

## The Authorship of Ezekiel 40-48

GEORGE R. BERRY

COLGATE UNIVERSITY

**W**HILE a few have questioned the authenticity of the book of Ezekiel, no one has doubted its substantial integrity, so far as known to the writer.

The authorship of Ezekiel 1-39 is not considered. For the present discussion it is assumed that these chapters are substantially the work of the prophet Ezekiel during the early part of the Babylonian exile.

Chapters 1-39 will here be designated as first-Ezekiel, and chapters 40-48 as second-Ezekiel.

The question of the authorship of second-Ezekiel will be considered from two standpoints, first that of thought, second, of language.

The thought of second-Ezekiel has no close resemblances to that of first-Ezekiel; and it has radical differences. The principal differences are the following. If Ezekiel is the author of second-Ezekiel, these chapters present a picture of the ideal future of the nation. Chapters 34-37 also present an ideal of the future. Between the two there is no resemblance. Chapters 34-37 are throughout a prophetic ideal; chapters 40-48 entirely a priestly ideal.

Again, the messianic picture of the two parts is entirely distinct. The portions of first-Ezekiel probably to be considered messianic are 17 22-24 21 32 (Eng. 27) 34 23-24 37 24-25. 17 22-24 pictures a world-ruler. 21 32 has also in mind a ruler, wearing the crown. The other two references are to a Davidic ruler.

The figure in second-Ezekiel corresponding to this messianic, Davidic, king is the prince, **נָשִׂיא**, who appears repeatedly. He is, however, a mere shadow of a prince. He is never called king, has no appreciable political power, and his distinctive work is almost entirely religious, to provide the offerings and care for the ceremonies. This term **נָשִׂיא** occurs repeatedly in first-Ezekiel, but in a sense entirely distinct from this. The one in mind is a political leader, and often the king.

Again, sin-offering and guilt-offering, **זָבַח חַטָּאת** and **זָבַח עֲוֹנוֹת**, are prominent in second-Ezekiel, they are not found in first-Ezekiel.

Again, the dominating principle of at least a large part of second-Ezekiel is an extreme conception of holiness, such as is entirely wanting in first-Ezekiel. While first-Ezekiel speaks more favorably of ritual matters than most of the other prophets, nevertheless his emphasis is always ethical. This conception of holiness in second-Ezekiel is more extreme than is found elsewhere in the Old Testament, and suggests not only distinct authorship from first-Ezekiel, but a time much later. The details of the arrangements and regulations of second-Ezekiel are dominated by the thought of guarding the holiness of the temple and all connected with it. Even the whole summit of the temple mount in Jerusalem is most holy, 43 12. Holiness is such a tangible reality that it can be materially transferred, by the clothes of the priests and by the offerings, 44 19 46 20. This thought is not found in P, unless in Lev. 6 11 (Eng. 18) 20 (Eng. 27), and the best interpretation does not find it there. The idea is explicitly denied in Hag. 2 11 f. Further, graves cause ceremonial pollution in their vicinity, 43 7-9, an idea not found elsewhere, and evidently not held in an earlier time, 1 Sam. 25 1, 1 Kings 2 34. The nearest analogy to this conception of holiness is found in Zech. 14 20 21, doubtless late post-exilic.

Various other matters of thought do not directly compare second-Ezekiel with first-Ezekiel, but indicate for second-Ezekiel a late date, and thus a date considerably later than first-Ezekiel. Most, but not all, of these indications have to do with the relation to P. Many passages in second-Ezekiel

resemble P, but usually with differences. The differences are of such a nature as to suggest for second-Ezekiel a date later than P. An acquaintance with P by the author or authors of second-Ezekiel is evident from such passages. There is also evident acquaintance with a usage later than P, and varying from it. The variation as given in second-Ezekiel thus represents largely a usage of a time later than P. Some of the variation is probably due, also, to the writer or writers of second-Ezekiel, being ideal modifications resulting from their general theories.

In several places the regulations of second-Ezekiel which are similar to those of P are more elaborate, more rigid, indicate larger quantities, or are more detailed and specific than in P. A sin-offering at the passover, Ez. 45 23, is found in second-Ezekiel only, cf. Ex. 12, Lev. 23 5, &c. At the feast of unleavened bread the burnt-offerings, Ez. 45 23, are larger than elsewhere, cf. the regulation in P, Num. 28 19. The meal-offering accompanying the burnt-offering is also larger, Ez. 45 24, cf. Num. 28 20 21. The meal-offering of the daily burnt-offering is also larger in second-Ezekiel than in P, Ez. 46 14, cf. Num. 28 5. The meal-offerings of second-Ezekiel elsewhere are also larger than in P, see 46 5 7, &c. In certain regulations, P gives them as addressed to Aaron and his sons, in second-Ezekiel they are addressed directly to the priests: thus Ez. 44 23, cf. Lev. 10 10-11, Ez. 44 29 a, cf. Num. 18 9 10, Ez. 44 30 a, cf. Num. 18 12-13, Ez. 44 31, cf. Lev. 22 8, Ez. 44 17-18, cf. Ex. 28 40-43. In the last case, the passage in Exodus has details not found in the passage in second-Ezekiel; but the latter passage adds one detail, of a generalizing nature, v. 18 b, "they shall not gird themselves with anything that causeth sweat". Again, regulations which in P speak of certain things as given to Yahweh are in second-Ezekiel specifically said to be given to the priests: Ez. 44 29 b, cf. Lev. 27 28, Ez. 44 30 b, cf. Num. 15 20-21, in the last case quite a different procedure being evidently in mind. General regulations enjoined upon the whole people in P are in second-Ezekiel applied specifically to the priests: Ez. 44 24 b, cf. Lev. 23 2 4, Ez. 44 24 c, cf. Ez. 20 12 13 20, the last being not from P but from first-Ezekiel. All the regula-

