

THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL IN MODERN STUDY¹

By HAROLD H. ROWLEY, M.A., D.D., THEOL.D., LL.D., F.B.A.

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN
THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

THE study of few books of the Bible has suffered a greater transformation in the last generation than that of the book of Ezekiel. In 1913 G. B. Gray wrote that "no other book of the Old Testament is distinguished by such decisive marks of unity of authorship and integrity as this",² and in the same year

¹ A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 11th of February 1953. The following abbreviations are used in the footnotes below: *A.J.S.L.* = *American Journal of Semitic Languages*; *B.A.* = *Biblical Archaeologist*; *B.A.S.O.R.* = *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*; *Bi.Or.* = *Bibliotheca Orientalis*; *B.J.R.L.* = *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*; *C.Q.R.* = *Catholic Quarterly Review*; *D.B.* = *A Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by J. Hastings and J. A. Selbie; *E.T.* = *Expository Times*; *H.S.A.T.* = *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, 3rd edn., edited by E. Kautzsch; 4th edn., edited by A. Bertholet; *H.T.R.* = *Harvard Theological Review*; *H.U.C.A.* = *Hebrew Union College Annual*; *J.B.L.* = *Journal of Biblical Literature*; *J.N.E.S.* = *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*; *J.P.O.S.* = *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*; *J.R.* = *Journal of Religion*; *J.T.S.* = *Journal of Theological Studies*; *M.G.W.J.* = *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*; *O.L.Z.* = *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*; *P.G.* = *Patrologia Graeca*; *P.L.* = *Patrologia Latina*; *R.B.* = *Revue Biblique*; *R.H.R.* = *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*; *S.A.T.* = *Die Schriften des Alten Testaments in Auswahl*; *S.E.Å.* = *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*; *Th.L.Z.* = *Theologische Literaturzeitung*; *Th.R.* = *Theologische Rundschau*; *Th.Z.* = *Theologische Zeitung*; *T.S.K.* = *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*; *V.T.* = *Vetus Testamentum*; *Z.A.W.* = *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*; *Z.D.M.G.* = *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*; *Z.Th.K.* = *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*.

² Cf. *A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament* (1913), p. 198. Even more emphatic was R. Smend, *Der Prophet Ezechiel* (1880), p. xxi: "Das ganze Buch ist veilmehr die logische Entwicklung einer Reihe von Gedanken nach einem wohlüberlegten und z.Th. ganz schematischen Plane, man könnte kein Stück herausnehmen, ohne das ganz Ensemble zu zerstören." More than one writer has criticized the extravagance of this statement. Cf. L. Dennefeld, *La Saint Bible*, ed by Pirot and Clamer, vii (1947), p. 462; A. Lods, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive* (1950), p. 445. C. C. Torrey, *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy* (1930), p. 20, cited Smend's statement with approval, save that he omitted the last eleven words—an omission to which S. Spiegel, *H.T.R.*, xxiv (1931), p. 279, draws attention, since Torrey himself excises a considerable number of pieces.

appeared the ninth edition of S. R. Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, in which a similar statement appeared.¹ There had, indeed, been several isolated challenges to this view, but so little following had they secured that they seemed negligible, and the scholars who analysed and dissected so many books of the Old Testament were in general agreed that here, at least, was a book which did not yield to analysis and distribution amongst a number of authors.²

Today this is no longer the case, and in the years that have passed since Gray's words were published there has been greater activity in Ezekiel criticism than in any previous comparable period,³ and it is hard to give a simple and clear account of the

¹ Cf. p. 279: "No critical question arises in connection with the authorship of the book, the whole from beginning to end bearing unmistakably the stamp of a single mind". Similarly H. A. Redpath, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel* (1907), p. xiv: "Scarcely any doubt has ever been cast even by the extremest critics upon the unity and authenticity of the book, though a few glosses and interpretative words or notes may have found their way into the text." C. G. Howie, *The Date and Composition of Ezekiel* (1950), p. 2, quotes from J. E. McFadyen, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York, 1933), p. 162, the statement that "corrupt as the text is in many places in Ezekiel, we have the rare satisfaction of studying a carefully elaborated prophecy whose authenticity is practically undisputed and indisputable", and observes (p. 103) that McFadyen had either failed to keep up or discounted the works of Hölischer and Torrey as of no importance. Actually in the London edition of McFadyen's work, published in 1932, the sentence quoted above read "whose authenticity has, till recently, been practically undisputed" (p. 187), and on pp. 201-3 there was an account of the work of Hölischer, Smith, and Torrey, with which he was well acquainted, while in *E.T.*, xlv (1932-3), pp. 471 ff., he had published an account of Hertrich's positions. Indeed, on p. 474b he had stated his conclusion that it is highly probable that Ezekiel was not an exilic prophet. He had therefore yielded to the modern views to some extent. Far more surprising than McFadyen's statement is that made by S. Fisch, *Ezekiel* (Soncino Books of the Bible) (1950), p. xiv a: "There has never been doubt cast upon the unity of the Book. Not even the more advanced Biblical critics have suggested a Deutero- or a Trito-Ezekiel".

² To list all the scholars who adopted this view would be wearisome, since it was the normal view of scholars of all schools, whether critical or conservative, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant. The book of Ezekiel provided one of the very few points in the Old Testament where all were agreed.

³ L. Dennefeld, *La Sainte Bible*, ed. by Pirot and Clamer, vii (1947), p. 464, complained of the extravagance of recent theory. It is certainly calculated to fill the student with wonder as to whether present-day scholarship has any objective standards.

immense variety of view put forward.¹ It is curious to observe that during this same period there have been many challenges to the findings of critical scholars on the books which they *did* dissect, whereas here the challenge arises because they did *not* dissect.² There have been more cross currents in Old Testament scholarship during this period than ever before, and many questions can no longer be regarded as settled by a simple appeal to "the consensus of scholarship". At the same time it must be said that they can no more be regarded as settled by appealing to the rejection of the consensus of former days. For while many can be found to agree in rejecting an earlier view, it is often found that their agreement quickly dissolves into wide disagreement as to what is to be set in its place.

This is particularly true of the book of Ezekiel. For while many scholars have rejected the view of Gray and Driver—the "critical orthodoxy" of the great days of literary criticism—they offer no consensus whatever on the substitution of a different view.³ In the present lecture our attention will be concentrated on three questions, though they cannot be kept separate from one another. These are the unity of the book, the date of its composition, and the place where the prophet exercised his ministry.

The simple reading of the book of Ezekiel will produce on the reader the impression of unity,⁴ and this unity, as has been said,

¹ Cf. C. C. Torrey, *J.B.L.*, lviii (1939), p. 78: "Quite recently, the long-standing picture of unity and harmony has been violently disturbed. It is as though a bomb had been exploded in the book of Ezekiel, scattering the fragments in all directions. One scholar gathers them up and arranges them in one way, another makes a different combination."

² A succinct account of these challenges will be found in *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (1951), ed. by H. H. Rowley, particularly in C. R. North's chapter on the Pentateuch. Briefer reference to the challenges may be found in the writer's *The Growth of the Old Testament* (1950).

³ J. E. Steinmueller, *A Companion to Scripture Studies*, 2nd edn., ii (1942), p. 265 n., dismisses them in a sentence on this ground.

⁴ Cf. J. Skinner, in Hastings's *D.B.*, i (1898), p. 817 a: "Not only does it bear the stamp of a single mind in its phraseology, its imagery and its mode of thought, but it is arranged on a plan so perspicuous and so comprehensive that the evidence of literary design in the composition becomes altogether irresistible"; A. Lods, *op. cit.*, pp. 443 f.: "Le livre d'Ézéchiél fait une forte impression

was allowed by the great majority of older scholars and still commands not a few supporters.¹ There is a strongly marked character about the whole, and the somewhat strange personality of Ezekiel makes itself felt everywhere. His call is represented as coming to him in Babylonia² in the year 593 B.C.,³ and all his work is said to have been done amongst the exiles of the first captivity, in whose midst he lived. It is true that many of his prophecies are addressed to Jerusalem, and he is sometimes apparently transported by air to the sacred city in a way that has

d'unité. La cohésion de toutes les parties de l'ouvrage a longtemps semblé aux critiques s'imposer avec la force de l'évidence. On retrouve partout le même style, le même esprit très particulier, les mêmes idées."

¹ Of recent scholars who, since the issue of the modern challenges, have adhered to the view of the substantial unity of the book, we may note the following: (a) Roman Catholic: L. Hudal and J. Ziegler, *Précis d'Introduction à l'Ancien Testament*, French trans. by M. Grandclaudon (1938), pp. 217 f.; M. Schumpp, *Das Buch Ezechiel* (Herders Bibelkommentar) (1942), pp. 1 f.; H. Haag, *Was lehrt die literarische Untersuchung des Ezechiel-Textes?* (1943), p. 126; H. Höpfl, *Introductio specialis in Vetus Testamentum*, 5th edn., revised by A. Miller and A. Metzinger (1946), pp. 465 f.; L. Dennefeld, *La Sainte Bible*, ed. by Pirot and Clamer, vii (1946), pp. 461 ff.; J. Chaine, in *Initiation Biblique*, ed. by Robert and Tricot, 2nd edn. (1948), pp. 140 ff.; F. Spadafora, *Ezechiele* (1948), pp. 15 ff. (on this, cf. the long article by J. García Ramos, *Estudios Bíblicos*, ix (1950), pp. 39-66, 129-57); J. Ziegler, *Ezechiel* (Echter Bibel vi) (1948), pp. 6 ff.; E. Power, in *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (1953), pp. 601 ff.; (b) Protestant: R. Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iii (1927), pp. 144 ff.; W. L. Wardle, in *The Abingdon Bible Commentary* (1929), pp. 714 ff.; J. Meinhold, *Einführung in das Alte Testament*, 3rd edn. (1932), pp. 269 ff.; O. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1934), pp. 411 f. (cf. also *J.P.O.S.*, xvi (1936), pp. 286 ff.); E. Sellin, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 7th edn. (1935), p. 100 (cf. 8th edn., revised by L. Rost (1950), p. 120); G. A. Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel* (I.C.C.) (1937), pp. xx ff.; B. Balscheit, *Der Gottesbund* (1943), pp. 189 ff.; E. Bruston, *La Bible du Centenaire*, ii (1947), p. xxvii; J. Paterson, *The Goodly Fellowship of Prophets* (1948), pp. 161 f.; Th. C. Vriezen, *Oudisraëlitische Geschriften* (1948), pp. 174 ff.; *The Westminster Study Bible* (1948), pp. 1162 ff.; E. J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (1949), pp. 234 ff.; A. Weiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 2nd edn. (1949), pp. 166 ff.; A. Lods, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive* (1950), pp. 443 ff. (cf. *The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism*, English trans. by S. H. Hooke (1937), p. 213); C. G. Howie, *The Date and Composition of Ezekiel* (1950), pp. 85 ff.; C. J. Mullo Weir, *V.T.*, ii (1952), pp. 97 ff.

² At Tel Abib. S. Löwinger, in *Études Orientales* (Hirschler Memorial Volume), ed. by O. Komlós (1950), pp. 62 ff., argues that this is not a place-name, but that it means "mound of desolation", and stands for the exiles themselves.

³ Ezek. i. 2.

puzzled students of the book. Ezekiel is quite unlike the great pre-exilic prophets in that he takes much interest in the details of the ritual of the Temple, and in the concluding chapters of his book we are offered a sketch of the restored Temple and its service that contrasts strangely with those earlier prophetic denunciations of the cultus, which have led many scholars to conclude that they would destroy it root and branch.¹

Until about thirty years ago, almost all scholars were agreed in thus accepting the book at its face value, and Ezekiel was frequently referred to as the "father of Judaism".² Of the small minority of scholars who adopted a different view I shall not speak here, since they cannot claim a place in a paper devoted to "modern study".³ Nor can more than a selection of more recent work be surveyed, since my purpose is not to exhaust my subject or my hearers but to illustrate the variety and fluidity of current views. Such views as are presented will be dealt with as objectively as possible, with a minimum of critical examination.

¹ For a study of this question, cf. the writer's paper "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament", *B.J.R.L.*, xxxiii (1950-1), pp. 74 ff.

² So still by J. M. Powis Smith, *The Prophets and their Time* (1925), pp. 161 ff. In the second edn., however, ed. by W. A. Irwin (1941), p. 216, this is reversed and we read: "The Book of Ezekiel is not the father, but the child, of Judaism." E. Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, English trans. by W. Montgomery (1923), p. 154, recognized in Ezekiel "the real father of Judaism", and the judgement remained unchanged in the 7th edn. of the German text (1935), p. 99, and in the 8th edn. revised by L. Rost (1950), p. 119.

³ For a review of the history of the criticism of Ezekiel from the time of Oeder, cf. S. Spiegel, *H.T.R.*, xxiv (1931), pp. 245 ff.; O. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1934), pp. 412 ff.; R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1941), pp. 525 ff.; W. A. Irwin, *The Problem of Ezekiel* (1943), pp. 5 ff.; C. G. Howie, op. cit. (1950), pp. 1 ff. and G. Fohrer, *Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel* (1952), pp. 5 ff. (The last named work was not released until 1953, and reached me on the day when the present lecture was delivered, too late to be of use in its preparation.) For a review of the literature of the last thirty years, cf. C. Kuhl, *Th.R.*, N.F. v (1933), pp. 92 ff., xx (1952), pp. 1 ff. Cf. also G. Fohrer's review of literature on the prophetic books generally, *ibid.*, xix (1951), pp. 277 f., xx (1952), pp. 193 ff. Other reviews of recent literature on Ezekiel will be found in several of the works referred to below, and especially by O. Eissfeldt in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. by H. H. Rowley (1951), pp. 153 ff. Cf. also now W. A. Irwin, *V.T.*, iii (1953), pp. 54 ff., which appeared when the present lecture was completed.

The modern period of the study of this book opened nearly thirty years ago with the most drastic dismemberment it has yet suffered. It suffered this at the hands of G. Hölscher,¹ who denied the prophet more than about one seventh of the whole book, and ascribed the rest to a fifth century editor.² Hölscher started with the canon that Ezekiel was a poet, who is unlikely to have been the author of the poor prose in which much of the book is written. He allowed him a few prose passages, but on the other hand he denied him some of the poetic passages, which are not written in the metre which Ezekiel usually employed.³

¹ *Hesekiel, der Dichter und das Buch* (1924). In his *Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion* (1922), p. 114, Hölscher had described the book of Ezekiel as a fifth century pseudepigraph, which utilized some literary remains of the true Ezekiel and which was subsequently added to by later hands. With this, cf. Hölscher's earlier work, *Die Profeten* (1914), pp. 298 ff., where the whole book was treated as substantially the work of Ezekiel. Hölscher's later view is followed by A. von Gall, *Basileia tou Theou* (1926), pp. 175, 200 f., but is dismissed as "amazingly unscientific tinkering", by Torrey, *J.B.L.*, liii (1934), p. 299. Cf. W. F. Lofthouse, *Israel after the Exile* (Clarendon Bible) (1928), p. 68: "To cut away half the book, in the absence of direct evidence for its lateness, can hardly be called scientific criticism." Against Hölscher cf. W. Kessler, *Die innere Einheitlichkeit des Buches Ezechiel* (1926); G. A. Cooke, *J.T.S.*, xxvii (1926), pp. 201 ff.; V. Hertrich, *Ezechielprobleme* (1932), pp. 12 ff.; and J. Battersby Harford, *Studies in the Book of Ezekiel* (1935), pp. 13 ff. H. Duensing *Th.L.Z.*, I (1925), col. 268, says: "Auf alle Fälle ist das der bleibende Wert der Arbeit Hölschers, dass er eine Seite des Ezechiel ins hellste Licht gestellt hat, die niemand so klar erkannt und gewürdigt hat wie er." W. Zimmerli, *Z. Th.K.*, xlvi (1951), pp. 249 ff., brings out some of the features of Ezekiel's work which even the most drastic criticism leaves. With Hölscher's view, cf. what S. Mowinckel had earlier said, *Ezra den Skrifflærde* (1916), pp. 125 f. (also Mowinckel's *Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia* (1914), p. 4). A. Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 2nd edn., ii (1952), p. 125, says: "In reality most of Hölscher's critics in principle accept his point of view. The book as it stands now is no authentic work of the prophet Ezekiel."

