

HARLOTRY AND HISTORY: AN ANALYSIS OF EZEKIEL 16

Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Theologischen Fakultät der Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, vorgelegt von Tracy J. McKenzie

30. Nov, 2017

Harlotry and History: An Analysis of Ezekiel 16

Hiermit versichere ich an Eides Statt, dass ich die Dissertation *Harlotry and History: An Analysis of Ezekiel 16* selbständig angefertigt und andere als die angegebenen Quellen und Hilfsmittel nicht benutzt habe. Sie hat noch keiner anderen Prüfungsbehörde vorgelegen.

Acknowledgments

*Every form of writing turns the
world into language.*

Verlyn Klinkenborg, *Several Short Sentences about Writing*

While true of writing in general and of Scripture in particular, Verlyn Klinkenborg's statement suggests that even this book has come into being out of its own 'world.' And so, it is a true pleasure for me to acknowledge the roles that a few individuals have played in creating the world behind this book.

First, I want to express my deepest appreciation to Reinhard Kratz. Herr Prof. Kratz graciously extended an invitation for me to participate with the *Theologische Fakultät* at the Georg-August Universität Göttingen while on sabbatical from my teaching responsibilities in Wake Forest, NC during 2012–2013. The *Fakultät* warmly welcomed me into their impressive community of scholars and he personally invested time in my development; for that kindness and assistance, I will be ever grateful.

Second, I would like to thank the provost, president, and board of trustees at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary for their approval of and provision for my sabbatical program. This project would not have come to fruition without their support in this extended time for development, research, and writing.

Finally, I owe the greatest degree of gratitude to my wife, Beth, and to my sons, Micah, Joel, Josiah, and Noah. Although the year abroad in Germany offered a considerable degree of privilege for us all, it did not come without cost for them. With eager expectation, Beth collaborated in the plans in spite of possible detriment to her own health. She took on every task that sustained our well-being in Europe while allowing me to pursue the requirements of my program of study. Each of the boys buoyantly complied with our plans although the timing in their own situations was less than ideal. They resourcefully and brilliantly matured throughout the year and since. Each is my greatest source of inspiration and joy.

Tracy J. McKenzie

Wake Forest, NC
November, 2017

Table of Contents

Introduction : The Interpretation of Prophecy and History: A Brief Survey	1
Chapter 1 : Text and Translation	45
Chapter 2 : Structure and Unity in Ezekiel 16	65
Chapter 3 : Literary Activity in Ezekiel 16	207
Conclusion : “Harlotry” and its Relationship to History	316

Introduction

1. The Interpretation of Prophecy and History: A Brief Survey

The relationship of prophecy to history has long been a topic in Old Testament Studies. In what way or to what extent does a prophecy reflect a particular historical context? Or better asked, “How does prophecy relate to history at all?” How does a prophetic text incorporate historical experience or exhibit the development of thought in Ancient Israel and Second Temple Judaism? Additionally, how do authors, scribes, and others actualize prophetic speeches, traditions, and texts? Not only has the interrelationship between prophecy and history been a subject of debate but also in what manner does prophetic literature cohere with other literary genres that also intersect with some sort of human historical experience. How do the varying usages of prophetic texts in the Old Testament reflect historical experience or structures? Do prophetic genres reflect an early historiography? These questions and more have been at the center of the debate over the Bible’s relationship to history since early modernity and in many ways, much longer.¹

The attempt to discern an orientation of prophetic texts to so-called ‘history’ yields a multiplicity of differing conceptions and hypotheses concerning prophecy’s relationship (or lack thereof) to historical events, traditions, and structures in current Old Testament Studies. No doubt this attempt at discernment reflects the complex process

¹ Take, for example, the discussion of the different levels or senses of Scripture, including the *sensus literalis*, which has received renewed interest in recent past; cf. Charles J. Scalise, “The *sensus literalis*: a hermeneutical key to biblical exegesis.” *Scottish Journal Of Theology* 42, no. 1 (January 1, 1989): 45-65.

that yielded prophetic texts. Recently, scholarly proposals have given attention to the activity of interpretation and scribal activity in order to discern prophecy's interdependence to the milieu in which it is produced.² In what follows, a brief survey attempts to trace the academy's growing recognition of this complex process of the production of prophetic texts. The analysis in the following chapters will attempt to bring Ezekiel 16 to bear on these issues. Although many other studies, literature, and scholars have touched on the issue of prophecy's complex relationship with history, this brief investigation narrowly focuses on those writings that yielded important developments or formulations of this relationship in the field of Old Testament studies and prophetic literature in particular. This brief survey extends to the publication of Walter Zimmerli's two-volume commentary on Ezekiel in 1969.³

At least as recently as the early modern period, scholars have postulated varying explanations of the intersection of prophecy and history. Amidst the complex factors concerning the period known as the Renaissance, traditional ways of thinking about theology and the Bible began to yield to varying degrees of humanism, individualism,

² For the former, see George J. Brooke, "Prophecy and Prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Looking Backwards and Forwards" in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*, eds. Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak, LHBOTS 427 (New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 151–65. For the latter, see Michael Floyd's contribution in the same volume, "The Production of Prophetic Books in the Early Second Temple Period" in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*, eds. Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak, LHBOTS 427 (New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 276–97.

³ Scholarship on Ezekiel has burgeoned significantly since then and to be sure, so has academia's perception of the production of biblical books. For the state of scholarship on Ezekiel see Karl Friedrich Pohlmann, *Ezekiel, Der Stand der Theologischen Diskussion* (Darmstadt: WBG, 2008); idem. "Ezekiel: New Directions and Current Debates" in *Ezekiel*, eds. William A. Tooman and Penelope Barter FAT 112 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 3–17. See also other contributions in Tooman and Barter's edited volume above. Finally, for a very helpful review of scholarly proposals for understanding the vision accounts in the book of Ezekiel, see Janina Maria Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives: A Redaction-Critical and Theological Study*, BZAW 475 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 1–37.

and rationalism.⁴ From the perspective of early naturalistic thought, which eventually gave way to Deism and controversies surrounding it, that which began as a debate over God's involvement in creation, also yielded a discussion concerning God's guidance and control of human history.⁵ In particular, in what way had God inserted himself in the course of history as it is expressed in Old Testament prophecies and presumably fulfilled later in the person and work of Jesus Christ?⁶ Is God so providentially concerned with his creation that he would engage humanity and the universe in such a way? This was a question with which early academics wrestled in the rational climate of the early Enlightenment. An orthodox response to these issues within the academic environment of the day involved what was an impossible balance between natural religion with its rational explanations of nature, morality, and religion while at the same time asserting that God was active in creation, miracles, and indeed, the history of Israel and the subsequent period of Jesus and his apostles. For some, a central line of argumentation for the truthfulness of Christianity was the confluence of Old Testament prophecies, presumably uttered in the environs of Ancient Israel, and the fulfillment of those prophecies in the historical person of Jesus Christ.

⁴ See the description of these centuries and intellectual movements by Magne Sæbø in "From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment – Aspects of the Cultural and Ideological Framework of Scriptural Interpretation" in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament The History of Its Interpretation*, Ed. Magne Sæbø, Vol II (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008) 21–39. See also in the same volume H.J.M. Nellen, "Growing Tension between Church Doctrines and Critical Exegesis of the Old Testament" in *HB/OT*, 802–26; Henning Graf Reventlow, "English Rationalism, Deism and Early Biblical Criticism," in *HB/OT*, 851–72.

⁵ James E. Force, *William Whiston: Honest Newtonian* (Cambridge: Cambridge Press, 1985), 63–70.

⁶ E.G.E. van der Wall, "Between Grotius and Cocceius: The 'Theologia Prophetica' of Campegius Vitringa (1659–1722)," in *Hugo Grotius, Theologian: Essays in Honour of G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes*, eds. Henk J.M. Nellen and Edwin Rabbie (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 195–215.

In Great Britain, what began as a description concerning the design of creation unfolded into a debate about historically explained prophecy and fulfillment. Early scientists could increasingly explain the mechanics of the universe. Many, such as Robert Boyle and Isaac Newton utilized their discoveries to argue against deism and atheism, showing God's providential care of his universe.⁷ Another of those academics, William Whiston, heir to Isaac Newton's chair, asserted the necessity of a literal, historically delimited but naturally and scientifically explained interpretation of texts in the primeval history.⁸ Whiston intended his interpretation to demonstrate the necessity of God's benevolent involvement in the universe. But the rationalistic argument of design in a theistic account of creation was not enough to counter the deistic thinking of the time. Eventually his utilization of rationalism would lead to a similar attempt to explain a literalistic but extrapolated interpretation of the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies in the person of Christ.

In the milieu of natural religion brought about by new scientific discoveries and Newton's science, Whiston attempted to demonstrate that the fulfillment of these prophecies was ample evidence of God's providential care of nature and man. Unlike the fideists of his day, who followed the traditional dogma about the fulfillment of prophecy through multiple levels of meaning in a prophetic text, Whiston articulated a single,

⁷ Charlotte Methuen, "On the Threshold of a New Age: Expanding Horizons as the Broader Context of Scriptural Interpretation," in *HB/OT*, 685–90; Force, *Whiston*, 63–70.

⁸ Force, *Whiston*, 48–49. Whiston demonstrates his interpretation in *A New Theory of the Earth, From its Original, to the Consummation of all things, Where in the Creation of the World in Six Days, the Universal Deluge, And the General Conflagration, As laid down in the Holy Scriptures, Are Shewn to be perfectly agreeable to Reason and Philosophy. With a large Introduction concerning the Genuine Nature, Stile, and Extent of the Mosaick History of the Creation*, 5th ed. (London, 1737), 367–382 but *passim* for the approach. For his hermeneutical principles see his introduction "Of the Mosaick History" to a *New Theory*, 95.

literal meaning for a presumed historical prophecy and its fulfillment. It was only with the utilization of this relatively recent privileging of a literal, historically-oriented and explained interpretation that one could rationalize against the fideists and yet, at the same time, demonstrate to the deists that God was actively involved in the affairs of men through the so-called revealed religion. This attempt seemed only fitting to Whiston since according to him, the New Testament relied on the literal fulfillment of these prophecies for proof that Jesus was the Messiah.⁹ Whiston writes, “I observe that the Stile and Language of the Prophets, as it is often peculiar and enigmatical, so is it always single and determinate, and not capable of those double Intentions, which most of our late Christian Expositors are so full of upon all occasions.”¹⁰ As for demonstrating to others the truth claims of Christianity regarding Jesus, Whiston proclaims, “For that can be by no other method so well attempted as by the demonstration, that all their [Jews] Old Predictions, relating to the Messias, whose Periods are already past, have been properly and literally, without any recourse to Typical, Foreign, and Mystical Expositions fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth.”¹¹ In this manner, Whiston attempts to rationally affirm God’s involvement with humanity through the course of history expressed in the Old Testament and fulfilled in the New Testament. Moreover, his historically oriented explanation of prophecy and fulfillment coheres with his rational explanation of the earth’s origin in accordance with the historical depiction of Moses’ hexameron.¹²

⁹ William Whiston, *The Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies* (London, 1708), 15–17.

¹⁰ Whiston, *The Accomplishment*, 13.

¹¹ Whiston, *The Accomplishment*, 13.

¹² Whiston, “Of the Mosaick Creation” in *A New Theory*, 1–3.

To be more precise, Whiston articulates a theory of how Old Testament prophecy and Old Testament narratives relate to actual events both past and future in a similar manner. Whiston asserts that just as “former [Historical Narrations] relate to the time and events *already past*; and the latter [Prophetical Predictions] to those which are to come: and that the former generally use a plain and vulgar Stile, for the information of all readers *immediately*; while the latter often are disguis’d in a parabolick or peculiar dialect, that they may long be conceal’d, and yet *at length* in God’s due time, may be plainly and distinctly understood by all. But that the one [prophecy] ought to belong still to *one* single and determinate event then future, as well as the other to *one* single and determinate event already past [historical narrative], I think ‘tis in its own nature not only reasonable but also absolutely necessary.”¹³ Whiston attempts to explain why prophecy is enigmatic, concealed until a proper time. Nonetheless, for him, it reflects one, future, determinate event and need not be explained through non-literal categories. Whiston’s view on prophecy was obviously a reaction against the deists’ attempt to marginalize God’s involvement in the universe while also incorporating a rational limitation upon interpretation. Consequently, it demonstrates an early struggle with history’s reciprocity with prophecy.

While Whiston was applying Newtonian thought to religious and academic pursuits in England, others on the continent were already expounding the manner in which passages of scripture reflected their origin and immediate, cultural milieu. One such person was Hugo Grotius. Normally given credit as the first person to privilege the

¹³ Italics original; Whiston, *The Accomplishment*, 14–15.

socio-historical context as a means to properly interpret a biblical text, Grotius was not trained as a theologian.¹⁴ Grotius pursued peace within the ecclesial conflict of his time and sought to free an interpretation of the prophets from a Christian dogmatism.¹⁵ In his 19th century history of interpretation, *Geschichte des Alten Testamentes in der christlichen Kirche*, Ludwig Diestel writes, “What makes him significant... is his extraordinary freedom from the Christian tradition of exegesis, the indifferent lucidity with which he looked at the text purely as a scientific object, as well as the vast background of world history on which the document of the scripture appears as only one among many significant issues: he himself was a laymen writing for the public.”¹⁶ To put the matter another way, he lacked a specific theological agenda and instead pursued an interpretation of texts that was grounded in a historically oriented understanding of the context.

In his explanations of the prophets, Grotius construes a passage’s meaning in a manner related to its portrayed context in Ancient Israel in contrast to the traditional Christian or New Testament understanding. For example, the “Immanuel” of Isaiah 7:14 refers to one of Isaiah’s sons, the suffering of Isaiah 53 refers to Jeremiah, the righteous branch of Jer 23:5 and the one shepherd and one king of Ezek 34:23 and 37:22

¹⁴ Ludwig Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testamentes in der christlichen Kirche* (Jena: Mauke’s Verlag, 1869), 430–34; Johann Anselm Steiger, “The Development of the Reformation Legacy: Hermeneutics and Interpretation of the Sacred Scripture in the Age of Orthodoxy,” in *HB/OT*, 739; Nellen, “Growing Tension between Church Doctrines and Critical Exegesis of the Old Testament,” *HB/OT*, 808–17.

¹⁵ See Nellen, “Growing Tension between Church Doctrines and Critical Exegesis of the Old Testament,” *HB/OT*, 808–17.

¹⁶ Diestel, *Geschichte*, 430–31.

respectively refer to Zerubbabel.¹⁷ For Grotius, the prophecy's first or primary meaning relates to the immediate socio-cultural context of the presumed author. His emphasis on this frame of reference for the primary meaning of a text earned him notoriety among his contemporaries that felt as if he were undermining the prophecy-fulfillment scheme of the testaments.¹⁸

Another scholar of Grotius' day was Johannes Cocceius. The two are often used in the same sentence albeit because of their opposing approaches.¹⁹ As noted above, Grotius construed interpretation by means of the immediate, historically understood context of the character of the prophet within the biblical narrative, e.g. Isaiah 7, or a context perceived within the literary context, e.g. Isaiah 53. Cocceius, on the other hand, turned attention towards a philologically derived interpretation, anchored in the literary context of an entire oracle, and unfolding in temporally understood historical periods. For Cocceius, of primary interest was not a narratively-derived occasion in which the writing originated but rather the temporal framework in which fulfillment of prophecies unfold and as they relate to their fulfillment in the person of Jesus Christ.²⁰ For him, scripture and prophecies adumbrate different epochs, some of which were past at the

¹⁷ Nellen, "Growing Tension between Church Doctrines and Critical Exegesis of the Old Testament," *HB/OT*, 813.

¹⁸ Diestel, *Geschichte*, 430–31.

¹⁹ Diestel, *Geschichte*, 429; G. Schrenk, *Gottesreich und Bund im älteren Protestantismus, vornehmlich bei Johannes Coccejus. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Pietismus und der heliengeschichtlichen Theologie* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann 1923); Van der Wall, "Between Grotius and Cocceius," 195–215; John Sandys-Wunsch, "Early Old Testament Critics on the Continent" in *HB/OT*, 973–975.

²⁰ Heiner Faulenbach, *Weg und Ziel der Erkenntnis Christi: Eine Untersuchung zur Theologie des Johannes Coccejus* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973), 45, quoted in Brevard Childs, *The Struggle to Understand Isaiah as Christian Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004) 237.

time of Scripture's origin, e.g. Genesis 1 and 2–3, while others were in the future at the time of Scripture's writing, e.g. those that pointed to Christ or the church, while others were even yet to be experienced, e.g. the millennium.

Cocceius was not concerned about a text's immediate historical context, which according to Grotius constrained the primary meaning, but rather how a prophecy and the words therein related to an entire literary context and how this pointed to an historical epoch. In this way, Cocceius attempted to use Scripture and prophecy to describe world history and to find in Old Testament narrative and prophecy a sort of harmonious coordination between not only Old and New Testament but also on the experience of human history, past, present, and future. One can hardly summarize Cocceius' view better than John Sandys-Wunsch, "The obvious future reference of biblical prophecy had been given a new force in Protestant dogmatics by Cocceius in the seventeenth century whose federal theology represented a departure from older orthodoxy that treated the Bible as a pool of proof texts to the view of the Bible as a book that presented the shape of history as a series of events leading to the introduction of the Kingdom of God. The prophets contained the evidence for this system of *Heilsgeschichte*."²¹ As such, Cocceius viewed prophecy as an entry into an experience of history whether that experience was past, present, or yet to come. Cocceius's lasting influence has primarily been on theological systems but he also impacted another biblical scholar, whose work in prophecy was also influential, Campegius Vitranga.

Noted for his commentary on Isaiah, Vitranga is an important figure in the study of the prophets not only because of his commentary on Isaiah but also his hermeneutical

²¹ Sandys-Wunsch, "Early Old Testament Critics on the Continent," *HB/OT*, 974.

program. Vitringa, no doubt a man of his time, sought a middle way between the approach of Cocceius, who construed his interpretation of the prophets in relationship to his understanding of their fulfillment in Jesus Christ and within the course of human history, and the approach of Grotius, who privileged an interpretation of prophecies that understood the presumed sociocultural situation portrayed in their literary context rather than an interpretation through church dogma or the New Testament.²² Sandys-Wunsch's viewpoint is again instructive. Vitringa "is conscious of trying to steer a middle course between Cocceius' theology which tended to find in the prophets foreshadowings of various epochs through world history up to the present and beyond, and Grotius' more realistic, literal reading of the Old Testament."²³ How does Vitringa's treatment of the prophets and history contribute to this survey? Vitringa's work demonstrates the differing hermeneutical impulses practiced at the time—or at least a struggle within his scholarly and ecclesial environment. What did he utilize from Grotius and yet retain from Cocceius? What unique practices does he contribute to an understanding of the interplay between prophecy, prophetic texts, and history? An answer to these questions in his writings on Genesis helps one discern the developing critical analysis of the books of the Old Testament and their use in the schema of prophecy and fulfillment.

Although there is a question whether Vitringa was successful in incorporating both Grotius' and Cocceius' method of interpretation, his attempt to carry out both

²² See Klaas Märten Witteveen, "Campegius Vitringa und die prophetische Theologie" *Zwingliana*, 19, no. 2 (1993): 345–46; Steiger, "The Development of the Reformation Legacy," *HB/OT*, 739; Van der Wall, "Between Grotius and Cocceius," 206.

²³ Sandys-Wunsch, "Early Old Testament Critics on the Continent," *HB/OT*, 974; Brevard Childs, "Hermeneutical Reflections on C. Vitringa, Eighteenth-Century Interpreter of Isaiah," in *In Search of True Wisdom: Essays in Old Testament Interpretation in Honour of Ronald E. Clements*, ed. Edward Ball, JSOTSup 300 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 90.

programs may highlight procedural options. On the one hand, it does appear that he had a literary sensitivity to the larger textual unit or subject matter that Grotius perhaps lacked. And yet on the other hand, Vitranga also showed sensitivity to philological concerns, which had of late emerged, in order to establish his understanding of prophecy, its context, and fulfillment and attenuate the interpretations of prophecy such as Cocceius had promulgated. As for the former, one can discern his sensitivity to a greater literary context in the book of Genesis in his *Observationum Sacrarum*, in which he writes “De Confusione Linguarum.” There he asserts, “Those sheets and records of the fathers saved by the Israelites, we say that Moses collected, arranged, fit, and where needed, completed; and also he put together the first of his books from these [sheets and records].”²⁴ Vitranga will utilize this observation in his discussion of the Babel narrative and origin of language. Even though others had already noted the diverse elements of the Pentateuch, Vitranga’s adoption of the theory demonstrates an early struggle to incorporate what was then non-traditional thinking into an otherwise conservative scholar’s approach to scripture.²⁵

In the quote above, one can see Vitranga’s view of the authorship and composition of the book of Genesis. Although he views Moses as writing the book, he recognizes a particular complexity to its unity both in diverse elements as well as the way in which Moses brought them together. Amidst a great deal of other philological concerns about which he writes, his consideration of these issues leads him to a

²⁴ Campegius Vitranga, *Observationum Sacrarum*, Libri Sex (Franequera: Wibii Bleck, 1712) 36. See also John Sailhamer, *Introduction to Old Testament Theology: A Canonical Approach* (Grand Rapids: Zonderan, 1995) 47, 144–156.

²⁵ Sandys-Wunsch, “Early Old Testament Critics on the Continent,” *HB/OT*, 973.

discussion concerning the *toledot* formula in Genesis. While his primary assertion is the authority and trustworthiness of these accounts, the method of composition and the phrase, “These are the generations of” eventually lead him to the Gospel of Luke and the related phrase in Matthew 1. These philological observations reveal a literary basis for his understanding of the composite book of Genesis and an association of these passages.

As stated above, however, it appears that Vitringa’s immediate concern at this point was not an interpretation of Genesis but the trustworthiness and authority of “the first of Moses’ book.” He was not attempting to analyze or exegete in a manner of what today one might call a synchronic reading; rather his concern related to the composite nature of the book and its reflection of authority. A few pages later, he adds,

“But what indeed in the situation thereafter I would establish, Moses collected these written things of the fathers and in order and manner abridged [redegisse-brought together, redacted] them; none, so much as I see in this hypothesis of mine leaves the sort of difficulty which would be able to be stirred against the authority of this book. Namely, since Moses was an official minister of the universal church, who would believe, Moses, had been in this work constructing an insufficient record and aid by the Holy Spirit, which had been other, since he prepared his other books and spread out others in convenience of the church with brilliant care? Certainly, Luke composed his gospel history out of narratives and by no means dubiously even out of their notes, which from the beginning they had been eyewitnesses and helpers of the word.”²⁶

From his comments here, one can see that his conclusion concerned the trustworthiness of Scripture, not accompanying intentions or historical context. Even so, it is rather interesting that he concludes that the author, albeit a traditional personage, retrieved different writings, which preexisted, and then brought those individual pieces into the book. From “this hypothesis of mine,” he then must assert that the book has not suffered

²⁶ Vitringa, *Observationum Sacrarum*, 39–40.

any loss of authority. Thus, he incorporates particular scientific observations from his and others' work and utilizes these observations to argue for the historical personage of Moses as the author accepted of the writings.

Vitringa does not set aside this issue quickly though. He continues to discuss the *toledot* phrase and its use in the Gospel of Matthew. There in Matthew, he points out that the phrase, "These are the generations of Jesus Christ" does not indicate a discussion of families and genealogies but rather the "history and deeds of Christ."²⁷ His interpretation of the phrase in Matthew shows the influence of the *toledot* in Genesis. These extended discussions are typical of Vitringa. From this habit one can discern his philological approach to interpretation and how this leads him to an association of texts within a larger literary context rather than merely an historical abstraction. Because of this philological and literary sensitivity—and without a doubt his orthodox convictions—he was unable to adhere strictly to Grotius' method. But equally obvious is his appreciation of Grotius' practice of interpretation, which along with his recognition of the "composite origins of the Pentateuch" earned him criticism among the more conservative scholars of his day.²⁸ For Vitringa, the truth of the Old Testament's prophecies concerning Christ had to be based on ration and clear proof of the fulfillment in the person of Christ; one could not base it on the authority of the Bible as a divine book or the writers as having a special authority.²⁹ Otherwise, there could be no

²⁷ Vitringa, *Observationum Sacrarum*, 41.

²⁸ John Sandys-Wunsch, "Early Old Testament Critics on the Continent," *HB/OT*, 973.

²⁹ *Commentarius in librum prophetiarum Jesaiae*, I (Leeuwarden: F. Halma, 1720), 12–14; van der Wall, "Between Grotius and Cocceius," 207.

argument for the truth claims of Christianity. In his Isaiah commentary, Vitranga applies aspects of Grotius' approach to a prophetic book.

In his preface to the commentary, Vitranga lays out his method of interpretation for the commentary. On the one hand, the reader must take into account the words and the immediate context of the prophecy. If one can interpret the prophecy as fulfilled in the time of the prophet, then the exegete is bound to do just that.³⁰ This he seems to take from Grotius and attempts to steer clear of the excesses of Cocceius and his adherents. But if there is not a clear indication that the prophecy was fulfilled in that time period, then it is only rational, Vitranga says, to look for another fulfillment in a later period.³¹ This rule allows him to avoid the limitations of Grotius. Of course, for Vitranga, bridled by doctrinal and presumably textual convictions, fulfillments to such prophecies as Isaiah 7 and 53 must belong to a later day than the prophet's own time.³²

Hence, it should come as no surprise that there is a peculiar hermeneutical double vision, so to speak, in his commentary. As Brevard Childs points out, an adherence to interpretation that is limited strictly to historical or grammatical analysis is not carried out through much of the commentary.³³ In fact, Vitranga only carries this type of interpretation out in his comments in the section of prophecies against the

³⁰ Vitranga, *Jesaja*, I, 16; discussed in van der Wall, "Between Grotius and Cocceius," 208.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² Vitranga, *Jesaja*, I, 12–14; discussed in van der Wall, "Between Grotius and Cocceius," 207. For Vitranga's comments on Isaiah 7, see *Jesaja*, I, 168–200 and for his comments on Isaiah 53, see *Jesaja*, II, 656–81.

³³ Brevard Childs, "Hermeneutical Reflections on C. Vitranga, Eighteenth-Century Interpreter of Isaiah," in *In Search of True Wisdom: Essays in Old Testament Interpretation in Honour of Ronald E. Clements*, ed. Edward Ball, JSOTSup 300 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 91–96; *idem. The Struggle to Understand Isaiah as Christian Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 246–50.

nations. Elsewhere, he seemingly follows a typical traditional interpretation that explains much of the prophet's subject as referring to Christ. But perhaps this shouldn't surprise the reader because it does conform to his "science of interpreting" these prophets.³⁴ In many respects, Vitranga's exposition of Isaiah demonstrates that he conforms to his stated methodology quite rigorously. For those prophecies that do not clearly—at least, for him—point beyond their immediate context, he exegetically contorts and limits his explanation so that it complies with a fulfillment in the context of the original prophecy. Apparently, these prophecies provide an opportunity to expound on that particular time frame whereas other prophecies—perhaps those which the New Testament or the church have traditionally claimed were represented in Christ—must relate to the farther reaches of the canon so that one understands them in relationship to Christ and the church. But again, this actually conforms to his hermeneutical method that he set out in *Typus Doctrinae* and *Commentarius Jesaiae*.

Consequently, Vitranga demonstrates an early attempt to overcome the problem that had already emerged and, of course, still exists: Explaining a prophecy's immediate, presumed socio-cultural context with ration and clarity and yet also appropriately relating it to the literary context in which the prophecy is situated in the section, book, or even canonical context. Perhaps Childs' assessment is worthy, "Vitranga's major contribution hermeneutically was his construal of the pattern of prophecy and fulfillment as a historical process in which the correspondence between the two could be rationally

³⁴ Campegius Vitranga, *Hypotyposis Historiae et Chronologiae sacrae a M. C. usque ad finem saec. I accedit Typus Doctrinae Propheticae* (Franeker: Joh. Bernhard. Hartung, 1722). See the Praefatio Ad Lectorem, **3 and *Typus Doctrinae*, 2–3; quoted in van der Wall, "Between Grotius and Cocceius," 202–03.

proven.”³⁵ As such, Vitranga was both caught up in and shaped numerous treatments of the prophets. Like Vitranga, ensuing treatments attempted to explain them in a rational and historical examination of prophecy, whether in relationship to their fulfillment, e.g. J. C. K. Hofmann, or nonfulfillment, e.g. Abraham Kuenen.

The contribution of J. C. K. Hofmann to the study of Old Testament prophecy is best seen in his work, *Weissagung und Erfüllung im alten und neuen Testamente*.³⁶ In this work, Hofmann attempts to explain the relationship of Scripture and prophecy to that of history. Like so many others, Hofmann sought to incorporate rationalism and the modern scholarly tendencies of his context into his conception of the Bible, or said more precisely, he sought construe the emergence of prophecy and Scripture within a historically oriented outlook. For Hofmann, prophecy and history were interrelated such that prophecy took place in history and became history because the same God that guided the giving of prophecy also guided history. Hofmann writes, “All new formulations to history are prophetic. Thus, Scripture puts us in the place, when it hands down all of these things in their correct sequence and true form, to write a history that is prophetic in nature.”³⁷ The novelty of his approach concerns not what the words of Scripture mean in relationship to church doctrine, from which the academy had moved away, nor to a biblically and prophetically conceived chronological system as had done Cocceius, nor even to an immediately limited socio-historical context as Grotius had

³⁵ Brevard Childs, *The Struggle to Understand Isaiah*, 249.

³⁶ J. C. K. Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung im alten und im neuen Testamente: Ein theologischer Versuch I–II* (Nördlingen: C.H. Beck’schen Buchhandlung, 1841–44).

³⁷ Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, 52.

done, but rather to an approach in which prophecy reflects a view of history that unfolds in the coming of Christ.

For Hofmann, what began and proceeded in Israel's history, at least as it is narrated in the Bible, culminated in the coming of Christ. This narrative unfolding in conjunction with the actual appearance of Jesus Christ reflected the sort of reciprocal relationship of which Hofmann speaks. He explains,

“The sequence of prophecies, through which the people of God consoled themselves then at the loss of this first glory and prepared for the appearance of a better and more complete one, was recorded in a series of prophetic writings. At the end of this time of the prophets, the knowledge of divine counsel sprouted in the history of the people, to chronicle the same of its entrance into Canaan until its removal in the exile in accordance with that knowledge and for the purpose of the explanation of that divine council. Precisely this same knowledge, effected by the spirit of God, sure enough guided more or less consciously the leaders and chiefs of the Jewish community so that they put together all these—however, only these—books for the same use, which in its entirety brought to mind how it became a community of people when which it was supposed to wait the revelation of the promised redeemer.”³⁸

It was this knowledge, recorded in the prophets, effected by the spirit of God, that both gave rise to the history of the people, explained it, guided the books' inclusion in the canon and engendered a hope in a coming deliverance.

To gain an understanding of Hofmann, Rogerson is helpful as he explains the difference between E. W. Hengstenberg³⁹ and Hofmann.⁴⁰ Hengstenberg explained individually isolated prophecies in relationship to an unfolding of time and events. It was this relationship between prophecy and unfolding through which one could discern

³⁸ Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, 49.

³⁹ E.W. Hengstenberg, *Christologie des Alten Testaments und Commentar über die Messianischen Weissagungen der Propheten* (Berlin, 1829, 1856–7).

⁴⁰ John W. Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century*, First Fortress Press Ed. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1984), 108–11.

that the isolated prophecies foretold of the coming of Christ over the course of Israel's history. According to Hengstenberg, they were genuine predictions. He extenuated the conundrum of a given prophet's presumed, immediate, historical context by explaining that a bystander in the prophet's own time could erroneously presume that they were for that immediate period. As the time of Christ drew near, however, one could piece together the dissonant—from a literary perspective—prophecies. And, when read from just the right perspective, one could then confirm that Christ was the messiah and that the doctrinal formulations of the church were correct.⁴¹

Hofmann did not approve of this view, however, because he thought its view of history was inadequate. His view of history was such that history itself reflected the outworking of prophecy and Scripture. Therefore, the history reflected in the Bible was equally revelatory of God's will, the key to and goal of which was Christ, which one enlightened by the Holy Spirit could in hindsight discern from Scripture—both Old and New Testaments.

Rogerson states that Hengstenberg's limited view of prophecy as forecast or prediction seemed to Hofmann, "[T]o rob history of its reality as an organic process guided by God. Hofmann did not deny that prophetic forecasts could be found in the Old Testament; but he opposed Hengstenberg's attempt to find prophecies of Christ in the Old Testament from Genesis 3.15 onwards. For him *History* was prophetic, not in the sense that forecasts about the future were made, but in the sense that there was an organic relationship between each segment of history, and what preceded and followed it. History was guided and shaped by the self-same spirit of God who spoke though the

⁴¹ Rogerson, *Criticism*, 109-110.

prophets. In each particular age, prophets spoke to their own people; but under the divine guidance, each age was the necessary prelude to the next age, culminating in the coming of Christ.”⁴² Prophecy and history reflect different medium of the same process. One is written, i.e. literary; the other unfolds in the events of which scripture speaks; a history of God’s salvation for Israel and eventually for the world in the advent of Israel’s redeemer.

Ludwig Diestel, in his description of this period and Hofmann’s conception, in particular, expresses his construal of Hofmann similarly, “God created both [*Geschichte* and *Weissagung*]: that a later one could be modeled in an earlier one and that the thing which is modeled comes true. The holy history [*heil. Geschichte*] carries the future in itself; the view of the present, in what sense it is pregnant with the future, is prophecy.”⁴³ Thus, an intertwined view of history and prophecy reflect the relationship between the two. They are, so to speak, two sides of the same coin.

One can also see in Hofmann’s description above that he equated God’s guidance of Israel’s history with his guidance of the inclusion of the books of the canon. Moreover—and this indicates his reliance on what he perceived as a realistic view of the history that the Bible reports—Hofmann did not want to quibble over the difference between books, e.g. Chronicles in relationship to Kings. He was not interested because he presumed that they reported the same event. Even though there may be differences, the event was the same and it was that presumed unified history that somehow articulated meaning—presumably, because it culminated in Hofmann’s key to history,

⁴² Rogerson, *Criticism*, 109.

⁴³ Diestel, *Geschichte*, 704.

namely, Christ. Thus, it becomes obvious that the chronicling of the events was the significant matter through which the people could be comforted from their past and wait for their redeemer. In contrast, a narrational description of those events together with the composition of other genre and texts was not the central issue, a conundrum for those scholars that had become increasingly aware of the difference between the description and what purportedly took place.

Furthermore, Hofmann expresses this expanded view of history in the dogmatic vernacular of his day, e.g. the “testimony of the spirit,” “facts of salvation,” and the relationship between the individual and the community. Ludwig Diestel explains, “In John 5:39, this qualifies for him as evidence, to the extent that it also contains inspiration itself. The OT is only a voice of the *Heilsgeschichte*—what basically is the result of this dynamically enlarged concept of the providential direction.”⁴⁴ After a brief description of Hofmann’s refusal to consider tradition contained in the Old Testament, Diestel adds, “Every report of the conditions to which each tradition is subject to history and speech, to word and writing is extinguished by him entirely as soon as the Holy Spirit lights the flame in it... Furthermore, Hofmann views the history almost exclusively as divine deed and the OT as holy history. These statements remain unproven, while they alone form the bridges by the claim that the essence of revelation would be facts, to the other, that thus every history reported in the Old Testament would be a fact of salvation, consequently, a prefiguring of Christ.”⁴⁵ For Hofmann, the Old

⁴⁴ Diestel, *Geschichte*, 705.

⁴⁵ Diestel, 705.