tions of Ez. 44 20-22 25 have close resemblances to the regulations of P, but with some differences. These regulations in second-Ezekiel relate to the priests. Ez. 44 20 is substantially identical with that concerning the high-priest in Lev. 21 10 10 e, and is stricter than the regulation concerning the ordinary priests in Lev. 21 5. Ez. 44 21 is the regulation laid upon Aaron and his sons in P, Lev. 10 8-9, here applied specifically to the priests. Ez. 44 22 is nearly identical with the regulation concerning the high-priest in Lev. 21 14, and more strict than that concerning the ordinary priests in Lev. 21 7. That is, the essential point is that in Lev. 21 14 it is provided that the high-priest shall not marry a widow; Lev. 21 7 does not place this restriction on the ordinary priests. Ez. 44 22 does, however, put this regulation upon the ordinary priests, with the exception that the priests may marry a widow of a priest. Ez. 44 25, again, is in substance identical with the regulations concerning the ordinary priests in Lev. 21 1-3, and is thus less strict than the regulations concerning the high-priest in Lev. 21 11. The tendency here manifested in second-Ezekiel is to make the regulations upon the ordinary priests more strict, so that they approximate to those earlier placed upon the high-priest. Ez. 45 10-12 is a regulation similar to that of Lev. 19 36, with the addition of much specific detail. Ez. 48 14 prohibits any sale of the land of the Levites, and is thus stricter than Lev. 25 32-34, which does make provision for sale under certain conditions.

Ex. 29 35-37 appears to be a conclusion of the ceremonies for purification of Aaron and his sons and for their consecration at their initiation into the priesthood. But these verses are much more an account of the purification and consecration of the altar, evidently the altar of burnt-offering. The much longer account of Ez. 43 18-27 is evidently based upon this passage in Exodus. This is explicitly the ceremony of purification and consecration for the altar of burnt-offering. This is not necessarily at the first making of the altar, v. 18 should, in fact, be translated: "These are the ordinances of the altar in the day of its being made ready to offer burnt-offerings thereon, and to sprinkle blood thereon." The ceremony of atonement

for the first day of the first month and for the first day of the seventh month, as it is usually, and probably correctly, understood, following 6, in Ez. 45 18-20 also resembles Ex. 29 35-37, but less closely. This is a ceremony for cleansing the temple, at least it is principally that, the words of v. 20, "for every one that erreth, and for him that is simple" being given differently in 6, and somewhat doubtful. The passage Ez. 43 18-27 will be first considered. V. 26 resembles Ex. 29 35 37; Ez. 43 19-20 25 resemble, although with much more detail, Ex. 29 36, with some resemblance to Ex. 29 12, Lev. 16 18, and other passages. Especially instructive is the phrase in Ez. 43 26, "so shall they consecrate it",  $\text{וַיִּמְלֵךְ}$ . This phrase "fill the hand" occurs a considerable number of times, mostly in P, having the regular meaning "to consecrate to the priest's office". Twice, 1 Chr. 29 5, 2 Chr. 29 31, it has a more general sense, but it is used of persons. In all its occurrences, therefore, except in Ez. 43 26, it is used in reference to persons. In this passage it is used of consecrating the altar of burnt-offering. It seems evident that it is here taken from the passage upon which this is based, that is, from the phrase  $\text{מִן הַיָּדָיִם}$ , Ex. 29 35. The reading of 6 and 3 "their hands" in Ez. 43 26 is evidently a correction to remove a difficulty, and is out of harmony with the passage itself.

With reference to Ez. 45 18-20 compared with Ex. 29 35-37, Ez. 45 18 resembles Ex. 29 36, and Ez. 45 20 resembles Ex. 29 37. There are also resemblances between Ez. 45 18-20 and the account of the day of atonement in Lev. 16, cf. especially Ez. 45 20 with Lev. 16 16 20 33. In this case, the presumption is that the much longer account in Leviticus is the later. It is generally recognized, however, that the day of atonement itself is in its origin later than the time of Ezra, and hence that the account in Lev. 16 and elsewhere is much later than most of P. Hence if Lev. 16 is later than Ez. 45 18-20, the latter may still be late, later than Ezra. The relation seems to be this. Ez. 45 18-20 is an account of a ceremony of purification for the temple twice a year. This is based somewhat upon Ex. 29 35-37, but this is a purification of the temple, as that is of the altar. In Lev. 16 it becomes a purification for

the temple, and for the altar, and also for the people, in the phraseology there used is specific mention of "the holy place, and the tent of meeting, and the altar", Lev. 16 20.

In P the killing of sacrifices is performed by the layman who presents them, Lev. 1 11 ff. 15 ff., in Ez. 44 11 it is done by the Levites. The custom of P is naturally the earlier. A suggestion of the custom of second-Ezekiel is found in 2 Chr. 29 34.

The altars of second-Ezekiel do not correspond entirely to any known in history. Their dimensions differ very greatly from those of P. The one in Ex. 27 1-8 was 5 cubits long, 5 cubits broad, and 3 cubits high. In the description of the altar in Ez. 43 13-17, the altar itself is 12 cubits square, but the base is 18 cubits square. Including the horns, the altar is 12 cubits high. The altar whose dimensions are given which is most nearly like this is the brazen altar of Solomon, described in 2 Chr. 4 1 as 20 cubits square and 10 cubits high. The altar of incense according to P, Ex. 30 1-5 37 25-28, was a cubit long, a cubit broad, and 2 cubits high. The altar described in Ez. 41 22 was 2 cubits long, 2 cubits broad, according to G, and 3 cubits high, the dimensions being similar to those of P, but larger. It is now generally held that this description in Ez. 41 22 does not apply to the altar of incense, but to the table of showbread. To this, however, there are several objections. It is called an altar, table is applied to it only as a descriptive term. Its dimensions are such that it is more nearly of the shape of the altar of incense than of the table of showbread. The table of showbread in Herod's temple, the only one of which the dimensions are known, was 2 cubits long, 1 cubit broad, and 1½ cubits high. Further, the description speaks of the "walls", i. e. sides of the altar. An altar has these, a table has legs instead, in fact the representation of the table of showbread of Herod's temple on the arch of Titus shows it with legs, see *DB.*, vol. III, p. 462. If this is the altar of incense, as seems evident, it is here larger than in P as the altar of burnt-offering was larger, probably representing, approximately at least, the dimensions of the altars as used in the later post-exilic times, perhaps somewhat idealized, as

the use of numbers might suggest. It is recognized that the altar of incense itself is probably a late feature, as it is generally considered, yet in this case the account in second-Ezekiel seems to be later than that in Exodus, as it well may be.