² W. A. L. Elmslie, *How Came our Faith* (1948), p. 191 n., declares himself of the opinion that "the material in the Book of Ezekiel is very far from being the product of one man; that much of it belongs to the consideration of post-exilic Judaism; and that while certain of its oracular passages are of pre-exilic date, these do not add any development of thought not covered by the eight great personalities".

³ Hölscher recognized twenty-one passages as genuine, of which sixteen were in poetry. These together cover in whole or in part some 170 verses out of a total of 1,273 contained in the book.

Some twenty years later Irwin¹ reached results almost as drastic as those of Hölscher, but along other lines. Starting from chapter xv he argued that verses in which the interpretation of oracles is to be found show a misunderstanding of the oracles themselves and therefore cannot come from the prophet himself.² This method was then extended throughout the book, with the result that Ezekiel was left with some 250 verses, as against the 170 which Hölscher had allowed him.³

In the meantime two other writers had independently but almost simultaneously attacked the book from a quite different angle. While both recognized the substantial unity of Ezekiel both maintained that the work originally had a Palestinian setting, and not a Babylonian, and that its first ascription was to a prophet who lived in the time of Manasseh, in the seventh century B.C. Subsequent editing, however, transferred it to the sixth century, and gave the Babylonian setting to the prophet's work which it now has. These two writers were C. C. Torrey⁴ and James

¹ *The Problem of Ezekiel* (1943). Cf. the reviews by A. van den Born, *Bi.Or.*, iv (1947), p. 120, and Louise Pettibone Smith, *J.B.L.*, lxviii (1949), pp. 384 ff.

² In *V.T.*, iii (1953), p. 64 n., Professor Irwin complains that in a brief twelve line review I was unfair to him in writing "Every interpretation of an oracle is rejected as coming from a later hand", and refers me to p. 274 of his book, where he recognizes some brief genuine interpretations and cites three verses in illustration. I regret any inaccuracy even in so brief a review, and in substituting the reading "almost every interpretation" express my apologies. The amount of allowed interpretation amongst the 251 genuine verses recognized by Irwin is certainly very slight as compared with the amount rejected amongst the thousand verses jettisoned. I greatly value Professor Irwin's warm friendship, and would avoid any semblance of unfairness to him.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 283, where Irwin says he allows 251 verses to be genuine, in whole or in part, "the proportion of their originality varying from complete genuineness down to a bare remnant of not more than a word or two".

⁴ *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy* (1930). For criticisms of Torrey's work, cf. K. Budde, *J.B.L.*, i (1931), pp. 20 ff.; S. Spiegel, *H.T.R.*, xxiv (1931), pp. 245 ff. (cf. Torrey's reply, *J.B.L.*, liii (1934), pp. 291 ff. and Spiegel's rejoinder, *ibid.*, liv (1935), pp. 144 ff.); C. Kuhl, *Th.L.Z.*, lvii (1932), cols. 27 ff.; W. F. Albright, *J.B.L.*, li (1932), pp. 97 ff. (cf. Torrey's reply, *ibid.*, pp. 179 ff.); W. E. Barnes, *J.T.S.*, xxxv (1934), pp. 163 ff.; J. Battersby Harford, *E.T.*, xliii (1931-2), pp. 20 ff., and *Studies in the Book of Ezekiel* (1935), pp. 38 ff. G. A. Barton, in *The Haverford Symposium on Archaeology and the Bible* (1938), p. 63, says: "The theory is set forth with all of Torrey's ingenuity (and he is very ingenious) and persuasiveness. It is, however, too ingenious. As one reads he is led to doubt that, were the theory true, even Torrey could have detected it!"

Smith.¹ There were important differences between them, however, as well as some similarities.

Torrey held that the work was from the beginning a pseudepigraph, and not the genuine work of Ezekiel. The prophet was thus a literary creation and not a real prophet at all. Torrey maintained that his creator lived in the third century B.C., and wrote the book, in its original form, about 230 B.C.² In this original form the supposed prophet is said to have been given a ministry in Palestine in the days of Manasseh. Somewhat later than 230 B.C. an editor is held to have revised the book and to have removed the prophet to a later age. This editor is thought to have had an anti-Samaritan bias, and chapters xl-xlviii are said to be the plan of a Temple that should surpass the Samaritan Temple on Gerizim. Smith, on the other hand, believed that Ezekiel was a real person, who lived and worked in northern Israel in the time of Manasseh,³ and who wrote the sketch of the restored Temple with a northern sanctuary in mind, but whose work was later revised and whose ministry was transferred by the reviser to a later age. Smith gives great emphasis to the recurring phrase "house of Israel", which is held to point to the north, and thinks that Ezekiel was a northerner who was deported in 734 B.C., but who returned to Palestine in 691 B.C.

L. Dennefeld, *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament* (1935), p. 172, dismisses the views of Hölscher and Torrey as too subjective to merit consideration. O. Eissfeldt, *Palästina-jahrbuch*, xxvii (1931), pp. 58 ff., finds evidence in Ezek. xvi. 26 f. for the reckoning from 597 B.C. in the book of Ezekiel, in an allusion that a later author or editor is unlikely to have made, and uses this evidence against Hölscher and Torrey.

¹ *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel: a New Introduction* (1931). Cf. the criticism of Smith in J. Battersby Harford, *Studies in the Book of Ezekiel*, pp. 31 ff. W. A. L. Elmslie, on the other hand, holds that more respectful attention ought to be paid to Smith's contribution. Cf. *Essays and Studies presented to S. A. Cook* (1950), p. 17.

² Irwin, *op. cit.*, p. 12, notes that Torrey is more radical than Hölscher: "At the worst, Hölscher is by a safe margin of some 170 verses, in whole or in part, less radical than certain other famous critics, for they delete the *entire* Book of Ezekiel; still worse, they delete Ezekiel himself also!"

³ Cf. C. Kuhl, *Th.L.Z.*, lvii (1932), col. 29: "Aus nunmehr über zwanzigjähriger Beschäftigung mit den Hes.-Problemen ist mir je länger je mehr deutlich geworden, dass Hes. kaum Exilsprophet gewesen sein kann . . . , und dass als Zeit seiner Wirksamkeit die Regierung Manasses manches für sich hat."

and there continued to preach.¹ Three oracles are held to have been delivered to the northern exiles,² and the rest to the people in Palestine. These two scholars were therefore primarily concerned with the date of the prophet, either fictitious or real, and with the sphere in which he worked, rather than with the breaking down of the unity of the book. Both, however, detected the hand of a later editor, who had radically transformed the whole book.

Shortly afterwards Hertrich combined the two approaches.³ Like Torrey and Smith he recognized a Palestinian setting for Ezekiel's ministry. Unlike them, however, he did not remove Ezekiel from his ostensible age. The oracles addressed to Jerusalem were held to have been delivered there, and the things represented as seen to have been seen in person on the spot, and not by second sight from a distance, as has often been held.⁴ On the other hand, Hertrich found greater evidence of editorial activity in the book than Torrey and Smith had done, though he denied the prophet far less than Hölscher and Irwin. Hertrich held that a disciple of Ezekiel's, himself living in the period of the Exile, edited his master's work and added much to it. The whole

¹ Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 95 f. hazards the suggestion that Ezekiel may have been "the priest sent back to teach the new settlers the manner of the God of the land".

² *Ibid.*, p. 91 n. The three passages are xx. 32 ff.; xxxvi. 16-32; xxxvii. 11-14.

³ *Ezechielprobleme* (1932). For criticisms of Hertrich, cf. G. A. Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, pp. xxii ff., and C. G. Howie, *The Date and Composition of Ezekiel*, pp. 5 ff. C. C. Torrey, *J.B.L.*, liii (1934), p. 291 n., dismissed Hertrich in a line, saying, "I have been unable to find anything useful, not already known, in Hertrich's *Ezechielprobleme*". In his *Geschichte des israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes*, ii (1932), pp. 34 ff., E. Sellin offered some criticisms of Hertrich's positions before the publication of his book, and to these Hertrich replied in *Ezechielprobleme*, p. 131 ff. J. Lindblom, *Profetismen in Israel* (1934), p. 302, holds Hertrich's view to be mistaken.

⁴ Hertrich is willing to allow the possibility that Ezekiel joined the exiles in Babylonia after 586 B.C., but assigns him no effective ministry there (cf. *Ezechielprobleme*, p. 126). At the opposite extreme was M. Bittenwieser, who assigned the prophet no effective ministry before 586 B.C. He held that chapters i-xxxi are entirely *vaticinia ex eventu*, and maintained on the basis of xxxiii. 21 f. and xxiv. 25 ff., that Ezekiel kept silence until the fall of Jerusalem. Cf. *H.U.C.A.*, vii (1930), pp. 1 ff.

of the section contained in chapters xl-xlvi was attributed to this disciple,¹ as well as not a little in the earlier chapters.

Herntrich's work greatly influenced Oesterley and Robinson² in their treatment of this prophet, though they did not wholly agree with him. They placed the call of the prophet in the reign of Jehoiakim, instead of in that of Zedekiah, and made his work begin even before the first captivity of Judah.³ They held, however, that he was deported to Babylonia with the exiles of

¹ These chapters were all rejected from the original book by Hölscher. They are also rejected by N. H. Snaith, in *A Companion to the Bible*, ed. by T. W. Manson (1939), pp. 423 f. The first scholar to challenge the originality of these chapters was G. L. Oeder, whose *Freie Untersuchung über einige Bücher des Alten Testaments* (written 1756) was posthumously published by G. J. L. Vogel in 1771. Cf. pp. 341 ff. Oeder cited the obscure tradition in Josephus, *Antiq.* X, v. 1 (x. 79), that Ezekiel left two books behind (pp. 347 ff.) This has been frequently referred to by later writers who have propounded divisive theories. R. Marcus, *Josephus* (Loeb edn.), vi (1937), p. 201 n., says Josephus probably thought of the book of Ezekiel as composed of two parts of twenty-four chapters each. An anonymous writer in the *Monthly Magazine and British Register*, v (1798), pp. 189 f., distinguished between the author of Ezek. i-xxiv and the author of xxv-xxxii, perhaps xxxv, and xxxviii f., and suggested that the latter group of chapters, together with much of the book of Isaiah (cf. *Monthly Review*, enlarged series, xxiii (1797), pp. 491 f.) and Jer. xlvi-li, were the work of Daniel, who was "a sort of poet laureat" to Nebuchadrezzar, but not the author of the book of Daniel (which is ascribed to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes). (I have not been able to secure access to Oeder's book in this country, and I learn that even in Halle, where it was published, no copy is found in the University Library. Professor O. Eissfeldt of Halle has, however, secured access to a copy and generously supplied me with references to this work. Nowhere is Oeder specified by name in the volume as the author, the title page merely stating that it is by the "Verfasser der christlich freyen Untersuchung über die so genannte Offenbarung Johannis", but L. Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche* (1869), p. 604 n., names Oeder as the author and states that it was written in 1756. This reference, too, I owe to Professor Eissfeldt. The translator of the *Christlich Freie Untersuchung . . . Johannis* into English, A. G. Moller, had already in 1852 stated in his Preface that Oeder was the author of this work). [Since the foregoing note was written a microfilm of Oeder's book has been obtained for the Manchester University Library.]

² *Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament* (1934), pp. 318 ff., esp. pp. 328 ff. T. H. Robinson had earlier held that Ezekiel had actually "edited" the present book, and had treated the whole as the genuine work of the prophet. Cf. *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel* (1923), p. 145.

³ The call of Ezekiel is placed soon after Jehoiakim's revolt in 602 B.C. (*Introduction*, p. 328). Cf. Irwin, *The Problem of Ezekiel*, p. 323, where the call of Ezekiel is placed either shortly before the events of 600 B.C. or shortly after.

597 B.C., and thereafter continued his work there. A double ministry is therefore postulated. Reflecting Hertrich's influence even more closely was a monograph by Battersby Harford, in which recent work was critically examined.¹

Next came Bertholet's commentary on Ezekiel.² At the end of last century he had published a commentary on Ezekiel,³ and it is instructive to compare with this his second commentary,⁴ published a few years after Hertrich's book had appeared. This was clearly influenced by Hertrich, though Bertholet by no means wholly followed him. Like Oesterley and Robinson Bertholet ascribed to the prophet a double ministry, but placed his call later than they did.⁵ Accepting the date given for his call in the book of Ezekiel, he held that Ezekiel prophesied in Palestine from 593 B.C. to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, when he was carried into captivity with the second company of exiles.⁶ Bertholet found evidence of two separate calls of Ezekiel combined in chapters i-iii,⁷ and argued that the second of these inaugurated the Palestinian ministry and the first the Babylonian. Like Hertrich, Bertholet attributed the compilation of the book to a later editor, who interpolated the work and who transferred the prophet's ministry wholly to Babylonia.

¹ *Studies in the Book of Ezekiel* (1935).

² *Hesekiel* (in Eissfeldt's *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*) (1936). In this K. Galling wrote the portion dealing with xl. l-xlii. 20 and xliii. 10-17, and the introduction to these chapters (pp. xix ff.). Cf. the appreciative review by M.-L. Dumeste, *R.B.*, xlvi (1937), pp. 430 ff., and the critical review by P. Heinisch, *Theologische Revue*, xxxvi (1937), cols. 220 ff. Cf. Torrey's comments on Bertholet's method, *J.B.L.*, lviii (1939), pp. 79 ff. G. A. Barton, in *The Haverford Symposium*, pp. 65 f., says: "At the moment the problem of Ezekiel is the most difficult and thorny in the whole Old Testament, but the theory of Bertholet seems to promise a sane solution."

³ *Das Buch Hesekiel* (in Marti's *Kurzer Hand-Commentar*), 1897.