Testament, which the Holy Spirit testifies is true, reveals God's control of history and his providential guidance toward its fulfillment in Christ.

Indeed, the facts of salvation that are reported in Scripture are affirmed by one's understanding of his need of salvation to which the Holy Spirit testifies. Hofmann himself discusses this relationship from the perspective of two points of reference: the Scripture, which gives the facts of history, and the testimony of the Holy Spirit. It is this same spirit that guides both the individual and the community in their need for salvation. He explains, "And if one asks us then, who reassures us that this agreement in us over the content of the word issues in us from the Holy Spirit, thus we answer that the mouth may confirm the truth by two or three witnesses... the reported facts of salvation are then experiences external to us, the testimony of their assurance an experience in us, whose unanimity with those needs [of salvation] leaves no doubt about its divinity, when one cannot deny the need itself from which they stem."⁴⁶ Hofmann thus associates the experience of salvation with a certainty regarding the facts reported in Scripture. Moreover, Hofmann describes the inspiration of the Holy Spirit not only in uttering the biblical book but in the experience of the community in which prophecy emerges.⁴⁷ Thus, it is not only Scripture that is given by the Holy Spirit but also the exact historical details of an ostensive prophetic event, which is otherwise described in the Bible, that is governed by God's inspiring action.

In his *Introduction to Old Testament Theology*, John Sailhamer describes Hofmann's views and the evolution of such ways of reading biblical texts. He writes,

⁴⁶ Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, 51–52

⁴⁷ Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, 49–50.

“So strongly did Hofmann believe that the Scriptures presented real and sacred “inspired” historical events, that he saw no fundamental difference between the inspiration of those events and the inspired recording of those events in Scripture itself. The message of the Bible was, in fact, the message of history: the fulfillment of the kingdom of God. Jesus and his kingdom is not only the key to the Scripture, but also the key to the whole of human history. Like the Scriptures, history itself is prophetic... Revelation lay in the historical facts witnessed to by the details of written Scriptures. There was, thus, an unexamined link between the inexhaustible written details of Scripture and the myriad of revelatory facts of history to which they witness.”⁴⁸

Thus, the development shifted in accordance with the intellectual thought of the day and brought new avenues for construing the relationship of prophecy to history. Even in Hofmann’s own day, opponents to traditional methods and interpretation recognized a shift in the way conservative scholars were reading biblical texts.

One of Hofmann’s opponents, Abraham Kuenen noticed the novelty of such an approach and the manner in which the so-called supernaturalists were using it. He indicates as much, “Without renouncing supernaturalism, but, on the contrary, in order the better to maintain it, they try to moderate or amend it, and they connect with it views which evidently have nothing in common with genuine supernaturalism, or even, according to our way of looking at things, are in direct conflict with it. Thus, for example, in the most recent times attention has been very eagerly fixed both on the intimate connection between prophecy and history, and on the moral character of prophetic inspiration. The former is done by Professor J. C. K. Hofmann of Erlangen, who brings prophecy and the divine revelation given in the facts of history into immediate connection with each other; that which history signifies, and that which it hides within itself, are revealed and explained by the prophets as the interpreters of

⁴⁸ Sailhamer, *Old Testament Theology*, 150–51. For the novelty of Hofmann’s approach, see also Diestel, *Geschichte*, 704.

God.”⁴⁹ Kuenen sees that Hofmann’s description is a development in what he understood as traditional views. In Kuenen’s own treatment, which we will discuss below, similar tendencies toward rationalism emerge but without the supernatural assertion. It quickly becomes obvious the extent to which Hofmann moved to a rationalistic approach in his explanation.

Thus, similar to the move of Whiston, conservative minded scholars jettisoned a pre-critical approach or traditional understanding of the relationship of the Bible to the world and in its place attempted to explain it in modern categories. Or, as Johann Anselm Steiger says in his essay in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament*, “It must not be overlooked that Whiston’s critical examination of the Old Testament citations in the New Testament was an expression of a hermeneutical development which can be observed on the part of Orthodoxy gradually aligning itself with rationalist and Enlightenment principles. The more Orthodoxy saw itself exposed to rational-historically arguing criticism, the more strongly it attempted to provide proof of the credibility of the Bible by arguing with the fulfillment of prophecies of the Old Testament in the New.”⁵⁰ A pre-critical approach to the Bible was no longer tenable.

Of course, Abraham Kuenen had no use for Hofmann’s supernaturalism. He was not only against traditional conceptions of history and prophecy but he also attempted to integrate prophecy into a purely humanistic and rationalistic approach; he was against any use of supernaturalism in a description of the relationship of prophecy and history.

⁴⁹ A. Kuenen, *The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel: An Historical and Critical Enquiry*, trans. Adam Milroy (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1877), 13.

⁵⁰ Steiger, “The Development of the Reformation Legacy,” *HB/OT*, 751.

Thus, Kuenen set out to debunk the notion of prophecy and fulfillment when understood in terms of supernaturalism. His extended argument against prophecy or more precisely, against its fulfillment in any sort of supernatural manner, stemmed from rationalism. In a manner that evokes Grotius' interpretation of prophecy—an interpretation in view of the presumed, immediate, historical background of the prophecy—Kuenen sought to demonstrate that a great deal of prophecy, which traditionalists had believed came true in one way or another, was not fulfilled in the manner so presumed. Instead, Kuenen listed various reasons for its lack of historical fulfillment. Either a book's presumed setting was artificial and actually later than first assumed, thereby succeeding the presumed fulfillment, or a fulfillment never occurred, or perhaps the presumed fulfillment was due to the prophet's extraordinary discernment of sensing an appropriate end to a matter.

These reasons and others provide for Kuenen a foundation for why prophecy did not actually concern prediction and therefore, did not concern fulfillment either. Regardless what the prophecy presumably had foretold, e.g. the destruction of Tyre or the coming of Christ, traditionalists could not claim that prophecy's so-called fulfillment proved anything about the divine origin of Scripture. This proposal necessitated a fresh analysis of prophecy without the presumptions of a traditional or supernaturalists' method.

So what was prophecy? And how did it relate to history? Prophecy, according to Kuenen demonstrated the ethical monotheism of the prophets that had developed within a natural, human context. It arose within a particular historical situation and although very laudable, it was strictly a human affair. He writes, "Yes, truly, the Israelitish

prophet *is a unique phenomenon in history*. It does not disown its human origin; that is borne witness to, both by its gradual ripening and by many imperfections which cleave to it. Every attempt to derive it directly and immediately from God must therefore fail.”⁵¹ For Kuenen, a supernatural origin would negate an origin that was borne out of normal, historical, human circumstances. It was these natural—albeit extraordinary circumstances that arose within a historical context, that Kuenen thought most thoroughly explained the complex factors of Israelite prophecy.

For Kuenen, Israelite prophecy eventually developed within a larger ANE prophetic context and even against the backdrop of Israelite false prophets and people. The false prophets were first and foremost concerned with the national interests of the nation. The canonical prophets were also engaged with those interests but primarily, they were concerned with the “Holy One of Israel.” It is this concern for the Holy One of Israel from which Kuenen views the canonical prophets developing within the historical context of Israel and the greater ANE. He writes,

“But still with most of them [the canonical prophets] the reverse side of the one truth which they firmly held along with their opponents, [the false prophets of Israel] stood on the foreground: the God of Israel *is the Holy One*. That was the source of the divergent and much more unfavourable judgment of the moral and religious state of the people; the source also of the dark anticipations of the people’s immediate future, of the cry “danger, danger, and no peace,” which forms the key-note of their preaching... *It is the moral earnestness combined with deep piety* which forms the characteristic mark of the canonical, as distinguished from the other prophets. That is to say: if we follow attentively the context which they maintain against the people, and especially against “the prophets,” and trace it back to its principles, we see in them the representatives of the same effort which we believed that we observed in prophecy from the very first, and which seemed to us to determine the direction in which prophecy itself worked and gradually raised Jahvism to a greater elevation.”⁵²

⁵¹ Kuenen, *The Prophets and Prophecy*, 591.

⁵² Kuenen, *The Prophets and Prophecy*, 584–85. See also the development Kuenen describes in 570–74.

And immediately following, Kuenen contrasts his “natural development” with those who resort to a “supernatural or immediate revelation” view.

“We do not allow ourselves to be deprived of the belief in God’s presence in history. In the fortunes and development of nations, and not least clearly in those of Israel, we see Him, the holy and all-wise Instructor of his human children. But the old *contrasts* must be altogether set aside. So long as we derive a separate part of Israel’s religious life directly from God, and allow the supernatural or immediate revelation to intervene in even one single point, so long also our view of the whole continues to be incorrect, and we see ourselves here and there necessitated to do violence to the well authenticated contents of the historical documents. It is the supposition of a natural development alone which accounts for all the phenomena.”⁵³

Thus, for Kuenen, Israelite prophecy developed within a particular historical context and was no more divine than any other human endeavor that “the holy and all wise Instructor of his human children” would conduct.

Thus, unlike Whiston, Cocceius, Vitranga, and Hofmann, Kuenen did not attribute to the prophets the ability to foretell the future through immediate access to divine revelation. Rather, their uniqueness lay in their commitment to tell of the holiness of the God of Israel. The ethical demands on Israel wrought by the canonical prophets’ call to know, believe, and obey Yahweh were their contribution to religion. Kuenen writes of his so-called “organic” view in contrast to the supernaturalists, “What the organic, in distinction from the supernaturalistic, view of prophecy places before our eyes, may in truth be called a spectacle altogether unique. The mechanical communications of God have disappeared, and with them also the progressive unveiling of the secrets of the future... It is the earnestness with which the prophets enter upon

⁵³ Kuenen, *The Prophets and Prophecy*, 585.

their task, the sincerity with which they believe in Jahveh and in his moral requirements, which place them in a position not only to maintain what has been handed down to them, but also to purify and elevate it.”⁵⁴ The canonical prophets called Israel, and indeed humanity, to recognize and obey the ethical demands wrought by their view of the unique and holy Yahweh.

One might ask, moreover, how did Kuenen view the relationship between the phenomenon of prophecy in Ancient Israel and the writing of prophetic books or the narratives in which one finds prophets and their vocation. It is actually this question that will eventually lead to the analysis of prophecy considered here: the production of prophecy and its relationship to matters external to the literary context. Due to developments in the analysis of the Pentateuch in his own day, Kuenen understood the writing of prophecy with a clarity that scholarship had only begun to recognize. Kuenen critiqued the view that saw the prophetic books as mere historical records. In particular, he asserts that the narrative books, which portray the prophets, do not merely and simply tell us about the prophets as if their goal was simply to tell us what happened. Rather, these narratives are the product of the prophets and prophetic ideology.

Kuenen’s point was that if one compares the writer of Chronicles to his presumed source in Kings or the writer of Deuteronomy to his presumed source in Exodus or Numbers, then their ideological viewpoint becomes clear. In these cases, he writes, “[T]hat history is for them a means, not an end; and that thus they have no scruple in allowing their own convictions and wishes to exercise an influence on their

⁵⁴ Kuenen, *The Prophets and Prophecy*, 574.

representation of the past.”⁵⁵ If one can discern this type of so-called history writing for the authors of Chronicles and Deuteronomy, then why not for the authors of Kings or the prophetic books? Would their focus be history for the sake of telling the reader ‘what really happened’ or were they not also interested in communicating ideas and messages. Thus, for Kuenen, it was less about an association between the writer and a putatively objective, bird’s-eye view of events than it was the communication of prophetic ideals. And in this manner, the prophets were history writers.⁵⁶

Another significant contributor to the study of the prophets and prophetic literature was Bernard Duhm.⁵⁷ In a way similar to Kuenen, Duhm also articulated a view of prophetic individuals as more than mere seers with ecstatic experiences or divine predictive abilities. The notion of prophecy may have begun with that type of phenomenon but Duhm described the result of the development of prophecy and prophets in Israel as those among the highest order of peoples and those who initiated an almost scientific spirit within Israel and even in world history itself.⁵⁸ In the introduction to his classic *Israels Propheten*, he writes that prophets,

“[I]ndeed looked after keenly enough even the external history but it was for them not the main thing and they had not the guidance in it. They were called to take on the leadership in the inner history of humanity and to fulfill a mission of Israel from which the people themselves can dream of nothing. Thus a third highest layer in the life of Israel developed, which only contained a small number of the best among the people and most were isolated against the masses.

⁵⁵ Kuenen, *The Prophets and Prophecy*, 436.

⁵⁶ Kuenen, *The Prophets and Prophecy*, 429.

⁵⁷ It is difficult to understand the interpretive framework of Duhm without an understanding of his appreciation of the Romanticism of Herder and Lowth. See Charles Shepherd’s description of this in *Theological Interpretation and Isaiah 53: A Critical Comparison of Bernhard Duhm, Brevard Childs, and Alec Motyer* (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2014), 16–22.

⁵⁸ Bernard Duhm, *Israels Propheten*, 2nd Ed. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1922) 4.

In other peoples, this highest layer took care to be formed by philosophers, men of science, statesmen, poets, and artists. That they have in Israel their beginning in the prophets, which knew no philosophy and science, was based on the fact that Yahweh remained the leader of history. Furthermore, the inner history is for these men progress, life, not ending in some closed system, on absolute truths, theories, and dogma. Prophets are the men of an eternally new [system.]”⁵⁹

The prophets were a new manner of men of the highest order; thus they articulated a message that would influence the entire world. But how would this take place? And how does one arrive at this point of view from what Scripture contains? Duhm’s analyses combine his own insights with the intellectual movements of his day: Romanticism, on the one hand and on the other, literary criticism, which had received its most prominent stamp from its best known proponent, Julius Wellhausen.

Duhm’s approach to the prophetic writings was, of course, partly the result of the growing conviction that the law came after the prophets. This view carried with it the understanding that the law was a later development to, decline of, and systemization to an inner, moral, and free religion, which the likes of Abraham represent and the particular prophets heralded. Consequently, those prophets such as Ezekiel, presumably due primarily to chs 40–48, who articulated a legal or systematic approach to God, Duhm described with a jaded view.⁶⁰ Other prophets, e.g. Jeremiah, who articulated an approach to religion from the heart and without a preoccupation with laws or the cult, represent the prophetic spirit that brought the people a free moral vision because of their accord with Yahweh.⁶¹ Perhaps most clearly, because of the now obvious complexities

⁵⁹ Duhm, *Israels Propheten*, 7.

⁶⁰ Duhm, *Israels Propheten*, 228–29; idem., *Die Theologie der Propheten* (Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1875) 260–63, 265, quoted in Henning Graf Reventlow, *History of Biblical Interpretation*, Vol 4, trans Leo G. Perdue (Atlanta: SBL, 2010) 330–31.

⁶¹ Duhm, *Israels Propheten*, 244, 268–270, 284.

to the book of Jeremiah, Duhm innovatively turned scholarship's attention to the development of stages in certain books.⁶²

Well known for his commentary on Isaiah, his (re-)articulation of a proposed third major layer in the book,⁶³ and the isolation of the books' Servant songs from Deutero-Isaiah, Duhm also posited different sources for the book of Jeremiah. Duhm easily discerned different textual sources for the book for several reasons: First, the book contains obvious references to independent texts; second, internal and external evidence demonstrates a compositional history; third, Jeremiah's amanuensis and second edition, after the first was burned in a fire, provides ample explanations for different views; and fourth, Duhm's assumption of Jeremiah's personality, his "emphasis on religion of the heart,"⁶⁴ and even a prophet's tendency for poetry, (because "poetic speech is the speech of the gods"⁶⁵), provide for Duhm an adequate basis for isolation of texts. Whether the individual poems of Jeremiah, the narratives about Jeremiah that Baruch wrote, or the incorporation of these narratives by later editors, Duhm displays a remarkable modern sense of the composition of the book.⁶⁶

Furthermore, as with the book of Isaiah, he considers the different historical contexts from which the various texts emerge. Some of Jeremiah's poems emerge from

⁶² Reventlow, *History of Biblical Interpretation*, 329–330.

⁶³ For Duhm's role in the promulgation of this hypothesis, see Charles Shepherd, *Theological Interpretation and Isaiah 53*, 39–41.

⁶⁴ Duhm, *Israels Propheten*, 284; Duhm's penchant for Romantic ideals is commonly recognized.

⁶⁵ Duhm, *Israels Propheten*, 95, quoted in Reventlow, *History of Biblical Interpretation*, 333.

⁶⁶ Duhm, *Israels Propheten*, 266, Idem., *Das Buch Jeremia*, (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1901) X.

his time in Anathoth, some from his time in Jerusalem, and some from an undetermined time although after the death of Josiah.⁶⁷ Additionally, he even suggests the significance of the new literary context in which an editor has placed different poems of Jeremiah. After discussing Jeremiah's dictation of his early poems, he says, "Since the scroll which was read three times a day could not have been too large, thus it could have contained only the songs, which prophesied the downfall; now it is united with a complete up to date poetry of Jeremiah and thus added many of those which we now find from ch 14, though provisionally the public effect was cut out by him. The gripping account of a great water shortage belong now to the older but now incorporated poems on which a remarkable prayer of the people and answer of Jahweh follow..."⁶⁸ He continues by describing the placement of the conversation between the prophet and Yahweh in the literary context of the poems dealing with the prophet's mother. Naturally, Duhm does not tease out the significance of these new literary contexts as scholarship might today, but his sensitivity to both historical and literary contexts is noteworthy and portend future approaches to this literature that reckon with redactional and expansionary additions.

While Duhm stopped short of establishing a robust historical picture of Isaiah or Jeremiah's later stages, another scholar emerges who does reckon with the formation of literature and with the relationship of prophecy to history, that of Hermann Gunkel. Gunkel's emergence within the History of Religion School need not be repeated here

⁶⁷ Duhm, *Israels Propheten*, 243.

⁶⁸ Duhm, *Israels Propheten*, 266–67.

nor do his many contributions to different facets of Old Testament scholarship.⁶⁹ What does concern us here is his construal of how prophecy emerges within a particular context and how the prophetic writings reflect a history of literature. For that contribution, one must understand his attempt to comprehend the prophetic literature (in some ways, whatever literature from the OT with which he was dealing) in the development of Israelite religion and culture and the prophetic writings as they were associated with an original setting in life, whether a prophet's ecstatic experience or the setting in which various forms of prophetic oral and literary forms developed.

The concern to understand prophecy in connection with the ecstatic experience of these men had been a factor in prophetic studies at least since Ewald.⁷⁰ Gunkel also paid particular attention to these experiences and with his adoption of Romanticist ideas and concern for genre, attempted to situate the Old Testament material among their prophetic experience as well as from preexisting forms of thought and expression.⁷¹ Like scholars before him, Gunkel thought that prophets' ideology represented a high water mark of religion and spirituality. But they also inherited a way of articulating their message from their culture. Consequently, one had to recognize these inherited ways of speaking or writing before understanding the message of these powerful personalities.⁷² Therefore, he sought systematically to comprehend the genres that clothe such fantastic

⁶⁹ See Reventlow, *History of Biblical Interpretation*, 337–58.

⁷⁰ G. H. Ewald, *Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament*, trans. J. Frederick Smith (London: Williams and Norgate, 1875) 8–19, 31–35.

⁷¹ Hermann Gunkel, *Die Propheten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917), 104–10.

⁷² Gunkel, *Die Propheten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), 34–40.

experiences so that he could then grasp the uniqueness and innovation of their words about morality and religion.⁷³

Because Gunkel understood Israelite prophecy originating in ecstatic experience, he thus thought that prophets articulated themselves in short, passionate, almost involuntary or instinctual pronouncements.⁷⁴ Moreover, not unlike his predecessors, Gunkel presumed that any development in systemization or classification of the cult or manner of expression represented a later maturation of that phenomenon.⁷⁵ In this manner, one could discern the original sayings of these religious innovators. But from this presumption regarding systemization and classification, Gunkel drew the conclusion that the original prophets were not concerned with writing mature documents. This practice developed from a later stage in the process of writing prophetic units or biblical books. The original prophets themselves were concerned only with immediate results of their pronouncements and not their future hearing or use. Consequently, it was others, who came along later, systematizers, such as Ezekiel, who actually developed these original, brief, prophetic pronouncements into units and books.

Truly, these ways of thinking led Gunkel to grasp the expansion of a biblical prophecy in a way that can almost be described as contemporary, although his aim was, of course, not the same as contemporary Old Testament studies today. Because the prophets were not concerned with or consumed by the preservation of their own words,

⁷³ Hermann Gunkel, *Das Märchen im Alten Testament* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1917) 1–15, *passim*; for the relationship to the famous fairy tales of Brothers Grimm, see 53–54.

⁷⁴ Hermann Gunkel, “Die Propheten als Schriftsteller und Dichter” in *Die Schriften des alten Testaments: Die Großen Propheten*, ed. Hans D. Schmidt (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), XXXIV—LXX.

⁷⁵ Gunkel, “Die Propheten,” XXXVII—XLI.

they would add or subtract from an original prophecy, as they felt needed. Moreover, others could also appropriate a prophecy since it was repeatedly and anonymously copied. When someone copied a prophecy, it was for the purpose of using it for an immediate context; thus, they expanded upon it and enlarged it until some grew into independent units or biblical chapters.⁷⁶

For Gunkel then, in order to understand the unique message of the prophets, one had to understand preexisting genres in and through which the prophets gave their unique voice. Once one accomplished that task, the interpreter could then discern what ideas were unique to the prophet and what were later additions by students or editors of the prophetic books. Therefore, to understand the prophets is to understand their individual elements, and for Gunkel, that meant their original, prophetic proclamations. The interpreter, who sought to understand the prophet, must discern the genres in which they wrote so that they could apprehend the original setting and purpose.

But Gunkel was not only interested in understanding the original prophet. He was interested in a history of the prophetic literature.⁷⁷ To pursue that history, Gunkel began at what he considered to be the most characteristic prophetic genre and moved to other genres that appeared to him as less prophetically characteristic in nature.⁷⁸ Moreover, Gunkel sought to show how the prophets adapted their genres and proclamations as the situation in Israel developed and called for new modes of prophecy. Finally—and this shows just how much contemporary OT scholars can learn from

⁷⁶ Idem.

⁷⁷ Idem, XLVI.

⁷⁸ Idem, XLVI–LXVIII.

Gunkel, he attempts to show how the disciples of the prophets reused their material in order to expand upon and make their books. Although his conclusion sounds like contemporary scholars with their discussion of *Fortschreibung*⁷⁹ or expansion, Gunkel describes it here in 1923.

The turn of scholarship with Gunkel places us at the doorstep of contemporary Old Testament studies. In particular, Gunkel's utilization of the notion of tradition and his methodology, which related to forms and tradition in his account of interpretation, provided a foundation for others' implementation of a similar method. Also, Gunkel's method imparted a means to connect the various forms of literature—and their now associated *Sitz im Leben*—to a particular time and culture. Additionally, his study of genre as a means to give a literary history yielded the importance of the study of genre for not only historical matters but also interpretation. In particular, Gerhard von Rad's use of the notion of tradition to associate the prophets, or for that matter, those who gave us the so-called sources of the Pentateuch, with that of history—even a history through the eyes of faith—laid the foundation for a significant understanding of the interrelationship between prophecy and history.

Following Gunkel, scholars adopted and expanded the methods related to genre and tradition. In the second volume of his *Old Testament Theology*, von Rad applied his methodology of tradition criticism to the prophets. He assessed that the Old Testament was to some extent a by-product of dependence upon traditions. He comments on this notion in conjunction with a movement away from concern for the peculiar nature of

⁷⁹ For an early description of this concept, see W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel 1–24, I*, BK XIII (Neukirchen-Vluyn: BK, 1969), 106.

individual prophets, “In more recent study of the prophets, the question of the psychological peculiarities of the prophet’s reception of revelation have markedly retreated into the background. A more pressing question is that of the particular form of the account of the vision given by the prophet and of the traditions by which he seems to have been influenced. There is good reason for this, as the account of the vision is itself part of the proclamation.”⁸⁰ For von Rad, prophecy was the result of individual prophets and later, others who took traditions that they inherited regarding aspects of Israel’s history and her sacred institutions or polity, and in their writing reflected upon those traditions for their understanding of Israel’s past, her behavior, and her subsequent future. Later, others would further develop those accounts into alternative stories, units, and books about Israel or Judah, people, events, institutions, and naturally, the prophets. Discovering at first the ‘little credos’ which formed the basis and subsequently, portraying the situations in which these stories evolved, von Rad seemed to provide a basis for the origin of thought contained in the books. Moreover, these developing accounts continued until they reached approximately their current forms and thus he traced the connection between books and actual events and history.⁸¹

Similar to Gunkel, not only were the traditions important but also related to them were various forms in which the prophetic words took shape. These similarities in form provided the basis for ascribing particular texts with a corresponding socio-cultural context. These assessments then provided a connection to different traditions or

⁸⁰ Gerhard von Rad, *The Message of the Prophets*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (London: SCP Press Ltd, 1968), 41.

⁸¹ Von Rad, *The Message of the Prophets*, 83; see also Rudolf Smend, *From Astruc to Zimmerli: Old Testament Scholarship in three Centuries*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 182.

institutions that gave rise to the prophetic words. Thus, form criticism provided another important method for discerning a connection to a particular historical context.

Moreover, these forms also assisted in establishing boundaries for literary units and provided a means for assessing what was unique to a particular prophet and what was to be understood as part of the form itself or the context in which it arose.⁸²

When understood from this perspective, it became apparent that other interested parties—disciples of the prophets, schools of the prophets, interested scribes—expanded upon these prophetic texts. Eventually, the recognition emerged that many of the accounts of the prophets reverberate with similar words, allusions, and concerns.⁸³ These reverberations were able to lead interested readers to a particular socio-cultural concern or institution. H. W. Wolff combined the insights from form and tradition criticism with this interest in a particular engagement stemming from an institution or locality.

Wolff is clear in his pursuit of ‘history.’ In the opening of his commentary on Hosea, he writes, “Any attempt to comprehend prophecy apart from the historical events surrounding it would only result in misunderstanding.”⁸⁴ And yet his dependence upon tradition criticism to arrive at that perceived history is clear. He comments throughout his writing that the prophet depended upon a particular tradition or was influenced by a distinct way of thinking about Israel’s past. In addition, the prophet’s own situation gave

⁸² Von Rad, *The Message of the Prophets*, 30–59.

⁸³ Although from the perspective of biblical law in the period of the Second Temple, see Teeter’s research and carefully argued conclusion related to reuse of similar material in that corpus and period. David Andrew Teeter, *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Late Second Temple Period*, FAT 92 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 269–70.

⁸⁴ Hans Walter Wolff, *Hosea*, trans. Gary Stansell, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), xxi.

rise to the distinct forms in which he wrote.⁸⁵ Hosea's innovative and powerful use of language beyond that of inherited forms leads Wolff to the conclusion about what content is unique about the prophet's message or what nuance or emphasis the prophet articulates his message in contradistinction from the tradition.⁸⁶ For example, Wolff speaks of Hosea's metaphor of Israel's husband, Yahweh. This metaphor reflects the mythology of Hosea's own time and yet Hosea develops his own theology from it. For Wolff, because, "Yahweh's partner in the marriage parable is not some goddess but historical Israel," the book demonstrates a particular reflection of Hosea's struggle with faith and his own contemporary situation.⁸⁷ From Hosea's use of the traditions, Wolff discerns the prophet's focus on Israel's past and present, and what would consequently be her future.⁸⁸

But, in conjunction with the trajectory of scholarship, Wolff's focus was more than merely Hosea's words: it was the transmission of his words. Hosea's dependence upon Israel's formative traditions was only an early stage in this prophetic book. After the prophet himself had shaped the traditions with his words, others transmitted and reflected upon his words with their own foci. Whether deuteronomic notions, recognized by verbal and theological associations with that movement, or one of various Judaic redactions, recognizable by the obvious focus on Judah in contradistinction from Israel, these scribe-authors sought to actualize, elucidate, and supplement the prophet's own

⁸⁵ Wolff, *Hosea*, xxiii.

⁸⁶ Wolff, *Hosea*, xxv–vi.

⁸⁷ Wolff, *Hosea*, xxvi.

⁸⁸ Wolff, *Hosea*, xxvii.

words. In words that would adumbrate Walter Zimmerli's discovery within the book of Ezekiel, Wolff indicates, "Still another redactor took certain of Hosea's sayings—either literally or freely—and used them to gloss other sayings in order to elucidate or supplement them.⁸⁹ These words, phrases, and clauses diverged from other Hosean material and hence, betrayed their uniqueness while the particular commonalities amongst them indicated the provenance for their emergence.

In summary, it was the use of traditions, e.g. wilderness, election, cultic, that alluded to Israel's past in particular ways and sparked more confidence of a historically situated phenomenon. Their forms in language likewise stimulated hypotheses about Israel's emergence and how these forms reflected social contexts and customs in ancient Israel and the wider ANE. How strongly are these forms and traditions rooted in a historical context? How concrete are the details regarding Israel's so-called birth? What can one say about prophetic language and its relationship to significant events in Israel's past? It is this aspect of the interface between prophetic word, the production of prophetic texts, and the various historical contexts involved that this analysis attempts to elucidate.

Hence, we arrive at the impetus and object for our own analysis of prophecy, Ezekiel 16. In some manner, there are three texts that hold significance for this pursuit: Ezekiel 16, 20, and 23. Scholars have often associated these texts with Israel's history in her "youth" and the election traditions from which the writers perhaps drew. Von Rad emphasized these three traditions in his treatment of the book of Ezekiel and their relationship to Israel's history as well as Ezekiel's unique interpretation of it. He says,

⁸⁹ Wolff, *Hosea*, xxxi; for Zimmerli, see below.

“It is to this priestly tradition that Ezekiel also owes his *picture of the history* of Israel’s origins. Like others, Ezekiel summoned up history to demonstrate her lost condition and sinful depravity. He drew up three such indictments, basing them on a broad historical foundation (Ezekiel 16, 20, and 23).”⁹⁰ Moreover, in his search for a positive assessment of Israel’s behavior in the so-called wilderness tradition, Robert Bach considers just how free a prophet would be in relationship to a tradition upon which that prophet reflects.⁹¹ In so doing, he attempts to find within Ezekiel 16 a reflection upon the wilderness tradition as well as a “finding tradition.”⁹² His work deals with a general idea of how tales may have been construed in ancient Israel as well as a necessary subjectivity commonly associated with a search for and dependence upon the notion of tradition.⁹³ Even so, Bach must concede that there is no lemma for “wilderness” or to “find” in Ezekiel 16.⁹⁴ Moreover, the term, נעורים, “youth” (Ezek 16:22, 43, and 60) that is found in other so-called election traditions and associated passages such as Jer 2:2 and Hos 2:17 does not occur in Bach’s assessment of the tradition behind Ezekiel 16. According to him, that term is an element added by the prophet.⁹⁵ Thus, we must ask the question

⁹⁰ Von Rad, *The Message of the Prophets*, 194.

⁹¹ Robert Bach, *Die Erwählung Israels in der Wüste* (Bonn, 1951), 5–6.

⁹² Bach, *Die Erwählung Israels in der Wüste*, 28–36. While not a finding tradition but based on adoption language in the ANE, see Meier Malul, “Adoption of Foundlings in the Bible and Mesopotamian Documents: A Study of Some Legal Metaphors in Ezekiel 16:1–7” *Journal of the Study of the Old Testament* 46 (1990): 97–126.

⁹³ Ronald E. Clements, *Old Testament Prophecy: From Oracles to Canon* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996) 6, 153. For a critique of the methodological aspect at the beginning of Form and Tradition Criticism, see the critique related to Gunkel in Walter Brueggemann and Hans Walter Wolff, *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982) 16–20; See also Rudolf Smend, *From Astruc to Zimmerli*, 123–30.

⁹⁴ Bach, *Die Erwählung Israels in der Wüste*, 34, 36.

⁹⁵ Bach, *Die Erwählung Israels in der Wüste*, 34.

whether the notion of tradition is the most pertinent way to frame an analysis of the chapter and its connection to historical elements. There is little evidence from his analysis for any conclusions.

Before concluding this survey with Walther Zimmerli, it may be instructive to consider one scholar's work on Ezekiel 16 that actually postdates Zimmerli. In his book, *Geschichtskonzepte im Ezechielbuch*, Thomas Krüger examines Ezekiel 5, 16, 20, and 23 in an attempt to examine "the variation of historical experiences and their conceptual framework as it found expression in the book of Ezekiel."⁹⁶ To be precise, Ezekiel 16, 20, and 23 were chosen because they were "executed broadly enough in order to recognize phenomena such as selection, emphasis, and periodization of the recorded event."⁹⁷ Krüger attempts to understand these issues by understanding experiences of history and divinity and how those experiences are captured in a portrayal of history and story in the sequence of sections and overall book. By calling into question different literary critical presentations and by developing a theological-philosophical design of history in these prophetic accusations and announcements of judgment, Krüger discerns a unity in the texts. Krüger's presentation, however, does not deal with the entirety of Ezekiel 16 (primarily only Ezek 16:1–43) or 23 and interacts mostly with Zimmerli's innovative (at the time) study.⁹⁸ Moreover, after annotating the inherent difficulties in attempting a redactional or expansionary analysis of the text, Krüger summarizes mainly Zimmerli's findings in Ezekiel 16 in particular as it relates to a connection between

⁹⁶ Thomas Krüger, *Geschichtskonzepte im Ezechielbuch*, BZAW 180 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988) 8.

⁹⁷ Krüger, *Geschichtskonzepte*, 8.

⁹⁸ Krüger, *Geschichtskonzepte*, 146–51.

Ezekiel 16 and 23.⁹⁹ This attempt shortcuts the essential step of analyzing the chapter(s) in its own structure before embarking on a consideration of how the two chapters and their constituent parts relate to one another. Only after this step could the juxtaposition of the two chapters be accomplished. Of course, Krüger's purpose relates to a more widely expressed understanding of history in the framework of the book but it does indicate a methodological starting point for the present study.

Walther Zimmerli can hardly be ignored in this survey. Truly, Zimmerli's work on Ezekiel has influenced other major works on Ezekiel after him; even those who reject his methodology attest to the importance of his work.¹⁰⁰ Arising out of a long and thoughtful analysis of the text, Zimmerli situates the words of Ezekiel and the background of the book in much of the historical contexts to which they refer. Moreover, throughout the commentary, Zimmerli will refer to different traditions emerging from a discussion of Ezekiel's prophecy.¹⁰¹ And yet, Zimmerli refers to a "development of a theme which is tacked on in a fresh, and almost separate, section, with a new point of view," which "can be regarded as a distinctive feature of this prophetic book."¹⁰² To be more precise, Zimmerli astutely recognizes the interplay of tradition, text, and supplementation. In speaking of Ezekiel 16, Zimmerli writes, "So

⁹⁹ Krüger, *Geschichtskonzepte*, 146–47; see below, Chapter 3 for the analysis on Ezekiel 16.

¹⁰⁰ E.g. Block's long list of references to Zimmerli's works. For an assessment of Zimmerli's importance and a review of research subsequent to Zimmerli, see Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives*, 1–37.

¹⁰¹ For example, among many other references Zimmerli refers to Bach's study regarding the wilderness and finding traditions, Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979) 339.