The peculiar picture of the stream flowing from the sanctuary in Ez. 47 1-12 resembles several other passages, but especially Joel 4 18 (Eng. 3 18), and Zech. 14 8, both quite certainly post-exilic passages. Both are brief statements, the passage in Ez. 47 is much longer and more detailed, it seems to be evidently later than those passages.

Ez. 47 22-23 provides full citizenship, as manifested by inheriting land, for sojourners. Such a provision is not found in P or elsewhere, and is naturally later than P. Regulations elsewhere simply prescribe kindness and consideration for the sojourner, as Deut. 10 18 f., Lev. 19 10, &c.

Aside from the day of atonement, already discussed, there is only one place in which the regulation of second-Ezekiel is less elaborate than in P. This is the celebration of the new moon, Ez. 46 6-8, compared with Num. 28 11-15. The burnt-offerings differ slightly; in Ezekiel they are a bullock, six lambs and a ram, and in Numbers two bullocks, seven lambs and a ram. On the other hand, the meal-offering is larger in Ezekiel. But Numbers prescribes a sin-offering, 28 15, which is wanting in Ezekiel. This seems to indicate a slightly greater importance of this celebration in P than in second-Ezekiel. This is consistent, however, with a later date for second-Ezekiel, on the supposition that at the time of writing the new moon celebration was less highly regarded than earlier.

The language of second-Ezekiel will now be discussed. The following lists are based on those given in Driver's Introduction, those which he gives being phrases characteristic of Ezekiel, of H, and of P, with consideration also of those common to more than one of these. Separation between the usage of first-Ezekiel and of second-Ezekiel gives the following results. The following phrases are found in first- and second-Ezekiel: *son of man*, several times in each; *stumbling-block of iniquity*, five times in first, once in second, 44 12; *house of*

*rebelliousness*, often in first, the full phrase not occurring in second, but *rebelliousness*, רָבָה, once, 44 6, although the text is doubtful; *Lord Yahweh*, this phrase will be discussed later; *idols*, אֱלֹהִים, often in first, twice in second, 44 10 12. In P, first-Ezekiel, and second-Ezekiel only one phrase is found, *this selfsame day*. In H, first-Ezekiel, and second-Ezekiel are found the following phrases: *to profane*, often in H and first-Ezekiel, once in second, 44 7; *my sabbaths*, several times in H, often in first-Ezekiel, once in second, 44 24; *to bear his iniquity*, often in H, once in first-Ezekiel, 14 10, twice in second, 44 10 12.

The phrases already cited are all, from these lists, that show similarity between first-Ezekiel and second-Ezekiel. The following phrases show different usage. The following are found in first-Ezekiel and not in second: *lands*, אֲרָצוֹת; *behold I am against*; *satisfy my fury upon*; *I Yahweh have spoken it*; and—*shall know that I am Yahweh*; *set thy face toward or against*; *watercourses*, מַיִם; *put a person's way upon his head*; *wings*, אֲנָשִׁים; *contempt*, מַחָזֶה, and *contemn*, שָׁחַ; *in the time of the iniquity of the end*; beginning a subject with a question.

The following are in P and first-Ezekiel, not in second-Ezekiel: *to be fruitful and multiply*; *for food*, לֶחֶם; *exceedingly*; *sojournings*; *peoples*, in the sense of *kinsfolk*; *rigor*, מִדְּיָה; *judgments*; *in all your dwellings*; *trespass*, noun and verb, פָּעַל and פָּעַל. The following are in P and second-Ezekiel, and not in first-Ezekiel: *kind*; *to swarm*; *as regards all*, כָּל; *possession*, מְחִיבָה.

The following are in H and first-Ezekiel, not in second-Ezekiel: *I will set my face against*; *that sanctify you*; *whoever*, מִי אִישׁ; *I will cut off from the midst of his people*; *to walk in the statute*; מִקֵּץ used of *unchastity*; *his blood shall be upon him*; *to bear the iniquity of (another)*. The long list of parallels between Lev. 26 and Ezekiel are all with first-Ezekiel, none with second-Ezekiel. In H and second-Ezekiel, not in first-Ezekiel, is found one phrase, *the bread of God*, as a description of the sacrifices.

The phrase *Lord Yahweh*, above mentioned, is a favorite



designation of God in first-Ezekiel, being found some two hundred times. In second-Ezekiel it is found 17 times, *Yahweh* 26 times, *God* once, and *God of Israel* twice.

From the comparisons thus far made, based on Driver's lists, it will be observed that the resemblances in phraseology between first-Ezekiel and second-Ezekiel are comparatively few, and the differences are very numerous. Also it will be observed that first-Ezekiel has numerous and striking resemblances to H, while these are very few in second-Ezekiel. Both parts of Ezekiel have resemblances in considerable number to P, but those which have to do with characteristic phraseology are much more numerous in first-Ezekiel than in second-Ezekiel.