⁴ Bertholet himself says: "Fast darf ich sagen, es sei vom früheren kein Stein auf dem andern stehen geblieben" (1936 commentary, p. v). For a comparison between the two commentaries, cf. S. Spiegel, *J.B.L.*, lvi (1937), pp. 403 ff., and for a long and careful review of the second, cf. M.-L. Dumeste *R.B.*, xlvi (1937), pp. 430 ff.

⁵ Cf. also Bertholet's paper "Hesekielprobleme", in *Mélanges Franz Cumont* ii (1936), pp. 517 ff.

⁶ R. H. Pfeiffer substantially follows this view. Cf. *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1941), pp. 536, 539 f.

⁷ Found in i. 4-ii. 2 and ii. 3-iii. 9.

The work of the editor was reduced to somewhat smaller proportions, however, and a substantial part of chapters xl-xlviii was left to the prophet.¹

On G. A. Cooke² the views of Hertrich left less mark, and he stood nearer to the older positions than did Bertholet. Nevertheless he was not entirely uninfluenced by recent study. He rejected the transfer of Ezekiel's ministry to Palestine, and held that the prophet worked only in Babylonia. He preferred to seek along psychological lines the explanation of the strange phenomena recorded in the text, and clung to the view of the substantial unity of the whole book. At the same time he recognized a larger number of secondary expansions than the older scholars had done at the beginning of the century, and marked a number of sections in the concluding chapters as such expansions.³

I. G. Matthews,⁴ who worked largely independently,⁵ reached results more akin to those of Hertrich, though not in full

¹ Dumeste ended his review, loc. cit., p. 436, by saying: "Nous sommes en face d'un très beau livre, qui sans se perdre en dissertations érudites sur tel ou tel point d'histoire ou d'archéologie, dit tout ce qu'on désire savoir sur le prophète Ézéchiél. De toutes façons, autant par la pondération des jugements que par la proportion harmonieuse des parties, c'est un ouvrage équilibré."

² *The Book of Ezekiel* (I.C.C.), 1936. Cf. the long review by P. Benoit, *R.B.*, xlvii (1938), pp. 597 ff. E. Bruston, *La Bible du Centenaire*, ii (1947), pp. xxv ff., adheres more closely to the traditional view of the book than does Cooke.

³ Writers who keep even closer to the older positions than Cooke have recognized additional matter in chapters xl-xlviii. So, e.g., P. Heinisch, *Das Buch Ezechiel* (1923), p. 227: "Manche Stücke aber sind von einem (oder mehreren) Redaktoren eingeschoben worden. Der anteil des Propheten und des Redaktors ist nicht immer zu scheiden." Cf. also W. L. Wardle, *The Abingdon Bible Commentary* (1929), p. 715b.

⁴ *Ezekiel* (An American Commentary on the Old Testament) (1939). Cf. also the same author's *Religious Pilgrimage of Israel* (1947), pp. 166 f. On p. 166 n. he says that since he published his commentary "an important contribution has been made by W. A. Irwin, *The Problem of Ezekiel*, in which the critical studies have been carried to a new conclusion". From this it would appear that he was prepared to modify his views in the direction of Irwin's. In the text above on the same page he observes: "Only a small part of the present book of Ezekiel seems to have come directly from the poet-prophet himself."

⁵ Cf. Irwin, op. cit., p. 28 n., where Matthews's authority is given for the statement that much of his work was done before the appearance of Hölischer's book, and that it was then reworked before the appearance of Hertrich's. "My results", says Matthews, "corresponded in a large measure with Hertrich. My final re-working was scarcely influenced by him."

agreement with him. He holds that the ministry of Ezekiel was wholly Palestinian, and that his work was edited in the period of the exile by a Babylonian editor, who compiled the section contained in chapters xl-xlvi from two separate sources. He also finds evidence of a third principal hand, of the apocalyptic school.¹ Throughout the book he found much secondary material, and though he does not carry this to the lengths of Irwin and Hölscher, he is hailed by Irwin as being on the right lines.²

A few other writers have reflected more closely the views of Bertholet. In a posthumous work Wheeler Robinson confessed³ that he had been slowly driven to accept the view that Ezekiel worked first in Palestine and then in Babylonia,⁴ and that two originally separate accounts of his call have been combined. Of these one belongs to the Palestinian ministry and the other to the Babylonian. Similarly van den Born⁵ and Auvray⁶

¹ Matthews says (p. xxx): "Ezekiel was a mystic, cultivating the inner light; his disciple was a priest, believing in sacramental grace; and the apocalypticist, failing to find God in history, turned expectantly to the age that was to be and put all his hope in the wonder-working God."

² Op. cit., p. 28. J. P. Hyatt, *Prophetic Religion* (1947), p. 28, declares Matthews right in principle, though he is not convinced that his interpretation is final.

³ Cf. *Two Hebrew Prophets* (1948), pp. 75, 81 ff. In his earlier work, *The Old Testament, its Making and Meaning* (1937), pp. 104 ff., he followed the view which had so long been normal. Cf. p. 107: "No other prophet is so consecutive in the arrangement of his book, whether this be due to Ezekiel himself or to his editors. The only part in which it is necessary to suppose that there have been considerable alterations or additions is the last nine chapters, which outline the restored Jewish temple and city"; p. 108: "None of the divisions as yet suggested, whether based on time or on place, has won general assent."

⁴ So also J. Delorme, in *Mémorial J. Chaine* (1950), pp. 115 ff.

⁵ *De historische situatie van Ezechiels Prophetie* (1947). Cf. also the same writer's *Profetie Metterdaad* (1947), pp. 61 ff., where a number of passages from Ezekiel are discussed; also *Schweizerische Kirchenzeitung*, cxiv (1946), pp. 210 ff., 220 ff., where his view was first outlined in an article which began with a review of major works on Ezekiel from Herrmann to Bertholet. To the author's kindness I am indebted for access to this article. In a private letter he states that he no longer believes that the hypothesis of a Jerusalemite-Babylonian Ezekiel will stand.

⁶ *Ézéchiel* (Témoins de Dieu) (1947), and *Ézéchiel* (La Sainte Bible de Jérusalem) (1949). Auvray regards Ezekiel as a fine poet who normally wrote in diffuse prose, but holds that the additions of copyists have made this yet more

accepted these views. They differed in that Auvray transferred the call recorded in chapter i to follow chapter xxxiii, which he held to close the account of the Palestinian ministry, whereas van den Born placed it after chapter xxxii, and made the Babylonian ministry begin with chapter xxxiii.

Here, too, belongs the unpublished work of O. R. Fischer,¹ of which Pfeiffer gives some account.² Fischer holds that Ezekiel was taken to Babylonia with the exiles of 597 B.C., and received his call there, but returned to Jerusalem to exercise his ministry there until the fall of the city. He then declined the Babylonian permission to remain in the west, but returned to Babylonia to carry to the exiles a message of encouragement.

To the problem of Ezekiel W. H. Brownlee devoted two unpublished dissertations.³ In the first⁴ he claimed to find evidence of several successive hands, and held that the book had been edited and re-edited a number of times, the final editor being a priest. Too late to be employed in this thesis he claims to have discovered that this priestly editor worked with a secret code, which Brownlee proceeded to break in a second thesis.⁵ Leaving this claim aside, we may note that in the earlier thesis he declared

diffuse (cf. the 1947 work, pp. 138 ff.). In rejecting the view adopted by Auvray, E. Power says: "The view . . . that Ezechiel's residence in Babylonia before Jerusalem's fall is the invention of a redactor and that his threats of punishment . . . were addressed to the Israelites in Palestine, is based on a misunderstanding of the prophet's mission and character. . . . His mission was to convert the exiles on whom all hopes of a restoration were based and who had to be disabused of their errors and convinced of God's justice and holiness before they could become the objects of his mercy and the recipients of his favours" (*A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scriptures* (1953), p. 603a).

¹ *The Unity of the Book of Ezekiel* (1939). This work I have not seen.

² Cf. *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1941), p. 531.

³ By the kindness of Professor Brownlee these two theses were loaned to me through the Duke University Librarian. Brownlee has published a sample of his method in *J.B.L.*, lxxix (1950), pp. 367 ff.

⁴ *Major Critical Problems in the Book of Ezekiel* (1946). This thesis was submitted to the Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary for the degree of Master of Theology.

⁵ *The Book of Ezekiel: the Original Prophet and the Editors* (1947). This thesis was submitted to Duke University, Durham, N.C., for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

that "every major critical theory with regard to the Book of Ezekiel has its elements of truth". With Hölscher and Irwin he held that Ezekiel was primarily a poet; with Torrey that the book was revised as a piece of anti-Samaritan propaganda; but against Torrey that Ezekiel was a historical character; in agreement with Hertrich that his ministry was exercised wholly in Palestine.

More recently another American dissertation has been devoted to our book. This time the study has been published, and it is notable because it returns more closely to the positions that prevailed at the beginning of the century than any of the views at which we have looked. While finding some secondary elements in the book, the author of this dissertation, C. G. Howie,¹ finds that by and large the book of Ezekiel is the work of a prophet who prophesied wholly in Babylonia in the years to which his work is attributed in the text which has come down to us. Quite independently, and without any knowledge of Howie's work, C. J. Mullo Weir reached a similar conclusion.²

Finally we may turn to note some further views, which, after the manner of Torrey, bring the prophet down to a post-exilic date. In a long series of articles, running back many years before Torrey published the book defending his thesis, but not before Torrey had indicated the nature of his view,³ Berry argued⁴

¹ *The Date and Composition of Ezekiel* (1950). Cf. also *B.A.S.O.R.*, no. 117, (February, 1950), pp. 13 ff. Irwin's scathing review of Howie appeared in *J.N.E.S.*, xi (1952), pp. 219 ff. Cf. also C. Kuhl's criticisms, *Th.Z.*, viii (1952), pp. 405 f.

² This view was presented in a paper read to the Society for Old Testament Study and subsequently published in *Vetus Testamentum*. In the discussion that followed the writer drew Professor Mullo Weir's attention to the recent publication of Howie's book, so that references to it were embodied in the published form of the paper. Cf. "Aspects of the Book of Ezekiel", *V.T.*, ii (1952), pp. 97 ff. Cf. also C. Kuhl, *Th.Z.*, viii (1952), pp. 407 ff., for criticisms of Mullo Weir's positions.

³ Cf. *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy*, xv (1909), p. 248, and *Ezra Studies* (1911), p. 288 n. Cf. also *Vom Alten Testament* (Marti Festschrift, B.Z.A.W., no. 41) (1925), pp. 284 f., where the prophecy against Tyre was discussed.

⁴ Cf. *J.B.L.*, xxxiv (1915), pp. 17 ff. (arguing that Ezek. xl-xlvi come from two late authors, xl. 1-xliii. 17 dating from 320 B.C. most likely, or possibly

that our book is a late post-exilic production.¹ Similarly Torrey's pupil, Millar Burrows,² in a published dissertation, placed the composition of Ezekiel probably in the late pre-Maccabaeen period,³ between the date of the composition of the Aramaic part of Daniel and that of the Hebrew part, on Torrey's

from 165 B.C., and xliii. 18-xlvi. 35 dating from after 300 B.C.); xl (1921), pp. 70 ff. (arguing that xlv. 1-8a and xlvii. 13-xlvi. 35 are Maccabaeen), xli (1922), pp. 224 ff. (arguing that xxxviii. 1-xxxix. 20 come from the Maccabaeen age and that Gog is Antiochus Eupator), xlix (1930), pp. 83 ff. (arguing that much besides xl-xlvi is late, but retracting his earlier view and declaring that no part of the book can be so late as the Maccabaeen period, and maintaining that the ministry of Ezekiel fell between 579 and 586 B.C. and was exercised in Jerusalem.) In *A.J.S.L.*, xliii (1926-27), pp. 231 ff., J. E. Dean criticizes one of Berry's criteria, on the basis of the LXX and Vulgate. M. Vernes, *Précis d'Histoire juive* (1889), p. 811, attributed the composition of Ezekiel to the third century B.C., while L. Seinecke, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, ii (1884), pp. 1 ff., regarded the whole book as a pseudepigraph coming from Maccabaeen times. E. Havet came down yet later and held that chapters xl-xlvi were a plan for the rebuilding of the Temple by Herod, while Gog's hosts were the Parthians. Cf. *Revue des deux Mondes*, xciv (1889), p. 824. Kuenen, in criticizing the views of Seinecke, said: "Über wirkliche Pseudepigrapha wird uns ein überraschendes Licht aufgehen, wenn erst die Zeit ihres Entstehens entdeckt sein wird; das Buch *Ezechiel* dagegen zeigt sich uns als ein zweckloses und dunkles Produkt, wenn wir es aus Babylonien und der exilischen Zeit nach Judäa und in ein späteres Jahrhundert verlegen" (*Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des Alten Testaments*, German trans. by C. Th. Müller, ii (1892), p. 305).

¹ More recently Berry has modified his views still further. Cf. *J.B.L.*, lviii (1939), pp. 163 ff., where he argues that Torrey's view is too extreme, though he agrees with him that much in the book of Ezekiel is late. He still places the genuine Ezekiel in Jerusalem between 597 and 586 B.C., and holds that he was transferred to Babylonia by revisers in the third century B.C., who wrote all, or nearly all, of chapters xl-xlvi.

² *The Literary Relations of Ezekiel* (1925). S. Spiegel, *H.T.R.*, xxiv (1931), pp. 310 f., praises this book for its restraint in making definite claims. For a criticism of Burrows cf. C. Kuhl, *Th.L.Z.*, liii (1928), cols. 121 f. For a very different literary study cf. H. Haag, *Was lehrt die literarische Untersuchung des Ezechiel-Textes?* (1943) (reviewed at length by A. Robert, *R.B.*, liii (1946), pp. 135 ff.).

³ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 105: "Thus my study of the literary relations of Ez has brought me—somewhat, I confess, to my surprise—to the conclusion that the view of Ez as a product of the late pre-Maccabaeen period is not only possible but very probable." The element of caution in this conclusion is to be noted. Burrows concludes: "If I am not yet entirely convinced that this is the correct view of the origin of Ez, it is only because a final decision must take account of considerations which I have, on principle, kept out of sight during this investigation."

dating of these compositions.¹ This result therefore was in very close agreement with the view which Torrey holds.²

In a series of articles published during and immediately after the first World War, W. Erbt argued³ that the book of Ezekiel was written in the early post-exilic period, between 535 and 523 B.C. Coming down later than Erbt, but not so late as Torrey and his American disciples, Nils Messel⁴ places the ministry of the prophet at about 400 B.C. Messel's work was prepared apparently without knowledge of Torrey's work, and he does not make the book a pseudepigraph. He argues that the exiles are the returned exiles, whose purer worship is contrasted with that of those whose fathers had not left Palestine. The book is held to have been much glossed, and an analysis of the whole, in which the glosses are distinguished, is offered.⁵

¹ Torrey dates Dan. i-vi c. 246 B.C., and vii-xii in the Maccabean period, and believes the author of the second half wrote the beginning of his own work in Aramaic and translated the beginning of the earlier work into Hebrew to dovetail the two parts together. Cf. *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy*, xv (1909), pp. 241 ff.