¹⁰² Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 30.

already a quite general review of the editorial section vv. 1–63 shows the development of tradition in the book of Ezekiel in a particularly clear way. The unit has not grown up in the manner of the collections of shorter independent oracles (cf. Amos 3ff) in which later material has sometimes entered between sayings. Rather it has been formed in a process of successive supplementation of a kernel element, the ideas of which have been developed and expanded.”¹⁰³ Indeed, capitalizing upon Zimmerli’s *Fortschreibung*¹⁰⁴ and more recent developments in the understanding of textual production and innerbiblical exegesis, a renewed analysis of prophecy in Ezekiel 16 is needed with the way in which it reveals methods of textual production and divulges social settings. However, the relationship of Ezekiel 20 and 23 to that of Ezekiel 16 and more broadly to the interplay between prophecy and history must await another treatment.¹⁰⁵

So what traditions, texts, and contexts lay in the background of this text? Is it an ancient tradition regarding Israel’s past that Ezekiel or one of his disciples developed? Are there deuteronomic or priestly traditions or redactions that shape different parts of the passage? How does one adjudicate whether the prophet himself articulated these nuances or where they contain the program of later expatriates? How does might a writer expand upon what is there and for what reason? Can one see how an ancient scribe

¹⁰³ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 334.

¹⁰⁴ The word that Zimmerli used to describe this phenomenon in the original of his German commentary on the book Ezekiel, *Ezechiel 1–24*, 106*–07*.

¹⁰⁵ Ezekiel 23, which has similarities with Ezek 16:44–58, does not correspond to the majority of the material in question in Ezekiel 16. Jörg Garscha attributes some of Ezek 23:1–25 to the historical prophet while the remaining material stems from later redactions, *Studien zum Eechielbuch: Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung von 1–39* (Frankfurt a.M.: P. Lang, 1974), quoted in Hiebel, *Ezekiel’s Vision Accounts*, 6. It appears that the two chapters have influenced one another in the growth of the book. We set the relationship between these two chapters aside to await further analysis unless it deals explicitly with lemmata in the chapter.

interpreted and actualized an earlier form of the text in his own contribution to it? Does the resulting text divulge a new context and indicate a development in thought or interpretation? How does one understand a basic unity of the chapter in light of obvious, diverse literary materials? It is these types of questions that the following analysis attempts to address.

In what follows in Chapter 1, I analyze the textual history of the chapter in order to provide a text for translation and also to discern significant textual problems that may in themselves indicate complexities or expansions. Second, Chapter Two demonstrates the composite unity of the chapter based on formulaic literary phenomena and grammatical commonalities. In Chapter Three, I attempt to ascertain the growth of the chapter based on the complex make up discovered in Chapter Two as well as the logical sequence of the growth of material as it develops in Ezekiel 16. Finally, in the conclusion, I summarize the most significant points of the analysis and address some of the motivations for the expansions. These bring about a proposal for dating the expansions within the general scholarly framework for the book.

Chapter 1

2. Text and Translation

In recent decades, a growing recognition has taken place among Old Testament scholars of the interrelationship of tasks that in the past have operated under distinct assumptions unrelated to each other—that of textual criticism and literary criticism. As early as 1975 and with roots even earlier, Shemaryahu Talmon queried, “If the history of the Bible text is no longer considered to become the object of systematic study only after the creative impulse, i.e., after the authoring of biblical literature had come to an end, but rather as partly overlapping with it, then it obviously becomes legitimate to probe into the possibility that the textual enquiry, designated “lower criticism,” may illuminate issues that are usually debated in the orbit of “higher criticism.””¹⁰⁶ That impulse has only grown stronger as scholars have recognized the significance of the materials at Qumran.¹⁰⁷

Related to the book of Ezekiel, P. Schwagmeier states, “Dass die Buchgenese sich noch deutlich in den überlieferten Handschriften niederschlägt, dass methodisch auf der Suche nach dem ezechielischen ältesten Text also ein enges Zusammenspiel von

¹⁰⁶ Shemaryahu Talmon “The Textual Study of the Bible – A New Outlook” in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, eds. F.M. Cross and S. Talmon (Cambridge: Harvard, 1975), 328.

¹⁰⁷ Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3d. ed. Rev. and exp. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012) 324–26; Ingrid E. Lilly, *Two Books of Ezekiel: Papyrus 967 and the Masoretic Text as Variant Literary Editions*, VTSup, 150 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012). Pgs 7–27 of Lilly’s book contains the methodological considerations for her work but the relationship of text criticism and literary analysis of texts remains paramount throughout her work. See also David Andrew Teeter, *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Late Second Temple Period*, FAT 92 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014) 53; more recently, Timothy Mackie in *Expanding Ezekiel: The Hermeneutics of Scribal Addition in the Ancient Text Witnesses of the Book of Ezekiel* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015) 19, who states, “This overlap between textual and literary criticism has been the subject of much discussion in recent years and has generated a new paradigm for understanding the development of the biblical text in the Second Temple Period.”

Text- und Literarkritik sowie Redaktionsgeschichte vonnöten ist.”¹⁰⁸ The recognition of the interplay between text and literary criticism accords well with the basic premise undergirding this analysis of Ezekiel because it is consistent with the expansionary makeup of these texts, the heterogeneity of texts sometimes involved, and the reuse of biblical texts utilized in the composition of biblical texts and books.

Text criticism has presumed in the past a narrow linear development from a single text type from which other copies ultimately stemmed. Primarily, analyses were undertaken in order to arrive at an original document, which was then the object of study. Literary Criticism has too often presumed the autonomous constitution of pre-existing texts involved in the composition of biblical books. Often the field of Old Testament Studies has attempted to discern written textual sources that constituted biblical books. Even those presumptions have subsequently undergone inquiry in recent years and must be more than merely presumed.¹⁰⁹ In other words, the *writtenness* of biblical texts may not have occurred until later in their tradition and composition history.

Additionally, one must reckon with the interpretation of biblical texts, which is now recognized to play a significant role in the production of biblical literature. That is, how did an existing prophetic text, e.g. in the exilic period, become actualized in various, later post-exilic or Persian period contexts? As Moshe Bernstein, in an article summarizing the different ways that biblical interpretation manifested itself at Qumran,

¹⁰⁸ P. Schwagmeier, “Untersuchungen zu Textgeschichte und Entstehung des Ezechielbuches in masoretischer und griechischer Überlieferung” (ThD diss., Univ. of Zurich, 2004) 237, quoted in Pohlmann, *Ezechiel: Der Stand*, 24.

¹⁰⁹ See Phillip Davies’ essay, “The Dissemination of Written Texts” in his and Thomas Römer’s *Writing the Bible: Scribes, Scribalism, and Script* (London: Routledge, 2014) 35–45. See also Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009).

has queried, “When does the writing of a biblical text cease and when does interpretation begin? When and where do we stop talking about Bible and begin talking about rewritten Bible?”¹¹⁰ If some form of prophetic or scribal schools or activity existed—which is beyond doubt—how did their activities affect the variety and dissemination of manuscripts or editions of books? How does this shape the goal of text criticism? The complexity of these factors has raised fundamental questions about the task of establishing an “original” text in whatever capacity it may be understood as original.¹¹¹

Thus, establishing a text that one will examine becomes, in part, a function of the particular goal for which one aims. A particular textual tradition may stem from a manuscript in a particular locale, interpreted and/or copied for a particular purpose. If one aims to understand the community that gave rise to such a text and translation, then a goal of an “original” text that stemmed from the putative hand of an author cannot be the objective. If one aims at the so-called original, how original does one get? Do we excise Jeremiah 52 because it was undoubtedly not original to Jeremiah? Or because it was not original to the book that bears his name? Do we eliminate Jeremiah 29 because it had a different origin? And this is to say nothing of the well-known problem of the different length and arrangement of the Jeremianic editions. And the conundrum does not end with the book Jeremiah. Issues approaching the level of differing editions of a book exist with the books of Ezekiel, Samuel, the Pentateuch with its obvious

¹¹⁰ Moshe J. Bernstein, *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*, Vol 2 STDJ 107 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 375.

¹¹¹ S. Talmon, “Textual Criticism: The Ancient Version,” in *Text in Context* ed. A. D. H. Mayes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) 142–48; E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 2d Rev. ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001) 181–83, 89.

compositional complexity, the book of Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, Zechariah and even the so-called Book of the Twelve. This list is to say nothing of the compositional or redactional makeup of other books. For example, there is the well known question concerning an appropriate designation for the first book(s) of TaNaK. Is it a Tetrateuch, Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? And what about the conspicuous frame to the book of Judges? Or the appendices to Joshua? And the list does not end here. Obviously, this analysis cannot deal fully with these issues. But we must raise the question: What text are we intent on analyzing? What textual situation is our objective?

Therefore, the textual analysis here will address several issues: a consideration of variants in light of a individual manuscripts with their own provenance and history, a variant and its conformity to a book or chapter—in this case, Ezekiel 16—and, in view of our purpose in this book, an attempt to address variants, when appropriate as a reflection of a particular expansion and the situation from which it may have emerged. Naturally, the analysis will also register unintentional errors or very late, isolated, scribal glosses.¹¹²

2.1 Translation

- 1 And the word of the LORD came to me, saying,
- 2 “Son of man, make known¹¹³ to Jerusalem her abominations.

¹¹² For these matters, see D. Barthélemy, *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project*, trans. Stephen Pisano, et al. (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 84–92; for his text critical decisions in Ezekiel 16, see Barthélemy’s *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament*, Vol 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 91–115.

¹¹³ LXX contains διαμαρτυραῖ here and 20:4 for the MT hiphil of ידע. The dissimilar glosses of the remaining six occurrences of hiphil ידע in Ezekiel and the typical translational equivalent underlying διαμαρτυραῖ (עוד) would perhaps suggest עוד in 16:2 and 20:4. However, the lack of a Hebrew manuscript attesting this form, the lack of the lemma, עוד in Ezekiel to verify its usage, and uniqueness of the LXX Ezekiel translator makes it difficult to recognize a different Hebrew lemma here.

- 3 And say, “Thus says the LORD¹¹⁴ to Jerusalem; your origin and birth were from the land of the Canaanite¹¹⁵. Your father was the¹¹⁶ Amorite and your mother was a Hittite.

¹¹⁴ The double appellation of the divine name in the book of Ezekiel is a well-known issue. In the appendix to Ezekiel 2, Zimmerli updated his earlier view in which he bracketed out “the LORD;” in a survey of research on the divine name in Ezekiel, he augmented his opinion by stating that in the case of some formulae, “The bracketing of יהוה which has been consistently carried through in the commentary on the basis of 6 (Ziegler) should thus probably be revised in the case of the three formulaic oracle complexes.” Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, trans. James D. Martin (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 562. Moreover, Leslie John McGregor supplemented the research and hypotheses regarding this conundrum in his *The Greek Text of Ezekiel: An Examination of its Homogeneity* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985) 75–93. McGregor states his conclusions regarding the possible development generating the double appellation. Due to the unique treatment of the divine name in a subsequent stage to that of the translation into the Greek text, he recommends that the double appellation was present in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. As far as I know, neither his nor earlier hypotheses have won overwhelming support. My tendency would be to follow the presumed earliest in this case although for several reasons that could be misleading, as McGregor points out. Still, his hypothesis is not convincing enough for me to negate the single appellation, which occurs the vast majority of time in P967. See McGregor, *Greek Text of Ezekiel*, 90–93. Where P967 has the double appellation, I follow it there as well. Moreover, Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann has also contributed to the latest research on the issue in his *Ezechiel: Der Stand der Theologischen Diskussion* (Darmstadt: WBG, 2008), 22–27. His proposal deals most directly with an analysis of language in Ezekiel 36ff and its effect on an understanding of chapter sequence. The Köln Text of P967 contains *nomina sacra* κυριος but is corrupt and not extant immediately following.

¹¹⁵ The absence of the article in most witnesses of the LXX is likely a means of translating the construct relationship, e.g. Gen 50:11, Deut 1:7.

¹¹⁶ It is common for the gentilic “Amorite” to take the article. It is absent in the LXX but the conundrum is why it is absent in the following clause with “Hittite,” cf. 16:45 in which neither contains the article.

- 4 As for your birth, on the day you were born your umbilical cord was not cut,¹¹⁷ you were not washed with water,¹¹⁸ and you were indeed not rubbed with salt nor were you swaddled.¹¹⁹
- 5 Not an eye took pity on you, to do for you one of these things to show compassion towards you. But you were flung upon¹²⁰ the field in the abhorrence of your soul on the day you were born.
- 6 And I passed by and saw you kicking about in your blood,¹²¹ and I said to you in your blood, “Live!”¹²²

¹¹⁷ Although Barthélemy proposes here the impersonal “one did not cut your cord,” Zimmerli’s indication following GKC that this is a qal passive for כרת appears to make better sense and is a simpler solution; W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, trans. Ronald E. Clements, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 323; GKC §22s, §52q, §64e. As for the Old Greek and other LXX manuscripts, see D. Barthélemy, *Critique*, 91–92; Leslie Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, Word, 28 (Dallas: Word, 1994), 226.

¹¹⁸ Scholars have put forward numerous proposals concerning the hapax, משעי, (for a summary of which, see Daniel Block, *The Book of Ezekiel 1–24*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 473) including proposals that the Old Greek omitted it because its meaning was unknown. However, its absence here in the Old Greek suggests most strongly that it is an MT plus and is therefore not translated here. LXX elsewhere in the chapter translates hapax and difficult words, e.g. 16:30, שלטת or 16:7, רבבה. Furthermore, numerous minuses exist in OG, at least P967, and more recent scholarship suggests that it is due to issues of various editions, not intentional omission; for the number of omissions, see J. Ziegler, *Septuaginta vol. XVI, 1 Ezechiel with einem Nachtrag von Detlef Fraenkel*, 3d. Ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 25; for a more recent perspective, see Lilly, *Two Books of Ezekiel*. The discussion of minuses along the lines of a coherence approach is suited to this analysis regarding the expansion of Ezekiel 16.

¹¹⁹ The occurrence of the Hophal infinitive absolute on the final two clauses appears odd but not incorrect; see GKC §113w. Moreover, the absence of the penultimate clause in manuscripts 233–239 and the final clause in Q-88 trouble commentators but the evidence lacks enough support to warrant elimination of these clauses, which in Hebrew contribute assonance to the verse as well as correspondence with the passive voice in the previous two clauses.

¹²⁰ LXX disambiguates whose “eye.” This text is most likely assimilation to 5:11; 7:4, 9; 8:18; 9:10; and 20:17. Even though the LXX is the more difficult reading—given the fact that Yahweh does indeed have compassion on infant Jerusalem in the ensuing verses, assimilation appears to explain the variance.

¹²¹ MT twice contains the plural noun phrase, בדםיך. The LXX translates both occurrences with the singular noun αἷμα in the appropriate case. Zimmerli queries whether the Hebrew plurals could result from the bloodletting of Jerusalem in Ezek 18:13, 22:2 already hinted in this passage, *Ezekiel 1*, 323. Moreover, he likewise points to the issue of uncleanness related to parturition in Lev 12:1–5, which uses a plural form of “blood.” One could indicate further that a plural form is also used in each of the 7 occurrences of the term in Leviticus 20, a chapter dealing with various sexual deviances, in particular, intercourse after menstruation in Lev 20:18. Therefore, the singular is translated here as well, presuming that the LXX likewise translated loosely according to the sense that the plural noun connotes merely a bloody scene involving parturition.

¹²² MT contains the imperative “Live” within the twice-repeated clause, “And I said to you in your blood, “Live!” And I said to you in your blood, “Live!” Because the OG, Vulgate, and Peshitta contain only one clause, Zimmerli did not include the second imperative, Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 323. Contra Barthélemy, *Critique*, 92–93 who along with Greenberg consider possible haplography in the versions and

- 7 A myriad, I made you, like the sprout of the field.¹²³ And you grew, matured, and came with the finest of ornaments.¹²⁴ Breasts took shape,¹²⁵ your hair sprouted, and you were naked and bare.
- 8 And I passed by and saw you and behold, your time was the time of lovers.¹²⁶ So I spread my garment over you, covered your nakedness, swore to you and entered into covenant with you,¹²⁷ utters the LORD God,¹²⁸ and you became mine.
- 9 I washed you with water, rinsed your blood from you, and covered you with oil.
- 10 Then I clothed you with embroidered cloth, put sandals of leather on you, bound you with linen, and covered you with fine material.

the repetition in the MT perhaps to be a rhetorical maneuver for emphasis; Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel, 1–20*, AB 22 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 276. Moreover, in the OG, this statement does not contain an imperative but the statement, “Life is from your blood!” However, given the difficulty of the presumably unvocalized, 2fs, imperatival form from חיה , it appears likely that OG is attempting to make sense of the text before them and is therefore a witness to the imperative and clause.

¹²³ The Old Greek (and the Peshitta) does not convince Barthélemy who sees in it an attempt to understand the difficult רבה and the imperative in the preceding verse. Moreover, an implication that a “multitude” referenced the growth of the nation of Israel is, according to him, what gave ancient interpreters trouble in the first place because of the “suddenness and brevity” of the conceivable interpretation within the metaphor, Barthélemy, *Critique*, 93. Block sees the similar lexical and grammatical construction in 16:38 as evidence that this construction here, as difficult as it may be to understand, require no emendation, Block, *Ezekiel I*, 478. I have left the difficulty intact in my translation without glossing “myriad” as “vigorous.”

¹²⁴ For the use of the superlative here, see GKC §133i. The presence of “ πολεις πολων ,” which appears to be a misreading of π for ρ , in P967 demonstrates the antiquity of this text; Frederic G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible: Fasciculus VII Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther* (London: Emery Walker Limited, 1937) 8–9. For a discussion of various other textual options, see Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 227. Block’s explanation of “completely nude” fails to convince on the basis of a lack of textual evidence, Block, *Ezekiel*, 478. “Ornaments” here refers not to literal jewelry but rather the natural beauty of a naked, voluptuous, young woman, to which the subsequent clauses refer.

¹²⁵ The terse, elevated language of 16:7 does not require a suffix on “breasts.” It is likely that the versions supplied one for clarity.

¹²⁶ LXX has καταλουντων from καταλω , “halt (lit. ‘unharness the pack animals’), rest, find lodging.” Walter Bauer, William Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, Frederick W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979) 414. It appears that the LXX interprets ים יד as a time of spending the night with one another or possibly, setting up house together; in other words, what two individuals do when they enter that time of life when they have intercourse.

¹²⁷ For the vocalization of אתך , see GKC §103b, 330; see also, Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 89.

¹²⁸ See the comment concerning the double appellation at 16:3. Here, the *nomina sacra* “ κύριος θεος ” is attested in P967.

- 11 I adorned you with ornaments¹²⁹ and gave bracelets upon your wrists and a necklace upon your neck.
- 12 I gave a ring upon your nose, earrings upon your ears, and a crown of glory on your head.
- 13 And you adorned yourself with gold and silver and your attire was linen,¹³⁰ fine material, and embroidered cloth. You ate¹³¹ fine flour, honey, and oil;¹³² and you became very, very beautiful.¹³³
- 14 A name for you materialized among the nations because of your beauty, for it was perfect in my splendor¹³⁴ that I placed upon you, utters the LORD.¹³⁵

¹²⁹ The singular noun is a collective.

¹³⁰ משי in 16:14aβ is likely an assimilation with the משי that follows.

¹³¹ The old vocalic feminine ending occurs on אכלתי and appears as Ketiv/Qere in MT.

¹³² Although several Greek manuscripts of later origin transpose “honey and oil,” B contains the same order as MT. The material is not extant in P967. The transposition could stem from the same construction in that order in Ezek 16:19.

¹³³ The clause, “And you reached the status of royalty” is not extant in B and likely indicates an interpolation, i.e. an exegetical gloss. A scribe saw the gifts, which young maiden Jerusalem was given, and reasoned that monarchial reality was intimated. See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 299–301.

¹³⁴ Zimmerli indicates that “splendor” was translated twice in LXX, *Ezekiel I*, 325; This includes B, not however extant in Kenyon’s edition, *Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, 9, and too fragmentary in Köln’s digitized, <http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/NRWakademie/papyrologie/Ezekiel/bilder/PT7abr.jpg>, 11/7/17. The translation possibly arose from a 1cs pronoun minus on εὐπρεπεία in a *Hexaplaric* recension or possibly to indicate the superlative of Yhwh’s beauty.

¹³⁵ The problem concerning the absence of the second appellation continues between the so-called “Old Greek” and the MT. We consistently side with the Old Greek.

- 15 But you trusted in your beauty and played the harlot on account of your name. You poured out your harlotry¹³⁶ upon everyone who passed by.¹³⁷
- 16 You took from your garments and made motley shrines¹³⁸ for yourself and played the harlot upon them; things that should not take place nor occur!¹³⁹
- 17 You took vessels of your glory from my gold and my silver, which I gave to you, and you made for yourself masculine images and played the harlot with them.
- 18 You took your embroidered garments and covered them. My oil and incense, you set before them.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁶ The lexeme, “harlotries” only occurs in the HB in Ezekiel 16 and 23. Each of these occurrences in the HB transpires as a singular in the LXX tradition. Here in Ezek 16:15 of the MT, the suffixed pronoun indicates a plural noun as is also the case in Ezek 16:22, 33, 34, and 36. In Ezek 16:26 and 29, the suffixed pronoun indicates a singular noun while 16:20 and 25 contain a Ketiv/Qere due to the difference between the received text and the way in which the Masoretes read it as a plural. GKC interjects that this is “for the most part probably only scribal errors” based on the fact that the ׀ was treated in the same manner as a plural ending, GKC, §911. Joüon makes a similar observation in P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Roma: E.P.I.B., 2006), §94j. Because of these graphical and phonetic considerations, and with the corroboration of the LXX, we translate this as a singular. In addition, the use of the abstract noun, “harlotry” implies behavior that emerges from multiple acts of the phenomenon. Thus, the singular could connote multiple acts similar to the use of a collective.

¹³⁷ The final clause of MT 16:15, “לִי־הִיא” is a minus in B (The verse is not extant in P967). For the full range of opinions and evidence in commentaries, see Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 228 note 15b, Block, *Ezekiel 1*, 486 note 134, Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 325–26, note 15b. Barthélemy, *Critique*, 96–99, treats this final clause of 16:15 with the final clauses of 16:16 and 19a for which, see below. After considering the full range of evidence in the manuscripts and versions, the committee of Barthélemy, et al., understood the two divergent ways of handling this text in 16:15—assimilation of the 3ms verb to a 2ms verb and a dative with negation—as an indication of attestation of the MT. In their opinion, the Old Greek (La^S contains a variation of the clause) did not translate the clause because of its difficulty. However, in view of recent research indicating the pluses of MT in Ezekiel, it seems more likely to me that the shorter reading is to be preferred. Hence, I would suggest that the expansionary clause indicates that everyone who passed by possessed her beauty—e.g. Keil indicates that the “לִי” refers to כְּלִי־עֹבֵר.” Therefore, “the beauty became his,” C.F. Keil, *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*, Vol IX, Reprint (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 204. See also Greenberg that her “harlotry” became his, Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 280. This would accord with later sections of the chapter and expansions. It would serve to exaggerate her degradation that the passerby possessed her sexual openness. For the use of feminine subjects with the לִי־הִיא clause, see Joüon, *Grammar*, §150k, l.

¹³⁸ The LXX (minus the graphemes of an incomplete lemma in P967, for which see the apparatus for Ezek 16:16 in Kenyon’s *Chester Beatty Papyri*, 9, which could stem from an expression in 16:17) glosses Hebrew בַּמִּוֹת with the plural noun commonly translated as “idol.” While this translational equivalent seems slightly ill-suited, the context could constrain an understanding in that direction. Regardless, the Hebrew appears straightforward; she took from her garments that were meant to dress her in stateliness and used them as bed sheets upon which to commit promiscuous acts. The garments served also to make these “shrines.”

¹³⁹ The MT, the Old Greek, and the remainder of the LXX and versions—albeit inconsistently, attest to these difficult clauses. My translation follows the proposed interpretation of Barthélemy, *Critique*, 98.

¹⁴⁰ The old vocalic feminine ending occurs here as also in 16:13 and appears as Ketiv/Qere in MT.

- 19 My¹⁴¹ bread, which I gave¹⁴² to you—fine flour, oil, and honey, I fed you—and you would give it before them¹⁴³ as a soothing aroma, and so it took place,¹⁴⁴ utters the LORD, God.¹⁴⁵
- 20 You took your sons and daughters, which you birthed¹⁴⁶ and you sacrificed¹⁴⁷ to them for consumption. Is this less than your harlotry?¹⁴⁸

¹⁴¹ The first, singular pronoun in the construction, “my bread” is a minus in P967. It is, however, extant in B as well as other LXX manuscripts. Moreover, it is extant in Hebrew manuscripts as well. Although it is difficult to discern with any certainty, it is possible that P967 dropped the 1cs pronoun in view of the first person verb in the ensuing clause.

¹⁴² P967 contains a first, singular, perfect verb while B and most other LXX manuscripts contain an aorist verb, see Ziegler, *Septuaginta vol. XVI, 1 Ezekiel*, 149, for manuscripts. Commentaries use an English pluperfect, perhaps because of the lack of any mention of bread in the gifts that Yahweh had bestowed upon maiden Jerusalem in the earlier part of the metaphor. I have left it as a simple past to reflect the *qatal* verb in relative clauses.

¹⁴³ Many have noted the difficult syntactical issues in 16:19a, see Zimmerli *Ezekiel 1*, 326, and Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 228, for details. As for the notion of frequentative aspect and succession in a *weqatal*, i.e. ונתחיהו, see Joüon, *Grammar*, §119v as well as §118d, §119a; see also GKC, §112dd.

¹⁴⁴ This enigmatic clause, ויהי, which is the third one occurring at the end of a clause or verse since 16:15, is represented in the Old Greek and the Hebrew. It also transpires in other LXX manuscripts albeit with additional content. The clause is not extant in the Peshitta. I follow here Barthélemy’s committee who gives it a rating of B and suggests a translation of “and this took place,” *Critique*, 99.

¹⁴⁵ P967 contains the Ezekielian formula “says the LORD, God.” B, on the other hand, simply reads, “says the LORD.” It is difficult to adjudicate why the OG manuscripts diverge but I have elected to follow P967 because the uniformity of a single divine appellation in B appears secondary. See note on 16:3 for more details.

¹⁴⁶ The prepositional phrase “to me” (לי) is a minus in the Old Greek. Given the characteristic of pluses in the MT Ezekiel, it appears likely to me that it was added because of the same clause in 23:37, לי ילדו רשא.

¹⁴⁷ The Old Greek does not contain the 3mp suffixed-pronoun on the verb in the clause “and you sacrificed them to them.” The connotation is obviously that Jerusalem sacrificed “sons and daughters” to the idols and therefore, it makes sense why the MT may have added it for clarification. There seems to be little reason why the Old Greek would have deleted it.

¹⁴⁸ In addition to the the Ketiv/Qere, the Hebrew syntax makes the clause difficult. See note on 16:15 for the issue of the singular/plural harlotry[ies]. LXX appears to have translated the nominal element as a verb in view of the difficulty in translating the מן with the adjective מעט. I see no reason why one would not understand this as comparative; the comparison is made between sacrifice of children and the various metaphorical harlotries.

- 21 You slaughtered my¹⁴⁹ sons and you presented them when offering them up to them.¹⁵⁰
- 22 With¹⁵¹ all your harlotries,¹⁵² you did not remember¹⁵³ the days of your youth¹⁵⁴ when you were naked and bare, kicking about in your blood.¹⁵⁵
- 23 And so it was after all your evil,¹⁵⁶ ¹⁵⁷utters the LORD.¹⁵⁸
- 24 You also built for yourself a mound and made for yourself a high place in every square.

¹⁴⁹ The Hebrew contains a 1cs pronoun, “my sons” while P967, B, and most other manuscripts of LXX read “your children.” Zimmerli suggests that this LXX reading is a correction to the statement in 16:20 that the children belong to Jerusalem, “and you took your sons and your daughters,” Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 326. This suggestion seems the most plausible but given the escalating rhetoric against Jerusalem for her harlotry—including the MT plus in 16:38, “those who pour out blood,” it is worth considering the opposite proposal that the Hebrew 1cs pronoun of 16:21 is a harmonization/escalation of 16:20, “which you bore to me.” Still, I would elect the former given the awkward notion of Yahweh bearing sons.

¹⁵⁰ LXX has the rare ἀποτροπιάζεσθαι, apparently an attempt to translate בָּהֶעֱבִיר.

¹⁵¹ The LXX contains τοῦτο. Zimmerli suggests a scribe misread Hebrew וְאֵת for וְאִתָּהּ. While that is a possibility, it is not unreasonable to read וְאֵת as “with, besides.” See Zimmerli for more details regarding secondary literature, *Ezekiel 1*, 326.

¹⁵² MT contains, “With all your abominations and your harlotries.” The Old Greek merely contains, “With all your harlotries.” Block suggests that the former contains a plus because it may have dropped out in the LXX “because of its similarity to the following word,” cf. Block, *Ezekiel*, 487. However, it appears more likely that a later scribe added the word, “abominations” in view of the framework of Ezek 16:2, and 43ff, as well as its association with the content of 2 Kings 16:3. But see S. Talmon’s discussion of just such an issue in Talmon, “Textual Study of the Bible,” 344–57.

¹⁵³ See the note concerning the old vocalic ending on “you ate” in 16:13.

¹⁵⁴ P967 contains νεοτητος; B contains ηπιστητος. Both appear to be a gloss for נַעֲרִים.

¹⁵⁵ For this clause, the LXX commences with a copula and concludes with ἐζησας. It is difficult to conceive how the Hebrew would have lost or incorrectly transcribed these lemmata. Rather, it is possible that the LXX conflates this clause with the same phrase and verb “live” in 16:6aβ and 6bβ.

¹⁵⁶ LXX contains a plural noun, “evils.” Zimmerli proposes that because otherwise in the book, a singular is reserved for a divinely sent evil, that this should be a plural with the LXX and Peshitta, *Ezekiel 1*, 327; contra Block, who argues the opposite, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 491. Zimmerli’s point can be used to argue that the LXX reasoned similar and translated accordingly. In addition, LXX could pluralize in light of the many acts of wickedness in the chapter.

¹⁵⁷ The interjection “woe, woe to you” is absent from the Old Greek; see the Köln manuscript of P967 <http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/NRWakademie/papyrologie/Ezekiel/bilder/PT7abr.jpg>, 5/1/17 and B at the Digital Vatican Library, http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1209/1166/scroll?sid=e43ffd4219baefc79a68d84b52c90905, 5/1/17. While homeoteleuton is a possibility, the expansionary and aggrandizing penchant of MT seems more likely the cause of this plus.

¹⁵⁸ See the comment concerning the double appellation at 16:3.

- 25 At every head of a path you built your high place,¹⁵⁹ abhorred your beauty, spread your feet to everyone who passed by, and multiplied your harlotry.¹⁶⁰
- 26 You played the harlot with the sons of Egypt, your neighbors who were great in size, and you multiplied your harlotry¹⁶¹ to provoke me.
- 27 And behold,¹⁶² I stretched out my hand against you, reduced your lot, and gave you to those who hate you, according to their desire, the daughters of the Philistines, who were embarrassed by your way of licentiousness.¹⁶³
- 28 You played the harlot with the sons¹⁶⁴ of Assyria because you were not satisfied. You played the harlot¹⁶⁵ and still you were not satisfied.
- 29 And you multiplied your harlotry¹⁶⁶ to the land of traders,¹⁶⁷ to Chaldea. And also, in this, you were not satisfied.

¹⁵⁹ LXX and the versions contain a plural noun for Hebrew רמתך. It seems likely that this plural harmonizes with the location of “every head of a path.”

¹⁶⁰ See the note on 16:15.

¹⁶¹ See the note on 16:15.

¹⁶² LXX contains εαν δε; there is a minus in the Peshitta. We retain the Hebrew and allow for translational variance with the Greek.

¹⁶³ For the rare interruption in the construct relationship, see GKC §131r.

¹⁶⁴ LXX reads θυγατερας Ασσοου, no doubt assimilation to “daughters of the Philistines” in 16:27.

¹⁶⁵ Given the rarity of הן (only in Jer 3:1 and possibly Is 23:17) occurring with an accusative and the minus of the accusative, third, plural pronoun in the LXX tradition, we have not included it here.

¹⁶⁶ B and P967 contain τας διαθηκας, A and Γ contain singular την διαθηκην, while Q contains τας πορνειας, i.e., the lemma of MT. It is likely that the *Vorlage* of OG contains “harlotry” and it has glossed it in view of the rather obvious allusions to which the clause and its neighboring clauses allude. Moreover, influence from 16:30 is plausible. However, it is also possible that the OG represents the original while MT harmonizes to the repeated harlotry. It seems questionable whether the translator of LXX would gloss “harlotry” this loosely but in the end, while MT does contain additions, it seems less likely that it would have harmonized to this extent. Therefore, I have elected to retain the MT.

¹⁶⁷ We retain the MT here for grammatical reasons as much textual reasons. See Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 328–29 for a full discussion.

- 30 What is wrong with your heart,¹⁶⁸ utters the LORD,¹⁶⁹ when you do all these things, the work of a woman, a brazen harlot?¹⁷⁰
- 31 When you built¹⁷¹ your mound at the head of every path and your high place you made in every square, you were not¹⁷² like a harlot, inasmuch scoffing¹⁷³ at payment.
- 32 The adulterous wife¹⁷⁴ takes strangers¹⁷⁵ instead¹⁷⁶ of her husband.

¹⁶⁸ The expression has contributed to considerable discussion for which see Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 328; Barthélemy, *Critique*, 99–101. The OG is most likely a witness to the text of the MT. And while a connection to an Akkadian/Aramaic phrase “to be full of fury” is possible, according to Barthélemy, it cannot be accomplished “but by way of conjecture, not one other version having the idea to link this word to the verb מלא or to its equivalent מלה” Barthélemy, *Critique*, 100. Thus, he concludes “How you lacked reason,” *idem.*, 101. Our translation follows his proposal yet retains the language of “heart.”

¹⁶⁹ P967 and B only contain shorthand for *nomina sacra*. See the comment concerning the double appellation at 16:3.

¹⁷⁰ LXX apparently doubly translates זונה as a “harlotrous woman” and “plays the harlot.” Then it construes תשלש as לשלש.

¹⁷¹ P967 and B read MT בבנותיך as a plural noun, “daughters” rather than the more apt בבנותך, which follows from a similar infinitive form ותך שבע in verse 30. “Daughter” plays a role in verse 30 as it also does in 44ff. GKC proposes that the Hebrew construction results from a scribal error, §911.

¹⁷² Neither P967 nor B have the negation. This reading is likely due to the fact that the entire section has affirmed that Jerusalem is like a harlot; it is odd that 16:31b seems to affirm the opposite. The Greek appears to have smoothed the difficult and unusual Hebrew construction and adverbial infinitive, אתנן לקלס, which would explain the lack of negation.

¹⁷³ LXX has “gathering” not “scoffing.” 3QEzek contains לקלס; *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*, Vol 2, ed. Eugene Ulrich (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013), 588.

¹⁷⁴ LXX adds ομοια σοι in an effort to bring coherence between the sudden third person construction and the otherwise second person address to Jerusalem.

¹⁷⁵ Scholars have suggested multiple possibilities for the use of *nota accusative* with an indefinite noun. G.R. Driver, “Ezekiel: Linguistic and Textual Problems,” *Biblica* 35 (1954), 152, proposes a longer text, זרים מאת אתננים תקח. Allen points out that this action does not fit what the previous verse said she does (or in this case, does not), *Ezekiel 1–19*, 230. Zimmerli follows the LXX, which reads, “...against her husband receives gifts,” *Ezekiel 1*, 329. Block thinks that the LXX was formed by homeoteleuton or reflects a different *Vorlage*, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 493. GKC, §117d suggests that the *nota accusative* could refer to specific “strangers in question.” Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 230, quotes Joüon, who indicates that at times, אס can be used with an indeterminate noun, Joüon, *Grammar*, §125h. We follow Barthélemy here who asserts that of all the versions, “the only real variant is the one from the Old Greek which clearly assimilates to the context,” *Critique*, 102.