Besides these comparisons, some further material may be added. In second-Ezekiel  $\text{לֵאלֹהִים}$  is found frequently in the sense of  $\text{לַעֲלֹה}$ . An approximate classification is as follows. In second-Ezekiel  $\text{לֵאלֹהִים}$  in its proper meaning is found 73 times, with the meaning of  $\text{לַעֲלֹה}$  39 times.  $\text{לַעֲלֹה}$  with its proper meaning occurs forty times, and with the sense of  $\text{לֵאלֹהִים}$  three times. The significant fact is, of course, that, to express the meaning of  $\text{לַעֲלֹה}$ ,  $\text{לֵאלֹהִים}$  occurs approximately as frequently as  $\text{לַעֲלֹה}$ , 39 times to 40. For comparison the facts were observed in the first three chapters of first-Ezekiel. Here  $\text{לֵאלֹהִים}$  occurs 22 times with its own force, and once in the sense of  $\text{לַעֲלֹה}$ ;  $\text{לַעֲלֹה}$  14 times with its own meaning, and twice in the sense of  $\text{לֵאלֹהִים}$ . It may be thought that these facts in second-Ezekiel are due to textual errors. This may be responsible for some cases, but cannot account for most of the usage. The usage in first-Ezekiel shows, in fact, about what might be expected from textual corruption, and no reason appears why second-Ezekiel should suffer more than first-Ezekiel in this respect. Further, in second-Ezekiel  $\text{לֵאלֹהִים}$  occurs in the sense of  $\text{לַעֲלֹה}$  in certain phrases and not in other phrases. The whole matter seems like the greater elasticity of late usage in second-Ezekiel.

$\text{כִּפֹּרֶת}$ , as is well-known, has two uses, a ritual and a non-ritual, entirely distinct. First-Ezekiel, in 16 63, has the non-ritual use, with *Yahweh* as the subject and the atonement made without thought of sacrifice. This is the only occurrence

of the word in first-Ezekiel. In second-Ezekiel the word occurs several times, and in each case with the characteristic ritual use, of atoning by legal rites. This is in direct contrast with the usage of first-Ezekiel. The passages in second-Ezekiel are 43 20 26 45 15 17 20. Of these passages, 45 15 and 45 17 refer to persons, in 45 15 the verb being followed by the preposition לָךְ and in 45 17 by לְךָ. Both these constructions are frequent with the ritual use elsewhere, so that these passages show nothing distinctive. In the other three passages, however, 43 20 26 45 20, the reference is to things, and the verb takes a direct object. This is an unusual construction, the almost uniform construction with things, in the ritual use, being that the verb is followed by the preposition לָךְ. The ritual use, it may be observed, aside from second-Ezekiel, is limited to H and P. So far as known to the present writer, the only places, aside from these in second-Ezekiel, where the verb takes the direct object, when used of things, are Lev. 16 20 33 *bis.* Lev. 16 has also the other use, with לָךְ, in v. 16 18. This chapter, however, as already noted, is generally considered to be later than the most of P, and so later than the time of Ezra. To summarize, then, the facts in reference to the construction of יָצַח with things are as follows. The uniform usage of P, aside from Lev. 16, and the uniform usage of H entire employ the construction with the preposition לָךְ. Lev. 16, later than Ezra, uses the same construction, with לָךְ, twice, and the direct object three times. This indicates quite clearly that the construction with the direct object is a late one, later than Ezra. This is the only construction, occurring three times, in second-Ezekiel. This indicates, therefore, for this part of second-Ezekiel, a late date, later than Ezra. It is worth while here also to recall the fact already mentioned, that Ez. 43 20, with direct object, is very similar to Ex. 29 36, with לָךְ, and Ez. 43 26 closely resembles Ex. 29 37, with the same contrast of usage. Ez. 45 20 is also parallel to Ex. 29 37, where לָךְ is used, although not as closely related as in the other cases.

Ez. 46 9 is similar to several passages, especially Ex. 34 23-24, Deut. 16 16. In these places in Exodus and Deuteronomy, and in several places elsewhere, the idea "appear before Yahweh"

is expressed by the Niphal of רָאָה followed by אֶת־פְּנֵי יְהוָה, אֶת being occasionally omitted. It is very commonly, and probably correctly, held that the original pointing was Kal instead of Niphal, giving the rendering, "to see the face of Yahweh", which was changed to the Niphal to avoid the material implication of the original reading. Ez. 46 9 uses an entirely distinct phrase, בּוֹא לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, not found elsewhere in such a connection, so far as the present writer knows. This seems to indicate a late period, the phrase being changed to avoid the difficulty of the other expression.

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

Many Hebrew words are found only in second-Ezekiel. Some of these, whose use has not much apparent significance, are not here mentioned. It seems worth while to call attention to the following words, however, none of which are found in first-Ezekiel, some only in second-Ezekiel, and others in second-Ezekiel and elsewhere in late literature. All of the words suggest late usage. רִצְפָה, *pavement*, occurs elsewhere only in Esther and 2 Chr. The earlier words for this idea are מִרְצֶפֶת, occurring once, and מִרְקָע, used frequently. Yahweh's altar is called a *table*, שֻׁלְחָן, only in second-Ezekiel, 41 22 44 18, and in Mal. 1 7 12; Ez. 39 20 and Is. 65 11 not being parallel. The term is thus used several times in the later apocalyptic literature, e. g. in Enoch 89 50 73, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, T. Lev. 8 18, T. Jud. 21 5, Jubilees 31 18. מְזוֹרָה in the sense of *altar ledge* is found only in second-Ezekiel; elsewhere only in 2 Chr. in the sense of the outer court of the temple. תְּרִיפָה, *healing*, is found only in Ez. 47 12, the word commonly used being מְרַפֵּא.

The syntax of second-Ezekiel makes a general impression

of lateness, in such matters as sentences with unusual arrangement of words, awkwardly and loosely constructed sentences, &c.

The facts thus far given seem to the present writer to give strong indications that first-Ezekiel and second-Ezekiel are of diverse authorship, and that second-Ezekiel is much later than first-Ezekiel.