² Cf. also G. Dahl, in *Quantulacumque* (Kirsopp Lake Festschrift) (1937), pp. 265 ff., where a similar view is propounded. Dahl, like Torrey, maintains the substantial unity of the book; but dismisses the dates as unoriginal, and holds that the work is a late pseudepigraph, composed after 240 B.C., purporting to be the work of a prophet who lived in Jerusalem in Manasseh's reign.

³ Cf. *O.L.Z.*, xx (1917), cols. 33 ff., 161 ff., 193 ff., 270 ff., 298 ff.; xxi (1918), cols. 6 ff., 33 ff.; xxii (1919), cols. 193 ff., 241 ff. With this view may be compared that of L. Zunz, who assigned the book to the early Persian period (cf. *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (1832), pp. 157 ff.), and who was followed by A. Geiger (cf. *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel* (1857), p. 23). Zunz later revised his view and transferred Ezekiel to the period 440-400 B.C. (cf. *Z.D.M.G.*, xxvii (1873), pp. 676 ff.). He was answered by H. Graetz, *M.G.W.J.*, xxiii (1874), pp. 433 ff., 515 ff. S. Davidson, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, iii (1863), p. 150, says: "The criticism of Zunz in relation to Ezekiel is superficial and reckless, unworthy of so acute a scholar." H. Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, III. Reihe, i (1902), pp. 135 ff., also placed the book in the early post-exilic period, with the exception of the Gog passages (on which see below), while O. Procksch, *Z.A.W.*, N.F. xvii (1940-1), pp. 99 ff., would place in the period 537-520 B.C. the priestly additions to the book.

⁴ *Ezechielfragen* (1945). Cf. also Messel's commentary on Ezekiel in Mowinckel and Messel, *De senere Profeter* (1944), pp. 464 ff.

⁵ For reviews of Messel's book, cf. A. van den Born, *Bi.Or.*, iv. (1947), pp. 10 ff.; J. J. Stamm, *Th.Z.*, iii (1947), pp. 304 ff.; A. S. Kapelrud, *S.E.A.*, xiii (1948), pp. 88 ff.; D. M. G. Stalker, *J.T.S.*, xlix (1948), pp. 83 ff.

Lastly, L. E. Browne has quite recently propounded¹ a view different from all those so far surveyed, though it owes much to several of them. He holds that Ezekiel lived in the time of Alexander and himself deliberately gave a false air to his book to deceive the authorities. He thinks that Ezekiel was amongst a group of people who were deported from Jerusalem to Hyrcania in the year 344-343 B.C., and that it was from this exile rather than from the exile of Jehoiachin that his dates, with the exception of three,² were reckoned. These three are held to have been reckoned from the accession of Artaxerxes III, who was long dead by this time. Browne considerably rearranges the book, and holds that chapters xl-xlviii were originally designed to be the plan of a Temple for north and south, to be located in the centre of the land. He finds no reason to question the substantial unity of the book.

From this incomplete survey it is clear that the flood-gates of criticism have been opened on the book of Ezekiel in our time, and scholars are making up for the critical gentleness shown to it by earlier generations of scholars. The debate is still far from ended,³ and is likely to continue for a long time. Scarcely any two of the writers whose work we have noted agree in their conclusions, and the measure of disagreement is often very considerable. They differ as to the amount of the book which is to be denied to Ezekiel, but there is a general recognition that there are more secondary elements than older scholars were disposed to find. While the majority of the recent writers leave the prophet in the sixth century B.C., those who loose him from that age disagree to no small extent in the period in which they locate him—or his creator in the case of the pseudepigraphical view. On the question of the scene of the prophet's ministry the division of opinion is more even. The view of an exclusively

¹ In a paper read to the Society for Old Testament Study on 31 December 1952, and published at the same time under the title *Ezekiel and Alexander*.

² Ezek. i. 1, xxix. 17, xl. 1.

³ Cf. J. Meinhold, *Einführung in das Alte Testament*, 3rd edn. (1932), p. 272: "Es ist hier also alles noch stark im Fluss"; cf. also *Bibel-Lexikon*, ed. by H. Haag, III. Lieferung (1952), col. 467: "Man kann daher ruhig sagen, dass die kritische Untersuchung Ez's noch kaum angefangen hat."

Palestinian ministry and the traditional view of an exclusively Babylonian ministry are matched by the view of a double ministry, and this last view seems to be gaining in support. To examine all of these views is clearly impossible here, and I must confine myself to some general observations and to the indication of where I stand amongst this maze of opinions. It is with diffidence that I offer an opinion on so highly debatable a question; yet if I failed to do so it might appear that discretion was the better part of valour.

We cannot approach the book with the simple *assumption* that it is a unity.¹ Few scholars can be found to maintain that the whole of the book of Isaiah is to be attributed to the eighth century prophet of that name. Secondary elements are found in the book of Jeremiah, though with the exception of Duhm² few have dealt so radically with that book as some would now deal with Ezekiel. In the collection of the Minor Prophets—which should not be thought of as twelve separate books but as a single collection of oracles of a number of prophets, each section of which has its own heading—it is common to find a number of intrusive oracles or sections which do not represent the work of the prophets under whose names they are given. It should perhaps be added that there is far greater caution in rejecting passages as inauthentic than there was formerly, but any idea that the literary criticism of these books is in danger of being abandoned would be quite misleading. There is therefore no *a priori* objection to the finding of secondary passages in the book of Ezekiel. Indeed, if we start with any presumption it should be in favour of the finding of such elements.

There is a general similarity about the structure of the three books Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel that is worth noting. The first part of Isaiah is similar to Jeremiah in that the oracles do not seem to be chronologically arranged, and the collection ends

¹ Cf. G. A. Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, p. v: "It is no longer possible to treat the Book as the product of a single mind and a single age."

² Cf. *Das Buch Jeremia* (Marti's Kurzer Hand-Commentar) (1901), where Duhm argued that apart from the letter to the exiles in Jer. xxix the only genuine words of the prophet which have come down to us are in poetry. About 270 verses in poetry are then left to Jeremiah.

with an extract from the book of Kings, while the oracles on foreign nations are collected together in one section. In the book of Ezekiel the foreign oracles are again collected together,¹ but here there is no extract from the book of Kings, because no comparably relevant extract could be found there. In Ezekiel, however, the oracles appear to be given a more chronological arrangement, and this is a feature Ezekiel does not share with the other two books. To First Isaiah there has been appended another collection of oracles without any indication of their age and authorship save such as can be gleaned from their contents.² The book of Ezekiel ends with nine chapters of description of the future Temple and its service in the restored Israel,³ that is once more quite unlike the earlier part of this book. All this would suggest that the plan of compilation of these books is substantially one, with such modifications as the varying material used by the compiler imposed upon him. His materials were much older, and in large part come from the prophets under whose name he presents them. But since, if these three collections were made by one compiler or by a single circle of compilers, we should unquestionably be brought down to the post-exilic age for their compilation, there would be nothing surprising in some non-Ezekielian elements finding their place in this book.

For the collection of the Minor Prophets we are also brought down to the post-exilic age, since the writings of post-exilic prophets are here included. The method of compilation was here modified because of the very different nature of the material. It is, however, probable that all these four prophetic collections, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and The Twelve, were made in the same age, probably in the fifth or fourth century B.C. It must be emphasized that this does not mean that the contents of the books are not in general genuine utterances of the prophets whose names they bear. The date of the compilation of a book must be

¹ Ezek. xxv-xxxii.

² This collection is commonly divided into Deutero-Isaiah, chapters xl-lv, and Trito-Isaiah, chapters lvi-lxvi, but Trito-Isaiah is most often attributed to a disciple or disciples of Deutero-Isaiah.

³ Ezek. xl-xlvi.

clearly distinguished from the date of the materials it contains, and, with the exception of the latter part of the book of Isaiah and the latter part of Zechariah, most may be recognized to be the authentic oracles of the prophets to whom they are ascribed.

While, then, there is no initial reason against the inclusion of secondary elements, it must be said that it is hard to accept the view that they are to be found in Ezekiel in large quantities. The impression of a single personality which the book makes is unquestionably strong.¹ The Old Testament panel engaged in preparing the new translation of the Bible has recently been working on the book of Ezekiel, and again and again members of the panel have commented on the evidences of a single mind which the work reveals.² That the editor who compiled the work contributed something to it is indeed probable, but to judge from the other prophetic books there is reason to suppose that he composed very little. He incorporated from more than one source, but he does not seem frequently to have added his own comments. There is nothing in any of the other books comparable with the sustained glossing and misinterpreting which Irwin finds in Ezekiel. Nor is there anything comparable with the editorial transfer of a prophet from one age to another or from one country to another which some have found here. It is true that to the work of Isaiah and Zechariah concluding chapters have been added which are generally held to be the work of other hands. Yet even here we do not have any real parallel to the view that the last nine chapters of Ezekiel are not authentic. In the case of the latter half of Isaiah and Zechariah, the background revealed in the chapters is different from the background of Isaiah's and Zechariah's times; but in the case of the chapters of Ezekiel

¹ Cf. C. C. Torrey, *J.B.L.*, lviii (1939), p. 77: "If any close attention is paid to peculiarities of style, language, religious conceptions, and the stage in the development of Jewish literature which is indicated, there is gained an overwhelming impression of an individuality which is the same throughout the book." Cf. also C. Kuhl, *Die literarische Einheit des Buches Ezechiel* (1917). I have to thank the author's courtesy for the loan of this.

² Cf. G. Dahl, in *Quantulacumque*, p. 267: "Too little weight has been given by recent research to the important fact that, up to at least the turn of the century, the practically unanimous verdict of the most competent scholars was that the book is clearly the product of a single mind."

we do not find this, and there is no consensus of opinion, comparable to that in the case of these other books and resting upon compelling grounds, which requires us to locate them in another age than Ezekiel's.¹

That the compiler drew his material from more than one source is very probable. It will be remembered that Jeremiah himself prepared a collection of his own oracles in the reign of Jehoiakim,² and it is likely that this was one of the sources drawn on by the compiler of the book of Jeremiah. Yet it was not the only source. There is some autobiographical material embodying oracles, and some biographical material embodying oracles, relating in the third person the setting of the prophecies. Besides these, we find oracles without any indication of their setting at all.³ The incident in the Temple recorded in chapter vii seems to be the same as that recorded in chapter xxvi, and it is probable that the compiler drew from two separate sources. Similarly the chapters of the book of Hosea relating to the prophet's marriage appear to be drawn from two sources,⁴ one standing in the first person and one in the third. A perennial subject of discussion amongst scholars is as to whether these chapters provide parallel accounts, or whether one relates the sequel to the other. In all these cases there is no reason to doubt that the various sources employed relate to the prophets concerned. Some may have been written down in the time of the prophet, and some may have been preserved orally and then written down after his time. But all are genuine oracles and experiences of the prophets in question. There is therefore no reason whatever why there may not have been in existence by the time the book of Ezekiel was compiled more than one source dealing with the work of Ezekiel, from which the compiler made

¹ G. Dahl, loc. cit., pp. 268 f., underlines the contrast between the evidence for the composite character of the Pentateuch and the evidence provided for the book of Ezekiel.

² Jer. xxxvi. 32.

³ Cf. S. Mowinckel, *Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia* (1914), pp. 17 ff., and *Prophecy and Tradition* (1946), pp. 21 ff., 61 ff.; Oesterley and Robinson, *Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament* (1934), pp. 224 ff.; O. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1934), pp. 161 ff.; A. Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 2nd edn., i (1952), pp. 256 ff.

⁴ Hos. i and iii.

extracts.¹ Views along these lines were proposed at the turn of the century by Kraetzschmar,² and in a revised form by Herrmann³ in his commentary on Ezekiel, published in 1924. But the book of Ezekiel is in general so much of a single stamp that

¹ G. Widengren, *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets* (1948), pp. 74 ff., notes some evidence contained in the book of Ezekiel which points to the fact that the prophet himself wrote down some of his prophecies. Widengren's book was in part designed to modify the emphasis on oral tradition which had been developed by Scandinavian scholars, and especially by I. Engnell, who built on the work of H. S. Nyberg (*Studien zum Hoseabuche*, 1935) and H. Birkeland (*Zum hebräischen Traditionswesen*, 1938). Cf. Engnell's *Gamla Testamentet*, i (1945), *The Call of Isaiah* (1949), and articles in *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk* (1948-52), especially that on "Traditionshistorisk metod", in vol. ii (1952), cols. 1429 ff. S. Mowinkel, *Prophecy and Tradition* (1946), had earlier sought to modify this emphasis. Cf. O. Eissfeldt, *Th.L.Z.*, lxxiii (1948), cols. 529 ff. In *The Call of Isaiah*, pp. 55 ff., Engnell offers some reply to Widengren's criticisms.

² *Das Buch Ezechiel* (Nowack's Handkommentar) (1900). Kraetzschmar thought that the present book was based on two sources, one written in the first person and one in the third. K. Budde, while rejecting some features of Kraetzschmar's view, agreed with it in substance. Cf. *Geschichte der althebräischen Litteratur*, 2nd edn. (1909), p. 156. C. Cornill, *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament*, English trans. by G. H. Box (1907), pp. 316 f., observed that Kraetzschmar's two-source theory did not seem to have a sufficiently wide basis of fact, though he recognized the presence of superfluous doublets. Similarly Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, English trans. by W. Montgomery (1923), p. 155, objects that in point of fact the third person is only once used of Ezekiel. Kraetzschmar's view can scarcely stand, therefore, in the precise form in which he presented it. Cf. L. Dennefeld, *La Sainte Bible*, vii, p. 464.

³ *Ezechiel* (Sellin's Kommentar) (1924). Cf. also the same writer's *Ezechielstudien* (Kittel's B.W.A.T.) (1908). Herrmann thought the prophet himself compiled the book on the basis of various notes which he had from time to time gathered together. By this means he explained the duplicates to be found in the book, rather than by Kraetzschmar's two recension theory. At the same time Herrmann recognized the activity of later hands in expanding the text. Cf. also H. Schmidt, *Die grossen Propheten* (S.A.T. II, ii), 2nd edn. (1923), pp. 472 f., and J. Hempel, *Die althebräische Litteratur* (1930), pp. 167 ff. Hempel believes that Ezekiel's oracles were transmitted orally and several collections were made before the book of Ezekiel was compiled from them. Of the value and importance of Herrmann's book there can be no doubt, and Cooke was much influenced by it. J. E. McFadyen, *E.T.*, xxxv (1923-4), p. 457 f., hails it as the work of a master, which represents the fruits of a profound and exhaustive study. It seems very doubtful if Ezekiel should himself be given so much place as compiler as Herrmann gives him, but the doublets may in part be explained by the variety of sources used by a post-exilic compiler. Many of the repetitions that abound in the book

it does not seem probable that much material from quite alien sources,¹ that do not go back at all to the work of the prophet, have been incorporated.²

Chapter xxvii, the chapter which deals with the ship Tyre,³ has frequently been analysed into separate components in poetry and prose, ascribed to different authors.⁴ Sometimes the whole has been assigned to a date later than the exilic age in which Ezekiel is represented as living. Julian Morgenstern believes that it refers to the events of 480 B.C.⁵ while L. E. Browne holds that it deals with Alexander's conquest of Tyre in the fourth century B.C.⁶ In a brilliant unpublished paper read recently to the Society for Old Testament Study, on the same day as L. E.

may, however, be due to copyists. Cf. M.-L. Dumeste, *R.B.*, xlvi (1937), p. 431 : "On ne saurait nier, en effet, la présence dans le texte d'éléments adventices que la critique peut délimiter avec plus ou moins de certitude. Ils se présentent tantôt sous forme de gloses, suspectes soit par leur caractère de doublets, d'amplifications explicatives, presque toujours signalées comme telles par la différence des deux recensions hébraïque et grecque."

