Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. International Theological Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Vieweger, Dieter. "Die Arbeit des jeremianischen Schülerkreises am Jeremiabuch und deren Rezeption in der literarischen Überlieferung der Prophet Ezechiels." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 1 (1988): 15–34.
- Villiers, G. de, and G. T. M. Prinsloo. "Gilgamesh Sees the Deep: From Shame to Honour." *Journal for Semitics* 11 (2002): 23–44.
- Voelz, James W. *What Does This Mean?: Principles of Biblical Interpretation in the Post-Modern World*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1995.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Walton, John H. *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.
- Warner, Martin, ed. *The Bible As Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Wevers, John W. *Ezekiel*. Edited by H. H. Rowley and Matthew Black. The Century Bible. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1969.

- Wikan, Unni. "Shame and Honour: A Contestable Pair?" *Man* 19 (1984): 635–52.
- Williams, Ronald J. *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*. 2d ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.
- Wilson, P. Eddy. "Deuteronomy xxv 11–12 One for the Books." *Vetus Testamentum* 47 (1997): 220–35.
- Wuellner, Wilhelm. "Where Is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987): 448–63.
- Young, Robert. *Analytical Concordance to the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955.
- Zimmerli, Walther. *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel Chapters 1–24*. Translated by R. E. Clements. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- . *Ezekiel 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel Chapters 25–48*. Translated by James D. Martin. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

VITA

Ronald Richard Mudge

February 28, 1970.

Flint, Michigan.

Collegiate Institutions Attended

University of Michigan-Flint, Flint, MI, B. A. in English and Music, 1992.

Graduate Institutions Attended

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, MO, M.Div., 1996.

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, MO, Ph.D. in Biblical Studies, 2012.

Previous Theses and Publications

Book Review of John R. Wilch, *Ruth* (Concordia Commentary; St. Louis: Concordia, 2006).
Paper presented at the annual Day of Theological Reflection, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 2006.

Current Memberships in Academic Societies

Society of Biblical Literature.

Society of Concordia Theological Faculties.

Society of Creation.