¹⁷⁶ For the translation, “instead” for תחת, see Ezek 23:5; cf. BDB, 1065, which perceives the occurrence as “under his authority.”

- 33 To all harlots, men give a gift.¹⁷⁷ But you, you gave your presents to all your lovers and bribed them to come into you all around with your harlotry.¹⁷⁸
- 34 With you, it was the opposite of those women in your harlotry;¹⁷⁹ no¹⁸⁰ one pursued you as a harlot. And in the way you gave payment, no payment was given to you and as such, you were the opposite.
- 35 Therefore, o harlot, hear the word of the LORD!
- 36 Thus says the LORD: Because your bronze was poured out¹⁸¹ and your nakedness was revealed in your harlotry with your lovers and with all the idols of your abominations and in accordance with the blood of your sons which you gave before them.
- 37 Therefore, behold I am gathering all your lovers to whom you were pleasing,¹⁸² everyone whom you loved and everyone whom you hated. I will gather them against you all around and reveal your nakedness¹⁸³ to them and they will see all your nakedness.

¹⁷⁷ P967 reads 3rd plural, present “they play the harlot with her” while B, et al. reads plural participle with a feminine accusative pronoun. LXX appears to note the peculiarity of the יתנו.

¹⁷⁸ See footnote 15 above.

¹⁷⁹ See footnote 15 above.

¹⁸⁰ The HB, P967, and Q contain the negation against B and others. The Peshitta does not translate this clause. It appears that B, et al. is attempting to reckon with the difficulty of what the clause states.

¹⁸¹ The term, תשנה, is problematic. See the discussion in the chapters below. Although cognate literature influenced scholarly literature in the 20th century, a connotation related both to wealth and blood within the metaphor of harlotry seems most plausible and in agreement with the versions.

¹⁸² Under the third entry for this lemma, KB glosses “1. to be pleasant... 2. To be pleasing: a) a woman pleases her lover Ezk 16:37,” 877. LXX’s επεμεινης provides witness for Hebrew ערב.

¹⁸³ LXX contains τας κακιας σου. Block asserts that LXX transposes first two letters reading “wickedness” *instead of* “nakedness,” Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 499, רעותך/ערוחק. Zimmerli indicates that the reading was influenced by Ezek 16:57 “your wickedness was revealed,” but then translates vs 57 with “nakedness.” The same lexeme, ערוחק, occurs at the end of 16:37b, *Ezekiel 1*, 330.

- 38 And I will judge you according to the sentence¹⁸⁴ of an adulteress¹⁸⁵ and¹⁸⁶ I will give to you a bloodletting¹⁸⁷ of wrath and vengeance.
- 39 I will give you in their hand and they will tear down your mound, pull down your high places,¹⁸⁸ strip you of your garments, take the vessels of your glory, and leave you naked and bare.
- 40 They will bring an assembly against you, and stone you, and cut you in pieces with their swords.

¹⁸⁴ B, et al. contain the singular form of “judgment” as does the similar Ezek 23:45—which one could set against my suggested reading by arguing that the LXX form in 16:38 represents an emendation in view of 23:45. However, the following compound, participial phrase, “those women who pour out blood” is absent from the OG. The minus there would suggest that it is preferred. These two coherent variances from the LXX against the MT also provide evidence against the MT in that the plus of “those women who pour out blood” required the plural “judgments.” Furthermore, MT contains a lengthy plus in Ezek 33:25–27, which is likewise concerned with idolatry and the pouring out of blood. Accordingly, the longer MT appears to reflect an even stronger polemic against idolatry and that Yahweh will enact punishment directly reciprocal to the sacrifice of children. Furthermore, Ezek 23:45 likewise contains an MT plus concerning the “pouring” of blood. Finally, the form of the verse in OG reflects a parallel structure, which appears to have been altered through the additions.

¹⁸⁵ B contains the singular “adulteress.” MT could be a gloss to 23:45 or harmonization to the subsequent plus, “those women who pour out blood.”

¹⁸⁶ For the lacunal clause “those women who pour out blood,” see the previous footnotes.

¹⁸⁷ LXX translates with preposition εἰν in order to smooth unusual syntax of verb נָתַן, suffixed pronoun, and object אֵל in construct with compound objects. Contra Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 330, who sees influence of 23:25. See also Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 230–1, for an extended discussion. Barthélemy estimates “that this expression is well placed in this book and that the versions did not probably read anything else...”, *Critique*, 104.

¹⁸⁸ Given the lack of clarity in P967 and the variance between P967 and B at this locale, it seems most plausible to retain the *lectio difficilior* of MT; to translate plural “high places” in spite of the disagreement in number between it and singular “mound” in the parallel clause.

- 41 They will burn your houses with fire¹⁸⁹ and execute judgments against you before the eyes of many wives. I will make you stop¹⁹⁰ from being a harlot and also, you will not give payment¹⁹¹ again.
- 42 I will cause my wrath against you to rest and my vengeance will turn aside from you. I will be calm and no longer be enraged.
- 43 Because you did not remember the days of your youth when you were restless¹⁹² before me in all these things and therefore I, look, I gave your way on [your] head, utters the LORD.¹⁹³ And did you not do¹⁹⁴ this licentiousness in addition to all your abominations?¹⁹⁵
- 44 Behold, everyone who tells a proverb about you will say, “Like mother, like daughter.”

¹⁸⁹ The textual variant that is witnessed by a few manuscripts of Kennicot, “They will burn in the midst of fire,” and an expansion in the Peshitta, namely, “They will burn you in the midst of fire,” could be the original wording in light of the judgments against wickedness in Leviticus 20, in particular, Lev 20:14. However, this judgment is not against a harlot but other immorality. Moreover, given the agreement of P967 and B, et al., to the MT, it appears most plausible to retain the reading of the Hebrew, contra Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 330–31. Of course, one could easily argue that the Kennicott manuscripts and Peshitta were a harmonization to the texts in Leviticus.

¹⁹⁰ LXX contains ἀποστρεψω σε ἐκ πορνείας in comparison with Hebrew מְזוֹנָה בְּתִידְשׁוּהָ. This Greek reading appears to be an attempt to translate the Hebrew text.

¹⁹¹ Except for one manuscript of Codex Alexandrinus, 106, LXX contains plural μισθώματα. However, there is no absolute plural form of the underlying Hebrew אָתָּן in the Hebrew Bible; moreover, it reads in 16:41 as a collective.

¹⁹² The versions translate the Hebrew Qal stem רָגַז as a Hiphil. Commentators generally follow the versions although see Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 288, who includes the negation from the previous clause. That judgment seems unlikely given the *wayyiqtol* construction in this clause and the reuse of “you did not remember the days of your youth” in the previous clause. The *lectio difficilior* is the Qal, which I attempt to retain in the translation in accordance with her insatiable ways in vv. 28–29. For more explanation, see the discussion of 16:43 in Chapters 2 and 3. Given the *wayyiqtol* construction, the prepositional phrase “in all these things,” and the correlative in 16:43b, the clause narrates her restless behavior before Yahweh because of which, he brought her deeds on her head.

¹⁹³ P967 contains the double appellation but B and A, et al. only indicate κύριος. See the comment concerning the double appellation at 16:3.

¹⁹⁴ The old vocalic feminine ending occurs on יְחִישֶׁה and appears as Ketiv/Qere in MT.

¹⁹⁵ For the unusual syntax and translation of the interrogative, see the absence of the interrogative particle in 16:56; Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 225; Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 505; and Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 331, translate 16:47 interrogatively as well. See also GKC §150a, which does not treat specifically this precise grammatical formulation but just says generally that there are cases in which the interrogative particle is absent.

- 45 You are a daughter of your mother, one who shows contempt for her husband and her sons. And you are a sister of your sisters,¹⁹⁶ who showed contempt for their husbands and their sons. Your mother was a Hittite and your father was an Amorite.
- 46 And your big sister, Samaria, she and her daughters were dwelling on your left. And your younger sister, who dwells on your right, is Sodom and her daughters.
- 47 But you did not walk in their ways and act according to their abominations;¹⁹⁷ [in a very¹⁹⁸ short time and¹⁹⁹] you acted more corruptly than they did in all your ways.
- 48 As I live, utters the LORD,²⁰⁰ if Sodom, your sister,²⁰¹ she and her daughters acted in the manner that you and your daughters acted—

¹⁹⁶ Along with 16:51, 52a, 52b, and 55, the lexeme, אַחֲוֹתַי in 16:45 inconsistently exhibits a *yod* in a possible plural construction. Barthélemy, et al. has a rather lengthy discussion surrounding these five cases. After reviewing modern and ancient versions, along with medieval exegetes and modern grammarians, he proposes that all five cases should be understood as plurals, Barthélemy, *Critique*, 105–09. In discussing “Nouns of Peculiar Formation”, GKC §96, declares, “In Ezekiel 16:52 אַחֲוֹתַי occurs (for אחיותיך). In the forms אחותי Jos 2:13 *Keth.*, אחותיך Ez 16:51, 55, 61, (to be read also in verse 45 for אחותך, which has been erroneously assimilated to the singular occurring in vv. 48, 49, 56), and אחותיכם Ho 2:3... the third radical has been entirely lost”, 284. Given the problematic nature of the development of this lexeme, we translate as a plural in all five cases. Perhaps significant though in relationship to the expansionary nature of the section, Ezek 23:31–33, which only speaks of Samaria as a sister of Jerusalem—Sodom is not mentioned in the chapter, uses the appropriate singular form.

¹⁹⁷ Along with 16:43bβ and 16:56a, one could understand this clause as an interrogative even though no interrogative particle or adverb exists; see 16:43 above and GKC §150a. However, the comparative מִן in the ensuing clause suggests that a comparison or perhaps even an ironic twist was the intent towards which this initial clause in 16:47 builds.

¹⁹⁸ The word, קָט, is a hapax legomenon; Zimmerli suggests that it should be removed due to dittography, Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 331, קָט כַּמֵּעַט. Additionally, it is absent in B. However, one could argue that the translator did not translate it due to a lack of knowledge of the hapax.

¹⁹⁹ The *wayyiqtol* with an apparent precursor in the clause is stunning and suggests a gloss. But also see Cooke’s comparisons to Ex 16:34 and 1 Sam 15:23; G.A. Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1951), 179. Given the hapax, קָט, the lack of evidence for that particle in B, and a clausal structure of x + *wayyiqtol*, I would propose that the entire construction is a late gloss in an attempt to explain the lack of congruence between 16:47a, when understood as a question, “Did you not walk in their ways and act according to their abominations?” and 16:47b stating that they actually acted more corruptly than did her sisters.

²⁰⁰ P967 is not extant here; B contains shorthand for single *nomina sacra*; A et al. contain single appellation. See the comment concerning the double appellation at 16:3.

²⁰¹ “Your sister” is absent in B; P967 is not extant at this point. I retain it here although there is no explanation for its accidental omission in B.

- 49 Look, this was the iniquity of Sodom, your sister: She and her daughters had pride, an abundance of bread, and plenty of ease²⁰² but she did not support the poor and needy.
- 50 They were haughty and committed an abomination before me, so I removed them when I saw.²⁰³
- 51 And Samaria did not commit half of your sins. You multiplied your abominations more than them and made your sisters²⁰⁴ appear righteous with all your abominations that you did.
- 52 Indeed, you, bear your humiliation inasmuch as you have mediated²⁰⁵ for your sisters with your sins when you acted more abominably than them; they are more righteous than you. Indeed, you, be ashamed and bear your humiliation as you made your sisters appear righteous.
- 53 And I will restore their fortune, the fortune of Sodom and her daughters, the fortune of Samaria and her daughters, and a fortune,²⁰⁶ that is, your fortunes²⁰⁷ in their midst.
- 54 In order that you bear your humiliation and will be humiliated from everything that you did when you brought about mitigation²⁰⁸ for them.²⁰⁹

²⁰² There is a plus in the LXX concerning Sodom and her daughters having an advantage. I retain the shorter reading. The singular verbs in the MT at this point reflect the focus on Sodom rather than her and her daughters. The plural reference appears in 16:50.

²⁰³ For more about the decision to retain the “1st person, “When I saw” instead of the 2nd person “As you saw,” attested by a few late LXX manuscripts, see Barthélemy, *Critique*, 110.

²⁰⁴ For the issue concerning the singular and plural “sister(s)”, see the footnote in 16:45.

²⁰⁵ The Old Greek supports a reading that suggests that Jerusalem “corrupted your sisters with your sins...” It appears to be an attempt to understand the rare Piel form of פלל; see also Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 332.

²⁰⁶ Barthélemy, et al., propose that the first person, “and I will restore” (בתיש) which occurs in the Old Greek, is an early attempt at making sense of the pleonastic construction in the Hebrew. As such, they follow the MT and translate accordingly; Barthélemy, *Critique*, 111–12; contra Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 332, Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 511, and Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 231.

²⁰⁷ As certain as one can be in this situation in which the MT has dubious plural/singular endings above, the *yod* most likely indicates a plural in ביתיך.

²⁰⁸ LXX most likely results from an inner Greek error between forms παροργισαι “to anger” and παρηγορησαι “to comfort”; so C. H. Cornhill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1886), 271.

²⁰⁹ For the hapax, אתך, see GKC §103b.

- 55 And your sisters,²¹⁰ Sodom and her daughters will return to their former state and Samaria and her daughters will return to their former state, and you and your daughters will return to your former state.
- 56 Was not Sodom your sister such a chronicle upon your lips in your heyday?²¹¹
- 57 Before your wickedness²¹² was revealed, like the time²¹³ of the reproach of the daughters of Aram²¹⁴ and those all around her, the daughters of the Philistines,²¹⁵ those treating you with despise²¹⁶ on every side?
- 58 You, you have borne²¹⁷ your licentiousness and abominations, utters the LORD.

²¹⁰ For the issue concerning the singular and plural “sister(s)”, see the footnote in 16:45.

²¹¹ I translate the unique form of the plural גאווניך somewhat as a superlative although the versions contain a singular. Another possible explanation for its unique appearance has to do with the confluence of singular and plural endings on nouns such as “sister(s)” and “fortune(s),” for which, see above. The *lectio difficilior* commends the plural construction.

²¹² Contra Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 332–33, the Hebrew manuscripts, the versions, and *lectio difficilior* affirm that one should read “wickedness” and not “nakedness.” Barthélemy has a more thorough discussion of the variant and arrives at the same conclusion, Barthélemy, *Critique*, 112–14.

²¹³ A great deal of speculation and emendation exists in the versions and modern era because of the unusual כְּמִן, for which see Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 333. The LXX glosses the phrase as ὄν τροπον σου. However, Barthélemy perceptively points out that Ezek 23:43 contains the Hebrew עַת (qere עֵתָה) and the various manuscripts of the LXX diverge with various adverbs, thereby evincing difficulty translating it there. Moreover, Ezek 27:34 also contains עַת in which case the LXX glosses it the same as in 16:57, σου, where it has the same meaning as here, “at the time where.” See Barthélemy, *Critique*, 114. To state succinctly, LXX has the same *Vorlage* as the MT and is therefore a witness to MT. Given the surrounding clauses, for which see Chapter 2, I follow Zimmerli’s suggestion in his notes on verse 57, *Ezekiel 1*, 333.

²¹⁴ Cooke asserts that “The historical allusion can hardly be correct; the time of Aram’s (Syria’s) hostility was much too ancient to be mentioned in this connexion [sic];” Cooke *Ezekiel*, 178. However, Barthélemy answers that the nomenclature could refer to the Syro-Ephraimite war or to a band of Arameans that Nebuchadnezzar had sent. He also indicates that in Ezekiel 27:16, the book indicates another Aram than that of Damascus; Barthélemy, *Critique*, 114. Without better attestation from a majority Hebrew text or the Old Greek, I retain here “Aram.”

²¹⁵ For syntactical reasons, Zimmerli deletes “the daughters of the Philistines” as a gloss and “all around her” as an attempt to clarify the gloss, *Ezekiel 1*, 333. MT, B, and P967 attest to the phrase.

²¹⁶ For the root שָׂט and meaning, see HALOT, 1440. For the ך in the lemma, see GKC §72p.

²¹⁷ See the discussion on this construction in Chapter 3 over the section concerning 16:58.

- 59 Indeed²¹⁸ thus says the LORD,²¹⁹ I will do with you²²⁰ according to what you have done, you who despised the oath to break the covenant.²²¹
- 60 I, I will remember my covenant with you in the days of your youth. And I will establish with you an eternal covenant.
- 61 And you will remember your way²²² and be humiliated when you²²³ take your sisters—from those who are older than you to those who are younger than you—and I will give them to you as daughters²²⁴ but not from your covenant.
- 62 And I, I will establish my covenant with you and you will know²²⁵ that I am the LORD God.²²⁶

²¹⁸ Neither B nor P967 contain “Indeed.” However, parablepsis could yield the lacuna. (P967 lacks the entire formula.) Moreover, Ezek 32:11 contains י in a similar clausal construction and there, it is translated in B and P967 as ὄτι. Thus it appears not to be a difficulty in translation; I retain it here in my translation.

²¹⁹ For the double appellation of the divine name, see above, Ezek 16:3.

²²⁰ For the second person pronoun on what appears to be an accusative marker, see Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 89, who quotes Bauer-Leander for this ‘false tradition’; Hans Bauer and Pontus Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräische Sprache des Alten Testaments 1* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1922).

²²¹ The accusative “oath” completing the verb “despise” is commonly translated as definite along with the accusative to the ensuing infinitive “to break the covenant” presumably because the clause gives some appearance of parallelism, thus suggesting poetry with its paucity of articles; see Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 232. However, the lack of definiteness on either element is odd and likely suggests a formulaic usage or more aptly an expansion based upon its usage in Ezekiel 17, for which see the comments on Ezek 16:59–63 below. B and P967 read “despised these things to transgress my covenant.” However, the appearance of “these things” אלה attests to the MT “oath” אלה; it appears that the presence of the 1cs pronoun is an interpretive gloss given the following verse.

²²² B and P967 contain singular “your way” as well as a few medieval Hebrew manuscripts according to BHS.

²²³ P967 contains a first, singular pronoun in the accusative-subject of the infinitive construction, “when I take.” B, however, contains the second, singular pronoun and therefore attests to Hebrew בקהתך. P967, along with more recent scholars, for which see Barthélemy, apparently harmonize the construction with the ensuing verb “and I will give” in 16:61b. Contra Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 333, Barthélemy considers the greater specificity of the Masoretic to be the original; Barthélemy, *Critique*, 115. Moreover, given that the remainder of LXX manuscripts—in particular, B—translate with a second, masculine, singular pronoun, I translate with the MT.

²²⁴ The Greek tradition apparently misread לְבָנוֹת “as daughters” for לְבָנוֹת “for building up.”

²²⁵ P967 contains επιγνωση; B contains επιγνωσει with a supralinear correction towards what appears to be P967.

²²⁶ P967 contains the double appellation here and given the likelihood that it represents a less corrected text than B or MT, I retain that reading. For more on the double appellation, see note on 16:3.

- 63 In order that you remember and be ashamed and your²²⁷ mouth not open again because of your humiliation when I atone for you, for all which you have done, utters the LORD.”²²⁸

Chapter 2

2. Structure and Unity in Ezekiel 16

Ezekiel 16 expresses the unfavorable portrayal of Jerusalem in two different metaphors. Although rescued and brought into marriage by Yahweh, she is a lascivious and recalcitrant maiden, who deserves and has incurred judgment. Peculiarly, the chapter ends with a prophecy of salvation. The chapter characterizes Jerusalem first as a harlot, then as a deviant sister. Moreover, each caricature involves a comparison with her negative counterparts. Jerusalem is not merely a harlot. She is worse than a harlot, in part, because she owes her very life and beauty to her husband, Yahweh, for his benevolent provision. According to the logic of the chapter, Yahweh discovered her lying in blood, provided for her growth, noticed her femininity, brought her into a covenant of marriage, and gave her his many gifts, which she then squandered in her harlotry. Moreover, she grows much worse than a harlot because unlike a typical harlot’s practice, she must pay for others to patronize her.

²²⁷ The pronoun “your” is present in B and P967 while it is absent in MT and significantly Old Latin codex Constantiensis. I presume it is a translational gloss in the Old Greek in view of the *yiqtol* verb and lamed preposition plus second, feminine, singular pronoun.

²²⁸ For more on the double appellation, see note on 16:3.

As for the second caricature in the chapter, she is worse than her sisters, Samaria and Sodom—both of whom are among the most notoriously depicted locales in the Bible because of their sexual deviancy and idolatrous practices—making them appear righteous when in the company of salacious and fetishistic Jerusalem. Jerusalem will require a restoration, just as each of her sisters humbly wait for and need. Finally, the chapter turns takes a positive turn as God will establish an eternal covenant in which all three sisters take part. In this manner, the chapter coalesces into a unity in view of the chapter's contents that share these particular features and that develop these themes, concerning which we will say more below.

In addition to this unfavorable portrayal, Ezekiel 16 forges a unity among its composite pieces based on a formulaic framework.²²⁹ As will be demonstrated below, formulas commence and conclude written prophetic units in the book of Ezekiel. Moreover, formulas contribute to a subdivision of the chapter into smaller units that exhibit a particular coherence. One particular formula, known as “the messenger formula”, along with other specific lexemes discussed below, assist in establishing an accusation-judgment structure common to the book of Ezekiel.²³⁰ Like other prophecies of judgment, Yahweh commands the prophet to inform the defendant, accuses that

²²⁹ See below but also Karin Schöpflin, *Theologie als Biographie im EzechielBuch: Ein Beitrag zur Konzeption alttestamentlicher Prophetie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 56–126; F. L. Hossfeld, *Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Ideologie des Ezechielbuches* (Würzburg: Echter, 1977); Thomas Krüger, *Geschichtskonzepte im Ezechielbuch* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1989), 63–198; Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, BK XIII (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 35–62, 104–114, idem, *Ezekiel I*, trans. Ronald E. Clements (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1979), 24–41, 68–74; Daniel Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: 1–24* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 30–39; F. Baumgärtel, “Die Formel *ně'um Jahwe*,” *ZAW* 73 (1961): 277–90; Rolf Rendtorff, “Zum Gebrauch der Formel *ně'um jahwe* im Jeremiahbuch,” *ZAW* 66 (1954): 27–37; Samuel A. Meier, *Speaking of Speaking: Marking Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 264–319.

²³⁰ For the accusation-judgment schema, see Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 38–39, Block, *Ezekiel: 1–24*, 459–66.

defendant, identifies a motivation, and then announces a sentence after which the assertion of the oracle's divine origin is repeated.

Additionally, another formula, “utters the Lord [Yahweh],²³¹” when it occurs in conjunction with other structural elements, assists in the subdivision of this accusation-judgment macrostructure into even smaller subunits within the chapter. Besides these formulas, grammatical-syntactical observations and various groupings of content provide demarcation of the chapter into still smaller subunits.

In what follows, I will first present a general structure of the chapter based on formulaic elements found throughout the book of Ezekiel and Chapter 16. These formulaic elements yield a macrostructure of accusation-judgment and the announcement of an eternal covenant. Additionally, the oft-repeated refrain, “utters the Lord [Yahweh],” will provide parameters to further subdivide this macrostructure into smaller coherent units.²³² Second, in conjunction with this formula, I will analyze and further subdivide these structural units into smaller textual pieces based on grammatical/syntactical considerations and observations based on content.

2.1 Structure and Formulas

2.1.1 Introductory Formulaic Elements, Ezekiel 16:1–2

²³¹ See Chapter 1, Ezek 16:3 for a text critical consideration of the double appellation of the divine name. For the sake of familiarity to readers and recognition of the formula, only in this section have I translated the double appellation as the EVV do albeit with brackets around the second name.

²³² This formula, however, merely provides parameters because other structural elements are often present in order to discern a structural transition. The formula serves more than one purpose in the chapter and therefore, I mention it cursorily here before addressing it in greater detail below.

Ezekiel 16 constitutes a literary unity within the book of Ezekiel by means of various formulae used within the book. The chapter begins in Ezek 16:1 with the so-called “word-event” formula, which occurs forty-nine times in the book: “The word of the LORD came to me, saying.”²³³ This announcement of Yahweh’s word coming to Ezekiel previously occurs at 15:1 and subsequently at 17:1. In addition, the oft-repeated closing refrain, which iterates that the message originated with Yahweh, “utters the Lord, [Yahweh]” occurs in the final clauses of chapter 15 and chapter 16.²³⁴ This word event formula and closing refrain, along with the obvious change of content within the individual chapters, contributes to the clear indication of individual, written prophetic units in and adjacent to Ezekiel 16. Moreover, Ezek 16:2 utilizes the common Ezekielian vocative “son of man,” which occurs ninety-three times in the book of Ezekiel. In a remarkable display of regularity, this well-known appellation appears in conjunction with forty-six of the forty-nine word event formulas.²³⁵ As one would expect from this consistency, the appellation recurs after the word event expressions in Ezek 15:2 and 17:2, thereby strengthening the demarcation of individual written prophecies in and surrounding Ezekiel 16.

²³³ Ezekiel 1:3; 3:16; 6:1; 7:1; 11:14; 12:1, 8, 17, 21, 26; 13:1; 14:2, 12; 15:1; 16:1; 17:1, 11; 18:1; 20:2; 21:1, 6, 13, 23; 22:1, 17, 23; 23:1; 24:1, 15; 25:1; 26:1; 27:1; 28:1, 11, 20; 29:1, 17; 30:1, 20; 31:1; 32:1, 17; 33:1, 23; 34:1; 35:1; 36:16; 37:15; 38:1; Ezek 1:3 varies slightly in view of the interruption of the superscription. See Schöpflin, *Theologie*, 57, for the full range of designations.

²³⁴ We will have more to say regarding this “oft-repeated closing refrain,” variously designated as “signatory formula” or “*Gottesspruchformel*,” below. See also Schöpflin, *Theologie*, 101–105.

²³⁵ The appellation does not occur in the third person interruption of the superscription in 1:3, which varies from other word event formulas, and after the word event formula in 17:11 and 18:1.

Additionally, Yahweh commands the prophet in 16:2, “make known to Jerusalem her abominations.”²³⁶ The use of an imperative subsequent to the appellation indicates a third recurring signal that marks the beginning of written prophecy in the book of Ezekiel. Of the forty-six constructions involving “son of man,” which are subsequent to that of the word event formula, twenty-seven have an imperatival form commanding the prophet towards some action.²³⁷ In addition to Ezekiel 16, Chapter 17 similarly follows suit with this phenomenon thus clearly delineating the two chapters in this manner. After a careful examination of such structuring elements, Schöpflin notes that these three phenomena, the word event formula, “son of man,” and subsequent use of the imperative, regularly occur in Ezekiel and introduce written prophetic units.²³⁸ Thus, these formulae generate a literary unity in Ezekiel 16 within the framework of the book. An additional expression, which we will now consider, contributes to the demarcation of literary units within the book but also assists in the structural framework of individual, written prophecies.

2.1.2 “Thus the Lord, [Yahweh] Says” Formula, 16:3, 36, 59

2.1.2.1 The Messenger Formula in Ezekiel 16:3

²³⁶ For similar constructions, see Ezek 20:4, 22:2, 23:36. For the specific verb *yd'* and its relationship to formulaic constructions, see Schöpflin, *Theologie*, 85–86. See also Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 335–36, for its use in “judgment-proof” formulations.

²³⁷ 6:2, 12:3, 13:2, 16:2, 17:2, 20:3, 21:2, 7, 14, 24, 22:24, 24:2, 25:2, 27:2, 28:2, 12, 21, 29:2, 30:2, 31:2, 32:2, 18, 33:2, 34:2, 35:2, 37:16, 38:2. Ezekiel 12:1–3 contains intervening material between the word event formula and imperative.

²³⁸ See Schöpflin, *Theologie*, 99–100. She also indicates a fourth element that is significant for the introduction of an Ezekielian written prophetic unit: the messenger formula or *Zitatansage*. We will address that in the next section.

Another formula common to the book of Ezekiel, “Thus the Lord, [Yahweh] says,” occurs in Ezek 16:3, 36, and 59. This so-called “messenger formula”²³⁹ regularly occurs in conjunction with other written, prophetic, introductory elements in the book, e.g. word event formula, “son of man,” and imperative, adding yet another linguistic signal to the major units within the book. Accordingly, in 17:3, the messenger formula succeeds the introductory, formulaic elements addressed above and assists in the delimitation of units between chapters 16 and 17. The formula, moreover, occurs inside written prophetic units thus appearing 126 times in the book overall.²⁴⁰ Hence, the formula appears in the preceding Chapter 15 in the middle of the prophetic unit as an announcement of Yahweh’s response in judgment. Thus, as the analysis below will demonstrate, the formula is used for more than merely an introductory element; it is also used as a structural device within the written prophetic unit.

The messenger formula in Ezek 16:3 succeeds the “word-event” formula, the vocative “son of man,” and the imperative instructing the prophet to inform Jerusalem of her abominations in 16:1–2. From here, Yahweh’s word comes forth in direct speech seemingly at once present to Ezekiel as well as to the arraigned Jerusalem. The word of Yahweh vividly portrays a history of his own benevolence to infant-maiden Jerusalem. He rescued her and provided for her before entering into covenant with her. He adorned her with many accouterments and she became very, very beautiful. With this beauty

²³⁹ For the use of this nomenclature, see Meier, *Speaking*, 277, who indicates its use following research by Claus Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, trans. Hugh Clayton White (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967); Schöpflin, *Theologie*, 57–68.

²⁴⁰ Schöpflin, *Theologie*, 91, likewise indicates that the formula occurs inside prophetic units in addition to its use as an introductory unit. MT contains a short form of the formula in Ezek 21:8, whereas OG does not.

brought about precisely by means of his gifts to her, maiden Jerusalem betrays her husband, Yahweh, and plays the harlot in a myriad of ways. In this manner, the word of Yahweh accuses Jerusalem for her bawdy behavior from Ezek 16:3aβ–16:34. It is after this account of Yahweh’s provision and Jerusalem’s spurning of it, that one encounters the next messenger formula.

2.1.2.2 The Messenger Formula in Ezekiel 16:36

The next occurrence of the messenger formula appears at 16:36, subsequent to this elaborate portrayal of harlot Jerusalem in Ezek 16:3–34. In addition to the messenger formula, one finds other factors in 16:35 that confirm that a transition has occurred in the chapter between vv. 3–34 and vv. 36–43.²⁴¹ First, 16:35 begins with the conjunctive adverb, “therefore” (לכן). Used sixty-three times in the book of Ezekiel, the word signals a transition from Jerusalem’s arraignment, which vv. 3–34 present, to the announcement of her punishment, which begins proper in 16:37. The word is often used in the book of Ezekiel in conjunction with its counterpart “on account of,” (ען) which then reiterates the basis for judgment. After additional formulaic elements in 16:35 and the messenger formula, which initiates v. 36, the word ען occurs in 16:36 providing a summary of Yahweh’s motivation for judgment. Subsequent to the motivation clauses in 16:36, “therefore” (לכן) occurs again in 16:37.²⁴²

²⁴¹ Meier cautions against using the formula alone as an indication of structure but one can observe clear structural tendencies when multiple formulas are utilized, *Speaking*, 293–98.

²⁴² For more on this pair and its use in “motivation” and “announcement of judgment” clauses, see Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 38–39.

Second, the vocative “Harlot,” occurs in 16:35 drawing a relationship between the previous section in which Jerusalem’s deeds as a harlot were presented and the subsequent announcement of judgment. Two other Ezekielian passages, Ezek 34:7–9 and 36:4–5 utilize similar structural elements as does Ezekiel 16:35–37ff. in which a group under indictment is identified first in an introductory accusation section. In both passages, the conjunctive adverb, “therefore” (לכן) commences an announcement of judgment before a vocative identifies the accused group. Subsequent to the vocative is the formula, “hear the word of the LORD,” a motivation clause (אז), a second “therefore,” (לכן) and finally, an announcement of judgment. In Ezekiel 34:2bβ–6, the word of Yahweh accuses the shepherds for maltreatment of the sheep before the messenger formula and the announcement of judgment occur in 34:10ff. The vocative, “shepherds,” and the command to “hear the word of Yahweh” occur immediately after the conjunctive adverb, “therefore” commences 34:7.²⁴³ Likewise, a motivation clause and other formulaic elements occur before the messenger formula and announcement of judgment begin in 34:10. Consequently, similar to Ezek 16:35–37, the messenger formula and the elements, “therefore” (לכן), a vocative, a command to “hear the word of the LORD,” a motivation clause (אז), and announcement of judgment mark a transition in the written prophetic unit.

Similar transitional elements occur in the written prophecy of Ezek 35:1–36:15. After the word event formula, “son of man,” and an imperative introduce the written prophecy in 35:1–3α, the word of Yahweh accuses Mount Edom for its eternal enmity

²⁴³ The elements, “therefore,” vocative, and command to “hear the word of the LORD” occur in 34:9 as well. For the command to “hear the word of the LORD,” see below and Schöpflin, *Theologie*, 89–91.

and hostile intentions towards the mountains of Israel. The prophecy transitions in 36:1 by means of a second “son of man,” an imperative now to prophesy to the mountains of Israel, and other formulaic elements. In this case, the announcement of judgment against Mount Edom and the remnant of the nations involves a message of salvation to the mountains of Israel. Motivation clauses (ען) occur in 36:2a β and 36:3ba. The connector “therefore” (לכן) commences 36:3 and 36:4 before the vocative “mountains of Israel” re-identifies the hearer of an announcement of judgment against Mount Edom and the remnant of the nations albeit a message of salvation for the mountains of Israel. The command “hear the word of the LORD” and the messenger formula round out the transition. The use of a vocative leads to a third element contributing to structure: a command to “hear the word of the LORD.”

This command for one to hear the word of the LORD, designated as “*Höraufruf*” by Schöpflin, occurs after each of these vocatives in 16:35, 34:7, 9, and 36:4 as well as other places in the HB.²⁴⁴ The imperative “hear” followed by the “word of the LORD” occurs ten times in the book of Ezekiel.²⁴⁵ This formula functions as a prophetic introductory element as well as one that contributes to a subdivision of a prophetic speech unit. Its use in conjunction with the connector “therefore,” (לכן) in 16:35 and in 16:37, the vocative “harlot” in 16:35, and motivation clauses (ען) in 16:36 after the messenger formula, effectively subdivides the written prophecy between the description of Jerusalem’s harlotrous acts and an announcement of Yahweh’s coming punishment.

²⁴⁴ See Schöpflin, *Theologie*, 89–91; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 346.

²⁴⁵ Ezek 6:3, 13:2, 16:35, 21:3, 25:3, 34:7, 9, 36:1, 4, and 37:4. A command to “hear the word” in Ezek 33:30 (and Ezek 44:5) is syntactically distinct from the aforementioned.

2.1.2.3 The Messenger Formula in Ezekiel 16:59

The final occurrence of the messenger formula in the chapter takes place in 16:59. Its appearance in 16:59 differs from the previous two occurrences in at least two ways. First, none of the aforementioned elements that occurred in conjunction with the messenger formula in 16:3 and 35 appear in 16:59. There is no vocative, no *Höraufruf*, no connector or motivation clause, and no other introductory prophetic formula. Furthermore, it is unique in view of a syntactical anomaly within the chapter. It begins, “Indeed, thus the Lord, [Yahweh] says” (וַיֹּאמֶר).²⁴⁶ The addition of “indeed” suggests an emphasis on the assertion that the following speech indeed originates with Yahweh. Thus, it appears likely that the main purpose for utilization of the formula here lies not in a macro-structural function but in its claim of divine origin. There are additional indicators, however, that suggest that the formula also contributes to a division of material albeit to a different extent as the other two occurrences.