¹ E. Bruston, *La Bible du Centenaire*, ii (1947), p. xxvii b, lists the following passages whose authenticity seems to him improbable: iii. 16b-21; v. 3 f.; vii. 19; x. 1, 4 f., 8-17, 20-2; xi. 11 f.; xvi. 45 b; perhaps xxvi. 19-21; xxx. 3; perhaps xlv. 26 f. G. Fohrer, *Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel* (1952), pp. 99 f., gives a much longer list of rejected passages.

² Cf. A. Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 2nd edn., ii (1952), p. 126: "The solution of the problems is to be sought along the same lines as in the case of Jeremiah. We have a complex of poetical words by the prophet-master Ezekiel, transmitted orally and at length fixed in writing. But alongside this we have . . . complexes of prose sermons, probably also based on words of the prophet, but transformed under the influence of disciples, and perhaps already in oral, but perhaps also in written form, joined to the collection of poems."

³ Cf. W. H. Schoff, *The Ship "Tyre"* (1920), p. 47. He would equate Tyre with Babylon, but J. M. Powis Smith observes that this founders on the statement that its destruction is to come at the hands of Nebuchadrezzar (cf. *J.R.*, i (1921), pp. 322 f.). Cf. L. Finkelstein, *The Pharisees*, i (1938), pp. 335 ff., where also it is argued that Tyre stands for Babylon, and the prophet by this subtle device pours forth his anger against Babylonia, while appearing to pour it on her rebellious subjects.

⁴ Cf. A. Bertholet, *Hesekiel* (1936), pp. 94 ff. On the reasons which led Ezekiel to devote so much space to Tyre, cf. W. E. Barnes, *J.T.S.*, xxv (1934), pp. 50 ff. Cf. also C. Mackay, *C.Q.R.*, cxvii (1933-4), pp. 239 ff.

⁵ Cf. *H.U.C.A.*, xvi (1941), pp. 10 ff.

⁶ Cf. *Ezekiel and Alexander*, pp. 4 f. L. Zunz, *Z.D.M.G.*, xxvii (1873), p. 678, earlier assigned the author of the Tyre oracles to the period of Alexander. Cf. also C. C. Torrey, in *Vom Alten Testament* (Marti Festschrift) (1925),

Browne's paper, Sidney Smith has examined this chapter in minute detail, and has shown that it can with perfect appropriateness be interpreted of Nebuchadrezzar's siege of Tyre in the sixth century, and that the whole chapter is a unity dealing with that event, the parts of which are necessary to the understanding of the whole.

Again we must beware of making into a canon the assumption that Ezekiel could only write poetry. It may be agreed that to Hölscher we owe the appreciation of Ezekiel as no mean poet.¹ S. R. Driver had labelled him "the most uniformly prosaic of the earlier prophets",² while J. A. Bewer had declared that "he was prosaic even when he wrote poetry".³ But Rudolf Kittel, though he rejected the views of Hölscher in general,⁴ was so convinced that Hölscher had rescued Ezekiel as a poet that he accepted two of Hölscher's reconstructed oracles and declared that they were the work of a true poet and amongst

pp. 284 f. Further, O. Eissfeldt, *Palästina-jahrbuch*, xxvii, 1931, p. 65 n., cites a letter written by Nöldeke a month before his death to Littmann in 1930: "Dass Alexander d. Gr. unter dem Namen Nebukadnezar's, der Tyrus belagert, im Ezechiel vorkommt, weiss ich längst." (Nöldeke's letter was published by E. Littmann, in *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Geschäftliche Mitteilungen aus dem Berichtsjahr 1930-1 (1931), p. 57, as an appendix to an obituary address.) H. Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, II. Reihe (1901), pp. 160 ff., held that Gog in Ezek. xxxviii f. represents Alexander the Great. Others have brought the Gog chapters down even later. Seinecke, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, ii (1884), pp. 13 f., in accordance with his general view of the date of the book, identifies Gog with Antiochus Epiphanes, while G. R. Berry, *J.B.L.*, xli (1922), pp. 224 ff., identifies him with Antiochus Eupator and N. Schmidt, *E.B.*, iv (1907), cols. 4332 f., with Mithridates VI, c. 88 B.C. For other views on the identification of Gog, cf. the writer's *Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 2nd edn. (1947), pp. 33 f., Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, pp. 562 f., and G. Fohrer, *Die Hauptprobleme*, p. 196.

¹ Long before Hölscher the poetic qualities of Ezekiel had been recognized by Lowth, who assigned him the rank of Aeschylus, and who declared that the greater part of Ezekiel is poetical. Cf. *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, English trans. by G. Gregory, 3rd edn. (1835), p. 232. A. Lods, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive*, p. 441, says that Victor Hugo classed Ezekiel with Homer, Aeschylus, and Juvenal (cf. Lowth, loc. cit. p. 233).

² Cf. *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 9th edn., p. 296, where it is also said: "He has imagination, but not poetical talent."

³ Cf. *The Literature of the Old Testament in its Historical Development* (1922), p. 183.

⁴ Cf. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* iii (1927), pp. 144 ff.

the finest poetry contained in the Old Testament.¹ He could not, however, accept the view that Ezekiel could only write poetry, or that his poetry must all have been of the same high quality.²

In the reconstruction of the sixteen poems which Hölscher allows to the prophet, prose verses are eliminated as secondary interpolations. We must beware of assuming too readily that such prose interpolations must come from other hands. G. Widengren³ has shown that the Qur'an contains prose insertions in poetic pieces, where both poetry and prose may be recognized as the genuine work of Muhammad, and we must beware of supposing that a Hebrew prophet cannot have supplied interpretations of his own oracles. If the interpretation demonstrably misunderstands the oracle, there is every reason to ascribe it to another author, since it may be presumed that the prophet himself understood the message his oracle was designed to express. The arguments of Irwin must therefore be studied with care, and cannot be dismissed without examination on the ground of any analogy from the Qur'an, or of any recognition that the prophet was capable of supplying an interpretation of his own oracles. We must, however, be very sure that the misunderstanding is not ours.

In the passage from which Irwin starts,⁴ Ezek. xv, we find an oracle in verses 1-5 and its interpretation in verses 6-8.

¹ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 159, referring to Ezek. xix. 2-6, 8 f., and xxvii. 2-9a, 25. A similar view of these two poems is taken by R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1941), pp. 564 f. Cf. also G. A. Cooke, *J.T.S.*, xxvii (1925-6), p. 202: "His theory does account for the contrast between the fine passages and the dull ones, the poems which flash like jewels and the monotonous prose of their setting."

² Cf. Pfeiffer, *loc. cit.* After praising Ezekiel's poetic gifts, Pfeiffer says: "the prose style of Ezekiel at its best is lucid and adequate, although it does not possess unusual distinction; at its worst it is pedantic, monotonous and repetitious."

³ Cf. *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets* (1948), pp. 35 ff., esp. p. 51: "The prophet himself makes interpolations in his earlier revelations in order to explain or modify his sayings from a preceding period of his prophetic activity. These additions may be of a tedious prosaic character, in quite another style than the expressive poetic language used by him in the revelations encompassing these late proclamations." G. Fohrer, *Die Hauptprobleme*, p. 41, rejects Widengren's conclusions based on this. ⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 33 ff.

The oracle declares the uselessness of vine wood as timber, save for fuel, and *a fortiori* its uselessness for anything after it is charred. Irwin declares that the plain meaning of this is that Judah was anyhow unimportant, how much more when she has been burned.¹ The interpretation, he remarks, concentrates not on the nature of the wood, but on the fire which is to consume it, and on the dire threat that though a piece of the wood, identified with the people of Jerusalem, may at first escape the fire, it will yet be seized by the fire and utterly consumed.² I am bound to say I am unable to see how this is a patent misinterpretation, or how it supplies the key to unlock the book of Ezekiel which Irwin finds here.³ The primary thought of the first half is not of the uselessness of the vine wood in itself, but of the utter uselessness of vine wood that has been charred. It would therefore be relevant for the prophet to say to his hearers: "You are such vine wood,⁴ useless for anything but fuel; and you too are to be consumed in the fire, and consumed completely."⁵ From this example it will be seen that I am not

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 34.

² *Ibid.*

³ In *V.T.*, iii (1953), pp. 63 ff., Irwin returns to this passage and reaffirms his view against the many scholars who were unconvinced by his argument. To the list of those unconvinced may now be added G. Fohrer (*Die Hauptprobleme*, pp. 7 f., 68).

⁴ Irwin, *op. cit.*, pp. 18 f., reproaches Kessler for saying that the thought that the people of Jerusalem are of no worth is implicit in the interpretation, and declares that this is precisely what the verses do not say. But verse 6 reads, "As the vine tree among the trees of the forest, which I have given to the fire for fuel, so will I give the inhabitants of Jerusalem". Surely this means "As the vine tree, worthless in itself as declared in the oracle, which is given to the fire and reduced to greater worthlessness, so worthless Jerusalem is to be given to the fire". There is a far closer connection between the oracle and interpretation here than we find in Isa. v. 1-7, where no one would dream of denying the unity of authorship of the whole. In the single verse of interpretation there, there is no reference to many of the elements of the parable that preceded it. Yet they are all to be supplied. As M. J. Gruenthaner rightly says in discussing Irwin's treatment of this chapter: "An author need not explain all the features of his parable. He may pass over some of these in silence if their meaning is clear to his audience or may be readily apprehended by them." Cf. *C.B.Q.*, vii (1945), p. 445. For Kessler's defence of the unity of this chapter cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 35 ff.

⁵ Cf. Howie, *op. cit.*, pp. 89 f., where it is similarly maintained that there is no patent misinterpretation. In the course of a scathing review of Howie's book

convinced that the secondary elements are so numerous as Irwin maintains¹—and I may add not even so numerous as Hertrich holds.

As to the place where Ezekiel exercised his ministry, before we transfer it to Palestine we need to be sure that the reasons are cogent. That many of his oracles are addressed to the people of Jerusalem is no evidence that they were delivered in Jerusalem. There is no reason to suppose that Amos travelled to the surrounding peoples to deliver the oracles against them which are

(*J.N.E.S.*, xi (1952), pp. 219-23), Irwin bitinglly says: "Howie can't see the differences that I pointed out between verses 1-5 and 6-8. That's regrettable; but no one can do anything about it except Howie himself" (p. 221b). It may be observed that a great many commentators have failed to see any evidence of misinterpretation, but have assigned the interpretation without question to the prophet himself. This is true not merely of commentators who were predisposed to accept the traditional interpretation. Herrmann recognized many secondary elements, but not here (*Ezekiel* (1924), pp. 90 f.), and so Cooke (*The Book of Ezekiel*, pp. 156 ff.). Similarly Matthews (*Ezekiel*, p. 53), with the exception of verse 8. It is possible that all of these writers and the present writer may, like Howie, be defective in understanding. But in that case where is the evidence that Ezekiel was not similarly defective, so that he too failed to notice any fundamental inconsistency?

¹ Irwin complains (*J.N.E.S.*, loc cit., p. 221), with some justice, that Howie sometimes misrepresents his views by using sentences out of their context and attributing to him views which he was citing from others. It is much to be regretted that the discussion of the issues on this so much debated subject is thus complicated. Complete fairness to the adversary is the first law of successful controversy. In *V.T.*, iii (1953), p. 64 n., Irwin complains that I was unfair to him in saying "isolated verses or sections are rejected with a confidence that the reader may not share" (*Book List of the Society for Old Testament Study* (1946), p. 26). Yet in the text above this complaint Irwin shows the utmost confidence in his rejection of xv. 6-8 (cf. p. 65: "I am thus obliged to insist that chapter xv is composed of a genuine oracle followed by spurious, false commentary") while he frankly recognizes that several scholars have failed to share it. In *The Problem of Ezekiel*, p. 283, he said: "The results attained are all open to question of greater or less seriousness", but proceeds "for the sake of tabulation" to "ignore such doubts", and on p. x he claims that in general he has established such high probability as to be accepted as *proof*. This certainly appeared to me to be the language of confidence. Now, in *V.T.*, loc cit., p. 65, Irwin says "That my analysis of the rest of the book was replete with uncertainty I was the first to assert. I merely did the best I could with evidence so inadequate that no result can ever be fully secure." This recognition that his only strong case is chapter xv, where he complains that the strength has not been recognized, and where I am unable to see the strength, is clear evidence that no confidence in the method is justified, and that it was an exaggeration to speak of *proof*.

included in the book of Amos,¹ or that all the foreign oracles included in the other prophetic books were delivered to other ears than those of Israelites. There is thus no compelling reason why Ezekiel could not have spoken before the exiles his prophecies that were in form addressed to the people of Jerusalem.² There is evidence of intercourse between the exiles and their homeland, as we know from the book of Jeremiah,³ and word of some of the prophet's oracles might well have reached Jerusalem. But even if not, that is no reason why they could not have been delivered to the exiles, though rhetorically addressed to the people in Judah and Jerusalem.⁴

Moreover, it is hard to see why an editor should have gone out of his way to transfer Ezekiel's ministry to Babylonia if it were actually exercised in part or in whole in Palestine.⁵ Fischer⁶

¹ Amos i-ii.

² Cf. E. Sellin, *Geschichte des israelitische-jüdischen Volkes*, ii (1932), p. 35; G. A. Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, p. xxiv.

³ Cf. Jer. xxix.

⁴ Torrey, *J.B.L.*, lviii (1939), pp. 81 f., raises against the theory of a Palestinian ministry of Ezekiel in the sixth century the fact that he must then be assumed to have lived in Jerusalem and Judaea for eight years without having heard of Jeremiah. That Jeremiah and Ezekiel do not mention one another is not surprising. Isaiah and Micah do not mention one another. Hence Auvray maintains that nothing can be made here of the *argumentum e silentio* (*R.B.*, lv (1948), p. 519 n.). But, as Torrey points out, it is not quite a case of silence. For Ezek. ii. 5 suggests that there is no other prophet in the same community giving the same warnings. Further, in xxii. 30 God is represented as saying to Ezekiel that he had sought for a man to stand in the breach, but found none. This would be surprising if Jeremiah lived in the same community at the same time. Similarly, Jer. xxiii would not suggest that Ezekiel was known to him in the same community. If, however, Ezekiel and Jeremiah were far apart, the one working in Jerusalem and the other in Babylonia it would be less surprising that they made no reference to one another, even though they knew of one another's work. Ezekiel's work in Babylonia had no effect in Jerusalem, and there was no reason why Jeremiah should mention it. On the other hand, Jeremiah had so little effective influence in Jerusalem—and himself complains that he was a laughing stock (Jer. xx. 7)—that when Ezekiel spoke of the leaders in Jerusalem he could be forgiven for not mentioning him.