Some further facts, however, indicate that second-Ezekiel is not a unit in point of authorship. The strongest indications are to the effect that chapters 40-42 are of different authorship from most or all of the remainder of second-Ezekiel. There is some conflicting evidence in reference to the early part of chapter 43. It is most probable that 43 1-17 should be joined with chapters 40-42, although it is possible that this portion should be joined with the following, leaving chapters 40-42 as a distinct portion. Well-marked peculiarities are found in chapters 40-42, and to some extent in 43 1-17, these being principally of language, which distinguish these chapters from the remainder of second-Ezekiel as well as from first-Ezekiel, some of these peculiarities not being duplicated elsewhere in the Old Testament.

Ez. 42 20 indicates that beyond the outside wall of the temple it is profane, i. e. common. This seems to be in contradiction to 48 12, where all that region is holy, as well as to 43 12 45 4, where a similar idea is expressed. This seems to separate between 40-42 and 43 1-17.

The idea "on this side—on that side" is expressed in chapters 40-41 repeatedly by the Hebrew **קַמֶּה—קִמָּה**. This Hebrew phrase never occurs elsewhere in the Old Testament. The standing phrase in common use for this idea is **קִמָּה—קִמָּה**. This latter phrase is the only one used in the remainder of second-Ezekiel, being found in 45 7 47 7 12 48 21. Neither phrase, obviously, is found in chapters 42 and 43, and it is also true that neither is found in first-Ezekiel.

**קָרַיב**, *round about*, is found in Ezekiel both singly and in the repeated form, **קָרַיב קָרַיב**. In chapters 40-42 it occurs singly twice, repeated 23 times. In 43 1-17 it occurs once, repeated, 43 12, and three times singly. In the remainder of

second-Ezekiel it is found singly 11 times, repeated not at all. In first-Ezekiel it occurs repeated once, singly 11 times. Here 43 1-17 is partly like chapters 40-42, but more like the remainder. The almost unanimous usage of 40 1-43 17 is in contrast with the almost unanimous usage of the remainder of the whole book.

The preposition ׀ before the article is ordinarily found as a distinct word, in the usage of the Old Testament generally, ׀ being not assimilated. *BDB.* says "׀ before article in all books much commoner than ׀". This statement, therefore, includes the usage of first-Ezekiel. In 40 1-43 17, however, the form ׀ only is found, occurring 15 times. In all the remainder of second-Ezekiel the form ׀ only is found, occurring 14 times.

The usual phrase to express the idea "facing in the direction of" is הַפְּנֵה, the Kal participle of הִפְּנֶה with the article, followed by a noun in the accusative, with or without ה directive, giving the direction. This is the form found in first-Ezekiel, where it occurs twice, and in chapters 44, 46, and 47, where it occurs five times. This phrase does not occur in 40 1-43 17. Instead is found the phrase הַפְּנֵה הַיָּמִין, and other suffixes, followed by the noun of direction. This is a very awkward phrase as compared with the other, and gives to הַפְּנֵה almost a prepositional force, *towards*. This occurs 8 times in 40 1-43 17. A phrase that is a mixture of the two is found in 43 1. Aside from the phrase cited, the use of הַפְּנֵה in this prepositional sense, *without* a verb, appears only in 40-42, being found there 13 times.

אֵילִם, porch, is found only in 40-41. The corresponding word in the remainder of second-Ezekiel, in first-Ezekiel, and elsewhere is אֵילִם, which is also found in 40-41.

A few other words that are found only in 40-42, or some part thereof, do not definitely indicate an authorship for these chapters distinct from the remainder of second-Ezekiel. They show a distinctive vocabulary in these chapters, however, which perhaps tends in that direction. Such words are the following. קֶנֶה, in the sense of measuring-rod and also as a measure of length is found only in 40-42. מִלֵּךְ, projecting pillar, is found

only in 40-41 and in 1 Kings 6 31, where the text is doubtful. **גלריה**, *gallery*, appears only in 41-42. **גלגל**, **גלגל**, and **גלגל** are found only in 40-42.

The form of 40 1-43 17 is in marked contrast with that of the most of 43 18-48 35. The first portion is entirely in the form of a vision, in which the writer is conducted by a "man", 40 3, the usual phrases, often repeated, being: "and he brought me", and "and he said unto me". In the second portion, the usual form is not of a vision. It is that of direct commands of Yahweh, the usual phrases being: "Thus saith the Lord Yahweh", **כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**, and: "saith the Lord Yahweh", **כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**, phrases which do not occur at all in 40 1-43 17. The only portions which in form resemble 40 1-43 17 are 46 19-24 and 47 1-12, which will be discussed later. Chapter 48 does not contain the phrases quoted, but is in the same general form, that of direct commands of Yahweh, and is closely connected with 47 13-23, where they do occur.

The facts given indicate that 40 1-43 17 are by one author, and that 43 18-48 35 are, at least for the most part, by a single author, who is not the author of 40 1-43 17. Nothing in language or thought gives any further strong indications of diversity of authorship in 43 18-48 35 beyond what has been noted. The regulation in 44 28, reading "no inheritance" with **וְ**, seems contradictory to the regulations prescribing an inheritance for the priests in 45 1-8 and 48 10. A certain amount of editorial revision is, of course, naturally to be supposed. In general there are similarities of thought and language throughout 43 18-48 35.

The argument thus far has assumed that P as a document belongs to the early post-exilic period. It is, of course, now held by many that the documentary view must be given up or modified. Its abandonment does not seem likely to the present writer. But even if P were considered much earlier than is usually done, that might modify the preceding argument somewhat, but it would not essentially change it, because it does not depend simply upon the regulations of P, but also upon the post-exilic usage.