Two factors indicate that a transition occurs with the use of this formula in 16:59. First, 16:58 ended with another common Ezekielian formula, “utters the LORD.” This formula, designated as the *Gottesspruchformel* by Zimmerli,²⁴⁷ is used as a concluding formula for prophetic speech.²⁴⁸ Although its utilization as a concluding formula is not straightforward, the absence of any other introductory formulas in 16:58

²⁴⁶ The subordinate conjunction is absent in LXX. See Chapter 1 for more details.

²⁴⁷ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 39*.

²⁴⁸ See below for a fuller discussion and Schöplfin, *Theologie*, 101–05 for more designations and a summary of its uses.

and its usage prior to the messenger formula in 16:59 hints at a conclusion for the purpose of transition.²⁴⁹

Second, the messenger formula indicates a transition in view of the abrupt change in vocabulary, the most significant of which relates to covenantal language. Prior to Ezek 16:59, the word “covenant” had appeared only in 16:8. Yahweh noticed the woman, rescued her, provided for her and finally, came into covenant with her and she became his. In Ezek 16:59, however, after this claim to divine origination of the message, the notion of covenant returns, occurring five times within four verses. The passage refers to the former covenant, “I will remember my covenant with you in the days of your youth,” (Ezek 16:60) but also appears to expand upon that notion in 16:60b–61 in explicitly theological terms.²⁵⁰ The absence of any extended discussion of “covenant” prior to 16:59 in conjunction with the messenger formula in 16:59 and the concluding *Gottesspruchformel* in 16:58 indicates a subdivision of the material between 16:58 and 16:59.

Thus, one can discern three units within the chapter based in part upon the messenger formula. In summary, the first two occurrences of the formula, which appear in conjunction with other formulas, contribute to the accusation-judgment structure in

²⁴⁹ Rendtorff, “Zum Gebrauch,” 36, concludes an analysis of the formula in the book of Jeremiah by saying, “So wird man die Formel auch vielfach dort zu verstehen haben, wo sie jetzt in einem größeren Zusammenhang einen Vers abschließt. Manchmal ist sie durch sekundäre Zusätze aus ihre Abschlußfunktion verdrängt worden.“ This formula occurs often in Ezekiel 16 and thus, I will discuss its different uses in the chapter in greater detail below.

²⁵⁰ For example, 16:60, “and I will establish for you an eternal covenant,” 16:62 “and I will establish my covenant with you and you will know that I am Yahweh,” 16:61, “and I will give them to you as daughters and not from your covenant.” See below, pp. 118–27, for more details as it relates to the role of covenant in a structural function.

16:3–34 and 16:35–43.²⁵¹ The third occurrence of the formula, which uniquely begins with יְהוָה, appears with no other introductory formulas and reintroduces the term “covenant” but expands upon its significance, indicates a structural division although one that is distinct from the occurrence of the formula in 16:35.

2.1.3 “Utters the Lord, [Yahweh]” Formula

A third formula, “Utters the Lord, [Yahweh],” occurs nine times in Ezekiel 16 and eighty-five times in the book of Ezekiel.²⁵² One can observe its use as a concluding formula, assisting the demarcation of structural units, by its appearance in conjunction with the word event formula. Of the forty-nine occurrences of the word event formula in the book of Ezekiel, which clearly initiates written prophecy in the book, this so-called *Gottesspruchformel* immediately precedes it eighteen times with a nineteenth occurrence preceding it with only an intervening verse. Moreover, the *Gottesspruchformel* precedes the messenger formula, which serves as introductory or structural formula, either immediately or with minimal intervening material another seven times. With an intervening verse, the *Gottesspruchformel* precedes the messenger formula another two times. Given the manner in which the word event and messenger formulas structure written prophetic speech in conjunction with other formulaic elements, these occurrences strongly indicate the concluding nature of the *Gottesspruchformel*.

Furthermore, the *Gottesspruchformel* contributes to structural development in a subunit when used in conjunction with other introductory elements. For example, after

²⁵¹ See below for the basis for dividing between 16:43 and 16:44.

²⁵² The refrain appears in 16:8, 14, 19, 23, 30, 43, 48, 58, and 63.

the Ezekielian formula “as I live,” the *Gottesspruchformel* occurs fourteen times contributing to the structural development of written prophecy.²⁵³ After the messenger formula, the *Gottesspruchformel* occurs an additional four times.²⁵⁴ Other elements also play a role in relationship to the *Gottesspruchformel* such as the formula, “I have spoken,” the clause, “your [their] way on your [their] head, I will give,” and the lexeme, “behold.”²⁵⁵ Additionally, the *Gottesspruchformel* assists in the structural development of written prophecy when it is accompanied by obvious syntactical or content related changes. For example, the formula occurs at the end of Ezek 16:14, a verse which indicates the positive results from Yahweh’s gifts to lady Jerusalem and concludes the narrative of Yahweh’s bestowal of gifts upon the maiden. Up to this point, the focus was upon Yahweh’s first person actions and the beauty of the woman. However, at 16:15, that focus shifts to the woman’s shameful actions. With the exception of a few relative clauses that refer to Yahweh’s past benevolence, second feminine singular verbs and pronouns, which refer to the woman, overwhelmingly dominate the action in 16:15–34. Also, the motif of the unit, the harlotrous woman, comes into clear view only at 16:15 and remains so throughout the section. This change in syntax and content in conjunction with the *Gottesspruchformel* likewise suggests a structural development in the unit.

²⁵³ This combination appears in Ezek 5:11, 14:16, 18, 20, 16:48, 17:16, 18:3, 20:3, 31, 33, 33:11, 34:8, 35:6, and 35:11.

²⁵⁴ Ezek 12:28, 13:8, 30:6, 45:9.

²⁵⁵ The *Gottesspruchformel* occurs in conjunction with “I have spoken” in Ezek 12:25, 28, 23:34, 26:5, 26:14, 28:10, 37:14, and 39:5 (and with intervening material in 24:14). It occurs in conjunction with the formula “your [their] way on your head, I will give” in Ezek 11:21, 16:43, 22:31. It occurs in conjunction with the lexeme “behold” with possible, intervening Ezekielian formulas or minimal material in Ezek 12:25–27, 13:8, 16:43–44, 16:48–49, 18:3–4, 21:12, 22:12–13, 24:14–16, and 39:8.

These considerations lead to a hypothesis. When the *Gottesspruchformel* appears with other formulae, lexemes, or syntactical and content-related structural elements in the book of Ezekiel, it contributes to the structural subdivision of the written prophetic unit. In contrast, when the *Gottesspruchformel* appears alone, the purpose for the formula has to do with other emphases or developments within the passage.²⁵⁶ Using this criterion, that is, on the basis of the *Gottesspruchformel* with other structural indicators, one can further divide the first subunit Ezek 16:3a β –34 between Ezek 16:14 and 16:15. One can also further divide Ezek 16:43 and 16:44 based not only on the *Gottesspruchformel* but also on the repeated clause, “your way on your head, I will give,” which appears in 16:43b and the sharp change in subject matter and vocabulary. Other *Gottesspruchformel* may likewise suggest a separation of material or a further subordination of subunits but it depends in greater part on the role of syntax and content and will be discussed below. Thus, on the basis of various Ezekielian formulas, one can structure Ezekiel 16 in the following manner.

Ezek 16:1–3a α Introductory Formula

Ezeki 16:3a β –14 Yahweh’s Actions towards Infant-maiden Jerusalem

Ezek 16:15–34 Jerusalem’s Harlotry

Ezek 16:35–43 The Announcement of Yahweh’s Judgment

Ezek 16:44–58 Sisters Jerusalem, Samaria, and Sodom

²⁵⁶ Schöpflin, *Theologie*, 103, quotes Rendtorff’s examination of the formula in Jeremiah, who indicates that besides its use as a concluding formula, one can discern its use in conjunction with other formulae to help introduce divine speech, its use in other rhetorical situations, and its use in conjunction with secondary additions, Rendtorff, “Zum Gebrauch,” 34–37. See also Hossfeld, *Untersuchung*, 39, who indicates that Rendtorff’s conclusions as it relates to the book of Jeremiah also apply to the book of Ezekiel. Contra Meier, also quoted in Schöpflin, who is less positive that one can discern a purpose in any single usage, *Speaking*, 309.

Ezek 16:59–63 Yahweh Will Establish an Eternal Covenant

2.2 Grammatico-Syntactical Observations and Content

2.2.1 Introductory Formula Ezekiel 16:1–3aα

As described above, Ezek 16:1–3aα contains introductory formulae that commence a written unit. In addition to the use of structural elements through which to discern the unity of the chapter, there are also grammatical indications. Although the chapter only contains two references to the city's name, Ezek 16:2 and 16:3, the second, feminine, singular verbal and pronominal forms referring to Jerusalem occur consistently throughout the entire chapter.²⁵⁷ This consistency provides yet another means of coherence for the composite, written oracle.

Additionally, Ezek 16:2 initiates a significant motif in the chapter: Jerusalem's abominable behavior. Found among the book's typical, Ezekielian conventions, the clause extends beyond mere formula; Ezekiel is to "make known to Jerusalem her abominations." In addition to Ezek 16:2, the imperative "make known" and accusative "abominations" occurs in 20:4 where Ezekiel was to make known the abominations of their fathers to Israel's elders. Moreover, the collocation occurs again in the opening of 22:2, in which Ezekiel is to "make known to the bloody city, [Jerusalem] all her abominations." A similar verbal notion, "declare," with the plural accusative "abominations" occurs in 23:36, "Declare to them their abominations." Strikingly, this clause applies to two sisters in Ezekiel 23, one of whom is Jerusalem. In the comparison

²⁵⁷ For the text critical issues with the second singular feminine verbs, see the text critical discussion in Chapter 1.

in Ezekiel 23, Jerusalem is negatively compared to her older sister, Samaria. This comparison bears many similarities to the comparison in Ezek 16:44–58 in which Jerusalem is compared negatively to her sisters Sodom and Samaria. We will consider this material in greater detail below.

The noun, “abominations” is also significant in the clause. The noun occurs eight times in this chapter but five of the occurrences appear in the section 16:44–58.²⁵⁸ A sixth occurs in the transitional verse of 16:43. Occurrences here at the onset of the chapter and in 16:36 round out its appearances in the chapter. The noun plays a large role in the book occurring forty-three times, the most of any book in the OT and nearly twice the number of occurrences than that of the next closest book, Proverbs. Thus, Yahweh’s directive in 16:2 sets an accusatory and familiar tone for the chapter.

2.2.2 Yahweh’s Actions towards Infant-maiden Jerusalem Ezekiel 16:3aβ–14

2.2.2.1 Circumstances of Jerusalem’s Birth Ezekiel 16:3aβ–5

After the formulaic introduction and command to the prophet to arraign Jerusalem in Ezek 16:1–3aα, the first unit commences with the story of Jerusalem’s origins in Ezek 16:3aβ. Yahweh said that Jerusalem’s “origin and birth” (מכרתתך ומלדתך) were, “From the land of the Canaanite. Your father was the Amorite and your mother was a Hittite.” The [plural](#) term, “origins” occurs only three times in the HB and all of those in the book of Ezekiel. The term makes its only appearance in Ezekiel 16 here in a compound construction with the plural term, “births” or more specifically in view of its use in 16:4, “birth circumstances” (מולדותיך). While Jerusalem’s birth is the subject of the subsequent

²⁵⁸ The noun’s occurrence in 16:22 does not occur in OG. See Chapter 1.

verses, the topic of her apparent origin does not return until much later in the chapter (16:44b–45). As for the land associated with her origin, the proper name, “Canaanite,” or even the proper name delimiting the land itself, “Canaan,” appears only here in the entire book of Ezekiel.²⁵⁹ The subject of Jerusalem’s parentage does return, however, in 16:44b–45 in the transition between the imagery of Jerusalem as a harlot and her imagery as a wicked sister. Specifically, in 16:45bβ, the clauses, “Your father was the Amorite and your mother was a Hittite” occur in a reverse order from that in 16:3.²⁶⁰ It is interesting to consider that the theme of Jerusalem’s heritage and parentage does not appear in the remainder of the accusation in 16:3–34 nor in the announcement of judgment in 16:35–43.²⁶¹ Furthermore, the metaphor relating Jerusalem to a harlot does not require a discussion of parentage nor heritage. It is possible, however, to associate the subsequent abandonment of the infant on the field to adoption rites in the ANE.²⁶² Then, Jerusalem’s lowly origin contributes to her base behavior. Of course, once the mother-daughter proverb is related in 16:44–45 and Jerusalem has two sisters, the metaphor naturally returns to the mother.

This statement of Jerusalem’s heritage is followed in 16:4–5 with a description of the birth circumstances. Ezekiel 16:4 commences with a repetition of “As for your

²⁵⁹ A similar lemma occurs in Ezek 16:29 and 17:4 but because of the parallelism in 17:4, the term is normally translated, “merchants.”

²⁶⁰ Unlike the occurrence in 16:3, the proper name, “Amorite” lacks the article in 16:45.

²⁶¹ The only references to familial relationships in the accusation—although not related to Jerusalem’s parentage, are the sacrifice of sons and daughters in 16:20–21 and the marital relationship of an adulterous woman and her husband in 16:32. The phrase, “blood of your sons” likewise refers to familial relationships in a motivation clause of 16:36bβ.

²⁶² Malul, “Adoption of Foundlings,” 97–126.

birth” (ומולדותיך) before exhibiting an envelope structure delimiting the remainder of 16:4–5. The phrase “on the day you were born” (אתך הולדת ביום) occurs immediately subsequent to the repeated “As for your birth,” (ומולדותיך) with which 16:4 begins. This same phrase (אתך הולדת ביום) appears again at the conclusion of 16:5 exhibiting the envelope structure in which the details of the birth are confined. In spite of the distinct vocabulary in 16:3aβ–b and the absence of the theme of Jerusalem’s parentage in the metaphor of Yahweh’s covenant marriage to lady Jerusalem, his provision for her, and accusation and announcement of judgment in 16:7–43, the connection of Jerusalem’s parentage to the material in 16:4–6, which conveys Jerusalem’s birth circumstances, exhibits a logical coherence.

The birth material begins in Ezek 16:4aβ, “your umbilical cord was not cut.” The collocation is not otherwise found in the HB but immediately expresses a neglect or abandonment of the infant where she lay subsequent to her egress, undoubtedly still attached to the placenta. To be sure, the entire verse depicts a scene in which there lacks a basic level of concern, cleansing, and medical care. The ensuing clause continues, “And with water, you were not washed.” This clause recurs in reverse order in v. 9 with Yahweh as the subject, “And I washed you with water.” Consequently, it shows that the action that the unnamed parents neglected to do in 16:4aβ, Yahweh accomplished on behalf of Jerusalem. Of course, according to the narrated time in 16:9, the infant will by then have grown into a young maiden and the “washing with water” will occur for a different purpose.

A third and fourth clause, which are linguistically related and further the depiction of neglect, occur in 16:4b, “And you were indeed not rubbed with salt nor

were you swaddled.” Neither clause contains lemmata that otherwise appear in the chapter but they do relate to the previous clause in 16:4aβ. The three clauses—and actually a fourth, 16:4aα that contains a qal passive—comprising these statements from 16:4aβ–16:4b occur in the Pual and Hophal forms each containing a *u* class vowel, *qibbut*s. Moreover, the latter two clauses each occur with Hophal infinitive absolute forms exhibiting assonance, which only reinforces the perception of coherence. Ezekiel 16:5 reinforces an understanding of the clauses in 16:4 through its use of a plural demonstrative pronoun “these things,” which points backward to the antecedents of cutting, washing, salting, and swaddling. It asserts, “Not an eye took pity on you, to do for you one of these things to show compassion towards you.”²⁶³ Hence, the phrase, “to do for you one...” likewise rhetorically expresses that while all four actions should have been done, in Jerusalem’s case, not one was undertaken on behalf of the neglected child. No one had taken pity upon her in the infant’s most uncertain hour. Her birth and infancy were fraught with vulnerability and compassionless indifference. Most assuredly, the reader is to understand that the infant-city had been neglected in order to accentuate her lowly birth as well as the compassionate chivalry of Yahweh.

Ezekiel 16:5b continues with another Hophal, second, feminine, singular verbal form indicating that the infant “was flung upon the field.” In this case, the perception extends from mere neglect to disdain since the action is one of actual movement in casting the infant away rather than merely leaving her lay in neglect. The motivation behind her neglect and repudiation is also explicit: “in contempt for your life.” This

²⁶³ The so-called “feminine infinitive” form, “to show compassion” utilizes *qibbut*s, the Hebrew *u* class vowel, possibly in an attempt for this clause to cohere with the Pual and Hophal clauses that surround it and utilize the vowel; see GKC, §45b.

verbal root also appears twice in the transitional verse, 16:45. There, Jerusalem’s mother also “showed contempt for” her husband and her sons. Consequently, it should come as no surprise that Jerusalem is contemptible along with her sisters, Sodom and Samaria, who, in like manner, “showed contempt for their husbands and their sons.” Finally, as mentioned above, the circumstances of Jerusalem’s birth conclude in the same way they began; this was “on the day you were born.”

2.2.2.2 Yahweh’s Provision, Ezekiel 16:6–14

2.2.2.2.1 Summary

The next subsection expresses in verbal form Yahweh’s many acts of provision, which, except for a few notable divergences, extends to the conclusion of this first unit in 16:14. The use of *wayyiqtol*, first, common, singular verb forms generally dominate and explicitly demonstrate Yahweh’s consistent and benevolent deeds done on behalf of Jerusalem. A *wayyiqtol* chain occurs in 16:6 depicting how Yahweh happens upon the infant, sees her and speaks to her before 16:7 breaks the chain with an X + *qatal* clause describing Yahweh’s gift of a “myriad.” In contrast to the remainder of 16:8–12, 16:7 expresses how the infant grows and develops in three *wayyiqtol*, second, singular, feminine verbal clauses and three nominal clauses. Ezekiel 16:8 returns to the dominance of first person verbs since six of eight clauses contain *wayyiqtol*, first, common, singular verbal forms. Furthermore, Ezek 16:9–12 is comprised of a tenfold *wayyiqtol* chain, which overwhelming foregrounds Yahweh’s many charitable actions towards infant-maiden Jerusalem. Finally, Ezek 16:13–14 characterize the effects of Yahweh’s gifts as the woman adorns these gifts—as well as additional precious

materials and foods, and becomes very, very beautiful. The section closes with a *Gottesspruchformel* but not before it indicates that her beauty, which was “perfect” because Yahweh had placed his adornment on her, was the reason that a name went out for her among the nations.

Moreover, this section appears to relate many of Yahweh’s provisions to the infant-maiden in vocabulary that it has in common with cultic terminology. This vocabulary, found also in Exodus 30, 35–39, Leviticus, and Numbers, suggests that Jerusalem was portrayed throughout the subunit in language that was consonant with her cultic peculiarity.²⁶⁴ Her accouterments, which were meant to set her apart from the nations and their idolatrous practices, become the means through which she prostitutes herself to those very entities. Furthermore, Ezek 16:11–12 contains language consonant with royal terminology. Bracelets, a necklace, a nose-ring, earrings, a crown, gold, silver, and fine attire intimate a royal nuance that only heightens the depth to which Jerusalem will soon fall. The following subunits constitute this section.

2.2.2.2.2 Ezekiel 16:6

As summarized above, Ezek 16:6 is written from a first person perspective; Yahweh says, “And I passed by and saw you.” The twofold *wayyiqtol* chain of 16:6a is repeated verbatim two verses later in 16:8. While Yahweh is the subject of the clause,

²⁶⁴ See Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 485–87, and Julie Galambush, *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as Yahweh’s Wife* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 95.

the second, feminine, singular pronominal form appears twice and indicates Jerusalem, as it will often occur throughout the chapter. A Hithpolel, feminine, singular, participial phrase, “kicking about in your blood” modifies the figure of infant-Jerusalem. The same phrase will occur in 16:22, which in retrospect chides Jerusalem for not remembering the vulnerable days of her youth. The term, “blood” occurs in the plural form and likely stems from the circumstances of birth but the imagery is heightened when, in the case of the MT, no one had severed the umbilical cord.²⁶⁵ Unlike the unnamed parents conspicuously absent in 16:4–5, Yahweh “sees” the infant kicking about in blood and thereupon speaks.

In Ezekiel 16:6b, the *wayyiqtol* chain advances to a third clause. Yahweh says, “And I said to you in your blood, “Live!” On the one hand, such a verbal command from Yahweh in conjunction with his observance of the situation in 16:6a would certainly counter the neglect of the parents in 16:4–5. In this case, the infant would surely “live” in view of Yahweh’s command to that end. On the other hand, one may question the appropriateness of a mere word to nurture a newborn in such a precarious moment. Would Yahweh not act in a way that would reverse the situation of 16:4–5? Would he not do more than speak in such an urgent situation? The answer will, of course, proceed in the story of Yahweh’s treatment of the child. Before consideration of that treatment, it is interesting to note that the verb, “Live!” appears only here in the chapter. Its usage here after the circumstances of neglect in 16:4–5 intimate the death that surely awaited

²⁶⁵ The clause, “Your umbilical cord was not cut” in the LXX reads, “They did not cover your chest.” For a discussion of this variant, see Chapter 1. Without the clause regarding the severing of an umbilical cord, the imagery of blood in 16:6 would not be quite as natural although a birth scene would still allow for such a connection.

Jerusalem without the intervention of Yahweh. Additionally, the double repetition—thrice in the MT—in 16:6 of “in your blood” not only accentuates the grave circumstances of the infant who wallows vulnerably in its blood but would likely, in particular in the plural form of “blood,” educe a cultic orientation of parturition, such matters which will come into full view in Ezek 16:9.²⁶⁶ Thus, Yahweh’s notice of and verbal response to the circumstances of the infant is contrasted with her ignoble progenitors.

2.2.2.2.3 Ezekiel 16:7–8

Ezekiel 16:7 begins by expressing Yahweh’s response to the infant’s dire situation: “A myriad, I made you, like the sprout of the field.” The second, feminine, singular, suffixed pronoun “you” displays the coherence between 16:7a and the infant in 16:6. Additionally, the first, common, singular *qatal* verb associates the one making a “myriad” with the one who spoke to the infant lying in its blood in 16:6. Unlike the *wayyiqtol* verbal forms, which comprised 16:6, this clause begins with “myriad” before proceeding to the *qatal* form, “I made.” (נתך) Finally, the lexeme “field” occurs a second time in the chapter, the first occurrence appearing in 16:5b and denoting a negative incident when the infant was thrown “to the face of the field.” Here, however, the word comprises a positive image as a member of the simile “like the sprout of the field” that draws comparison with the indefinite noun “myriad.” Rather than mere number or quantity, the context suggests that Yahweh caused the robust growth of the infant most

²⁶⁶ See Lev 12:1–5 for parturition and Lev 15:19–30 and 20:18 for issues of ritual purity after menstruation. For a discussion of the use of the plural form here, see notes on these verses in Chapter 1; see also Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 323, Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 276, and Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 227.

probably as it relates to hair on the head or related to her growth of pubic hair, which will become explicit in 16:8bβ.

Subsequent to this clause, one finds a threefold *wayyiqtol* chain, the first two clauses consisting of only the verbs themselves. Each verb occurs in a second, feminine, singular verbal form, further establishing a connection to the antecedent Jerusalem. She grew, (ותרבי) she matured, (ותגדלי) and she came with the finest of ornaments. The first two clauses indicate that her growth and maturity were a result of the “myriad” that Yahweh gave. The rescued infant will soon emerge as a young maiden. These two roots occur in close proximity in 16:26 although in different forms and in negative connotation. Moreover, the *wayyiqtol*, second, feminine, singular verb, “And you grew” (ותרבי) will appear an additional four times in the same form in Ezek 16:25, 26, 29, and 51. On the first three of these occasions, Jerusalem “multiplied harlotries”; the fourth, she “multiplied abominations.”

The third clause of 16:7aβ, “And you came with the finest of ornaments,” is enigmatic (literally, “ornaments of ornaments”) although the subsequent context suggests sexual imagery involving a young maiden.²⁶⁷ Unlike the description of “ornaments” in Ezek 16:11–13, in which Yahweh gives the maiden various accouterments, there is no description from where or whom these ornaments come.²⁶⁸ They appear to be a result of the growth of the infant into a pubescent maiden, which

²⁶⁷ See GKC for the use of the superlative, §133i; for an attempt to connect “ornaments” with other literature involving sexual imagery, although ultimately with little or no literary evidence, see Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 276–77.

²⁶⁸ For more information on the text critical analysis, see Chapter 1 and for the reading, “you entered the time of menstruation” and other options, see Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 227.

results from Yahweh's gift of a "myriad." Hence, in the logic of the metaphor, Jerusalem has matured from infant to maiden in merely the space of 16:7a.

Three more non-*wayyiqtol* clauses attest to the congruency of this verse with verse 8 and portend the significance of the feminine characterization of Jerusalem subsequently found in the rest of the chapter. First, Ezek 16:7ba tersely declares, "Breasts took shape." The infant, laying in its blood on the day it was born in 16:5–6, has now grown into a pubescent maiden. Neither lemma, "breasts" nor "took shape," appear elsewhere in Ezekiel 16.²⁶⁹ A second clause in 16:7ba is likewise related to the infant-maiden's pubescence and explicitly refers to her through the second, feminine, singular personal pronoun suffixed to the noun, "hair." The clause reads, "And your hair sprouted." The verbal root, "to sprout" is the same root that occurred in 16:7a in the simile, "like the sprout of the field." Additionally, such a comment must refer to pubic hair, as the woman would have had hair on her head for quite some time concomitant with her budding breasts. In this description, one may note again the bygone days of the infant. Although less than a verse has transpired, the alarming days of Jerusalem's infancy are in the past and Jerusalem has blossomed into an adolescent woman.

A third clause in 16:7b contains an independent, second, feminine, singular pronoun, which must refer to the now fresh, young maiden in its description, "you were naked and bare." (וערִיָּה עָרֶם) Although five intervening clauses have referred to the infant's growth into a young woman, an association exists between the explicit description of her nakedness and the nakedness of the infant, which no one swaddled

²⁶⁹ The term, "breasts," however, plays a significant role in the negative portrayal of Jerusalem in Ezekiel 23.

and consequently, would have remained naked from its birth. Thus, one discerns the congruence within the first seven verses through references to the infant-maiden Jerusalem and Yahweh's discovery of her. The collocation, "naked and bare" (וערִיָּה עָרֹם) will occur two more times in the chapter in 16:22 and 39. After Yahweh's provision, the maiden will forget her vulnerable state of nakedness and after her many unconscionable enterprises, she will return to her original state of nakedness.

Ezekiel 16:8 furthers the pubescent theme of 16:7 and develops the newfound interest that Yahweh has for Jerusalem. It begins by repeating verbatim the initial two, *wayyiqtol* clauses of 16:6, "And I passed by you and saw you." The occurrence of this compound construction in 16:6 referred to Yahweh's encounter and notice of the exposed infant wallowing in its blood. Here, the same construction refers to Yahweh's encounter and notice of exposed maiden-Jerusalem with budding breasts, sprouting pubic hair, and exposed "ornaments." The stunning revelation of the verse can hardly be overstated. Yahweh notices the voluptuous young maiden! Moreover, the two second, feminine, singular pronouns within this repeated compound clause cohere with each remaining clause of the 16:8, which likewise contains a second, feminine, singular pronominal or verbal reference. Thus, the verse further reiterates the story of Yahweh's relationship to the young infant-maiden.

As it relates to content, the remaining clauses in 16:8a β –b also reinforce the perspective upon Jerusalem as a budding woman entering menses. The first clause, which succeeds Yahweh's discovery of the maiden in 16:8a α , transpires in a nominal clause similar to which 16:7b ended. The clause begins with the exclamatory particle, "Behold", and draws attention to an exceptional time in the life of the young maiden:

“Your time was the time of lovers.” The lexeme, “lovers” only appears in the book of Ezekiel in 23:17 and here. Additionally, the nominal clause advances a time concurrent with that of budding breasts and sprouting pubic hair, which one reads in 16:7b. The pubescent maiden has now matured into a woman of conjugal age. Of the fifteen clauses in 16:7–8, seven refer explicitly to the maturation of the woman while an additional five clauses subsequently relate to Yahweh’s procurement of the woman in view of her maturation. Interestingly, one may further observe in Ezek 16:7–8 a unique perspective. Of the fifteen clauses in these two verses, only one refers to Yahweh’s gift to the maiden. In a rather nondescript manner, it reports that he “gave a myriad like the sprout of the field” and the infant flourished into a woman of marriageable age. This image is quite in contrast to the many express, benevolent acts, which will unfold in 16:9–12 in which Yahweh will care for and bless the maiden with accouterments.

Subsequent to the nominal clause concerning the “time of lovers” in 16:8aβ, a *wayyiqtol* chain begins that expresses Yahweh’s conjugal desire for the young maiden. In imagery quite unlike anything else in the description of Yahweh’s relationship to Jerusalem, Yahweh spreads his garment over the maiden.²⁷⁰ This act leads to the next clause in which Yahweh expressly covers her nakedness. (ערוה) The same root denoting nakedness occurred twice at the end of 16:7 when the maiden was described as “naked and bare.” (וערייה ערם) Now, Yahweh has remedied that situation. As for the verb, “to cover,” Yahweh will “cover” the maiden again in 16:10 with fine cloth before she spurns her benefactor in 16:18 by taking other conferred materials and “covering”

²⁷⁰ Besides here, one finds similar imagery for the purpose of marriage only in Deut 32:11 and Ruth 3:9. For the relationship of Deuteronomy 32 to Ezekiel 16, see Jason Giles, “Ezekiel 16 and the Song of Moses: A Prophetic Transformation?” *JBL* 130, no. 1 (2011): 87–108.

masculine images. Eventually, because of her lewd behavior he will reveal her “nakedness” before her adulterous lovers in 16:37.

Next, in Ezek 16:8b, Yahweh swears to the young maiden and enters into covenant with her. Unlike its role in the rest of the HB, the term, “to swear” is virtually absent from the book of Ezekiel, occurring only here and in an unrelated passage in Ezek 21:28. Yahweh also, “enters into covenant” with the maiden, which in the context must symbolize marital relationship between Yahweh and maiden Jerusalem.

Concerning the rare collocation, “to come into covenant,” (בברית בוא) the collocation does not otherwise occur in the book of Ezekiel although the term, “covenant” itself will recur in 16:59, 60 (twice), 61, and 62.²⁷¹ The *Gottesspruchformel* brings to a close the first person action of Yahweh in 16:8 before the verse itself concludes with the affirmation that Jerusalem indeed became Yahweh’s, “and you were mine.” As mentioned above, each clause in 16:8 explicitly refers to the young maiden through a pronoun thus consistently maintaining a focus upon her throughout the verse.

One could summarize the content of 16:7–8 in that the relationship of Yahweh and Jerusalem comes into clear view. The clauses consistently refer to each character and moreover, develop the story of the vulnerable once-infant, now maiden-bride. The story could end here from a literary perspective: An infant was abandoned in neglect and disdain, gracious Yahweh found the infant and bestowed a “myriad” upon it, the infant grew into a desirable young woman, Yahweh thus noticed her, entered into marital covenant with her, and she became his. One almost expects “and they lived happily ever

²⁷¹ The collocation only otherwise occurs in Jer 34:10 and 2 Chron 15:12, neither of which concern marriage.

after.”²⁷² Obviously, however, a great deal yet remains in the chapter of the depiction of the young maiden and her relationship with Yahweh. Will the two have children? Will they live on in matrimonial bliss? Will he or she be unfaithful? Or, to put the matter a different way, how will the marriage of Yahweh to Jerusalem depict the history between the two characters? Why and when did the city end up forsaken? Thus, the story of Yahweh’s relationship to Jerusalem remains the focus of 16:9–43.

In spite of these questions in response to the situation described in Ezek 16:4–8, a few observations emerge regarding the content in Ezek 16:7–8. First, in response to the infant’s pressing situation described in 16:4–6a, Yahweh merely speaks and “gives a myriad.” Yahweh does nothing in Ezek 16:7–8 in direct relationship to the described circumstances with the exception of the assertion, “and I passed by and I saw you,” a verbatim repetition from 16:6aα.²⁷³ In other words, nothing in the lexical content of 16:7–8 indicates that Yahweh acts in a manner directly corresponding to the dire straits of the infant. How was the infant clothed? Was her blood washed in accordance with prescribed practices? How did the infant survive with the neglect of normal newborn care? We will return to these matters in a later section.

Second, the grammatical dominance of first person, singular, *wayyiqtol* verbs in which Yahweh acts on behalf of the infant-maiden in 16:6 and again in 9–12 is limited in the intervening 16:7–8. Instead 16:7a opens with an *x + qatal* clause before

²⁷² H. Gunkel, *Das Märchen im Alten Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1917), 113–15. See also W. Eichrodt’s assessment of Gunkel and understanding of what he calls the “fairy tale motif” in *Ezekiel*, trans. Cosslett Quin, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970) 202.

²⁷³ This construction is a *Wiederaufnahme* that we address below in the comments to these verses in Chapters 2 and 3. For the concept of *Wiederaufnahme*, see Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 85–86.

proceeding with a second feminine singular, *wayyiqtol* chain asserting the maiden's growth into puberty. Ezekiel 16:7b similarly opens with two *x + qatal* clauses before concluding with another nominal clause. Additionally, after the opening repetition in 16:8, another nominal clause articulates Jerusalem's adolescent maturation similar to that material found in 16:7b before the verse continues with a description of Yahweh's marriage to her. In contrast, the first, common, singular *wayyiqtol* chain, which began in 16:6, continues in 16:9–12 without interruption. Still, Ezek 16:7–8 cohere with the general plot concerning Yahweh and Jerusalem. Both characters execute verbal action in the verses and Jerusalem consistently receives pronominal reference.

Third, these verses present a rather distinct portrayal of the relationship between Yahweh and the maiden. They emphasize the feminine qualities of Jerusalem and the subsequent marriage with Yahweh. The marital activity is conveyed in a first person singular *wayyiqtol* chain similar to that of 16:6 and 9–12 but with one exception, the verbal roots do not appear again in Ezekiel 16:1–43.²⁷⁴ The marriage relationship does return to the chapter, however, in a later description of Jerusalem's actions against her husband in 16:44ff. Regardless, Ezek 16:7–8 contains content and themes that contribute to the portrayal of Yahweh and Jerusalem in 16:6–14. Yahweh found the infant abandoned in the field, blessed her in a manner that resulted in her maturation, and bound her to him in a marriage covenant. In this way, these verses contribute to the theme of Yahweh's benevolence and the appropriateness of the woman's devotion and fidelity to him.

²⁷⁴ The one exception to this assertion is the verb "cover." In Ezek 16:10, Yahweh will "cover" her with silk and in 16:18, she "covers" her masculine images with embroidered garments.

Finally, the next section, which involves Yahweh “rinsing blood,” yields two distinct notions regarding Yahweh’s relationship to Jerusalem. On the one hand, the reader now expects the account of Yahweh’s matrimony with Jerusalem to continue. From this perspective, Ezek 16:9–12 present Yahweh tending to the menstruation of his young bride. On the other hand, the shift from abandoned infant to young maiden occurred rather abruptly and without specific indications of how Yahweh treated the infant. From this perspective, Ezek 16:9–12 address in congruent language the unenviable situation of the infant in vv. 4–6.