⁵ Cf. H. M. Orlinsky, *B.A.S.O.R.*, no. 122 (April 1951), p. 35: "What could Ezekiel (or a redactor) have hoped to gain by shifting the locale of the initial call from Judah (if so it was) to Babylonia?" Howie offers a number of pointers to a Babylonian background, of varying weight, and to these may be added G. R. Driver's argument, *V.T.*, i (1951), pp. 60 ff., that the imagery of the prophet's inaugural vision may have been suggested by the work of a Babylonian brass-founder.

⁶ Cf. Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, p. 531.

thinks the prophet was with the captives of 597, but that he returned to Jerusalem when he received his call. Others have argued that when Ezekiel was bidden to prophesy to the people of Israel,¹ unless he was a second Jonah he must have gone to them.² But this immediately raises the question how one of the exiles could return to his native land at will.³ Surely the deportees were not free to return whenever they wished. The suggestion has been made,⁴ and rejected by Mullo Weir,⁵ that Ezekiel was a fifth columnist in the service of Babylon, and therefore permitted to return. But if Ezekiel had been in Jerusalem at the same time as Jeremiah, in the years just before the fall of Jerusalem, it would be hard to explain why he did not suffer persecution. Jeremiah was suspected of being a fifth columnist, and suffered grievously.⁶ If Ezekiel had been allowed to return home by the Babylonians there would be even more reason to suspect him; and in any case the nature of his message of impending destruction was as much calculated to arouse persecution as Jeremiah's. Yet there is no suggestion that Ezekiel suffered in any comparable way.⁷

Again, if the view of Hertrich and those who follow him is correct, it would be hard to explain how an exilic author could transfer the ministry of his master from Palestine to Babylonia at a time when many around him would know that Ezekiel had not prophesied amongst the exiles.⁸ No clear motive for this

¹ Cf. Ezek. iii. 11.

² Cf. Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, p. 536. On this passage (Ezek. iii. 11), cf. C. Kuhl, *Th.Z.*, viii (1952), pp. 413 f., and Mullo Weir, *V.T.*, ii (1952), p. 101.

³ Cf. Mullo Weir, *V.T.*, ii (1952), p. 101.

⁴ Cf. Bentzen, *Introduction*, 2nd edn., ii, p. 128: "It cannot be called impossible that the Babylonians have allowed him to go back to the city—on the contrary, they may have used him and his preaching for their own purpose, as clever propagandists of today often do."

⁵ *Loc. cit.*

⁶ Cf. Jer. xxxvii. 13 ff., xxxviii.

⁷ C. Kuhl, *Th.Z.*, viii (1952), pp. 410 ff., replies to this by pointing to such passages as Ezek. iii. 9; ii. 5; iii. 7; ii. 3, 6; iii. 24 f., to prove that Ezekiel did have to suffer. But there is no reference here that is not compatible with private treatment by his fellow exiles, and capable of referring to such suffering as Jeremiah knew all through his ministry as the result of the rejection of himself and his message, and nothing whatever that points to official action taken against Ezekiel by the state authorities.

⁸ Cf. N. Messel, *Ezechielfragen*, p. 13.

quixotic transfer is provided in the book of Ezekiel, and no author would resort to such a fiction, when he knew that he would quickly be found out, unless he had some very strong motives. Nor can the use of the term "house of Israel" be pressed into the service of any of the theories of a Palestinian setting for Ezekiel's ministry. Smith found in this phrase evidence of a northern Israelite ministry, but Battersby Harford,¹ after a careful examination of the eighty-three occurrences of the phrase in the book of Ezekiel, was able to demonstrate that it is often used for the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem. That this does not demand for the prophet a ministry in Jerusalem has been shown by G. A. Danell,² who finds evidence that it also stands for the exiles.³

As to the theory of two calls, separated by some years, it will be remembered that Jeremiah had his call renewed after some years,⁴ when he was dispirited and downcast.⁵ But there is nothing whatever to suggest that either of the two alleged calls of Ezekiel was a renewed call.⁶ At the beginning of the vision recorded in chapter i we are given a precise date, in the fifth year of the captivity. No dated oracle earlier than this stands anywhere in the book, and there is no clear evidence to connect any oracle with earlier events. Many scholars find no reason to doubt the reliability of this dating. There is no reason to transfer this date to the vision of chapter ii, and then to place the vision of

¹ Cf. *Studies in the Book of Ezekiel*, pp. 93 ff.

² Cf. *Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament* (1946), pp. 237 ff. Cf. also Mullo Weir, *V.T.*, ii (1952), pp. 100 f.

³ Mullo Weir, loc. cit., cites Ezek. xi. 15 and xxxvii. 11 as clear examples. Many of the occurrences are ambiguous and cannot be pressed on either side in the discussion of this issue.

⁴ Jer. xv. 19 ff.

⁵ Cf. Jer. xv. 15 ff.

⁶ S. Spiegel, *J.B.L.*, lvi (1935), p. 170, cites rabbinic evidence for the tradition that the prophetic career of Ezekiel began in the Holy land, and this is repeated by P. Auvray, *R.B.*, lv (1948) p. 514. The Targum of Jonathan renders Ezek. i. 2 f.: "On the fifth of the month, in the fifth year of the captivity of King Jehoiachin, the prophetic word came from the Lord to Ezekiel the son of Buzi, the priest, in the land of Israel; again a second time He spoke to him in the province of the land of the Chaldees by the river Chebar." H. M. Orlinsky, *B.A.S.O.R.*, no. 122 (April 1951), p. 35 n., rightly points out that this has no evidential value. It is much easier to explain why the Targum should alter the tradition so as to make the prophet's call come to him in Palestine than to explain why the Biblical text should expunge a Palestinian call.

chapter i later than that of chapter ii.¹ Moreover, if this is done the vision of chapter i is left without point or purpose. By itself it merely records the prophet's vision of the living creatures, and of the throne and him that sat thereon, and, on Bertholet's view, finishes with the command to the prophet to stand upon his feet. There is no call or commission here. On the other hand, the call of chapter ii is made to start abruptly with the commission to the prophet, without any indication of the occasion or introduction of the Speaker who commissioned him.²

Bertholet transfers Ezek. i. 2 to precede ii. 3,³ and then changes the date of i. 1 to provide the date of the vision in chapter i. As the text stands i. 1 is dated in the thirtieth year, but there is no indication of the point from which the reckoning is made. In i. 2, however, the date is given as the fifth year of the captivity of Jehoiachin. Almost unlimited discussion has gathered round the former of these dates and very varied solutions have been proposed. It is the latest date given in the book if it reckons from the same point of time, but since it would appear to indicate

¹ Speaking of the variety of treatment accorded to chapters i-iii Irwin says "the situation as a whole is eloquent testimony to the chaos of current criticism of the Book of Ezekiel" (*The Problem of Ezekiel*, p. 224). He observes that "Matthews finds a vision of a storm at sunset in i. 4-5, 22, 26-28; and Hertrich follows the jig-saw method, carving the three chapters into sections that appeal to him and then piecing them together in a new order. . . . All alike, however, accept the presence of a genuine original, though again the views differ widely, from Herrmann, Bertholet, and Cooke, who accept practically everything, to Hölscher and Hertrich, for whom Ezekiel's material is a mere framework greatly expanded by the 'throne chariot' material" (pp. 223 f.).

² C. Kuhl, *Th.Z.*, viii (1952), p. 402, notes, as many others have done, that Ezekiel exercised a dual ministry. He was a prophet of judgement and also a minister of consolation and hope. The one ministry he exercised especially before the fall of Jerusalem and the other especially after that fall. But this is hardly sufficient to establish the view that he received a separate call before taking up the second ministry. Kuhl observes that the role of Watcher is essentially different from that in chapter ii. That is no reason why it should not figure in the prophet's call, as it is said to do in chapter iii. The prophet only learns all that is involved in his call as he responds to it and exercises his ministry, when he realizes that it was all really there from the beginning. The work of Moses in the wilderness and at Sinai was totally different from his work in Egypt, but he did not require a second call before he could undertake it.

³ Cf. *Hesekiel* (1936), p. 3. G. R. Berry holds that Ezek. i. 1a, 4-28a once preceded xliii. 4. Cf. *J.B.L.*, li (1932), pp. 54 ff.; lvi (1937), pp. 115 ff.

the time of the prophet's call,¹ most editors have held it to be quite outside the series of dates given elsewhere in the book.² It has been variously interpreted as the thirtieth year after Josiah's reform,³ or the thirtieth year of the prophet's age,⁴ or the thirtieth year after the foundation of the Neo-Babylonian empire.⁵ Bertholet,⁶ following some earlier scholars,⁷ arbitrarily

¹ J. Begrich, *Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel und Juda* (1929), p. 206, observes that the identity of the month in i. 1 and i. 2 is an indication that the same year is intended.

² Some writers have taken this to be within the series, and to reckon from the exile of Jehoiachin. It is then the latest date in the book. So A. Merx, *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, ix (1883), p. 73. Albright so takes it, and understands it to be the date when Ezekiel completed the preparation of the book. Cf. *J.B.L.*, li (1932), p. 96. So also S. Spiegel, *H.T.R.*, xxiv (1931), p. 289 and *J.B.L.*, lvi (1937), p. 407; G. R. Berry, *J.B.L.*, li (1932), p. 55; B. D. Eerdmans, *The Religion of Israel* (1947), pp. 196 f.; O. Procksch, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (1950), p. 309 n; C. G. Howie, *Date and Composition of Ezekiel*, p. 41. L. E. Browne, *Ezekiel and Alexander*, p. 10, also takes this date to be that of the completion of the book, though he does not hold it to be within the general series and transfers it to a late post-exilic period.

³ So the Targum of Jonathan; Jerome (cf. Migne, *P.L.*, xxv (1884), col. 17); H. Graetz, *M.G.W.J.*, xxiii, 1874, p. 518 n.; J. Herrmann, *Ezechiel*, 1924, p. 10; and L. Finkelstein, *The Pharisees*, ii, 1938, pp. 632 ff.

⁴ So Origen (cf. *P.G.*, xiii (1862), cols. 672, 675); R. Kraetzschmar, *Das Buch Ezechiel* (1900), p. 4; K. Budde, *E.T.*, xii (1900-1), p. 39, and *J.B.L.*, l (1931), p. 29; C. Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1912), p. 127; O. Eissfeldt, *Palästina-jahrbuch*, xxvii (1931), p. 66 n.; J. Battersby Harford, *E.T.*, xliii (1931-2), p. 24a; J. A. Bewer, *A.J.S.L.*, l (1933-4), pp. 98 ff. and in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, 3rd and later editions, ad loc.; E. J. Young, *Introduction*, p. 238. It is frequently pointed out against this view that nowhere else do we find the prophet's own age used in this way and that it is not a very natural way of expressing it. But on any interpretation the verse is unique. It is to be noted that in Num. iv. 3, 23, 30, 35, 43, thirty appears to be the age at which a Levite entered on his official service, and the same may be true of a priest. The verse would therefore mean that at the age when Ezekiel would have entered on his priestly service, if he had still been in Jerusalem, he was called of God to the prophetic office. Cf. Bewer, *A.J.S.L.*, loc. cit., p. 99. In Luke iii. 23 we are told that Jesus was "about thirty years of age" when he entered on His ministry. It must be recognized, however, that the Hebrew, even as emended by Budde, is not very natural. R. H. Kennett, *Old Testament Essays* (1928), p. 43, thinks Ezekiel may have actually ministered in the Temple and therefore have been more than thirty years old at the time of his call.

⁵ So E. F. C. Rosenmüller, *Scholia in Vetus Testamentum*, VI, i (1808), p. 15; S. Davidson, *Introduction*, iii (1863), p. 141; R. Smend, *Der Prophet Ezechiel* (1880), p. 5.

⁶ Cf. *Heseķiel* (1936), p. 3.

⁷ So J. W. Rothstein, in Kautzsch's *H.S.A.T.*, 3rd edn., i (1909), p. 817,

proposed to change the text to read "thirteenth year" and then reckoned from the captivity of Jehoiachin,¹ as in the other cases.² This cannot be pronounced very satisfactory. It is hard to see why any editor should transfer the date from chapter ii to stand alongside a different date in chapter i, bringing the reader from the thirteenth year of the captivity to the fifth year immediately without explanation, while the corruption of thirteenth to thirtieth presupposed is not an easy one to explain as accidental, and one still harder to explain as deliberate.³

reckoning as the thirteenth year of Nebuchadrezzar. Cf. E. Sellin, *Geschichte des israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes*, ii (1932), p. 39. It is to be noted that this yielded a different date from that obtained by Bertholet. For more recent scholars who have followed this way cf. L. Dennefeld, *La Sainte Bible*, vii, p. 468; E. Bruston, *La Bible du Centenaire*, ii (1947), p. 594; A. Lods, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive* (1950), p. 433. ¹ So P. Auvray, *Ézéchiël* (1949), p. 21.

² W. Erbt, *O.L.Z.*, xxii (1919), cols. 193 f., held that the original text had *third* year, and has been followed by V. Hertrich, *Ezechielprobleme*, p. 74, where, however, the rest of the text is differently reconstructed.

³ Of other views on this date we may note the following: (1) that an original reading *fifth* (of the exile of Jehoiachin) was altered to *thirtieth* to make the *forty* years of Ezek. iv. 6 tally with the *seventy* years of Jer. xxv. 11 (so Bertholet, *Das Buch Heseķiel* (1897), p. 2, following the suggestion of B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia* (1901), p. 202, and earlier *Die Theologie der Propheten* (1875), p. 253 n; so also G. Jahn, *Das Buch Ezechiel auf Grund der LXX hergestellt* (1905), p. 1, and J. Chaine, in *Initiation Biblique*, ed. by Robert and Tricot, 2nd edn. (1948), p. 142); (2) that the date is all that survives of a suppressed prophecy (so R. Dussaud, *R.H.R.*, lxxvi (1917), pp. 137 ff. and Spiegel, *H.T.R.*, xxiv (1931), p. 290); (3) that the reckoning is by the years of Jehoiachin's *life* (so N. H. Snaith, *E.T.*, lix (1947-8), pp. 315 f.); (4) that the meaning of *thirtieth* year in this verse is the same as that of *fifth* in the following verse, the difference of twenty-five years being accounted for by varying systems of chronology, which elsewhere yield a similar difference (so J. Begrich, *Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel und Juda* (1929), pp. 206 f. and G. A. Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, pp. 3 f.); (5) that the reckoning is by the years of the reign of Artaxerxes III (so L. E. Browne, *Ezekiel and Alexander*, p. 10); (6) that the reckoning is by the years of Manasseh's reign (so C. C. Torrey, *Pseudo-Ezekiel* (1930), pp. 63 f.); (7) that the thirtieth year of a Jubilee period is meant (so F. Hitzig, *Der Prophet Ezechiel* (1847), p. 3), and S. Fisch, *Ezekiel*, (1950), p. 1b). Of these the view of Torrey has been most often criticized. Cf. K. Budde, *J.B.L.*, 1 (1931), pp. 20 ff.; S. Spiegel, *H.T.R.*, xxiv (1931), pp. 282 ff.; J. Battersby Harford, *E.T.*, xliii (1931-2), pp. 23 f., and *Studies in the Book of Ezekiel* (1935), pp. 41 ff.; V. Hertrich, *Ezechielprobleme*, p. 51; I. G. Matthews, *Ezekiel* (1939), p. ix. G. Fohrer, *Die Hauptprobleme*, p. 115, criticizes the view of Begrich. The first of the above mentioned views can claim the support of the margin of a single manuscript (cf. J. Ziegler, *Ezechiel* (Göttinger Septuaginta, XVI, i (1952), p. 91), but this was doubtless to

The dates given in the book are almost all in chronological sequence, and some scholars have held that the undated material is here chronologically arranged.¹ In that case there would be a notable difference from the other prophetic books. This would be easily understandable if all the material in the compiler's sources were dated, but since only a few of the chapters are dated, this seems unlikely.² Some have dismissed the dates altogether as spurious, and the work of the editor.³ But this seems quite improbable, since in that case he might have been expected to supply dates throughout. Wheeler Robinson⁴ argues that we have evidence that all the material was not chronologically arranged since iii. 16-21 is placed between the fifth year of the captivity and the sixth month of the sixth year, yet by its subject matter it must be placed after the fall of Jerusalem some years later.⁵ This is not very convincing, since there is

harmonize with the following verse, and is of no textual weight. A. van Hoonacker, *R.B.*, N.S. ix (1912), pp. 241 ff., suggested that the text originally read: "The word of the Lord which came to Ezekiel, the son of Buzi, the priest, in the land of Chaldaea (by the river Chebar) during a period of about thirty years." This is very vigorous emendation.