The time of writing of the two portions of second-Ezekiel

remains to be considered. Various things have already been noted which indicate a date considerably later than the time of Ezra. These indications already noted deal principally with 43 18-48 35. Some further indications of late date in this portion will now be considered.

The only judges mentioned are the priests, 44 24, which is appropriate only to the time after Ezra, when the priests exercised political and judicial functions, as they did not earlier. The figure of the "prince" suits this period better than any other. He has no political importance, but great religious service. He is, however, evidently regarded as the head of the nation. He is thus entirely distinct from the actual Messianic expectation of any period. He is appropriate only to a time when the ceremonial of religion is the chief concern, which is, of course, the period after the exile. Under Persian and Greek domination, too, the political side was not much in the thought of the people, while the religious side was their immediate care.

In second-Ezekiel the only priests recognized are "sons of Zadok", 40 46 43 19 44 15 48 11. It will be observed that both portions of second-Ezekiel are included in these references. Nowhere else is the priesthood so much restricted as this. These sons of Zadok are descendants of Zadok who was placed in charge at Jerusalem by Solomon when he deposed Abiathar. In P all sons of Aaron are priests. At the return from the exile the regulation presupposed is that of P. The sons of Zadok are most prominent, but others are recognized as priests along with them. This is explicitly stated in Ezra 8 2, and is also implied in the treatment of earlier times in Chronicles, as in 1 Chr. 24 3-4. After that time, however, it is evident that the prominence of the sons of Zadok continued to increase, so that they came to comprise all or practically all of the priests. This is indicated by the fact that the Sadducees, a priestly party, originating near the beginning of the Maccabean period, derived their name, as it is now generally recognized, from Zadok. Further, Sirach, just before the Maccabean period, speaks of the sons of Zadok alone as priests, 51 12 ix. Second-Ezekiel, therefore, is simply describing the fact of this later

time, that the sons of Zadok are the priests, practically or entirely, this being a description rather than a limitation. The time thus indicated, then, is considerably later than that of Ezra.

The exceedingly prosaic, almost obvious, directions of Ez. 46, designed to avoid tumultuous crowds at the feasts, are in the manner of late Judaism, not of the earlier.

All the evidence, then, concerning 43 18-48 35 points in the same direction, indicating the composition of these chapters considerably later than the time of Ezra. Before seeking to indicate the occasion more precisely, however, it will be advisable to consider the other portion of second-Ezekiel, 40 1-43 17. Some features of language are shared by these chapters with the remainder of second-Ezekiel, and these suggest lateness. The mention of "the sons of Zadok" as the priests is also a feature common to the two portions, as just noted, and suggests lateness. The special peculiarities of language in 40 1-43 17 also indicate lateness. The general statement may be made, then, for this portion as well as for the other that a time considerably later than Ezra is indicated for its composition. Nothing as yet noticed gives any definite indication which of the two is the earlier. 43 1-17 may be a supplement to 40-42, perhaps added by a different hand, but it has many of the same peculiarities, and so is closely associated with it.

The date and specific occasion of 40 1-43 17 will naturally be considered first. This is chiefly a description of the temple, and its courts, with the various objects connected with it. What temple is in mind? Is it a description of a temple actually present or a temple of the future? How far is it actual and how far ideal? The account here is much more detailed than any description of the temple either of Solomon or Zerubbabel. The building itself in Zerubbabel's temple, however, was substantially identical with Solomon's, and this description, so far as comparison is possible, is apparently of a building substantially identical with that common plan. So far as courts are concerned, however, the temple of Solomon had actually only one court, while the temple here described



has two. In the Old Testament itself there is no account of the courts in Zerubbabel's temple, in the Maccabean period there were two, 1 Macc. 4 38 48 &c. The description of the courts here, then, does not correspond to those in Solomon's temple, but apparently it does to those in Zerubbabel's temple. The description here, then, of the temple and its courts is not a description of the actual temple of Solomon, if it has any relation to that it is as ideal. The description does correspond closely, however, to Zerubbabel's temple, so far as is known. It may be, therefore, a description of that actual temple, or an ideal description with some relation to it.

The purpose of such a description, however, could hardly be to furnish a mere account of a temple actually standing in its entirety. No service to be rendered by a description under such circumstances can be conjectured. The only natural suggestion is that it was a description designed to serve as a guide in the building or repair of the temple. This suggests, then, as the specific time of composition some occasion when the temple had been destroyed or materially injured and its rebuilding or restoration was contemplated. What occasions of this kind are actually to be found in the history? The first occasion is of course the destruction of the temple at the time of the Babylonian captivity. That occasion, however, is much too early for the indications already mentioned. Some have thought that the temple was destroyed or materially injured under Artaxerxes III, Ochus, in 346 B. C., Jos. Ant. xi, 7, 1. Others think that such an event took place under Ptolemy Soter in 320 B. C., Jos. Ant. xii, 1, 1. Neither of these events certainly included a destruction or material injury of the temple. The first is said to have included a desecration of the temple. On the second occasion the city was captured, and the temple might naturally have been injured. The partial destruction and desecration of the temple under Antiochus Epiphanes in 168 B. C. is of course well-known, a destruction which seems to have been greater than is often thought, see 1 Macc. 4 38. In this case the temple was rebuilt and cleansed, and rededicated in 165. This Maccabean event, however, does not seem very probable, inasmuch as the Maccabean back-

ground is not definitely reflected in these chapters. Also, it is not easy to suppose that a Maccabean composition, at least of any length, can be found in a *prophetic* book. At the same time, this Maccabean origin is a possibility.

There seems to be a probability of a considerable injury to the temple on some preceding occasion, either in 346 or 320 B. C., the latter date seeming to be more probable. Aside from the historical references already mentioned, some Old Testament passages appear most probably to refer to such an event. This is not necessarily the case with Ps. 74 and 79. The most probable passage referring to this time is Is. 63 7-64 11 (Eng. 12), 63 18 and 64 10 (Eng. 11), being of special importance in this connection. This passage is sometimes supposed to have been written during the Babylonian exile, but all the remainder of trito-Isaiah, 56-66, is generally considered to have been considerably later than that, making such a date probable for this portion also. A date soon after 320 B. C. seems probable, then, for 40 1-43 17, with about 165 B. C. a possible date, but much less likely.