2.2.2.2.4 Ezekiel 16:9–12

Ezekiel 16:9 begins by addressing Jerusalem’s need for cleansing, which first surfaced in 16:4. Ezekiel 16:9 states, “And I washed you with water.” The first, singular, *wayyiqtol* verb repeats the same lexemes found in 16:4aβ, albeit there, the clause’s *x + qatal* construction and negation provide the reader a perspective of neglect. Neither lemma, “to wash” nor “water” appears again in Ezekiel 16. One also finds in 16:9 a return to the pattern of first, singular, *wayyiqtol* verbal forms that first appeared with Yahweh’s discovery of the infant in 16:6 and reappeared in 16:8 as Yahweh executed a series of actions to covenant conjugally with the pubescent maiden. Here in 16:9–12, Yahweh also performs deeds that benefit maiden Jerusalem. The *wayyiqtol* chain continues until 16:13 when it switches to second feminine singular *wayyiqtol* verbal forms. Even there the logic of the narrative remains, however, as the woman adorns herself with the gifts which Yahweh gave and eats his food.

After the washing with water in Ezek 16:9a α , the verse continues, “And I rinsed your blood from you.” One may consider whether this occasion relates to that of infant-Jerusalem, in which language it mirrors rather conspicuously, or must it relate to the pubescent maiden? The “washing with water” and rinsing “blood” linguistically fits with 16:4–6 but one must also consider its coherence with the growth of the young maiden. Naturally, after the mention of a “time of lovers,” developing “breasts,” growing “hair,” “nakedness,” and a marriageable age—all related to feminine pubescent matters—the issue of menstruation lies at hand. Thus, Ezek 16:9 likely associates the actions of “washing with water” and “rinsing blood” with the concerns of a young maiden during menstruation or from bleeding caused by the consummation of marriage. The verb, “to rinse” is normally used in the book of Ezekiel in collocation with “rain,” which rinses a land clean in view of Yahweh’s judgment. The sole utilization of the verb here in Ezekiel 16 marks the book’s only departure from that practice. The plural term, “blood,” on the other hand, appeared in 16:6 twice and besides its appearance here in 16:9a, will appear again in Ezek 16:22, 36, and 38 (twice).

A third clause in 16:9 utilizes another rare verb, which is only used here in the book of Ezekiel, “And I covered you with oil.” Furthermore, of the nine occurrences of the verb in the HB, five passages also contain this precise material for anointing, i.e. covering “oil.” Unlike the verb, the term, “oil” occurs also in Ezek 16:13, 18, and 19 as a food item that Yahweh gives to the woman and she subsequently squanders as an offering in her harlotrous, false worship. Here, however, the term occurs not as an item of food but rather with a connotation of cleansing. Thus, similar to the clauses in Ezek

16:9a, this clause in 16:9b extends the typical functions of hygienic care and preparation for dress and social interaction in the HB.²⁷⁵

Ezekiel 16:10 consists of four first person, singular, *wayyiqtol* clauses in which Yahweh attires lady Jerusalem with different articles of clothing or footwear. The first clause describes Yahweh's act of dressing the woman, "Then I clothed you with embroidered cloth." Indeed, Ezek 16:7 reported that the woman was "naked and bare" and 16:8 indicated that Yahweh spread his wing over her and covered her nakedness. Here, however, the text begins to describe Yahweh's provision for the woman in a concrete manner. Moreover, the verbal root "to cloth" and the lexeme "embroidered cloth" reappear in Ezekiel 16.²⁷⁶

The second clause reports that Yahweh bound her with special leather, most likely indicating he "put sandals of leather" on the woman.²⁷⁷ This rare verb, normally used to indicate that a door is bound or locked, only occurs here within the book of Ezekiel.²⁷⁸ Likewise, the noun, "leather" is used only here in the HB outside of the Pentateuch. A third clause similarly indicates that Yahweh dresses the young woman in a special manner, "and I bound you with linen." Although the verb occurs more frequently, the noun appears rarely outside of the Pentateuch, occurring here in Ezek

²⁷⁵ The verb occurs nine times in the HB. Besides Ezek 16:9, 2 Sam 12:20, 2 Sam 14:2, Mic 6:15, Ruth 3:3, Dan 10:3, and 2 Chron 28:15 all connote anointing oil with hygienic preparation. The verb also occurs in Deut 28:40 without a necessary connection to hygiene. The final occurrence of the verb is in Ex 30:32 and deals with the anointing of oil and burning of incense.

²⁷⁶ The verbal root "to clothe" reappears in Ezek 16:13. The lexeme "embroidered cloth" reappears in Ezek 16:13 and 18.

²⁷⁷ Galambush comments that "This association between the clothing of Yahweh's wife and her symbolic identity as the temple/tabernacle is made explicit in the Targum." *Jerusalem*, 95.

²⁷⁸ Judg 3:23, 24, 2 Sam 13:17, 18, Ezek 16:10, Cant 4:12 (2x), 2 Chr 28:15. The nominal form connotes a sandal or shoe and is used more frequently in the HB.

16:10 and 13.²⁷⁹ The final clause of 16:10 repeats the verb that occurred in 16:8 describing how Yahweh “covered the nakedness” of the maiden. Here in 16:10, Yahweh says, “and I covered you with fine material.” The verb, “to cover” will appear again in 16:18 although in a different context. The noun, “fine material” is a *dis legomenon* used only here in the HB where it will occur a second time in a related clause in Ezek 16:13.

Ezekiel 16:11 advances the *wayyiqtol* chain which began in 16:9 with two first person, singular verbal forms. The content of Yahweh’s provision switches from clothing, which 16:10 reported, to jewelry, which 16:11–12 will describe. First, Yahweh “adorned you with ornaments.” The noun form “ornament” occurred twice in 16:7. There, the text described her growth and development and that she “came with the finest of ornaments”—literally “ornament of ornaments”—although no particular elements ensued. Here, however, the first clause introduces Yahweh’s general bestowal of ornaments, whose precise form will follow in the subsequent clauses. Moreover, the verb “to adorn” will reappear again in 16:13 further indicating the fine gems with which the woman adorned herself. The final clause of 16:11 says, “And I gave bracelets upon your wrists and a necklace upon your neck.” Neither bracelets nor a necklace appear again in Ezekiel 16 unlike the oil, embroidered cloth, linen, and special material. These latter articles appeared in Ezek 16:9–10 and recur again in the chapter.

Ezekiel 16:12 continues the first person, singular, *wayyiqtol* chain in which Yahweh declares his gifts of jewelry to lady Jerusalem. The verse contains one clause with the predicate “and I gave” and then supplements it with three object phrases, “a ring upon your nose, earrings upon your ears, and a crown of glory on your head.” The

²⁷⁹ It also occurs outside the Pentateuch in Ezek 27:7 and Prov 31:22.

wayyiqtol “and I gave” occurs consecutively a second time here after a similar occurrence in 16:11. Moreover, similar to the jewelry in 16:11, neither a ring nor earrings appear again in Ezekiel 16. The phrase “crown of glory” likewise does not appear again in Ezekiel 16 although the phrase “vessels of your glory” appears in 16:17 and 39.²⁸⁰ In view of the context in 16:17, the phrase, “vessels of your glory” applies to more than just the “crown” mentioned in 16:11; it also minimally applies to the upcoming, “gold and silver” in 16:13.

In summary, Ezek 16:9–12 comprises first person, singular, *wayyiqtol* action foregrounding Yahweh’s benevolent care for Jerusalem after his marriage to the maiden. Yahweh cleanses her, clothes her in fine attire, and adorns her with jewelry. In every clause, at least one occurrence of the second, feminine, singular pronominal suffix appeared. Thus, the section strongly manifests the relationship between Yahweh and Jerusalem, clearly articulating Yahweh’s benevolence by means of his many gifts to lady Jerusalem.

2.2.2.2.5 Ezekiel 16:13–14

Ezekiel 16:13 α maintains the *wayyiqtol* verbal action but the grammatical person shifts to second, feminine, singular verbs thus indicating activity of the woman rather than Yahweh. The woman dons various opulent elements that result in her beauty, thus heralding her name among the nations. Interestingly, two kinds of gifts appear in the short list in 16:13: those gifts that Yahweh reportedly bestowed upon the woman in

²⁸⁰ “A crown of glory upon your head” appears in Ezek 23:42 while “vessels of your glory” appears in Ezek 23:26.

the preceding verses and those elements that appear for the first time in the chapter. There is no explanation from whom or where these new elements come but each of them reappears later in Ezekiel 16. On the one hand, the elements, gold, silver, fine flour, and honey, recur in vv. 17 and 19 at which time harlot Jerusalem spends those gifts in her harlotry.²⁸¹ On the other hand, the gifts in 16:13, which Yahweh bestowed previously, such as, linen and fine material, do not appear again in Ezekiel 16. In addition to each of these situations, there are two gifts in Ezek 16:13 that also occurred previously, embroidered cloth and oil, and take place again in Ezek 16:18 in which the harlot squanders them on her idolatry.²⁸²

Ezekiel 16:13 begins, “And you adorned yourself with gold and silver.” The appearance of the *wayyiqtol* verbal form “you adorned” marks the second appearance of the verb and the fifth appearance of the root in the chapter. Yahweh had “adorned” Jerusalem with ornaments in 16:11a. In 16:7, the young woman came with “ornament of ornaments,” translated above as the “finest of ornaments.”

The collocation “gold and silver” appears for the first time in the chapter before making another appearance in 16:17. Here, the woman dons gold and silver, each item appearing quite naturally in the context of other jewelry found in 16:11–12 although neither item appeared earlier in the description of Yahweh’s gifts. In Ezek 16:17, the two precious metals occur with first person possessive pronouns indicating that they were Yahweh’s gold and silver and were an element of Jerusalem’s vessels of glory.

²⁸¹ For example, “choice flour and honey” appear in Ezek 16:13 for the first time but they also appear in 16:19, which describes Jerusalem as presenting these materials before her masculine images. See below for more details.

²⁸² For example, see how the harlot covers masculine images with the embroidered cloth in Ezek 16:18a. “Oil” is used as incense in 16:18b.

Yahweh had given Jerusalem a “crown of glory” in 16:12 amidst other jewelry.

Therefore, the woman dons the gold and silver directly after receiving the “crown of glory” for her head.

The next clause in 16:13a β breaks the *wayyiqtol* chain that extended from 16:8a β . Here, a nominal clause occurs that states what material comprised the woman’s clothes, “your attire was linen, fine material, and embroidered cloth.”²⁸³ The noun form “attire” (מלבוש) appears only here in Ezekiel 16 but the verbal root is utilized in Ezek 16:10 to convey Yahweh’s act of clothing lady Jerusalem with embroidered cloth. Interestingly, in Ezek 16:10, other verbal forms are used to articulate Yahweh’s clothing of lady Jerusalem in linen and fine material as well as an additional “leather.” Moreover, a varied order of materials emerges there.

Subsequent to this depiction of Jerusalem donning various accouterments in 16:13a α , an x + *qatal* clause ensues. The clause, which begins asyndetically, contains a list of three food items, “fine flour, honey, and oil,” after which a second, feminine, singular *qatal* verb form occurs, “you ate.”²⁸⁴ As mentioned above, the terms “fine flour” and “honey” appear here for the first time in the chapter, as does also the verbal action “to eat.” Moreover, although the term “oil” occurred in 16:9, it was not used as a

²⁸³ It is possible that these nouns simply extend the *wayyiqtol* clause, “And you adorned yourself with...” that began the verse. The clause would then read, “And you adorned yourself with gold, silver, and your attire, linen, special material, and embroidered cloth.” In this case, “linen, special material, and embroidered cloth” would stand in apposition to the noun “attire.” The second, feminine, singular pronoun, which makes the nominal form “attire” definite, however, commends it as a nominal clause. The woman, however, had been “attired” in these precise materials in 16:10 whereas the gold and silver had not been explicitly given. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to consider it an extension of the *wayyiqtol*. In that case, the *wayyiqtol* chain is interrupted in the next clause, which introduces new elements. Commentators translate it as a nominal clause.

²⁸⁴ See the remark concerning the *Ketiv* and *Qere* in Chapter 1.

food item but rather appeared in a list of hygienic preparation. Thus, one should consider its occurrence here in conjunction with the other meal items and the action of eating, each of which reappear in 16:19 although in a varied order.

The final clause, Ezek 16:13b α , returns to a *wayyiqtol* verbal form but remains focused on the activity of the woman.²⁸⁵ To be more specific, the clause conveys her state of being, “and you became very, very beautiful.” The once vulnerable infant-
maiden has grown into a very, very attractive woman, to be sure, as an express result of Yahweh’s care, accouterments, and food. The verbal root “to be beautiful” appears here as the first of four occurrences in the chapter. Three of those occurrences occur in quick succession at the transition between the first and second subunit of the text, Ezek 16:13, 14, and 15. The fourth appearance of the root “to be beautiful” occurs in Ezek 16:25. Meanwhile, the twice-repeated adverb “very” occurs in order to emphasize unequivocally the brilliance of her beauty.²⁸⁶ Very little description of the woman has taken place since the depiction of her growth into a pubescent maiden in Ezek 16:7–8. Although no terminological connection exists with those clauses, the portrayal of the woman as very, very beautiful here logically coheres with the expression of her growth into pubescence, Yahweh’s discovery of her, and his covenant with her.

²⁸⁵ The final clause in 16:13 in the MT, “And you reached the status of royalty” is absent in B and P967, <http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/NRWakademie/papyrologie/Ezechiel/bilder/PT7abv.jpg>, 11/8/17. It appears unlikely that any scribe would have accidentally or intentionally deleted such a clause. Moreover, it makes sense why a scribe would have added such a comment given the royal items that have appeared in the list of Yahweh’s gifts.

²⁸⁶ Occurring only here in Ezekiel 16 but see also Ezek 9:9; also Gen 17:2, 6, 20, and Ex 1:7. It is interesting that in the QapGen, i.e. 1Q20 or Genesis Apocryphon, Sarai’s beauty is described in similar ways in Column 20, line 6–7 along with the mention of breasts in line 4 and as given “silver and gold” in line 31; Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20)* (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004), 100–03.

Ezekiel 16:14 advances the result of lady Jerusalem's beauty. The verse begins, "And a name for you materialized among the nations because of your beauty." The clause coheres with what precedes it in light of the lexeme, "beauty," whose verbal root occurred in the previous clause. Moreover, two second, feminine, singular pronouns—one suffixed to "beauty" and the other suffixed to the *lamed* preposition, indicating whose "name" spread to the nations—associate this clause with the story of lady Jerusalem. The clause also connects with what follows since the lexemes "beauty" and "name" both occur in the following verse. A subsequent ׀ clause will further establish the connection between the gifts that Yahweh had given, her beauty, and thus her newfound fame.

Several elements are new, however, with Ezek 16:14a. First, the wayyiqtol forms have occurred either in the first or second person in the chapter up to this point, highlighting the relationship between Yahweh and Jerusalem. Here, however, the wayyiqtol verbal form "to go out" occurs in the third, masculine, singular form, with the masculine noun, "name" as the subject. This observation reveals a second new element: Jerusalem's "name." Yahweh's relationship to Jerusalem and subsequent care and provision have granted a status to Jerusalem that was previously nonexistent. Jerusalem is beholden to Yahweh for her beauty as well the accouterments that resulted in her beauty. What will lady Jerusalem do with her beauty and her newfound fame? Why did Yahweh entrust it to her? How does the story of Yahweh's provision portray Jerusalem's origin and maturation? How will her response depict her character as well as Yahweh's reaction to his bride? These questions and the subsequent story place the blame squarely on the shoulders of Jerusalem.

Prior to a discussion of Jerusalem's response to Yahweh's "perfect" splendor, a third novel element appears in Ezek 16:14a. The corollary to the notion of reputation involves among whom one has a reputation. This leads to a consideration of the lexeme "nation." No mention of the lexeme, "nations" nor hardly any indication of an entity other than Jerusalem and Yahweh have taken place in the chapter.²⁸⁷ The chapter has focused on Yahweh's relationship with Jerusalem with apparently little concern over her relationship with others. However, it is precisely others, namely, "the nations" that come into play in 16:14. Jerusalem's name materializes among the nations, which leaves one to wonder, what role they will play in Jerusalem's relationship to Yahweh.

The second clause in 16:14 is a dependent clause initiated by the subordinate conjunction *כִּי*. As mentioned above, this clause grounds the reason for lady Jerusalem's beauty. It was, "Perfect in my splendor that I placed upon you." Three new lexemes appear here, all of which relate in some manner to Yahweh's gifts: the lexemes "perfect," (*כליל*) "splendor," (*הדר*) and the verbal action, "I placed." (*מתיש*) In spite of the distinct vocabulary, the clause clearly coheres with the portrayal of Yahweh's relationship with Jerusalem in the preceding verses. Yahweh had given his ornaments to Jerusalem, his ornaments that transformed Jerusalem into a very, very beautiful woman. The third, masculine, singular independent pronoun refers to the woman's beauty describing it as "perfect." (*כליל*) This occurrence marks the adjective's only appearance in the chapter. The use of the adjective makes clear that no one could ever blame Yahweh for his bestowal resulting in the woman's "beauty." It was, after all, "perfect." Moreover, it was "perfect" because it consisted of Yahweh's own "splendor." (*הדר*) The

²⁸⁷ The exception is her mother and father in 16:3.

first, singular pronoun suffixed to the noun, “splendor” leaves no doubt to whom it belonged; it was Yahweh’s splendor.²⁸⁸ The relative clause, “which I placed upon you,” connects Yahweh’s past action of charity to Jerusalem through the first, masculine, singular verb and the second, feminine, singular pronominal suffix attached to the preposition. Ezekiel 16:14b effectively summarizes what has transpired in Ezek 16:9b–13b α while precluding any incrimination of Yahweh and reinforcing the sense of obligation Jerusalem should feel towards Yahweh.

Finally, the *Gottesspruchformel* concludes 16:14b. Its appearance here after the ׁ clause, which summarized 16:9b–13b α , and prior to the upcoming syntactical, lexical, and content-oriented variations in 16:15 draws this subunit to a climactic ending. Ezekiel 16:3a β –14 related Jerusalem’s indigent origins, her growth into a maiden of marriageable age, and Yahweh’s (double) discovery and marriage to her. Moreover, Yahweh benevolently outfitted lady Jerusalem with luxurious clothing, jewelry, and food items resulting in Jerusalem’s extreme beauty. Consequently, her name went out among the nations, the very name over which she will soon play the harlot with presumably those very nations. Ezekiel 16:15–34 will largely focus upon the woman’s responses to Yahweh’s care and provision. The woman, whose gifts from Yahweh make her attractive, will fail to recognize from whom her beauty comes and instead will spend it on her lovers. Her response will bring about Yahweh’s punishment in the subsequent section, Ezek 16:35–43.

²⁸⁸ The noun makes its only appearance in the chapter here.

2.2.3 Jerusalem's Harlotry, Ezekiel 16:15–34

2.2.3.1 Jerusalem's Beauty and Name Begets Harlotry Ezekiel 16:15

The initial verb of Ezek 16:15 promptly intimates the main character, and ultimately, the perpetrator, in the subunit: lady Jerusalem. Second, feminine, singular verbal forms appear in the subunit thirty-eight times. Twenty-seven of those second, feminine, singular verbs occur in the *wayyiqtol* form, foregrounding the narrative action of lady Jerusalem. In contrast to the *wayyiqtol* forms in this subunit, only four second, feminine, singular *wayyiqtol* forms occur in the next subunit, Ezek 16:35–63. Meanwhile, seven second, feminine, singular *wayyiqtol* forms occurred in the subunit, Ezek 16:1–14.²⁸⁹ In other words, lady Jerusalem's actions dominate this subunit in clear contrast to the surrounding context. Thus, Ezek 16:15 begins with a second, feminine, singular, *wayyiqtol* verb stating, "But you trusted in your beauty." One can immediately see the connection to what preceded in the occurrence of "beauty." This verbal root appeared in 16:13 and 16:14 and now becomes the occasion for her confidence. The verb, "to trust," however, occurs here for the first time in the book and does not appear again in the chapter nor does it play a major role in the book.²⁹⁰

The second clause of Ezek 16:15 also coheres with the previous subunit. It does so by means of another *wayyiqtol* verbal form in which the woman is the subject. Second, a prepositional phrase, which completes the verbal action, contains the object,

²⁸⁹ One of these *wayyiqtol* forms in 16:5 occurs in the passive form, another consists of the final "to be" clause in 16:8b, and the third involves the stative verb, "to be beautiful" in 16:13b.

²⁹⁰ In the entire book, the verb itself only appears otherwise in Ezek 33:13. Two nominal forms of the root occur a total of 12 times.

“name,” which Ezek 16:14 utilized to indicate that the woman’s “name” went out among the nations. Here, the noun returns as an object of the preposition, לַע, although the noun makes its final appearance in the chapter at this juncture. In contrast to these two repeated elements, the verbal notion in the second clause is also new. This time, however, the verb introduces the central motif to the entire chapter. The clause reads, “And you played the harlot on account of your name.” The root itself, “to play the harlot” occurs twenty-one times in the chapter including the verbal form and two nominal forms; twenty of these occurrences transpire in Ezek 16:15–36. In view of these observations, it is quite remarkable that such a central notion has not yet transpired in the chapter. Additionally, this particularly conjugated verbal form, “And you played the harlot” occurs here in Ezek 16:15aβ and also in Ezek 16:16, 17, 26, and 28 (2x). The next clause, Ezek 16:15b, quickly repeats this root via its nominal form, thus establishing the notion within the subunit.

Ezekiel 16:15b commences with another second, feminine, singular *wayyiqtol* form albeit with yet another distinct verb, “You poured out your harlotry upon everyone who passed by.” The verb, “to pour out” occurs one additional time in the chapter in Ezek 16:36.²⁹¹ Additionally, the nominal form, “harlotry” appears here for the first in the chapter.²⁹² Astoundingly, this nominal form only appears in Ezekiel 16 and 23 in the entire HB. The form takes place nine times in Ezekiel 16 and eleven times in Ezekiel 23.²⁹³ Furthermore, the prepositional phrase, “upon every who passed by” indicates the

²⁹¹ The verb also occurs in 16:38 although it does not appear in the OG.

²⁹² Concerning the text-critical issue of the singular or plural form of the noun, see Chapter 1.

²⁹³ Ezek 16:15, 20, 22, 25, 26, 29, 33, 34, 36; 23:7, 8 (2x), 11, 14, 17, 18, 19, 29, 35, 43.

recipients of her harlotry and is therefore linked with the previous clause that Jerusalem “played the harlot on account of your name.” Because her “name materialized among the nations” in 16:14, it becomes clear that this prepositional phrase not only looks back to the nations in the transitional 16:14 but also prepares the reader for the ensuing instances of the woman’s harlotry in the metaphor.

One can discern in these remarks the transition that occurs in Ezek 16:15. The nouns, “beauty” and “name” constitute a noticeable hinge that connects backward to the previous section. Her beauty was a result of Yahweh’s care and provision and gave her a name among the nations. This beauty and her name will now become the basis from which she acts in perverse manner and attracts her harlotrous lovers. The issue of harlotry, brought about through the first mention of the root in 16:15aβ, prepares the reader for the various, ensuing acts of harlotry. Additionally, the final clause of 16:15 offers an alternative description of the nations: “everyone who passes” her will be the recipient of her unleashed harlotries. In this manner, the term, “nations” and the prepositional phrase, “upon everyone who passed by” set the stage for what follows of Jerusalem’s various act of harlotries and lovers.²⁹⁴

2.2.3.2 Harlotry with Her Gifts Ezekiel 16:16–19

After the transitional verse of 16:15, Ezek 16:16–19 narrates three actions in which the woman “took” Yahweh’s provision and perverted it for “harlotry.” A fourth action in the section describes how the woman used the food items, which Yahweh

²⁹⁴ The view that Jerusalem’s beauty attracts her lovers will soon change since she will eventually be compared with a harlot, who is anything but attractive. Eventually, she will have to pay for others to patronize her in Ezek 16:31–34.

intended for her to eat, to offer up “soothing aroma” in her false worship. This short unit is delimited from what preceded it since it is lacking the lemmata and a theme from the transitional 16:14–15. For example, terminology and notions related to “beauty,” “name,” and “nations” do not occur. However, harlotry remains the motif of the subunit as the vocabulary shifts to reflect that theme. Moreover, the harlot utilizes gifts that Yahweh gave in 16:10–13 as a means to play the harlot.

Ezekiel 16:16 begins in the same manner that 16:17 and 18 will begin, “and you took.” The verb occurs in second, feminine, singular, *wayyiqtol* verbal form, thus indicating activity of the woman. The woman took from her “garments,” a general term denoting various materials of clothing. The term has not occurred previously in the chapter but it reappears in 16:18 in construct with the “embroidered cloth” in which Yahweh outfitted lady Jerusalem in 16:10a. Furthermore, the second, feminine, singular, pronominal suffix is affixed to “garments” demonstrating that it is indeed from the woman’s attire. Considering that the narrative has included no other report of her outfitting, it is quite fitting to presume various articles of precious materials with which Yahweh clothed her in Ezek 16:10 and she donned in 16:13.

From these garments, the next clause in 16:16a β indicates that she “made motley shrines” for herself. The clause commences with another *wayyiqtol* verbal form once again indicating the exertion of the woman. The plural accusative noun, “shrines,” which often translates as “high place,” occurs only here in the entire chapter. Moreover, the participial adjective, translated above as “motley,” appears only here in the book of Ezekiel and only a handful of times in the entire HB. The adjective describes a quilted or patchwork production in which the woman took her garments and sewed together a

makeshift edifice. The accusative phrase, “motley shrines” exists only here in the entire HB.

Regardless of the rarity of the construction, its purpose is relatively clear as the next clause shows in Ezek 16:16aβ2. It reads, “and you played the harlot upon them.” The materials that Yahweh had bestowed upon the woman and had brought about her beauty become the very components upon which she prostituted herself. The *wayyiqtol* verbal form “to play the harlot” appears here as it did also in 16:15 and reiterates again as it will so many times in the chapter that the woman has spurned and squandered Yahweh’s provision. The verse concludes with an ambiguous compound construction that is similarly present in the versions but remains rather dubious. What appears to be the feminine, plural participle, באוֹת, could refer to the grammatically feminine, plural “motley shrines” that is then negated. The final clause is likewise dubious in reference, containing a third, masculine, singular form of “to be” that is also negated. If correct, the conclusion of the verse would express, “Such places which are not to come and it will not be!”²⁹⁵ On the other hand, after a consideration of the evidence, Barthélemy proposes a more general conclusion, “things that should not take place nor occur.”²⁹⁶ Again, the connotation seems obvious enough: Lady Jerusalem has acted in a shameful manner, squandering her position.

The second *wayyiqtol* verbal form, “and you took” emerges in Ezek 16:17αα and, just as the preceding verse, incorporates elements from the previous subunit. The woman

²⁹⁵ Allen provides a recent, extensive treatment of this dubious construction as it relates also to the final clause in 15b; Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 228; see also Chapter 1 and D. Barthélemy *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament*, Vol 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 96–99.

²⁹⁶ Barthélemy, *Critique*, 98.

took, “vessels of your glory from my gold and my silver”—items which appear in 16:12b–13aα. One can make several observations about this clause. First, Ezek 16:17aα utilizes the construct phrase, “vessels of glory” which does not precisely occur previously in the chapter. The term, “vessels” occurs here for the first time before it recurs in the announcement of judgment in Ezek 16:39 in the same phrase, “vessels of glory.”²⁹⁷ However, the term “glory” did appear in 16:12b. Moreover, the phrase in 16:17 is “your glory,” indicating the glory that was given in 16:12, an implication that is made certain by the ensuing constructions. The “glory” of 16:17 is from “my gold and my silver which I gave to you.” The woman had donned “gold and silver” immediately after obtaining the “crown of glory” in 16:12b. Moreover, it indicates explicitly that Yahweh was the one who gave the “gold and silver” to the woman. Interestingly, in 16:16, no explicit indication arises stating that Yahweh also gave the woman “garments.” Nonetheless, there exists here a second occasion of the woman taking gifts which Yahweh had given. What will she do with the precious materials, which Yahweh had given? The next clause reveals her proclivity.

Ezekiel 16:17aβ contains a second occurrence of the *wayyiqtol* construction, “and you made.” The first occurrence appeared in 16:16a similarly indicating the woman’s actions, “You took... and you made...” There, the woman took the garments, produced shrines, and played the harlot. Here, the woman takes the vessels of glory, gold and silver, and produces for herself “masculine images” and “plays the harlot with them.” The verb, “to make” emerged for the first time in 16:16 prior to its use here and

²⁹⁷ Ezekiel 16:39 contains an almost verbatim two clause construction as does Ezek 23:26, “And they will strip your garments and take vessels of your glory.”

another utilization in 16:24. Each appearance expresses the production of some type of idolatrous accessory, which was then used for her metaphorical harlotry. The accusative phrase, “masculine images” contains the construct noun “images” and the noun, “male.” Both words are rare in the book of Ezekiel, the term, “male” appearing only here and the collocation itself, only appearing here in the entire HB. Again, the intended connotation is clear as the final clause in 16:17 repeats the *wayyiqtol* verbal form, “and you played the harlot,” along with the prepositional phrase, “with them.” The prepositional phrase “with them” contains the *bet* preposition with the third, masculine, plural pronominal suffix referring to the masculine images. Interestingly, the thrice-repeated *wayyiqtol* “and you played the harlot,” which occurred in 16:15, 16, and 17, will not appear again until 16:26 in spite of the continued barrage of Jerusalem’s whoring practices.

Ezekiel 16:18 begins familiarly, “you took your embroidered garments.” For the third time in as many verses, the woman “takes” her allotment with which Yahweh had endowed her. This occasion reports the woman’s appropriation of her embroidered cloth, a term which occurred in 16:10 and 13 before making its final appearance here in 16:18a. Additionally, the woman took from her garments material with which to produce the colorful high places in 16:16. Here, the woman takes the embroidered cloth and through another second, feminine, singular, *wayyiqtol* verbal form, “covers them.” Concerning the verb, “to cover,” Yahweh had “covered” the woman’s nakedness in 16:8a and “covered” her with fine material in 16:10. Now, the perverted woman takes the materials with which Yahweh “covered” her and utilizes them to decorate her images. The third, masculine, plural pronoun refers to the “masculine images,” which the woman had made from Yahweh’s gold and silver in the previous verse. In each of

the three situations from Ezek 16:16–18a described above, the women used those items that Yahweh had given her, for her own harlotrous purposes.

In contrast to the preceding clauses, Ezekiel 16:18b accommodates various elements not hitherto seen in the subunit. First, the clause does not commence with a *wayyiqtol* but rather an *x + qatal* clause. Second, there is no explicit assertion that the woman “took” from Yahweh’s endowment as 16:16a, 16:17a, and 16:18a had begun. Third, the term, “incense” emerges in the clause for the first time in the chapter. This term was not among those items included in Yahweh’s gifts nor does it appear again in the chapter.

However, the clause coheres with the surrounding context in view of several observations. First, the clause begins, “and my oil and my incense.” The term, “oil” occurred in 16:9b as hygienic preparation; it occurred in 16:13aβ within a list of food items, which Yahweh gave lady Jerusalem to eat. The term appears here in 16:18b, before also occurring in 16:19 again in the list of food items. This leads to a second observation. The noun phrase, “my oil” is conjoined with another noun phrase “my incense.” These two materials are a pair of items that she will give before the masculine images. Both nouns are suffixed with a first, singular pronoun, whose antecedent is Yahweh. Finally, the third, masculine, plural pronoun has as its antecedent the “masculine images” that the woman had produced in 16:17 and covered in 16:18a. Thus the clause furthers the view of Jerusalem’s idolatrous practices.

In a manner that is dissimilar from the preceding verses, Ezek 16:19a begins without a *wayyiqtol* and without the verbal action “you took.” Rather, it commences with another *x + qatal* clause and a noun not hitherto seen in the chapter. Yahweh

alleges, “and my bread, which I gave to you...” Although the term, “bread” has not appeared, the relative clause maintains that Yahweh gave it to the woman. The next clause clarifies the conundrum. The inclusion of the bread among the gifts that Yahweh gave to her is explained through reference to the “fine flour, oil, and honey,” which emerged earlier in Ezek 16:13aβ. There, the woman had eaten the ingredients and became beautiful. Here in Ezek 16:19, the initial ingredient, “fine flour” occurs asyndetically subsequent to the relative clause “which I gave to you,” itself an explanatory comment on the noun phrase, “my bread.” The verbal action associated with the ingredients also utilizes Yahweh as the subject of a Hiphil verb, “to eat.” It reads, “fine flour, oil, and honey, I fed you.” Thus, there appear two explanations of this “bread.”

Perhaps most intriguing in the verse is the ensuing clause in 16:19aβ, “and you would give it before them as a soothing aroma.” The third, masculine, singular accusative pronoun “it” is affixed to the *weqatal* verbal form, “you would give” and has as its antecedent the syndetic “my bread,” which began the verse. Intervening, however, between the “bread” and the *weqatal* verbal form is the clause containing the three ingredients, itself asyndetic. Although, the *weqatal* verbal form does not easily fit into the current context—one would perhaps anticipate a *qatal* form—when understood in succession with the first occurrence of “which I gave to you” in 16:19aα, the connotation becomes quite clear.²⁹⁸ Yahweh gave it to her and she subsequently gave it away to her images! That this understanding is accurate becomes apparent when the

²⁹⁸ For the consecutive use and sense of the *weqatal* after a *qatal*, see P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 2006), §119v. See also §118d and §119a for the notion of succession in a *weqatal*. See also GKC, §112dd.

woman gives Yahweh's bread before the masculine images in view of the preposition and third, masculine, plural pronoun, "before them."

Another anomalous element in the verse is the cultic terminology, "soothing aroma." It occurs only here in the chapter; a description of the cultic practice is not forthcoming nor was it anticipated in the previous subunit. The woman was described as eating the ingredients with no expectation of any type of soothing aroma. Here, the presence of cultic ritual, both in 16:18 and 19, brings with it an unexpected turn.

The final clause in 16:19a is problematic. It represents the third text critical issue on the clausal level, the other two occurring at the end of 16:15 and the end of 16:16. This clause occurs prior to the *Gottesspruchformel*, which concludes the verse. The clause comprises merely one word in the Hebrew, a third, masculine, singular, *wayyiqtol* verb with the lemma, "to be." (וַיְהִי) The clause likely expresses in narrative form the achievement of the offerings in the previous clause.²⁹⁹ Finally, 16:19 concludes with the *Gottesspruchformel*. Without the presence of any other formulas, the refrain lacks the structural force of a major transition. The distinct vocabulary that will transpire in 16:20 suggests, however, a subdivision of material with 16:16–19.

2.2.3.3 Harlotry with Her Children Ezekiel 16:20–21

This small unit differs significantly in lexical material and theme from those elements that have preceded it in the chapter. Even so, the motif of harlotry, so prevalent in the subunit, appears in the unit albeit in a distinct manner. Ezekiel 16:20 opens with a

²⁹⁹ Cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 326, who deletes it as an addition. See Chapter 1 for more text critical details.

familiar, second, feminine, singular, *wayyiqtol*, “and you took.” This precise verbal form transpired at the opening of 16:16, 17, 18, and now 16:20, making this a familiar outset to the verse. On this occasion, however, the woman took “your sons and daughters” rather than some element which Yahweh had previously bestowed upon the woman. Any content concerning children has not appeared since the opening of the chapter and that, of course, concerned Jerusalem herself when she was an infant. Yahweh did not give lady Jerusalem any children in the section in which Yahweh given other gifts to her. Perhaps, however, that is to be expected since childbearing is atypical, as a husband cannot give a woman a child without the woman herself taking part and executing the birthing process. Additionally, second, feminine, singular pronouns are affixed to both terms, indicating coherence with the remainder of the chapter. Moreover, the ensuing relative clause explains the sons and daughters, saying, “which you birthed.”³⁰⁰ The *qatal* verb occurs in the second, feminine, singular form referring to lady Jerusalem. The verb, “to birth” last appeared in the envelope structure of 16:4–5 concerning the circumstances of Jerusalem’s birth and will not appear again in the chapter.