¹ So F. Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 4th edn., revised by J. Wellhausen (1878), pp. 392 f. Cf. C. F. Keil, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die Schriften des Alten Testaments*, 3rd edn. (1873), p. 297, where it is held that the prophecies in each of the three sections i-xxiv, xxxiii-xxxix, and xl-xlvi are chronologically arranged, while those in xxv-xxxii are arranged according to subject matter. Cf. H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Old Testament: its Making and Meaning*, p. 107: "No other prophet is so consecutive in the arrangement of his book."

² G. Fohrer, *Die Hauptprobleme*, p. 29, rejects the view that the dates are valid for the interspersed passages.

³ Hölscher, *op. cit.*, pp. 108, 125 f., 147, regards all the dates as late redactional; Matthews, *op. cit.*, pp. xiv f., as editorial additions by one who lived in Babylonia among the captives; Torrey, *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, pp. 58 ff., and *J.B.L.*, lviii (1939), pp. 73 ff., as an alteration of dates which originally all fell within the years 30-2 of Manasseh's reign (he notes that the *months* and *days* exhibit a regular sequence, with the exception of viii. 1, where LXX removes this exception), and Irwin, *The Problem of Ezekiel*, p. 265, dismisses them as spurious or at best doubtful. For other discussions of the chronology, cf. R. Dussaud, *R.H.R.*, lxxvi (1917), pp. 144 ff., N. H. Snaith, *E. T.*, lix (1947-8), pp. 315 f., J. Finegan, *J.B.L.*, lxi (1950), pp. 61 ff.

⁴ Cf. *Two Hebrew Prophets*, p. 71.

⁵ Robinson is here following Bertholet, *Hesekiel* (1936), pp. 13 f. So also M.-L. Dumeste, *R.B.*, xlvi (1938), p. 597; L. Dennefeld, *La Sainte Bible*, vii (1947), pp. 462, 457; P. Auvray, *Ézéchiël* (1949), p. 27 n. Cf. also M. A. Schmidt, *Th.Z.*, vi (1950), pp. 91 ff.

nothing in the content of iii. 16-21 to date it after the fall of Jerusalem.¹ Nevertheless, it is very improbable that we have a strictly chronological arrangement, since it is unlikely that an editor would have the means to decide this, and it is probable that iii. 16-21 is not in its original place, since it does not fit very well into its context.²

We may here pause to consider L. E. Browne's solution of the problem of these dates.³ They run mostly from the fifth year to the twelfth year,⁴ and these are all probably to be reckoned from the captivity of Jehoiachin. Three dates, however, do not fall within these limits. They refer to the twenty-fifth year,⁵ the twenty-seventh year,⁶ and the problematical thirtieth year at the beginning of the book.⁷ In the case of the twenty-fifth year, it is not surprising that it falls out of its place in the series, since it introduces the sketch of the restored Temple which was placed at the end of the book. Browne reckons all the smaller numbers from the Hyrcanian captivity, and so brings all these dates down to 254 years below their apparent date. The three larger numbers, however, he reckons from the accession of Artaxerxes III, and avoids offering any explanation of this by saying that it was quite natural.⁸ It would be hard to think of anything more unnatural than to go on reckoning the years of a king long after he was dead. Moreover, xl. 1 states explicitly

¹ In Ezek. xxxiii. 1-9 the thought of iii. 16-21, and in part the language may be found repeated. This is not sufficient reason to transfer iii. 16-21 from its present context, or to conclude that the prophet cannot have been commissioned to the role of "watcher" until after the fall of Jerusalem. In chapter xviii we already read that Ezekiel had exercised the ministry committed to him in iii. 16-21. The role of "watcher" to which he is appointed in this passage is a role of warning, and this is always of the essence of the prophetic function.

² Writers who do not dismember the book, but who hold to its substantial unity, have been prepared to agree that iii. 16-21 is out of place in its context. So E. Bruston, in *La Bible du Centenaire*, ii (1947), p. xxvii b; E. E. Flack, in *Old Testament Commentary*, ed. by Alleman and Flack (1948), p. 743a; E. Power, in *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (1953), p. 604a. On the other hand C. Kuhl, *Die literarische Einheit des Buches Ezechiel* (1917), p. 14, found that these verses fit well in their present context.

³ Cf. *Ezekiel and Alexander*, Table at beginning and pp. 6 ff.

⁴ Cf. Ezek. i. 2; viii. 1; xx. 1; xxiv. 1; xxvi. 1; xxix. 1; xxx. 20; xxxi. 1; xxxii. 1; xxxii. 17; xxxiii. 21.

⁵ Ezek. xl. 1.

⁶ Ezek. xxix. 17.

⁷ Ezek. i. 1.

⁸ Op. cit., p. 9.

that it was reckoned from the exile of Jehoiachin, and not by the years of any Persian king.¹ As for the date in i. 1, Browne follows Berry² and Albright³ in thinking this indicates the date when Ezekiel completed his book. It seems to me very improbable that Ezekiel actually edited his book, and more likely that it was compiled at about the same time as the other prophetic books. Apart from i. 1, on which I know of no wholly satisfactory solution, it would seem likely that all the other dates are reckoned from the captivity of Jehoiachin. The tablets published by Weidner⁴ just before the Second World War relating to the rations allowed to Jehoiachin and his five children have directed attention anew to that unfortunate monarch.⁵ That he should continue to be thought of by the Jews in exile as their king, and that they should reckon dates by his reign rather than by the years of Zedekiah is in no way surprising.⁶ For it must be remembered that he went into exile when he had been on the throne for three months only,⁷ and therefore the years of his exile would be also the years of his kingship.⁸

The theories that transfer either the prophet himself or his literary creator to a post-exilic age are unconvincing. Here we

¹ In only one of the cases where Browne reckons from the exile of Hyrcania (Ezek. i. 2) is there any explicit reference to the exile of Jehoiachin, though it is probable that the others are reckoned from the same date.

² Cf. *J.B.L.*, li (1932), p. 55.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 96.

⁴ Cf. *Mélanges Syriens offerts à M. René Dussaud*, ii (1939), pp. 923 ff. For translation by A. L. Oppenheim of parts of these texts cf. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, ed. by J. B. Pritchard (1950), p. 308b.

⁵ Cf. W. F. Albright, "King Joiachin in Exile", *B.A.*, v (1942), pp. 49 ff. and J. Finegan, *J.B.L.*, lxxix (1950), pp. 61 ff.

⁶ Cf. Albright, *loc. cit.*, pp. 53 f.: "Another product of Weidner's discoveries is new evidence for the authenticity of the Book of Ezekiel. . . . Now we know that Joiachin was not only the legitimate king of the Jewish exiles in Babylonia from their own point of view; he was also regarded by the Babylonians as legitimate king of Judah, whom they held in reserve for possible restoration to power if circumstances should seem to require it." Cf. J. Finegan, *Light from the Ancient Past* (1946), pp. 188 f.

⁷ 2 Kings xxiv. 8.

⁸ In *J.B.L.*, li (1932), p. 93, Albright pointed out that the reckoning by the years of Jehoiachin's captivity, rather than by his reign, would be dictated by reasons of tact, so as not to incur the displeasure of the Babylonian authorities. Cf. *B.A.*, *loc. cit.*, p. 54: "This system of dating is thus one which could scarcely have been invented centuries afterwards; it is a striking confirmation of the genuineness of Ezekiel's prophecies."

may start from the latest such view, that of L. E. Browne. This creates more problems than it solves. Of these a few only can be mentioned here. It has long been held that the latest strand of the Pentateuch dates from the fifth century B.C. L. E. Browne would attribute it to the fourth century B.C.¹ This seems to me to be impossibly late, especially since he assigns the Chronicler to the same century.² The Priestly Code must have been issued and have been combined with the other Pentateuchal sources to form our present Pentateuch before the Samaritan breach became final, since the Samaritans as well as the Jews accepted it as Scripture. On the other hand the compilation of the Chronicler's history—Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah—is almost certainly to be placed after the Samaritan schism, since for the pre-exilic period the northern history is omitted from the books of Chronicles, in contrast to the books of Kings, and a strong anti-Samaritan feeling is evident in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. A considerable interval should therefore be allowed between the promulgation of the Priestly Code and the work of the Chronicler. This is more naturally allowed for on the usual view that the Priestly Code was prepared in the fifth century B.C., and brought to Jerusalem by Ezra, while the Chronicler is placed at about 300 B.C. The debased Hebrew style of the Chronicler as compared with that of the Priestly Code would also suggest that a long interval lay between them.³

For the moment, however, let this pass. Browne holds that Ezekiel wrote chapter xxiv in view of Alexander's crossing of the Dardanelles,⁴ and recognized the immense suffering and slaughter that was inevitable. In the following year, *before the battle of Issus*, Browne thinks the prophet wrote the prophecy against Egypt contained in xxx. 20-26⁵ in which Babylon must stand for Alexander. This would be a highly unnatural cipher for Alexander at this time. In the same month Ezekiel is supposed to have prepared his plan of the Temple and its service, with a

¹ Op. cit., p. 3.

² Ibid.

³ Cf. S. R. Driver, *Introduction*, 9th edn., pp. 505, 535 ff. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 130, where it is said that the writer who exhibits the greatest stylistic affinities with the Priestly Code is Ezekiel.

⁴ Op. cit., p. 7.

⁵ Cf. Browne's table of dates.

view to the creation of a Samaritan Temple for a reunited people. Several other scholars have in various ways associated the plan of the temple with Samaria or Shechem,¹ rather than with the Jerusalem Temple, though it is almost certain that the writer had the plan of the pre-exilic Jerusalem Temple in mind,² and in the view of many scholars must have seen it.³ But if Ezekiel outlined the plan for this prospective Samaritan Temple

¹ Cf. Cameron Mackay, *Princeton Theological Review*, xx (1922), pp. 399 ff., 661 ff.; xxi (1923), pp. 372 ff.; xxii (1924), pp. 27 ff.; *E.T.*, xxxiv (1922-3), pp. 475 ff. (replying to criticisms made by W. F. Lofthouse, *ibid.*, pp. 198 ff.); *C.Q.R.*, cxix (1934-5), pp. 173 ff.; and *E.T.*, lv (1943-4), pp. 292 ff.; M. Gaster, *The Samaritans* (1925), p. 15 (cf. S. Spiegel, *H.T.R.*, xxiv (1931), pp. 273 ff.); J. Smith, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, pp. 66 ff.; W. L. Wardle, in *Supplement to Peake's Commentary* (1936), pp. 12 f. (where it is recognized, as by Spiegel above, that the Temple was to be moved farther north than Jerusalem, but without association with Samaria or Shechem). Vogel, in his annotations on Oeder's *Freye Untersuchung*, argued that Ezek. xl-xlviii was written in the interests of a Samaritan plot to persuade the returned Jews to abandon the Temple which they had rebuilt and to erect a new shrine in its stead (pp. 386 ff.). Torrey, on the contrary, holds the book of Ezekiel to be a piece of anti-Samaritan propaganda. Cf. *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, pp. 102 ff. (cf. Spiegel, *loc. cit.*).

² Cf. M.-L. Dumeste, *R.B.*, xlvi (1937), p. 436; "L'opinion de beaucoup la plus vraisemblable est que l'auteur de ce plan a vu de ses yeux non seulement les ruines du Temple salomonien, mais le Temple lui-même, avec les diverses transformations qu'il avait subies aux époques successives de la monarchie, et que le prophète modifie encore suivant son idéal d'absolue sainteté de la Maison de Dieu. Le plus probable est que cette description date des premiers temps de l'Exil et rien n'autorise à en contester la paternité à Ézéchiél." On the relations between Ezekiel's Temple and Zerubbabel's cf. J. Jeremias, *Z.A.W.*, N.F. xi, pp. 109 ff., where the conclusion is reached: "Die Übereinstimmungen zwischen dem Tempelentwurf des Hesekiel und dem Neubau des Tempels nach dem Exil sind so weitgehende, dass alle Wahrscheinlichkeit dafür spricht, dass der Neubau auf Grund des Entwurfs . . . errichtet worden ist" (p. 112). In an unpublished Lyons dissertation, *Le Culte dans la Littérature prophétique exilienne et postexilienne* (1952), J. Théophane Chary devoted his opening chapters to a careful comparison of Ezekiel's Temple with Solomon's, with the Tabernacle of the Priestly Code, and with the Chronicler's Temple. W. F. Lofthouse, *Israel after the Exile* (1928), p. 88, says: "Ezekiel is influenced by three things, his memories of the Temple of Solomon at Jerusalem, his familiarity with Babylonian art and architecture, and his own sense of symmetry and, generally, of what pertains to the holy." R. H. Kennett, *Old Testament Essays* (1928), p. 43, says: "It is difficult to believe that Ezekiel would have been so well informed about the Temple ritual unless he had actually ministered there as a priest."

³ M. F. Unger, *Bibliotheca sacra*, cv (1948), pp. 418 ff.; cvi (1949), pp. 48 ff., 169 ff., maintains that Ezekiel foresaw a future temple to be constructed in Palestine in the millennium.

for a reunited people,¹ it must have been before the schism between Jerusalem and Samaria became final. It must therefore, *ex hypothesi*, have fallen between the acceptance of the Pentateuch and the work of the Chronicler. Yet Browne attributes the writing of the latest strand of the Pentateuch and the work of the Chronicler to the fourth century. Events must have moved very fast.