What date shall be assigned to 43 18-48 35, or to the most of this, if it may not be altogether a unit? The time is quite certainly not Maccabean, the condition of things presupposed is not of a Maccabean character. One fact not previously mentioned, however, suggests a reasonably late pre-Maccabean date, viz. the ideal treatment. This appears particularly in relation to the geographical features of the land, especially in 45 1-8 47-48. A pronounced ideal element here is obvious, the whole plan of laying out the land pays no attention to geographical facts, mountains and valleys are ignored, the greater width of the land toward the south is unrecognized, the stream, in 47 1-12, pursues a course which leads it over a mountain ridge, &c. Such ideal treatment, particularly geographical, is a conspicuous feature, as is well-known, of the apocalyptic literature of the Maccabean time. It is also found in the Old Testament, but particularly in the later prophetic portions, see e. g. Is. 65 17 66 22. This suggests that this portion, 43 18-48 35, is somewhat later than 40 1-43 17, i. e. somewhat later than 300 B. C.

What is the condition presupposed by this portion? The principal feature, relating to external circumstances, is that the writer contemplates a numerous population in Palestine, with representatives of all the twelve tribes, so that the land will need to be freshly allotted among the tribes. This allotment evidently has in mind the original allotment among the twelve tribes, to the account of which there are many verbal parallels. It is evident that during most of the Persian and Greek periods only a small part of Palestine was actually inhabited by the Hebrews. Hence such an expectation must have had in mind a considerable return of the scattered people. This expectation of such a return often recurred during the Persian and Greek periods; it might naturally be expected to be in mind at any time when circumstances looked reasonably favorable. Portions of the reigns of Ptolemy II and of Ptolemy III were thus favorable. Ptolemy II reigned from 285-247, and Ptolemy III from 247-222. The latter part of the reign of Ptolemy II, 264-248, was occupied with a war with Syria, which caused suffering in Palestine, which therefore would not be a favorable occasion. But any of the earlier part of the reign of Ptolemy II, or the reign of Ptolemy III seems favorable. Both rulers showed favors to the Jews. Ptolemy II is stated in Jewish tradition to have been a patron of the temple in Jerusalem, and to have liberated all Jewish captives in his realm, and also to have been the ruler under whose direction the Septuagint translation was made. Ptolemy III is said to have offered abundant sacrifices at the temple in Jerusalem, and the whole empire was especially prosperous in his reign. Hence either the period 285-264 or 247-222 seems favorable for such a composition as is in mind. The underlying principle of the writer was an extreme conception of holiness, which appears in his rearrangement of the population of the land, and also in the ceremonial regulations. This idea of holiness was an especial feature of the post-exilic time, and evidently increased as years went by, so that an extreme form of it would naturally be expected in the periods indicated. The ceremonial regulations here given probably represent the working of this principle of holiness in actual

practice quite as much as they do in the mind of the writer, and it may be even more. A later time than this might be possible, e. g. during the reign of Antiochus the Great after Palestine had passed under his control in 198 B. C. But a later time like that is less likely, principally because it does not seem probable at that late period that this portion would have been included among the prophets. The writer of 43 18-48 35 is evidently a priest, a fact which seems equally evident in reference to 40 1-43 17.

There are indications that the writers of second-Ezekiel were reasonably familiar with first-Ezekiel, as appears from the use of a small portion of the distinctive phraseology of first-Ezekiel. This is true to a greater extent of the author of 43 18-48 35 than of 40 1-43 17. There is no reason to think, however, that any portion of second-Ezekiel was designed by the author to be a supplement to first-Ezekiel. It is also evident from what has already been said that the authors of second-Ezekiel, particularly the author of 43 18-48 35, were especially familiar with portions of P, although some of the familiarity may be with the regulations of P in use more than with them in written form.

It has already been suggested that 46 19-24 and 47 1-12 are different in form from any other portion of 43 18-48 35. They do not have the phrases characteristic of this portion of second-Ezekiel, "thus saith the Lord Yahweh" and "saith the Lord Yahweh", and they do have the phrase "and he brought me", and related phrases, which are characteristic of the other part of second-Ezekiel. These phrases do not occur elsewhere in this portion, except in 43 18 44 14, which will be discussed later. Also, 46 19-24 resembles in contents the other portion of second-Ezekiel more than this portion, being similar to 40 44-46 and 42 13-14. Nevertheless the resemblances in phraseology of both passages, 46 19-24 and 47 1-12, are with the part of second-Ezekiel in which they stand, not with the other. How is this to be explained?

The probable solution seems to the writer to be as follows. 43 18-48 35, being composed later than 40 1-43 17, was written

without any reference to it, not having been designed as a supplement. The two were united by an editor, presumably not much later than the time of the second part, who found their common element in the fact that both were dealing in some measure with the temple. 47 1-12 may have been written by the author of the most of 43 18-48 35, and revised by the editor just mentioned, particularly by the addition of the phrases already referred to which are characteristic of the preceding portion. But inasmuch as these phrases seem quite closely connected with the remainder, it seems more probable that it was written by another author, and presumably by the editor himself. 46 19-24 bears even stronger marks of composition by this editor. This editor, being of about the same time as the writer of 43 18-48 35, and being a student of this portion, used the same general phraseology, but used also the introductory phrases of the other portion, in order to bind the two more closely together. The introductory words at the beginning of 43 18, "And he said unto me, Son of man", are also by the editor. This is an introductory phrase like those of the preceding portion, and serves to unite the two parts. When this is omitted, the verse begins with the characteristic phrase of the second portion, "Thus saith the Lord Yahweh". Part, and perhaps the most, of 44 1-6<sup>a</sup> was added by the editor. The characteristic phrase of this portion appears in 6b, "thus saith the Lord Yahweh", while elsewhere are the characteristic phrases of the preceding portion, "then he brought me", 44 1 4, and "And Yahweh said unto me", 44 2 5. At least these phrases of the preceding portion were added by the editor. How much more comes from the editor is not certain. Probably the most of v. 5 is from the original author, as this is closely connected with the following and serves well to introduce it. In that case, either the phrase of v. 6, "Thus saith the Lord Yahweh", originally stood at the beginning of v. 5, and has been transferred to its present position, or such a phrase stood there, which has been omitted. It is probable, then, that most or all of v. 1-4 are by the editor.