The next clause introduces another new concept into the chapter. It reads, “and you sacrificed to them for consumption.” The second, feminine, singular *wayyiqtol* form reiterates the activity of the woman.³⁰¹ Moreover, the prepositional phrase, “to them” refers to the antecedent “masculine images,” a referent that has occurred consistently since 16:17. The infinitive, “to consume” appears at the end of the clause in conjunction

³⁰⁰ For the absence of “to me,” see the text critical issue in Chapter 1.

³⁰¹ The third, masculine, plural pronoun, which is found in the MT but not the Old Greek, coheres with the “sons and daughters” mentioned in the first clause of the verse. See Chapter 1 for more details.

with the preposition, ל. The same verb occurred in 16:13 and 19 in relationship to fine flour, honey, and oil, which the woman ate. Its occurrence here marks a new usage within the chapter as this utilization occasions the idols consuming the sons and daughters. In general then, the notion of sacrificing sons and daughters arises unexpectedly and appears extraneous when compared with the woman's production of cultic accessories from Yahweh's gifts.

The final clause of the verse rhetorically asks, "Is this less than your harlotry?" The comparison with harlotry demonstrates the distinct nature of the child sacrifice. This action of child sacrifice is compared with the notion of harlotry prevalent in the other scenes in 16:16–19. The single noun, "harlotry" indicates the general tendency of Jerusalem in contrast with this conspicuous practice of child sacrifice. While the comparison shows a distinction between the general and particular conceptions, their comparison also supports the similar perception of the description and the condemnation that the incidents procure within the chapter.

Ezekiel 16:21 expresses a second, although not unrelated view of Jerusalem's experiences with child sacrifice. The verse begins, "And you slaughtered my sons." The second, feminine, singular, *wayyiqtol* form remains focused on the action of the woman. The lexeme "to slaughter" arises only here in the chapter and comments further on the sacrifice of sons and daughters mentioned in 16:20aβ.³⁰² Moreover, the clause indicates that the sons were Yahweh's through the first, common, singular, affixed pronoun. Thus, the relative clause in 16:20, which states, "which you bore to me," relates to this first

³⁰² It also appears in Ezek 23:39 in the context of child sacrifice.

person pronoun. The term, “daughters,” however, is absent in this clause in contrast to the initial mention of children—both sons and daughters, at the onset of 16:20.

The next clause in 16:21b extends the *wayyiqtol* chain stating, “And you presented them when offering them up to them.” Again, the second, feminine singular *wayyiqtol* form continues with the common lemma נתן “presented.” The third, masculine, plural pronominal suffix indicates the plural “sons” from the previous clause or possibly the more general “sons and daughters,” represented in the pronoun affixed to the verb, “and you sacrificed them” in 16:20aβ. Finally, the verse concludes with an adverbial infinitive clause, “when offering them up to them.” The adverbial infinitive בהעביר, “when offering up,” occurring in the Hiphil stem, appears only here in Ezekiel 16.³⁰³ In conjunction with the accusative marker, the third, masculine, plural pronoun occurs again indicating the children received the action of “offering up.”³⁰⁴ Moreover, the preposition, ל, likewise appears again with the third, masculine, plural pronoun expressing that this action was indeed executed for the sake of idols, apparently to the last antecedent, the “masculine images” of 16:17. Thus, although child sacrifice is not described as “playing the harlot” in the same way as the production of cultic objects in Ezek 16:16 and 17, its comparison with “harlotry” in Ezek 16:20b causes its inclusion in Jerusalem’s abhorrent deeds. Consequently, Ezekiel 16 refers yet to another “harlotry” that Jerusalem enacted.

³⁰³ In the context of child sacrifice, the form also appears in Ezek 20:26, 20:31, 23:37.

³⁰⁴ Because of its relationship to other OT texts which have to do with child sacrifice, commentators generally understand an addition of “fire” through which the children are passed, Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 487, 489–491; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 326, 344.

2.2.3.4 She Forgot the Days of Her Youth Ezekiel 16:22-23

Ezekiel 16:22–23 comprises a summary statement made in retrospect of the woman’s youth. Ezekiel 16:22 fronts a mention of the woman’s “harlotry” and explicitly relates the woman’s misdeeds as a function of not remembering the days of her youth.³⁰⁵ The clause reads, “and with all your harlotry, you did not remember the days of your youth.” The arrangement, “to remember the days of your youth” occurs again in Ezek 16:43, 60, and 23:19. Hence, from the placement of these constructions, one can perceive the importance of its inclusion in the chapter both as it relates to content and also as it relates to structural transitions. Here, the emphatic beginning of the clause, “and with all your harlotry” (תזנתיך כל אתו) is contrasted with the concluding accusative phrase, “the days of your youth” (בעורייך ימי את) by means of the particle and the pronominal suffix affixed to “harlotries” and “youth.” Thus, the clause summarizes the sentiment of the story up to this point, namely, Jerusalem had forgotten the time of her youth in view of her many, wanton harlotries.

Moreover, as if to leave no doubt to which days 16:22a refers, the two concluding clauses of the verse repeat two collocations from previous sections of the chapter. Specifically, these days of her youth were when she was “naked and bare,” a phrase occurring in 16:7bβ, and when she was “kicking about in blood,” a phrase occurring in 16:6aβ. Thus, it appears her vulnerability is in view in the “days.”

³⁰⁵ Concerning the absence of “abominations” and the copula, see Chapter 1. It appears more likely that a later scribe added the word, “abominations” in view of the framework of Ezek 16:2, and 43ff, as well as its association with the content of 2 Kings 16:3.

Additionally, the second, feminine, singular verbal and pronominal suffixes leave no doubt that the referent is Jerusalem. These clauses thus characterize Jerusalem's days as an infant "kicking about in your blood" and Jerusalem's days as a pubescent maiden "naked and bare" as the "days of your youth." The use of the "to be" verb at the beginning and end of 16:22b endow the half-verse with a peculiar envelope structure in which the reader is implicitly reminded that Yahweh had done so much for the maiden. She, however, had forgotten from whence she had come. One other observation concerns the adverbial nature of 16:22ba. The temporal infinitive clause, "when you were" depicts a passing of time in this portrayal of Jerusalem, a perception that the phrase "days of your youth" already expresses.

Ezekiel 16:23a then draws the subsection to a somewhat artificial conclusion, "and so it was after all your evil." One can make three observations about this clause. First, the second feminine, singular pronominal suffix reiterates the consistent referral to Jerusalem hitherto in the chapter. Second, the singular noun "evil" undoubtedly conceives rather generally all of Jerusalem's harlotrous actions thus far.³⁰⁶ And third, the preposition, "after" is now the third element within four clauses that has advanced a passage of time into its portrayal of Jerusalem. The second and third observations substantiate the view of the clause as an appraisal or recapitulation of what has transpired. Moreover, the verse closes with the *Gottesspruchformel*, a formula, which often signifies a concluding function.³⁰⁷ In the absence of other formulas, however, it

³⁰⁶ As for the possible plural noun, which would more precisely construe the numerous harlotrous actions of Jerusalem thus far in the chapter, see Chapter 1.

³⁰⁷ See above footnote 21 and Rendtorff, "Zum Gebrauch," 34–37.

would appear that the formula does not indicate a major structural transition. Moreover, the ensuing verses contain references to earlier lemmata in the chapter and the *Leitmotif*, “harlotry,” factors which likewise indicate that the *Gottesspruchformel* does not require a major transition here.

2.2.3.5 She Builds Mounds and High Places Ezekiel 16:24–25

As if the retrospective summary of Jerusalem’s past was only a momentary pause, Ezek 16:24 again commences with a second, feminine, singular *wayyiqtol* form in which the woman constructs another cultic object. Moreover, the clause explicitly indicates that Jerusalem is the beneficiary of the object through the now-expected, second, feminine, singular pronoun suffixed to the preposition. The terminology, which articulates the production, however, has not yet occurred in the chapter, nor has the object of its action. Yahweh says, “And you built for yourself a mound.” The common Hebrew verb, “to build” will occur again in 16:25 and 31, each in the context of building a cultic object. The term translated “mound” occurs eleven times in the HB but only connotes a cultic location here in Ezekiel 16, otherwise simply indicating something curved. It may be interesting to note—unlike the occurrences of cultic productions in 16:16, 17, and 18, that the woman does not “take” from any gifts or articles which Yahweh previously gave. The materials from which she manufactured the “mound” are not indicated. In this manner, the incident is similar to Ezek 16:20–21 when the woman took her children and used them as cultic fodder. She had not explicitly received them from Yahweh. Additionally, the lack of previously mentioned gifts from Yahweh reveals what could be the instantiation of the metaphor. Besides the reference to

Jerusalem in the form of the second, feminine, singular verb, the construction could otherwise represent a particular utterance of prophetic accusation.

In the format of parallelism, Ezek 16:24b reads, “And you made for yourself a high place in every square.” The common Hebrew term, “to make” occurs in the second, feminine, singular, *wayyiqtol* form. The verb occurred previously in the chapter when the woman made for herself “motley shrines” in Ezek 16:16 and “masculine images” in Ezek 16:17. Additionally, this particular prepositional phrase with second, feminine, singular pronoun occurred in each context, “and you made for yourself.” The object of the verb, “high place,” occurs five times in the HB, four of which appear here and only then does it have a connotation of false worship.³⁰⁸ The verse ends with a prepositional phrase indicating the location of her cultic production, “in every square.” This phrase will reappear in 16:31 as a second indication of where she manufactured her high places. There, however, it will occur in association with an atypical harlot who pays instead of receives a wage for her work.

Ezekiel 16:25aα breaks the short *wayyiqtol* chain, which had begun in 16:24. Instead, it commences with a prepositional phrase, “at every head of a path.” Following the prepositional phrase, the *qatal* form of the verb, “to build,” which was also used in 16:24a, appears with cultic object, which 16:24b described. In other words, this construction inverts the verb, which is used in the first clause of 16:24, with the cultic object that appears in the second clause.³⁰⁹ Following this x + *qatal* clause in 16:25, a

³⁰⁸ The term also occurs in 1 Sam 22:6; versions diverge in translating it as a proper name or simply a hill.

³⁰⁹ This appears to be a case of selected inverted quotation; see Pancratius C. Beentjes, “Discovering a New Path of Intertextuality: Inverted Quotations and Their Dynamics” in *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible*, eds. L.J. De Regt, J. de Waard, and J.P. Fokkelman (Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1996), 31–50.

wayyiqtol chain begins in Ezek 16:25a^β in second, feminine, singular forms. Several lemmata, which constitute the clauses in the *wayyiqtol* chain, are familiar from previously encountered terms and collocations. The first clause of the chain says, “And you abhorred your beauty.” The verb, “to abhor” appears here for the first time although the nominal form occurs in 16:2, 22, 36, 43, 47, 50, 51, and 58; the verb appears again in 16:52. The object of the verb, “beauty,” is conjoined to the second, feminine, singular pronoun. Lady Jerusalem’s beauty was a result of Yahweh’s care and provision and the reason a name went out for her among the nations. Moreover, she had trusted in her “beauty” and thus, played the harlot with her name. This clause returns to that theme although the use of the verb depicts a stark contrast of the heights to which her beauty had lifted her in Ezek 16:14–15.

The second clause contains an even more extreme caricature of Jerusalem. “And you spread your feet to everyone who passed by.” The pairing of this verb and object is not found elsewhere in the HB and signals the strong rhetoric of the passage. The portrayal in 16:24–25 has certainly materialized into a full-blown metaphor and is perhaps sharpest here, as the production of a “high place” and “mound” have incurred Yahweh’s rancorous critique. More than mere pairing of object and verb, the clause indicates that Jerusalem acted indiscriminately to everyone who passed by her, thus implying that she had no discernment or self-image from which to refrain her brazen promiscuity. The idiom, “everyone who passed by” appeared also in 16:15 when the woman was said to have “poured out your harlotries on everyone who passed by.” The final clause of the verse culminates by saying, “And you multiplied your harlotry.” This

precise construction occurs three times in five verses: 16:25, 26, and 29. A fourth appearance of the verb in 16:51 has Jerusalem multiplying “abominations” rather than “harlotry.”³¹⁰ Thus the distinct vocabulary of “building mounds,” “high places,” and “spreading feet” in 16:24–25 is combined with the familiar terminology, “abhorring beauty” and “multiplying harlotry.”

2.2.3.6 Harlotry with the Nations Ezekiel 16:26–30

Ezekiel 16:26 initiates a section of material, which concerns Jerusalem’s relationship with foreign nations. The section contains terminology and content which is unequivocally distinct from the rest of the chapter in spite of several occurrences of the root, “to play a harlot.” The section begins, in fact, with the now familiar second, feminine, singular *wayyiqtol* form, “And you played the harlot.” This same form occurred at the transition between subsections in 16:15, 16, and 17, and will appear two more times in the chapter, both appearances occurring in 16:28. The initial clause of 16:26 continues, “And you played the harlot with the sons of Egypt, your neighbors who were great in size.” Several observations are notable here. First, each of the nations with whom Jerusalem plays the harlot in Ezekiel 16 also appears in Ezekiel 23.³¹¹ Second, as Block observes, the order in which the nations are mentioned in the chapter reflects the order in which the HB portrays Israel’s relationships with them.³¹² Naturally, Egypt is the first one with which the chapter deals. Third, Egypt is denounced throughout the

³¹⁰ The verb also appears in 16:7 although in a different context.

³¹¹ Jerusalem doesn’t explicitly “play the harlot” with the Philistines in Ezekiel 16. Ezekiel 16:27 contains several complex factors concerning its relationship to the surrounding material. See below.

³¹² Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 495.

book of Ezekiel, in particular, Ezek 17:15, a text which contains linguistic connections to Ezek 16:59. Fourth, it does so by describing them as “neighbors” and as those “who were great in size.” In all likelihood, the latter expression is a double entendre with the primary focus on the size of the Egyptian’s sexual organ, a strong denunciation of Jerusalem’s willingness to indiscriminately enter into accord with them.

The ensuing clause in 16:26 repeats the final clause of 16:25, “And you multiplied your harlotry to provoke me.” Here, the *wayyiqtol* chain continues, as does the redundant mention of harlotry. However, the clause ends with a novel charge. The *lamed* preposition prefixed to an infinitive denotes a purpose motivating Jerusalem’s harlotry. The only reason for her harlotry hitherto was her forgetfulness and wickedness in Ezek 16:22–23. This infinitive of purpose indicates that she multiplied her harlotries in order to provoke Yahweh, an interesting charge given the use of this term elsewhere in the HB.³¹³ The use of such language as well as Jerusalem’s relationship to the “sons of Egypt” brings with it a different conception of “harlotry” than what one has read up to this point in the chapter.

Up to this point in the chapter, Ezekiel 16 has utilized the concept of harlotry to depict metaphorically a relationship between Jerusalem and her benefactor Yahweh, her production of cultic objects, those objects, and her sacrifices to those objects. This marks the first time in which the harlotry does not involve Jerusalem’s relationship to those things but rather involves her relationship with a foreign nation. Although the term

³¹³ For example, the term is used in a significant matrix of idolatry in Deut 32:16–21 besides numerous occurrences in Kings and Jeremiah; see Samantha Joo, *Provocation and Punishment: The Anger of God in the Book of Jeremiah and Deuteronomic Theology* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006); Tracy J McKenzie, *Idolatry in the Pentateuch: An innertextual Strategy* (Eugene: Pickwick, 2010), 96–101.

“nations” was present in 16:14–15, no specific appellation has occurred nor have Jerusalem’s misdeeds with a specific nation taken place. Moreover, the question arises how relationships with foreign nations fit within the metaphor of harlotry? Did the nations lead Jerusalem astray with their idolatry? Or does the mention of foreign nations relate to Jerusalem’s dependence upon foreign governments for military and political purposes, a practice that is condemned elsewhere.³¹⁴ Regardless of these questions, the subsection manages to cohere with the larger purpose of the passage in view of the verbal root “to play the harlot” and the lewd imagery such as a sizeable phallus.

Ezekiel 16:27 likewise contains anomalous terminology, grammar, and content. First, the verse begins, “And behold, I stretched out my hand against you.” The initial term, “behold” has not occurred in this subunit and indicates with force the first, singular *qatal* verb that follows. The verb indicates the action of Yahweh, a switch in a section, which has consistently referred to the action of harlot-Jerusalem. Moreover, the action of “stretching the hand against” demonstrates the judgment of Yahweh, which the following clauses will announce.³¹⁵ This raises the question why an announcement of judgment transpires in this context. One would expect the announcement of judgment following Ezek16:35 where an announcement of judgment indeed takes place. What

³¹⁴ See Isaiah 7, Jeremiah, and Ezek 17–23.

³¹⁵ Ezek 16:27 “stretch out [N/P] hand against [N/P]” is quite common in the latter prophets and the Pentateuch occurring in Exodus, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zephaniah. Moreover, it occurs as a threat to Israel, Jerusalem, and foreign nations as well as inanimate objects like the water and heavens in the Pentateuch. In Exodus, it is used in the plague narratives as a directive from God to Moses or Aaron. He is to “stretch out his hand over...” and a plague will result. In other words, it is a judgment collocation that occurs twenty-one times in the HB. As for the book of Ezekiel, the collocation occurs in Ezek 6:14, 14:9, 13, 16:27, 25:7, 13, 16, and 35:3.

purpose is its inclusion here? The answer may lie in Jerusalem's relationship to the Philistines about which we will say more below.

The *hinneh* clause precedes two *wayyiqtol* clauses, which retain Yahweh as the subject. In addition, the first clause, 16:27a β , “and I reduced your lot,” also contains a reference to Jerusalem through the second, feminine, singular pronoun, an element present in 16:27a α and one that is present three times in 16:27b α . The exact meaning of “reduced your lot,” a collocation that does not otherwise appear in the HB, is not entirely clear although scholars have put forward several proposals.³¹⁶ The ensuing clause, 16:27b α , however, may guide an appropriate understanding of its purpose here. The clause states, “And I gave you to those who hate you, according to their desire, the daughters of the Philistines, who were embarrassed by your way of licentiousness.” This clause makes clear that Yahweh delivered Jerusalem to the Philistine women in some manner by means of the verb, “to give” and the suffixed pronoun, “you.” Thus, “reduced your lot” likely refers to a vanquishment of some sort for Philistia over Jerusalem. Consequently, 16:27a β and 16:27b α cohere with the sense judgment in 16:27a α —“Behold, I stretched out my hand over you.” Moreover, from 16:27b α , it is also obvious that the Philistine women hated Jerusalem and were humiliated in view of Jerusalem's lewd behavior. The term translated here as “licentiousness” occurs here for the first time but will recur in 16:43 and 58.

³¹⁶ See Gerhard Liedke, *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze: eine formgeschichtlich-terminologische Studie*, WMANT 39 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1971), 164–65; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 345 who references theories from Eissfeldt and Alt as well as others; Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 495–496; Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 229, who references Liedke noted above; and Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 283.

Thus, the verse contributes to the section in three ways: First, the mention of “Philistines” contributes to this section in which foreign nations are mentioned in the order Israel encounters them in the Hebrew Bible.³¹⁷ Second, the report that the Philistine women were embarrassed contributes to the absurdly ironic picture that Yahweh’s own wife embarrassed a Gentile nation with her obscene comportment. Finally, there is no mention of Jerusalem’s “harlotry” with the Philistines because their relationship was not one of alliance, as occurred with Egypt, Assyria, and the Chaldeans, but one of enmity. Thus, the text manages to contribute to the unfathomable portrayal of lady Jerusalem’s lewd behavior.

The next verse, Ezek 16:28, returns to the theme of Jerusalem playing the harlot with foreign nations. It begins, “And you played the harlot with the sons of Assyria.” The second, feminine, singular *wayyiqtol* verb and prepositional phrase, “to the sons of...” matches the same construction which began 16:26 in which Jerusalem played the harlot with the sons of Egypt. Moreover, this same verb appears again in 16:28bα with a third, masculine, plural suffixed pronoun again referring to the Assyrian men. Unlike the phrase, “sons of Egypt,” which only appears in Ezekiel 16—although the name itself, “Egypt” figures prominently in Ezekiel 23—the phrase, “sons of Assyria” occurs also in Ezek 23:7, 9, 12, and 23. The appellation, “sons of Assyria” in 16:28aα is further modified by *mem* preposition affixed to the negation for an infinitive (בלתי) or in this case, a verbal noun translated as “satiated.” Thus, Jerusalem played the harlot with the sons of Assyria “because [she] was not satisfied.” Her harlotry, of course, did not satisfy

³¹⁷ Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 495.

her thirst; the next clause states, “And you played the harlot [with them].”³¹⁸

Immediately following this reiterated *wayyiqtol*, the text states, “and still you were not satisfied.” Thus, the second, feminine, singular *qatal* verb, “to be satisfied” appears in root form twice in 16:28 before appearing again in 16:29 in the precise form.³¹⁹ In so doing, this root connects the references to the sons of Assyria in 16:28 and to Chaldea in 16:29.

Ezekiel 16:29^{aa} repeats the clause found earlier in 16:25 and 26, “And you multiplied your harlotry.” Here, however, the construction also contains a prepositional phrase indicating another foreign power upon whom Jerusalem poured out her promiscuity. She “multiplied [her] harlotry to the land of traders, to Chaldea.” Now, the third foreign power upon whom Jerusalem enacted her harlotry, the so-called “land of traders,” or Chaldea, enters the discussion. The phrase “land of traders” only occurs twice in the HB, here and unmistakably in the parallelism of Ezek 17:4. The moniker “Chaldea” appears only here in Ezekiel 16 but figures prominently in Ezek 23:14, 15, 16, and 23. The Chaldeans, or Babylon, was another nation with whom Jerusalem (Hezekiah in 2 Kings 20:12–19) had undoubtedly flirted. The final clause of 16:29 states the outcome, “And also, in this, you were not satisfied.” A similar clause, with the exception of “in this” appeared in 16:28 concerning Jerusalem’s relationship with Assyria. The root “to be satisfied” appears three times in two verses but only appears otherwise in Ezek 16:49 regarding Sodom and not Jerusalem. Thus, its role in the chapter is limited. Its role in the book does not appear grand either but one can discern

³¹⁸ For the absence of “with them,” see Chapter 1.

³¹⁹ The verbal noun, “satiety” appears again in 16:49, “satisfaction of bread.”

its import here in 16:28–29. First, Jerusalem’s harlotry had left her unsatisfied, a state that seemed to compel her to more relationships and only perpetuated the problem. Second, these unfulfilling relationships oblige the question: Had Yahweh satisfied Jerusalem? The next verse reveals the source of the dilemma.

Ezekiel 16:30a concludes the section concerning foreign nations while 16:30b opens up another distinct section of text. Ezekiel 16:30a asks, “What is wrong with your heart, utters the LORD?” This question coheres with the logic of the metaphor.³²⁰ Jerusalem had wandered away from a relationship with Yahweh, which was perfect in every possible way, to relationships that did not satisfy her. This paradox made no sense and required explanation. Thus, the text provides an answer in its very question before it also provides an analogy to an unusual harlot and adulteress in the upcoming section. Included in the clause is another occurrence of the *Gottesspruchformel*. The absence of other Ezekielian formulas suggests that a major transition is not the purpose of the formula. Rather, another minor transition transpires with distinct content and vocabulary and indications of a composite text.³²¹

Finally, 16:30b forms the transition to the next subsection, when it combines these acts with a particular view of the lady Jerusalem as a hardheaded harlot. Ezekiel 16:30b says, “When you do all these things, the work of a woman, a brazen harlot?” Always in view is the second, feminine, singular pronoun referring to Jerusalem; here,

³²⁰ The precise lemmata of the clause are uncertain upon text critical grounds but the variant manuscripts reveal a perceived association between 16:30a and the notion of covenant and Yahweh’s marriage to Jerusalem. For the text critical discussion, see Chapter 1; for the association of the subunit with “covenant” and Yahweh’s marriage to Jerusalem, see Chapter 3 concerning 16:59ff.

³²¹ A fuller explanation of the *Gottesspruchformel* and the absence of other formulas is found in footnote 21 and discussed above.

the pronoun is suffixed to the adverbial infinitive from the root, “to do, make.” Thus, the “work” in question appears to be the conduct of her harlotry, which she has proliferated leastwise on the three nations, if not each of her harlotrous acts enumerated from 16:15–29. Her conduct was so incontinent that it embarrassed the pagan women of the Philistines. Furthermore, in spite of the frequent use of “to do, make” in the HB, one may note that she “made colorful high places” in 16:16, “made masculine images” in 16:17, and “made high places” in 16:24. Furthermore, the plural demonstrative pronoun occurring in 16:30b, which must have as its antecedent the woman’s multiple acts of behavior substantiate these suggestions.

Meanwhile, two absolute nouns occur in the dependent clause of 16:30b, “woman, wife” (הַיְשָׁה) and “harlot.” Of course, the root, “to play the harlot” has appeared repeatedly since 16:15. However, this is the first occasion of this particular nominal form, which refers specifically to a harlot (הַזֹּנֵה). This precise form will now transpire four times within six verses: 16:30, 31, 33, 35, with a final appearance in 16:41. Furthermore, the noun, “woman, wife,” which has not appeared yet in the chapter, will now take place three times in the next five verses: 16:30, 32, 34, itself also making one final appearance in 16:41. In other words, these two terms appear here for the first time in the chapter and then frequently in the next few verses before basically disappearing in the remainder of the chapter. This observation clearly indicates that 16:30b also looks forward to the next section in its current context.

This realization may help guide an appropriate understanding of the final word of the verse in spite of it being a hapax. Its appearance at the end of the clause and as an adjective modifying “harlot” suggests it also is looking forward to the pitiful behavior

that ensues. Indeed, the behavior also fits the inappropriate conduct of the woman with her foreign paramours since it appears that the next section is a further description of the desperate activity of Jerusalem. There, the harlot-wife attempts to obtain what she already has. In so doing, she spurns what she already has and attempts to pay for that which she is unable to obtain. This portrayal of the woman as yet unsatisfied but still doggedly in pursuit of a relationship, which was already hers to enjoy with Yahweh, obtains in each unfortunate portrait of Jerusalem. Ezekiel 16:31–34 will ridicule the woman further for her senseless and contemptible behavior.

2.2.3.7 A Unique Harlot and Adulteress Ezekiel 16:31–34

The next section of material combines two conceptions of Jerusalem's promiscuous practices: one as an unusual harlot, who gives instead of receives her wages, and another as a wife, who takes strangers rather than her husband. Prior to those comparisons, however, Ezekiel 16:31a begins with a rather obvious repetition of the language of producing cultic places, which appeared in 16:24–25. It opens in 16:31a α , "When you built your mound at the head of every path." This adverbial infinitive clause utilizes the same verb, "to build" (בנה) and its object "mound," as did 16:24a. However, it combines this collocation with the location which is found not in 16:24a but rather 16:25a "at the head of every path." Ezekiel 16:25a concerns "high places," and not

“mounds.”³²² Thus, one can discern an interchange of terms within this matrix of terminology.³²³

Additionally, Ezek 16:31aβ likewise utilizes material found in 16:24. The clause in 16:31aβ, “And your high place, you made in every square,” virtually repeats the earlier clause. Syntactically, the clause contains an *x + qatal*, second, singular, verb form and the second, feminine, suffix form is affixed to the noun itself rather than as a prepositional phrase. The clause is an extension of the adverbial infinitive found at the beginning of the verse. Subsequently, 16:31b turns immediately to the theme that will appear in the following verses. It reads, “But you were not like a harlot, inasmuch scoffing at payment.” As mentioned above, the term “harlot” appears in rapid succession between 16:30 and 35. The *x + qatal* clause utilizes another second, feminine, singular verbal form and also the negation. Ironically, after just calling Jerusalem “a shameless harlot” in 16:30 and frequently depicting her as “playing a harlot” and “multiplying harlotry” throughout the subunit, now the text asserts that she is not like a harlot. The reason, however, becomes clear.

The metaphor likening Jerusalem to a harlot reaches its zenith in this section. She was not like a harlot because normally harlots receive payment for their performance. Jerusalem, on the other hand, scoffed at receiving payment. Ezekiel 16:31bβ explains her depravity by using a *lamed* preposition plus an unparalleled *Piel* infinitive construct

³²² The phrase in 16:31a reads, “at the head of every path” while the phrase in 16:25a reads, “at every head of a path.” Regardless, 16:25 concerns a “high place,” not a “mound.”

³²³ We will discuss this phenomenon in Chapter 3 as it relates to expansionary material. A similar form may be phenomena known as Seidel’s law. See also Beentjes, “Discovering a New Path of Intertextuality: Inverted Quotations and Their Dynamics,” 48–49; S. Talmon “The Textual Study of the Bible”, 321–400, idem. *Text and Canon of the Hebrew Bible: Collected Studies* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 61.

of the root “to mock, scoff.”³²⁴ (טלף) The object of the infinitive is “payment.” This term, payment, occurs only here in 16:31, 34 (twice), and, along with the terms “harlotry” and “woman, wife,” which also appeared in 16:30, in 16:41. In this manner, 16:31b anticipates three different expositions of Jerusalem’s backward ways in Ezek 16:32–34. In summary, Ezek 16:31 combines the production of false cultic locations at the head of every street and in every square with the notion of a backward harlot in 16:31b.

Ezekiel 16:32 contains just one clause and introduces the notion of adultery apparently as a further explanation of Jerusalem’s behavior. The clause begins with a subject phrase and, in one of the rare occasions in the subunit, contains a third, feminine, singular verb instead of the normal second, feminine, singular form. This departure from the norm informs the reader that the point of the clause concerns the typical practice of an adulterous wife. It states, “The adulterous wife takes strangers instead of her husband.”³²⁵ As mentioned above, the term, “wife” appeared at the end of 16:30 seemingly in preparation for this analogy. The term appears again in 16:34 and 41. The participial adjective, “adulterous” appears for the first in the chapter and will make one other appearance in the announcement of judgment in 16:38.³²⁶ Another term occurring for the first time is the common Hebrew designation, “man.” It is syntactically conjoined with the third, feminine, singular pronoun referring to “wife” and is the object of the preposition “instead of.” Finally, although *nota accusativi* before an indefinite noun is

³²⁴ GKC, § 114o.

³²⁵ For the translation, “instead” for תחת, see Ezek 23:5; cf. BDB, 1065, which perceives the occurrence as on “under his authority.”

³²⁶ The same root also appears four times in Ezek 23:37 and 45.

rare, it's occurrence here in conjunction with the term "strangers" apparently refers to those nations with whom the woman related instead of Yahweh, "her husband."³²⁷ No doubt, this description is intended to show the absurdity of the woman who already has a husband and hence, someone to provide for her and protect her, and yet is still unsatisfied and looks for more. This description is analogous to the situation with Jerusalem. She has Yahweh for her husband. He cared and provided for her when she was in a pitiable state. And yet, she has taken "strangers."

The description does not stop there as the initial clause in 16:33a contains a verb whose most likely subject is the "strangers" in 16:32b. At first glance, however, the comparison departs from the analogy to an adulterous wife and returns to a harlot, in this case, "to all harlots." Ezekiel 16:33a begins with the prepositional phrase, "to all harlots," once again indicating that this description concerns the normal practice of a professional harlot. Next, the clause contains the third, masculine, plural, *qatal* verbal form whose nearest antecedent is the masculine plural "strangers" which ended 16:32. "Strangers," that is, men who patronize a harlot, give something in return. The clause closes with an obscure object. Actually, the verse uses two distinct lexemes, each of them a *hapax legomenon*, in order to denote a harlot's payment. Men always give to a harlot a "gift." Ezekiel 16:33ba draws the comparison quickly back to Jerusalem by means of a disjunctive *waw* and a second, feminine, singular independent pronoun, "but you." In Jerusalem's case, "But you, you gave your presents to all your lovers." As if to underscore the comparison in the clause, a second, feminine, singular pronoun— independent, verbal, or suffixed to a noun—refers to Jerusalem four times. The section

³²⁷ Cf. GKC, §117d, 364; Joüon, §125h.

had not explicitly referred to Jerusalem since 16:31b α but here draws a sharp contrast to the professional harlot. Jerusalem gave gifts to her lovers!

The term, “lovers,” a *Piel*, masculine, plural, participle appears for the first time in the chapter at the end of 16:33b α . This occurrence also marks the first occasion of the verbal root, “to love” in the book of Ezekiel. In the entire book of Ezekiel, this root appears only seven times and only in Ezekiel 16 and 23. Moreover, it will only occur as a *Piel*, masculine, plural participle, with the exception of a *qatal* form in a relative clause in Ezek 16:37a. The next occurrences of the root appear after the structural transition to the announcement of judgment in Ezek 16:35–43.

The final clause in Ezek 16:33 refers to these “lovers” by means of the accusative, third, masculine, plural pronoun. A second, feminine, singular, *wayyiqtol* verb commences this final clause, “And you bribed them to come into you all around with your harlotry.” The rare verb, “to bribe” only occurs here in the book of Ezekiel but its meaning is clear and constitutes the third distinct approach that the section has taken in order to express the same point. Jerusalem had to coerce her partners to come into her. A *lamed* preposition plus infinite construct, “to come” and the preposition, “into” plus second, feminine, singular pronoun, “you” implies the sexual nature of the metaphorical encounters. In addition, another prepositional phrase repeats the familiar noun, “harlotry” which will likewise occur in the next clause. One final observation in 16:33 concerns another term appearing for the first time in the chapter, “round about, every side,” which is prefixed with a *mem* preposition and occurs again in 16:37, the immediate context to other occurrences of the verbal root, “to love.”

Ezekiel 16:34 is particularly interesting for a number of reasons. First, it concludes the section having to do with two appearances of the term “payment,” which appeared first in 16:31bβ at the beginning of this section. Second, it contains yet a fourth statement comparing Jerusalem’s unconventional practice with that of general harlotry. Third, it opens and closes with an envelope feature, the term, “contrary,” (הֵפֶךְ) which occurs only here in the book of Ezekiel.³²⁸ These reasons suggest that the verse is a transitional or clarifying statement integrating various features from surround material.

Ezekiel 16:34 begins by declaring that Jerusalem was backwards from other women. It states, “And with you, it was the opposite of those women in your harlotry.”³²⁹ As mentioned above, the term הֵפֶךְ denotes that Jerusalem is unlike other women. The *bet* preposition plus second, feminine, singular pronoun and the מִן preposition affixed to “the women” make the comparison explicit. The mention of “women” or more specifically, “wives,” corresponds to the first appearance of the term in 16:32a concerning the adulterous wife. Furthermore, the plurality of the term quite possibly alludes to the practice of “all harlots” referred to in 16:33a. Finally, the prepositional phrase, “in your harlotry” repeats the same phrase found at the end of 16:33 and as the eighth occurrence of the noun, “harlotry,” (תִּזְנוּת) it will only appear once more in the chapter in Ezek 16:36.³³⁰

³²⁸ This precise term, “הֵפֶךְ” only occurs otherwise in Is 29:16. The verbal root is more common.

³²⁹ I translate the article here as the demonstrative pronoun since the article presumably refers to either the wife of 16:32a or the typical harlot in 16:33a.

³³⁰ The term otherwise only occurs in the HB in Ezekiel 23; in Ezek 23:7, 8 (twice), 11, 14, 17, 18, 19, 29, 35, and 43.