Since the law of the Priestly Code must have been established before the Samaritan schism, and Browne assigns the composition of Ezek. xl-xlviii to the year before the building of the Temple on Mount Gerizim, these chapters must have been written when the Priestly Law was already accepted. It was still accepted in the time of the Chronicler. It is scarcely likely that Ezekiel challenged the Priestly Law and demanded the establishment of a new Temple elsewhere than in Jerusalem at such a time, and the common view that Ezekiel stands somewhere between the promulgation of Deuteronomy and the preparation of the Priestly Code is much more natural.

For consider the folly of Ezekiel on Browne's view. Deuteronomy had drawn no distinctions within the Levites, but accepted them all as priests, and laid it down that any country Levite could go to the central sanctuary and minister there.² In the reform of Josiah this was not put into effect.³ The Jerusalem priesthood guarded its own privileges successfully. Ezekiel rationalizes this position, and lays it down that in the restored Temple only the Zadokites shall have the full status of priests.⁴ He proposes some compromise, however, in that he lays it down that the rest of the Levites shall have an inferior status in the Temple.⁵ The Priestly Code modifies this arrangement and provides that the Aaronites shall have full priestly status, while the rest of the Levites shall have a lower status.⁶ The Aaronites

¹ Cf. Ezek. xxxvii. 15 ff. On this passage, cf. W. E. Barnes, *J.T.S.*, xxxix (1938), pp. 391 ff., where it is argued that this passage speaks of two *trees* becoming one, and not two *sticks*.

² Deut. xviii. 6 ff.

³ 2 Kings xxiii. 9.

⁴ Ezek. xliv. 15 ff.

⁵ Ezek. xliv. 9 ff.

⁶ Exod. xxviii. 1 ff. ; Num. iii. 5 ff.

included the family of Zadok and the family of Abiathar.¹ These two were priests together in Jerusalem in the time of David, but in Solomon's reign Abiathar was dismissed,² and the Jerusalem priesthood had remained Zadokite.³ But Abiathar was of the family of Eli,⁴ the priest of the Ephraimite sanctuary of Shiloh.⁵ What could be more foolish than for Ezekiel, if he was working for a union of north and south, as Browne supposes, to urge that an existing arrangement which recognized the line of the old northern sanctuary should be done away with in the interests of the Jerusalem priesthood, who were to be transferred to a northern sanctuary? It is surely a more likely development that is normally envisaged, with Ezekiel offering the non-Jerusalemite priesthood an inferior status, before any of them had achieved equal status, and the Priestly Code then carrying this a step farther and allowing some equal status.⁶

¹ According to Exod. xxviii. 1, Aaron had four sons, but Nadab and Abihu were consumed for offering strange fire to God (Lev. x. 1 ff.; Num. xxvi. 61). The priestly lines were therefore confined to Eleazar and Ithamar. Zadok is traced in 1 Chron. xxiv. 3 to Eleazar, while Abiathar is traced to Ithamar.

² 1 Kings ii. 26.

³ A few scholars deny that Zadokites here means the descendants of the Jerusalem priesthood and the degraded Levites the priests of the non-Jerusalemite shrines. Thus Messel, *op. cit.*, pp. 133 ff., would identify the Zadokites with part of the Jerusalem priesthood and the degraded priests with other Jerusalem priests who now lost their status. Berry, *J.B.L.*, xxxiv (1915), p. 39, thinks those who were condemned to a lower status had gone astray after Greek idols, and would make the emergence of *Zadokites* to denote the preferred priests later than the use of *Aaronites*. Cf. however, his article "Priests and Levites", *ibid.*, xlii (1923), pp. 227 ff., where he modifies this view, while still finding the reference in Ezekiel to belong to the Greek period and the displaced Levites to be the priests of the Samaritan temple which was destroyed in 130 B.C. In the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Zadokite Fragments the term *Zadokites* is used for the members of the sect of the Scrolls. But here the present writer has argued that the sect stood for the right of the line of Zadok to hold the high priestly office, and the issue in that case was not whether Zadokites alone were entitled to be priests. Cf. *B.J.R.L.*, xxxv (1951-2), pp. 128, 137 ff., and *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1952), pp. 79 ff. On the question of the Zadokites in the book of Ezekiel, cf. A. Bentzen, *Studier over det zadokidiske præsterkabs historie* (1931), pp. 44 ff.

⁴ Cf. 1 Sam. xiv. 3, xxii. 9.

⁵ Cf. 1 Sam. i. 3, 9.

⁶ The northern connections of the book of Deuteronomy are often noted, and Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 2nd edn. (1946), p. 241, thinks that its nucleus came from Shechem. Cf. also B. Luther, in E. Meyer, *Die*

These arguments apply with equal or greater force against the other late hypotheses. It is even more improbable that Ezekiel would advocate his policy at the end of the third century B.C., or even about 400 B.C. In his prophecies Babylon is most naturally taken to mean Babylon, and Nebuchadrezzar to mean Nebuchadrezzar. He looked for a destruction of Jerusalem which happened in the days of that monarch, but which did not happen in the later ages to which the work is ascribed.

On the question of Ezekiel's psychology,¹ the transfer of his ministry to Jerusalem is held to ease the difficulty. Wheeler

Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme (1906), pp. 542 ff.; G. A. Danell, *Studies in the Name Israel* (1942), p. 56; and I. Engnell, *Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses*, vii (1946), pp. 21 f. The present writer thinks it probable that the compilers of Deuteronomy envisaged a reunited Israel with its central shrine at Shechem (cf. *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, T. H. Robinson Festschrift (1950), pp. 166 f.), but that the fact that Josiah's Law Book was found in Jerusalem when the work of religious reform and the cleansing of the Temple had begun determined the course of events. After the destruction of Jerusalem, when the Temple lay in ruins, it would not seem unpractical for Ezekiel to think again of a reunited Israel along similar lines, with a Davidic king but a central sanctuary established in the north, and with the Jerusalem priesthood having a higher status than the rest of the Levites. But again events determined otherwise, and such a programme would no longer seem realistic after the Jerusalem Temple had been rebuilt and growing tension had developed between Jerusalem and Samaria.

¹ Innumerable studies have been devoted to the psychology and physical condition of Ezekiel, and it is impossible to traverse them here. Klostermann (*T.S.K.*, I (1877), pp. 391 ff.) maintained that the prophet suffered from catalepsy, and this view was accepted by Bertholet (*Das Buch Hesekiel* (1897), pp. 18 ff.); Kraetzschmar (*Das Buch Ezechiel* (1900), p. vi); L. Gautier (*Introduction à l'Ancien Testament*, i, 2nd edn. (1914), p. 424); H. Schmidt (*S.A.T.* II, ii, 2nd edn. (1923), p. 395); E. Stave (in *Studier tilegnede Frants Buhl*, ed. by J. Jacobsen (1925), pp. 231 ff.); J. Meinhold (*Einführung in das Alte Testament*, 3rd edn. (1932), p. 260); and A. Lods (*Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive* (1950), pp. 435 f.), but rejected by J. Herrmann (*Ezechielstudien* (1908) pp. 75 ff.); J. Touzard (*R.B.*, N.S. xiv (1917), pp. 91 f. n.); D. Buzy (*R.B.*, xxix (1920), p. 209); P. Heinisch (*Das Buch Ezechiel* (H.S.A.Tes.) (1923), pp. 14 ff.); W. L. Wardle (*The Abingdon Bible Commentary* (1929), p. 714); M. Schumpp (*Das Buch Ezechiel* (1942), pp. 4 f.); L. Dennefeld (*La Sainte Bible*, vii (1947), pp. 460 f.), F. Spadafora (*Ezechiele* (1948), pp. 14 f.) and E. Power (*A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (1953), p. 603). M. Bittenwieser (*H.U.C.A.*, vi (1930), pp. 3 f.) prefers to see the phenomena of ecstasy in Ezekiel, and says we have no means of establishing catalepsy beyond conjecture. Cf. also the study of the prophet's psychology by E. C. Broome, *J.B.L.*, lxxv (1946) pp. 277 ff. (on which, cf. Kuhl, *Th.R.*, N.F. xx (1952), p. 11), and also H. W. Hines, *A.J.S.L.*, xl (1923), pp. 50 ff., and C. G. Howie, *op. cit.*, pp. 69 ff. On

Robinson says: "We have no need to raise difficult psychological theories as to Ezekiel's telepathy and clairvoyance."¹ It is doubtful, however, how far we avoid difficulties by the transfer of the prophet's ministry, and O. Eissfeldt wisely observes that it "may well be asked whether Robinson has not given in too easily to the great difficulty actually lying in the tradition."² The incident of the death of Pelatiah³ and Ezekiel's immediate knowledge of the siege of Jerusalem⁴ are held to be easier to explain if the prophet were on the spot. In the former case the prophet is said to be transported to Jerusalem where he prophesies against Pelatiah, who falls down dead while the prophet is speaking. Mullo Weir points out⁵ that it is not said that Pelatiah died as the result of Ezekiel's word.⁶ Moreover, it is clear that we have a vision rather than an objective experience, since the cherubim lifted their wings.⁷ What we really have then, is a story of Ezekiel's being transported in a vision to Jerusalem, and being so vividly conscious of what he sees there that he utters a prophecy against Pelatiah, and in that moment is aware that Pelatiah has fallen down dead. Similarly in the

the possibility of explaining some of the phenomena by clairvoyance cf. Mullo Weir, *V.T.*, ii (1952), pp. 104 f., and W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 2nd edn. (1946), p. 249. Albright says: "Until the possibility of true clairvoyance has been disproved it would be rash to deny the possibility of Ezekiel's autoptic visions." R. Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iii (1927), p. 146, finds evidence of "two souls within one man", due to his double environment, first in Jerusalem and then in Babylonia. Albright, loc. cit., observes: "While the individual is undoubtedly happiest when his personality is most fully integrated, the traditional motto, *mens sana in corpore sano*, is not well calculated for progress since it conduces rather to stagnation."

¹ Cf. *Two Hebrew Prophets*, p. 78.

² Cf. *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. by H. H. Rowley (1951), p. 157.

³ Ezek. xi. 13.

⁴ Ezek. xxiv. 2.

⁵ Cf. *V.T.*, ii (1952), p. 104.

⁶ Torrey, *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, p. 40, says Pelatiah is represented as having died as the result of the prophet's word. He asks: "In what way did this death-dealing prophecy reach Pelatiah at the moment of its utterance, and how did the prophet straightway know of its fatal effect?" M. Bittenwieser, loc. cit., p. 17, thinks the Pelatiah incident was subsequently created. He says: "The most probable explanation is that when some ten years after Pelatiah's death Ezekiel wrote his book, it occurred to him to bring this dramatic occurrence and the imaginary prophecy made on his visionary voyage to Jerusalem into the relation of cause and effect."

⁷ Ezek. xi. 22.

other case we merely have knowledge at a distance of something that could not be known through ordinary channels of communication.¹

G. A. Cooke was disposed to accept the record of these and other things, while holding that today we should express things in other language,² and Widengren has devoted attention to the psychological line of approach,³ and argued that we probably have cases of levitation. "When now the phenomena of levitation are felt extremely strong", he says, "the prophet or seer must have had the feeling that he was not experiencing a vision where he imagined himself to be carried away, but that he was subjected to a real transportation."⁴ That Ezekiel was a strange personality is not made any more improbable by modern study,⁵ and I do not find it improbable that he could be aware of things that happened at a distance with the assurance of certainty.⁶

¹ Mullo Weir thinks that in the case of the siege of Jerusalem it may have been a mere coincidence that the prophet's premonition was correct. Cf. *V.T.*, loc. cit., p. 105.

² Cf. *The Book of Ezekiel*, pp. xxiii, xxvii f.

³ Cf. *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets* (1948), pp. 94 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

⁵ H. Knight, *E.T.*, lix (1947-8), pp. 115 ff., offers a study of the personality of Ezekiel, in which he argues that such contrasts are to be found within his personality as it appears in the book of Ezekiel that we are bound to resolve him into a duality or plurality of persons. He concludes (p. 120b): "Try as we will these antithetic personalities cannot be harmonized or blended in a consistent and convincing psychological portrait. They must therefore point to a duality or plurality of authorship. Hence the conclusion which is the outcome of modern criticism . . . is strongly reinforced by an inquiry which takes its point of departure in the psychology of religion."

⁶ Nearly twenty-five years ago the writer, then living abroad, was one night unable to sleep and had so strong a sense of a hostile presence in the room that he got out of bed and searched it. This did not allay the feeling, which continued for some time until his whole body was trembling, though he was quite certain he was alone. Suddenly there came a sense of complete serenity, and immediately he fell asleep. The next morning he told his hosts that something had happened the previous night which would profoundly affect the whole current of his life, and though frequently questioned during the next few weeks he did not waver in this certainty. He had no idea what had happened or how it would affect him. Some five or six weeks later he learned that some thousands of miles away a meeting had been held at the precise hour of his disquiet, at which he, and questions affecting his work, had been discussed, when the issue had been one wholly unexpected by him, but one which indeed changed the current of his life. This

While it is wise to speak with caution in the present almost chaotic state of criticism on the book of Ezekiel,¹ I hold substantially by the views with which we began, the views that were almost universal in critical and anti-critical camps at the beginning of the century. I do so, not through any dogmatic predisposition towards those views, or through unwillingness to consider alternative views, but because I believe they better satisfy the evidence we have. I find greater unity in the book of Ezekiel than in Isaiah or Jeremiah, though I do not think we ought to regard the book as compiled in its present form by the prophet himself. Its materials probably go back to him or to his disciples, and were drawn on by a later editor who supplied little that he did not find in his sources. The ministry of Ezekiel I would place wholly in Babylonia² in the period immediately before and after the fall of Jerusalem.³

was in no sense a parallel experience to anything in Ezekiel's life, but it sufficed to warn the writer not to be dogmatic as to the limits of knowledge at a distance, or as to the limits of the effects of action at a distance.

¹ Cf. G. A. Cooke, *J.T.S.*, xxvii (1925-6), p. 202: "No one who has worked at Ezekiel can feel satisfied that all the problems have been solved."

² Cf. A. Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, ii, 2nd edn. (1952), p. 128: "The possibility of a Palestinian period in the ministry of the prophet cannot be dismissed *a limine*; but *proof* has not been given against the traditional view." G. Fohrer concludes his study by saying: "Das Ergebnis der Untersuchung hat die alttestamentliche Tradition als zutreffend erwiesen. Mit der grossen erreichbaren Wahrscheinlichkeit lässt sich feststellen, dass Ezechiel in der frühexilischen Zeit unter den jüdischen Deportierten in Babylonien gelebt und gewirkt hat." Cf. *Die Hauptprobleme*, p. 260.

³ G. Dahl well underlines the importance of the issues which are at stake in all these discussions. He says (*Quantulacumque*, p. 284): "One need hardly point out the imperative need of finding a satisfactory answer to this pressing problem of contemporary criticism; for upon it depends in large measure not only our understanding of the book itself, but also of the whole development of the later Hebrew religion." (I would express my thanks to many scholars, British and foreign, who have enabled me to see many of the works referred to in the notes of this article.)