It seems probable, also, that 43 18-27 was transferred to

its present position by the editor, in order to form a close connection with the concluding verses of the preceding portion, as both have to do with the altar of burnt-offering. The original position of 43 18-27 was then in connection with 45 18-20 which it resembles, as already noted. 43 18-27, dealing with the altar, is of too special a nature to be a natural beginning of the original work. Such a transference leaves 44 5 as the beginning of the work, which by its general nature is well adapted for that purpose, and does indicate the nature of the thought of this portion better than any other single verse.

No further definite evidence of editorial activity appears in 43 18-48 35.

The completed work, comprising practically second-Ezekiel as it now stands, was united with first-Ezekiel by an editor. This was perhaps the same editor as the one just mentioned, but it seems more probable that it was another, but probably not very much later. The union with first-Ezekiel, it seems probable, took place by 200 B. C., otherwise this portion, second-Ezekiel, would probably not have been put with the prophets, but with the hagiographa. The principal reason for the union with first-Ezekiel would seem to be the use by second-Ezekiel of a few of the characteristic phrases of first-Ezekiel, particularly noticeable being such introductory phrases as "thus saith the Lord Yahweh", and "saith the Lord Yahweh". The similarity between first-Ezekiel and second-Ezekiel which would attract the attention of an editor is thus of a different kind from the similarity between the two parts of second-Ezekiel, already noted, thus suggesting the activity of two editors, already mentioned. The union with first-Ezekiel was also favored by the fact that Ezekiel was a priest, and second-Ezekiel deals with priestly matters. If Ezekiel was in the original order the last of the major prophets, that might also favor the union, this anonymous portion being put at the end of the collection of major prophets. But the original order of these prophets is actually quite uncertain.

The editor who united first-Ezekiel and second-Ezekiel

added but little to second-Ezekiel. A few slight additions have been made, either by this editor or subsequently, which serve to join the two parts more closely together. 40 1, or at least 40 1a, is such an addition, doubtless by this editor, serving as a seam to unite the two parts. 43 8 is also a similar addition, either by this editor or subsequently, being a reference to first-Ezekiel. There are no other obvious editorial additions.

A few explanatory statements may be added. It is usually supposed that there is no reference to the high priest in second-Ezekiel. A few have thought that official to be meant, it is true, by "the priest" in 45 19. In the light of what has already been said, that view is obviously to be accepted. The term "the priest" is, then, used here as a designation for the high priest, according to the common usage in P and elsewhere, which is here followed.

What is said concerning the Levites who went astray after idols, 44 10-14 48 11 is usually understood to be the sentence of degradation upon the pre-exilic priests of the high places, indicating that they are to be no longer priests but are to occupy a subordinate position and be known as Levites. According to the date here accepted such a view is, of course, inadmissible. The whole of 44 6-31 deals with the priests and Levites. Three elements seem to form the background of this treatment: the going astray of the Levites after idols (44 10 12 48 11), the introduction of foreigners into the temple, apparently not as attendants but as spectators (44 7 9), and the desire or attempt of the Levites to officiate as priests (44 13). The going astray after idols, at the period here in mind, means following after Greek gods. It is well known that Hellenizing tendencies were strong at this time. The career of Joseph the tax-collector, nephew of the high priest, beginning about 230 B. C., is an example of a man of prominence who was thoroughly given over to Hellenism. In general, Hellenistic influences were strong in Levitical circles. The author of chapter 44 seems to have in mind incidents in which the Levites were carried away by these tendencies while the priests were not so influenced. In the absence of detailed information concerning these times,

such incidents can not be definitely located, but they are natural under the circumstances. The entrance of foreigners into the sanctuary is closely associated in treatment with these transgressions of the Levites, and might readily be a result of these Hellenizing practices. That there was at least one attempt by the Levites in the time after Ezra to seize upon some of the duties of the priests is well-known, *DB.*, vol. IV, p. 88. This regulation forbids any such attempt. In general, this passage in chapter 44 favors the priests as against the Levites. Their work is described in terms which indicate it as subordinate, almost menial. No privileges of theirs are mentioned, some which were theirs in P are now tacitly or explicitly denied them. This is particularly the case with the tithe. That is assigned in Num. 18 21 24 to the Levites, while a tithe of the tithe is to be given from that to the priests, Num. 18 26. Here nothing is given to the Levites, and it seems to be intended to give all to the priests, for 44 30 assigns to the priests every contribution, *תְּרומָה*, a word which is elsewhere applied to the priests' tithe of the tithe, Num. 18 26-29, and to the tithe of the Levites, Num. 18 24, as well as to other contributions. At some time after Ezra the tithe was actually withdrawn from the Levites and assigned to the priests, and other regulations were changed to the advantage of the priests as compared with the Levites, *DB.*, vol. IV, p. 94. This whole passage, 44 6-31, has numerous resemblances to Num. 18, especially in phraseology.

After all, the view here presented is, so far as concerns second-Ezekiel, in substantial accord with the saying of the rabbis which has been so mystifying to critics that "the men of the Great Synagogue wrote Ezekiel".