The final clause in 16:34a β derides, “And no one pursued you as a harlot.” The third, masculine, singular *Pual* form, “to play the harlot” occurs only here and indicates that no one was interested in Jerusalem as a harlot, a factor that stems from her bribes and payments to her lovers and allies at the expense of her covenant to Yahweh. The next clause, 16:34b α , comments further with an adverbial infinitive. The construction, which is comprised of a conjunction and *bet* preposition plus the verb, “to give” suffixed with the second, feminine, singular pronoun, likely indicates manner as much as it does temporal significance.³³¹ In other words, “But in the way you gave payment...” Next, the main clause of 16:34b α disjunctively continues, “No payment was given to you.” This clause repeats the ridiculous notion, which was expressed in 16:31b and 16:33, that Jerusalem was forced to pay others for what normally one receives money. The term, “payment” and the verb, “to give,” which themselves are related by the verbal root, each occur twice in the clause as does the second, feminine, singular pronoun. Finally, the section is brought to a close prior to the formulaic elements in 16:35 with another clause, which approximates the way in which Ezek 16:34 began. It reads simply, “And as such, you were opposite.” Here the verse ends as it began with הפך, “contrary.” The second, feminine, singular, verbal form concludes the subunit, 16:15–34, with the same second, feminine verbal construction found over thirty-eight times. The focus has predominantly been on the actions of harlot-Jerusalem.

In summary, the envelope structure, which comprises 16:34, affirms the particular point of the section, that unlike the typical practice of a harlot, Jerusalem was

³³¹ Given the parallel manner in which 16:34a parallels 16:34b, it is probable that the notion of manner in this adverbial clause is comparable to the manner in which no one pursues her as a harlot, בתוך parallels בתזונה.

forced to pay for others to patronize her. Moreover, one can see the development of the entire subunit. Jerusalem had produced cultic locations, which were metaphorically portrayed as promiscuous acts. She had taken Yahweh's accouterments and produced objects with which to play the harlot. She had sacrificed precious possessions—even her children, to these objects. Moreover, her relationships with foreign nations became a means with which to play the harlot. But in the end, she was worse than a harlot. Harlots at least compel some value; Jerusalem's value was none other than the value of the gift, which she had to give. She had fallen to the greatest of depths.

2.2.4 The Announcement of Yahweh's Judgment Ezekiel 16:35–43

2.2.4.1 Yahweh Demands an Audience Ezekiel 16:35

The next section begins in typical Ezekielian format.³³² As demonstrated above, various formulaic elements and terms subdivide the accusation of harlotry, which occurs in 16:15–34, and Yahweh's announcement of judgment for the harlotry, which occurs in 16:35–43. The verse begins with a conjunctive adverb, “therefore,” indicating Yahweh's reaction and ensuing announcement against Jerusalem's decadence. The verse also utilizes the vocative “O harlot,” in one of three final uses of the root in the chapter,

³³² See above, pg. 5–7; see also, Schöpflin, *Theologie*, 89–90; Kruger, *Geschichtskonzepte*, 139–42; Meier, *Speaking*; W. Eugene March, “Laken: Its Functions and Meanings,” in *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, eds. Jared J. Jackson and Martin Kessler (Eugene: Pickwick, 1974), 256–84.

appearing here, 16:36, and 41, in order to link this section with the previous diatribe against her varied expositions of harlotry. Finally, the formulaic, “Hear the word of the LORD,” functions as a call for the audience to listen as the prophet announces Yahweh’s message of judgment.

2.2.4.2 Yahweh’s Motivation and Sentence Ezekiel 16:36–39

Ezekiel 16:36 opens with yet another formulaic statement, the so-called messenger formula, “Thus says the LORD.” This formula functions in conjunction with other markers as a structural guide to the chapter as well as affirming the divine origin of the message. Subsequent to this formula, as occurs elsewhere in Ezekiel, a short, summary of Yahweh’s motivation for judgment occurs. The motivation clause begins with “because,” (כִּי) thereupon listing several grounds for Yahweh’s judgment. Thereafter, this construction will give way to another “therefore,” in 16:37 after which the section will reverberate various enunciations of coming woe.³³³ The brief statement of Jerusalem’s malefaction in 16:36, for which Yahweh’s punishment will come, contains various components that are congruent with material earlier in the chapter.

The first clause of the motivation in 16:36a reveals a surprising selection of terms. It reads, “Because your bronze was poured out.” The dependent clause utilizes a Niphal infinitive from the root, “to pour out,” followed by a peculiar noun-subject, “bronze” (תְּשֻׁנָּה) with the second, feminine, singular pronoun. Ezekiel 16:15 utilized the

³³³ For the formulation and background of this construction, see K. von Rabenau, “Das prophetische Zukunftswort im Buch Hesekiel” in *Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen*, ed. R. Rendtorff and K. Koch (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1961), 61–80; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 35–39.

same verb, when the woman had “poured out” her harlotries upon everyone who passed. Additionally, in the MT, she will receive a judgment of “those who pour out blood” in 16:38.³³⁴ There is, however, a good deal of discussion related to both terms, “to pour out,” and “bronze.”³³⁵

The point here is not to exhaust the possible denotations of these terms nor conclude which was necessarily contained in an ‘original’ text. Rather, this analysis attempts to consider their possible relationships with other terms in Ezekiel 16 and therefore, draw a conclusion of their purpose within the chapter based on an internal analysis. The term, תִּשְׁנֶה, whose extant form in the MT is not in question, does not occur

³³⁴ Because of the reasons given in the text critical note concerning this verse, I do not include the phrase, “those women who pour out blood” in a so-called original text of 16:38. I include this in the discussion here because it seems to commend a discussion between textual criticism and literary criticism. Apparently, a scribe saw within this section a reason to add that Jerusalem would be punished because she “poured out blood.” Whether that reason was as simple as a corresponding concern in Ezekiel 23, or because of what he saw in Ezek 16:20–21, or because of the clause, “your bronze was poured out,” it is difficult to conclude the motivation underlying the reciprocal punishment (perhaps some combination of the reasons given above). A similar clause occurs in 23:45 concerning which see below.

³³⁵ For a full discussion, see the versions, LXX and Targum, and G. R. Driver, “Linguistic and Textual Problems: Ezekiel,” *Bibl 19* (1938): 65; Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 285–86, 296–97; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 329–30; Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 498–500. As for the *Niphal* infinitive construct in MT, פָּרַשָׁה, the Targum renders this verb as a parallel to the verb in the following clause, “reveal, uncover.” (גלה) From a similar perspective, Zimmerli commends a “slight graphic change” (and vowel change) in order to emend the MT to פָּרַשָׁה, “to strip off, strip, make bare” suffixed with the second, feminine, singular pronoun, ך, in view of parallels found in Jer 13:26 and Is 47:2. It seems likely though that the Targum could be depending on knowledge of those texts as well and attempting to explain the difficult use of “pour out” with “bronze.” Furthermore, Zimmerli questionably translates the term, תִּשְׁנֶה, as “shame,” undoubtedly in accordance with Driver’s explanation according to an Akkadian term; Driver, “Problems,” 65. However, “shame” is quite different than Driver’s suggested “superfluity, luxury,” or even his own suggestion of the connotation in this context, “sexual extravagance.” (Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 330). Block, likewise, uses an Akkadian cognate to understand the Hebrew term. But he must explain, “Ezekiel has changed a pathological expression into an erotic image, referring to female genital distillation produced at sexual arousal.” Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 500. In other words, in spite of his supposed dependence upon comparative use in Akkadian, Block must still argue that “Ezekiel has changed” even that comparatively derived understanding. Admittedly, these translations are possibilities but they seem not to follow from the evidence that they have discussed. For these reasons, I translate the verb and the object in order to render possible a double entendre that euphemistically she poured out her bronze colored menstrual fluid to her paramours in her promiscuity while leaving open the possibility that more literally, Jerusalem poured out her wealth of bronze to her foreign partners. For a rendering of these possibilities, see also Koehler, L. and W. Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Study Edition. Vol 1, Ed. Johann Jakob Stamm, trans. M.E.J. Richardson (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 691.

elsewhere in Ezekiel 16 or in those texts with which it may have a linguistic connection by means of harlot-related terminology or imagery.³³⁶ Moreover, its association to any texts in which foreign powers took bronze utensils from Jerusalem, likewise, is limited.³³⁷ And yet, the immediately preceding Ezek 16:31–34 just utilized three distinct terms for remuneration: נָדָה, אֶתְנֶן, and נָדָן. It is more than plausible therefore, that the תְּשֻׁבָה constitutes a literary link to that section. That is, the metaphorical, adulterous harlot gave wealth rather than receiving gratuity and gain for her services. In addition, 16:36 will take up lemmata from previous sections as it portrays the harlot as issuing her goods and revealing her nakedness to her “lovers” (מֵאֵהֶבֶיךָ), a designation for Jerusalem’s paramours that was last utilized in Ezek 16:32 and subsequently utilized in vs. 37. Naturally, it is on account of this “pouring out” that Yahweh will bring his judgment.

Therefore, one must consider four potential associations the collocation “bronze poured out” has in the chapter. First, as mentioned above, it could relate to the general practice of promiscuity to which 16:15 refers, “You poured out your harlotry upon everyone who passed by.” Various examples of Jerusalem’s harlot-like activities are enumerated in the chapter and this very well could relate in a general manner to all of them. The question, however, concerns the connotation of the term translated above as “bronze.” Commentators attempt to translate the term congruent with both a relationship to cognate language and an understanding of the harlot imagery of the chapter. And yet, as it pertains to an understanding on the basis of comparative literature, one must admit

³³⁶ For those texts that have a relationship to Ezekiel 16, see Ezekiel 23, Jeremiah 2:20, 3:3, 5:7–9, and Hosea 2:5–7, 4:10–18.

³³⁷ See 2 Kings 25:13–14 for tribute of bronze items to Babylon. See 2 Kings 16 for a tribute paid to the king of Assyria but it does not appear the bronze items were used; however, see 2 Kings 16:18b.

that this is the only occasion of such a connotation in the HB and therefore the evidence is thin. Furthermore, both Block and Zimmerli, who depend upon comparative analyses, must still translate the word differently than what the analyses suggest.³³⁸ It would seem that these translations are indeed, not entirely drawing from the comparative evidence but rather upon their own sense of the context of Ezekiel 16, a practice that is likewise attempted in this analysis.

Second, the use of תשנה could specifically refer to a particular instance of Jerusalem's improper cultic activities in the chapter. One of the harlotries that followed the general condemnation in 16:15 was the slaughter of sons in Ezek 16:20–21. Interestingly, a condemnation of these very sacrifices returns in the final clause of this verse, Ezek 16:36b. It reads, “In accordance with the blood of your sons which you gave before them.” For this reason, the MT indicates that Yahweh will judge them according to “those who pour out blood” in 16:38a. It is possible that there is an intentional association between the clause, “because your bronze was poured out,” the slaughter of children in 16:20–21, and the clause, “In accordance with the blood of your sons, which you gave before them” in 16:36bβ. If this suggestion is accurate, it would reveal a conflation of the clause, “And you poured out harlotries” in 16:15 and the notion of shedding blood through the sacrifice of their children in the aforementioned passages.³³⁹ It is interesting to note that unlike most other instances of improper, cultic activity in the chapter, the slaughter of sons is never called harlotry, only compared to it in 16:20bβ.

³³⁸ See footnote 181.

³³⁹ It would seem that the extant MT phrase “those women who pour out blood” in 16:38aβ represents a scribal attempt to demonstrate Yahweh's reciprocal punishment in light of these activities.

Still, in such a scenario, the interpreter must presume that the term, “bronze” connotes blood based upon its color, the usage of “poured out” in the chapter, and the relationship between “your bronze was poured out” and the final clause of 16:36, “In accordance with the blood of your sons which you gave before them.”³⁴⁰

The third possible association it has in this context emerges from the parallel clause and its verb, “reveal.” Zimmerli argued that one should understand the verb, “to pour out” as the verb, “to strip, strip off, or make bare.” Because of the second, feminine, singular pronoun, one could orthographically interchange the verbs with the exception of one letter, which, in this case, one could easily transmute.³⁴¹ If Zimmerli is correct, then the term is parallel to the verb in the next clause, “to reveal.” In such a case, “bronze” would be the object of the infinitive “to uncover.” Is “bronze” also then parallel to “nakedness” in the next clause? Should one understand the nuance of “bronze” as (menstrual) “blood,”³⁴² “shame,”³⁴³ “sexual extravagance,”³⁴⁴ or “wealth?”³⁴⁵ Still, the term, “bronze” would remain problematic and not easily understood in the context. Even so, the association would relate to the parallel clause and other contexts in Ezekiel 16 that indicate the exposure of the woman.

³⁴⁰ KB notes the development from Akkadian and its denotation of menstruation, presumably red or bronze in color rather than the blood from sacrifices, I:691.

³⁴¹ Two letters only if one considers the anachronistic, diacritical difference between ψ and \wp . See footnote 105 above; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 329–30.

³⁴² KB, I: 691, which traces the possible connotation from medieval Hebrew and Akkadian.

³⁴³ Abraham Geiger, *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der inneren Entwicklung des Judentums* [Breslau: Hainauer, 1857], 65, quoted in Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 498; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 329.

³⁴⁴ Driver, “Linguistic Problems,” 65.

³⁴⁵ Jerome, in the Vulgate, translated the term with “*effusum*” meaning “wealth.”

The fourth possible association has to do more with the noun translated above as “bronze” than it does with the verb. If “bronze” is a synecdoche in which the literal metallic material connotes wealth, this clause could relate to the harlotry described in the relationships in Ezek 16:26–29 and 16:31–34 as mentioned above. In this scenario, Jerusalem “poured out wealth” to foreign powers for protection and strength rather than trust in her husband, Yahweh.³⁴⁶

In summary, the third association above, which concerns the transposition of verbs, creates an additional problem rather than solves the actual dilemma. The problem is not so much with the verb, “pour out” as it is with the connotation of “bronze,” which again is only extant in this form. For this and other reasons, one can put aside the third possible association.³⁴⁷ This conclusion leaves a consideration of the other options as a possibility. Although the linguistic evidence connecting “bronze” wealth to the harlotry in Ezekiel 16 is not explicit, it seems a plausible factor in interpretation. Indeed, a relationship between the pouring out of the blood in child sacrifice, and the giving of bronze wealth to alliances are all subsumed under the practice of general harlotry in the chapter. While the translation, “Your bronze was poured out” most likely relates to the practice of child sacrifice for which reason, Yahweh will judge Jerusalem, this occasion of harlotry is subsumed into the general denunciation of harlotry within the chapter, which includes the harlot-like alliances other than looking to Yahweh for protection. Therefore, a double entendre is indeed plausible.

³⁴⁶ See Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 498, note 206, for the many occasions when Israel paid tribute to Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon. This understanding appears to reflect the intent perceived in the Vulgate.

³⁴⁷ See footnote 105.

The next clause in 16:36a β asserts that Jerusalem's "nakedness was revealed." The noun, "nakedness" appeared in 16:8 in which Yahweh covered the maiden's "nakedness." Additionally, the collocation, "naked and bare," two terms, which relate to the verbal root of "nakedness," occurred in 16:7 and 22. In 16:7, the collocation depicted the maiden's burgeoning pubescence. In 16:22, the woman had forgotten that time in which she was "naked and bare, kicking about in the blood" of her birth. Here, in this motivation for Yahweh's judgment, Jerusalem is accused, "And your nakedness was revealed in your harlotry upon your lovers."³⁴⁸ The same verb, "to reveal," the subject, "nakedness," and the object, "lovers," whose nominal form appears in 16:37a α and corresponding pronominal form appears consistently until 16:41, occur in the ensuing 16:37 as part of the punishment, which Yahweh will carry out. There in 16:37b β , Yahweh himself will "reveal your nakedness to your lovers." Finally, in 16:39, the woman returns to her pitiable state, in which she was found in 16:7, when her lovers left her, "naked and bare." Thus, the woman comes full circle and because of her harlotry arrives at the same state of her ignoble beginnings.

Two other terms in 16:36a β likewise evoke language from 16:15–34. The term, "harlotry," whose nominal form only appears here in 16:35–43 and whose root is used only one more time in the subunit, reverberates with the denouncement of the previous section. Moreover, the term, "lovers" first appeared in the section concerning the normal practice of harlotry in 16:31–34. There, the section asserted in various ways that

³⁴⁸ I retain in translation here the more wooden "upon your lovers" in order to expose the connection between this prepositional phrase and the following one, "upon the idols of your abominations," and the corresponding punishment in 16:37, "upon you." In Chapter 1, I translate in smoother English and in accordance with the following prepositional phrase, "with all the idols of your abominations."

normally, a harlot receives wages. Jerusalem, on the other hand, had to “give your gifts to all your lovers.” Here then in 16:36a β , because Jerusalem had revealed herself and enacted her harlotry “upon your [her] lovers,” she will soon face a punishment that corresponds to her own actions, when in 16:37, Yahweh will gather her lovers “upon” her and reveal her nakedness.

Two additional phrases in 16:36b contain language from the various sections in 16:15–34. While the term, “idol” makes its first and only appearance in the chapter, it occurs in construct with “abominations,” a term, which appeared in the opening of 16:2 and which will make six more appearances in the chapter.³⁴⁹ Moreover, the final phrase, “And in accordance with the blood of your sons which you gave before them,” incorporates the theme of child sacrifice from Ezek 16:20–21. This allusion is rather obvious in view of two observations: First, 16:20 refers to “sons” as an accusative pronoun of the verb, “to sacrifice” and 16:21 uses “sons” as an accusative object of the verb, “to slaughter.” Although no explicit reference to “blood” took place in those verses, its otherwise rare use in the absolute form in the chapter indicates the association. And second, the relative clause, “which you gave to them” modifies the phrase, “in accordance with the blood of your sons” at the end of 16:36. This relative clause contains the same prepositional phrase, “to them” as well as utilizing the same verb, “to give,” common though it is, as did 16:20–21. Thus, the initial motivation for punishment contains language that is congruent with the description of Jerusalem’s

³⁴⁹ The particular term, “idols” (גלול) occurs forty-eight times in the HB, thirty-nine of which appear in Ezekiel. The term, “abominations,” which appears 43 times in the MT book of Ezekiel and eight times in Ezekiel 16—not including the occurrence in 16:22 deleted on the basis of its absence in non-hexapleric manuscripts, occurs five times in Ezek 16:44–58.

various acts of harlotry in 16:15–34. It is on this basis that Yahweh will announce his punishment in 16:37–43.

Ezekiel 16:37 commences the announcement of judgment in characteristic Ezekielian style, “Therefore, behold I am gathering all your lovers.”³⁵⁰ This conjunctive adverb complements the motivation clause in 16:36a subsequent to the message formula. Moreover, “behold” corresponds to an earlier occurrence of the particle in 16:27 and the rehearsal of Yahweh’s punishment meted against Jerusalem there even though it was not in a section with other pronounced punishments. Now, Yahweh will act again. The first, singular pronoun, which is suffixed to the emphatic particle, indicates that Yahweh is the one, who is performing the action of the masculine, singular, participle from the verb, “to gather.” The only other occurrence of the root in Ezekiel 16 takes place in 16:37b, just three relative clauses removed.

Additionally, Yahweh is gathering all Jerusalem’s “lovers,” which is the third and final form of the participle from אָרַב, the other two occurring in 16:33 and 36. The association between Yahweh’s punishment and Jerusalem’s harlotrous actions are clear. In 16:33, the woman gave her lovers gifts and bribed them to come into her all around. As a result, Yahweh would gather her lovers. The second, feminine, singular pronoun suffixed to “lovers” reinforces the constant reference to Jerusalem. Moreover, it is your “lovers,” only referred to specifically in 16:33 and 36 but strongly implied—by means of words, which link backward and forward in the transitional 16:30—are also those

³⁵⁰ Clauses and passages with various combinations of “therefore,” and “on account of” occur in the following chapters and verses: Ezek 5:7–11; 12:11–12; 13:8–23; 15:6–8; 16:35–37; 20:24–27; 21:9, 29; 22:19, 23:35; 24:9–13; 25:3–16; 26:2–3; 28:2–7; 29:6–10; 31:10; 34:7–9, 20–21; 35:5–11; 36:2–7, 13–14.

relationships with Egypt, Assyria, and the Chaldeans.³⁵¹ Moreover, Ezek 16:31 combines the motif of her backwards harlotry to her lovers with the motif of the production of “mounds” and “high places,” another section which mentions Jerusalem’s harlotrous love affairs with her paramours by means of the clause, “And you spread your feet to everyone who passed by” in 16:25aβ.

Returning to 16:37, one finds that the first of three relative clauses in 16:37aβ, “Which you were pleasing to them” appears to pun the verbal form in the clause just discussed in 16:25aβ, “Everyone who passed by.” In that clause, a 3ms participle from עבר indicates the recipient of harlot Jerusalem’s sordid actions. Here in 16:37aβ, Yahweh will gather those lovers, to whom harlot Jerusalem “was pleasing,” (ערב).³⁵² It therefore appears that Yahweh is gathering against Jerusalem those lovers to whom she spread her feet. In other words, the term “lovers” in 16:37aα coalesces within a larger matrix of material found in the previous subunit and to which the expression “lovers” corresponds through language and coherence. The remaining relative clauses in Ezekiel 16:37aβ also advance materials that correspond with other explicit paramours.³⁵³ The relative clauses follow the accusative particle and thus relate to 16:37a as a compound accusative phrase with her “lovers.” Here, Yahweh will gather, “Everyone whom you loved and all whom you hated.” The second, feminine, singular, *qatal* “you loved” is from the same verbal root as the participle, “lovers” in 16:33, 36, and 37a. The second

³⁵¹ For the linkages, see above in the sections concerning 16:26–30 and 16:31–34.

³⁵² Under the third entry for this lemma, KB glosses “1. to be pleasant... 2. To be pleasing: a) a woman pleases her lover Ezk 16:37,” 877. LXX’s *επεμειγης* provides witness for Hebrew ערב.

³⁵³ Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 501, footnote 229, who references Wilfred Watson, “The Hebrew Word-pair *'sp//qbš*” *ZAW* 96 (1984), 433.

relative clause contains the second, feminine, singular, *qatal* form “you hated.” The verbal root occurs six times in the book of Ezekiel and only twice in Ezekiel 16, here and in 16:27b, which refers to the Philistine women hating Jerusalem.³⁵⁴ Thus it appears that Yahweh is gathering all of Jerusalem’s acquaintances whether those with whom she played the harlot or those with whom she had enmity.

The initial clause of 16:37b reveals a similar pattern of shared language and correlation. The clause begins in accordance with 16:37a with Yahweh stating, “And I will gather them against you all around.” The first, singular, *weqatal* form repeats the verbal stem of the masculine, singular participle, “to gather” in 16:37a. Furthermore, suffixed to the accusative marker is the third, masculine, plural pronoun, “them,” whose antecedent, “lovers,” the three previous relative clauses attempted to clarify. Moreover, the second, feminine, singular pronoun suffixed to the preposition, “against you” reports the disturbing reality that Yahweh will use these agents as the instruments of his punishment against Jerusalem, his metaphorical bride. Finally, the adverb, “all around” reverses the notion found in 16:33bβ. There, it stated that Jerusalem bribed all her lovers to come to her “all around.” Now, however, Yahweh will gather against her those same lovers “all around.” Yahweh’s judgment has a reciprocal feature to it, a feature that becomes all the more explicit as the subunit progresses.

The next clause in 16:37bβ repeats a collocation contained in 16:36a. Ezekiel 16:37bβ states, “And I will reveal your nakedness to them.” In Ezek 16:36a, Yahweh expressed a motivation for his upcoming punishment. Jerusalem’s “nakedness was revealed” in her harlotries. In a stark reversal, however, Yahweh will now expose her

³⁵⁴ See the same verbal form in a similar context in Ezek 23:28.

nakedness. Additionally, the third, masculine, plural pronoun, “to them” indicates he will expose her to the very lovers with whom Jerusalem had played the harlot. The final clause of the verse utilizes the third, masculine, plural, *weqatal* form of the verb, “to see.” For the first time in the pronouncement of Yahweh’s punishment, the agents of his punishment are the subjects of an action, “And they will see all your nakedness.” The addition of the form, “all” suggests a heightened extreme to Jerusalem’s nakedness. Her nakedness was revealed in 16:36a, Yahweh himself would reveal it in 16:37bβ, and now, her former lovers, who are now gathered against her, will see her completely exposed.³⁵⁵

Ezekiel 16:38 further develops the punishment in reciprocal manner to Jerusalem’s harlotry and bloodshed. The verse returns to the first, singular, *weqatal* form in which Yahweh carries out the action. Ezekiel 16:38a says, “And I will judge you according to the sentence of an adulteress.”³⁵⁶ The main verb, “to judge” appears only here in the chapter while nominal forms of the root appear here and in 16:41.³⁵⁷ The second, feminine, singular pronoun is suffixed to the verb as the one who receives Yahweh’s judgment. The translation, “the sentence of an adulteress” represents the noun, “judgment” formed from the same root (פִּטְשָׁם) and the feminine, participle of the verb, “to commit adultery” (מִנְאֵפֶת or מִנְאֵפָה).³⁵⁸ The verb, “to commit adultery” occurred

³⁵⁵ Block develops this punishment along the lines of Hosea 2:4–5 and the concept of divorce, Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 501–502; also, Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 346. See also P. A. Kruger, “Israel the Harlot,” *JNSL 11* (1983), 107–116, who relates the passage in Hosea to Ezek 16:37–40. Cf. Hans Walter Wolff, *Hosea*, trans. Gary Stansell (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974).

³⁵⁶ See the explanation for the choice of the singular “sentence” and “adulteress” in the footnotes to the translation of 16:38 in Chapter 1.

³⁵⁷ See also the close correspondence to Ezek 23:45; otherwise, the root also occurs in Ezek 23:10, 24, and 36.

³⁵⁸ For the forms, see KB, 658. In the MT, another feminine participle is conjoined to this one, which is plural in both cases. It indicates that the judgments will correspond to “those women who pour out blood.” Rather than a single judgment, it appears that the clause expresses two types of judgments—

in the description of the backwards harlot in 16:31–34. The harlot was like an adulterous wife who took strangers as lovers instead of her husband. Now, Jerusalem will face the consequences for her adulterous actions perpetrated against Yahweh as various components of his punishment unfold.³⁵⁹

Ezekiel 16:38b parallels 16:38a. It reads, “And I will give to you a bloodletting of wrath and vengeance.” The second, feminine, singular pronominal suffix corresponds to the suffixed pronoun on the verb, “to judge” in 16:38a and reflects the dative object of the verb “to give.”³⁶⁰ The verb itself parallels the verb in 16:38a, while the accusative noun, “blood” receives the action of the verb and indicates what Yahweh will “give” to Jerusalem.³⁶¹ The chapter has incorporated the term, “blood” mostly as it relates to infant- or maiden-Jerusalem in 16:6, 9, and 22. However, in 16:36b, it was “according to the blood of your sons which you gave before them,” that Yahweh would now punish Jerusalem. Therefore, it is quite fitting that he is now “giving the blood of wrath and

also in view from the plural noun, “judgments,” which Jerusalem was to bear for both types of offenses. Although Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 502, footnote 232, lists punishments for adultery and murder found in legal code, the punishment for murder is for just that, murder. In contrast, the action of “pouring out blood” is conceived more generally, accidentally, or from various emotions, and therefore, worthy of different punishment. With the exception of Gen 9:6 and Numbers 35:33, which is a summary based on different types of intentional and unintentional killing in a chapter explaining cities of refuge, there is little linguistic connection between punishments for “murder” and a punishment for “pouring out blood.” Therefore, one cannot presume that the ensuing punishments in 16:39–41 correspond to two different procedures for punishments. It is interesting to note that the various procedures of punishment that the section pronounces have to do with punishment in the HB typically enacted upon an adulterous or sexually promiscuous person and not a murderer or one who poured out blood.

³⁵⁹ This verbal root also plays a role in Ezek 23:37 and 45.

³⁶⁰ On the dative aspect of pronominal suffixes conjoined directly to the verb, see P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 411–412.

³⁶¹ One can find other occurrences of the verb, “to give” (נתן) taking “blood” as an accusative in Deut 21:8, 1 Kings 2:5, Jer 26:15, Ezek 24:8, Jonah 1:14.

vengeance” to Jerusalem. The term, “blood” appears for the final time in the chapter here but not before it introduces two nouns with which it is in construct.

The collocation, “wrath and vengeance” (וּקְנָאָה חֶמֶה) have not appeared in the chapter but appeared previously in Ezek 5:13. Moreover, the collocation will appear in Ezek 16:42 before also appearing in Ezek 23:25, 36:6, and 38:18–19. The individual term, “wrath” plays a more prominent role in the book of Ezekiel making over thirty appearances. Since only the collocation occurs in the chapter and only here in this section of Ezek 16:35–43, it is quite apparent that it has to do with Yahweh’s punishment against Jerusalem. It is clear from its usage in Ezek 16:42, that it is Yahweh’s wrath and vengeance that he himself will calm upon the execution of his punishment. The statement here in 16:38b that Yahweh will give to Jerusalem the blood of wrath and vengeance relates primarily to two factors. First, in the parallelism of 16:38, it corresponds to Yahweh’s judgment of adultery. Parallel to how Yahweh will judge Jerusalem for her metaphorical adultery, he will also give Jerusalem a bloodletting. Second, it relates to the term, “blood,” which we have already noted accords with the shedding of blood in 16:20–21, 16:36a, 16:36b, and now here. In reciprocal fashion, Yahweh’s wrath and vengeance will yield a bloodletting through the coming punishment.

Yahweh’s first person action continues in 16:39aα although the verse quickly transitions grammatically to another actant in the second clause. The verse begins, “And I will give you in their hand.” The previous clause, 16:38b, began with the same Qal, *weqatal*, first, common, singular form from the common Hebrew verb, “to give.” The difference here is that the second, feminine, singular pronoun is not suffixed to the verb

as it was in 16:38b but is instead suffixed to the sign of the accusative. Thus, even more explicitly Jerusalem is receiving the action of Yahweh's "giving" and he is giving her into "their hand." This idiom refers to the yielding of an object into the power of another. In this case, the third, masculine, plural pronoun refers to the "lovers" from 16:33, and 36–37. Ezekiel 16:37 explained the identity of these lovers and that Yahweh was gathering them against Jerusalem. In upcoming clauses in 16:39aβff., the end of 16:37 indicated that the lovers would execute merely one action: they would "see all the nakedness" of the woman, which Yahweh himself would "reveal to them." Beginning with the next clause in 16:39α2, the account embarks on a chain of ten *weqatal* clauses in which a group will act against Jerusalem.

Each of the remaining clauses of 16:39 that describe the actions of the lovers contain at least one lemma that occurred in the arraignment of Jerusalem in Ezek 16:15–34. Ezekiel 16:39α2 commences the series of third, masculine, plural *weqatal* verbs, "And they will tear down your mound." Although the verb, "to tear down" occurs only here in the chapter, it indicates a demolition of Jerusalem's idolatrous, harlotrous practices at the "mound," one of the very places at which Jerusalem had multiplied her harlotrous practices in 16:24–25, and 31. Even more ironic in this and each of the ensuing descriptions of the actions of her paramours is the reversal of the harlotrous actions by the very lovers with whom she had then committed her brazen deeds. This turnabout indicates the foolishness of Jerusalem when she indiscriminately gave herself to those who were not truly lovers and indeed, showed no loyalty. Moreover, it indicates Yahweh's reciprocal judgment in correspondence to her misdeeds.

Next, these lovers will “pull down your high places.” This clause, likewise, contains another obvious echo of 16:24–25 and 31. Similar to the parallel verb in the previous clause, this verb, “to pull down” appears only here in the chapter. As an indication of the sense of judgment that these two verbs connote, the collocation, “to tear down” and “to pull down” (הרס, גתץ) occur together in Ezek 26:12 when Yahweh describes how he will bring Babylon to raze Tyre. In this case, Jerusalem’s harlotrous, cultic locations will experience a similar fate at the hands of her lovers.

A third clause depicting the actions of the lovers emerges in Ezek 16:39aβ. The lovers would “strip you of your garments.” While the Hiphil *weqatal*, “to strip” occurs for the first time in the book, the accusative object “your garments” incorporates the same lexeme that relates to the material that Yahweh gave the woman and that she took in order to make and decorate her high places and images in Ezek 16:16 and 18.³⁶² Additionally, the second, feminine, singular pronoun on each of the objects mentioned thus far, “your mound, your high place, your garments,” and the ensuing object, “vessels of your glory” indicate the relationship between these items and her idolatrous productions in Ezek 16:16–18a.

The next clause in 16:39aβ likewise relates to material through which the woman played the harlot in 16:17. There the woman, “took the vessels of glory,” which Yahweh had given to her in 16:12–13, and she made masculine images” for herself. Ezekiel 16:39 states, “And they will take the vessels of your glory.” The language shared between the two clauses relates not only to the common verb “to take,” but also

³⁶² The verb, to strip, occurs also in Ezek 26:19 subsequent to the verbs in the previous clauses, tear down and pull down.

significantly to the collocation “vessels of your glory.” The reciprocal nature of the passage is clear: The material that Yahweh provided for the women, which she then squandered in harlotrous idolatry, Yahweh will now take away by means of the women’s false lovers.

The final clause of 16:39 comes to an anti-climactic conclusion in view of what follows it. It reads, “And they will leave you naked and bare.” The lovers had already seen the nakedness of the woman, which she herself exposed according to 16:36 and Yahweh himself had exposed in 16:37. Additional points, however, also emerge from this clause. Significantly, the use of Hiphil form of the verb expresses the result of what has already transpired with the woman.³⁶³ Namely, they stripped off her garments and took her vessels of glory. Thus, she would be naked from those actions. On the one hand, the verb merely states the obvious. On the other hand, the clause makes clear that the lovers leave her in this state without providing anything to cover her “nakedness and bareness.” The contrast between these false lovers and Yahweh becomes clear. In the precise state that Yahweh saw her and provided for her, the lovers do nothing. In contrast, Yahweh provided the rich accouterments that, of course, she subsequently squandered on these same lovers. And now they take her riches and leave her in the same vulnerable and pitiable state prior to her covenant with Yahweh in 16:7.

In each of the previous four clauses, the second, feminine, singular pronoun referred to the woman’s possession of her particular accessory. The lovers were dismantling her possessions. In 16:39b, however, the construction references the woman

³⁶³ See Hans Joachim Stoebe, “Gut und Böse in der jahwistischen Quelle des Pentateuch,” *ZAW* 65 (1953),” 191, quoted in Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 330.

by means of the accusative pronoun and relates not to her possessions but her own being. It is also interesting to note that this final clause of 16:39 also does not relate to the destruction and dismantling of the mound and high places that appeared in 16:39α. These cultic productions were associated with her clothing because she utilized her garments to fabricate them. However, they presumably have little to do with her nakedness. Thus, the woman has almost come full circle. Although she is left in her naked state without the benevolent provision with which Yahweh outfitted her, she has not returned to the desolate and baseness of her birth. And yet, more destruction follows.

2.2.4.3 Her Lovers' Execute the Sentence Ezekiel 16:40–41a

The actions of the lovers in 16:39 leave the woman without the accessories that Yahweh provided and in a state inversely related to her former situation. Even so, Ezek 16:40–41 carries the situation forward to a predicament that the earlier story does not mirror. The five clauses of the subsection similarly utilize the third common plural *weqatal* that began in the previous subsection in 16:39α2. Thus, the section begins another series of actions, stating, “And they will bring an assembly against you.” The Hiphil plural verb indicates that the lovers will incite a riot against Jerusalem. In a manner quite distinct from terminology in Ezek 16:39, neither the verb, “to go up” nor the accusative, “assembly” have appeared in the chapter.³⁶⁴ As stated above, however, the third plural subject of the verb, as well as the second, feminine, singular pronoun which occurs throughout in reference to Jerusalem, cohere with actions of the lovers in 16:37bβ and 39. The next clause, 16:40aβ, says, “And they will stone you.” In the same

³⁶⁴ See 23:46b–47, which contains some of the precise clauses of Ezek 16:40–41.

manner as the previous clause, the accusative noun and the verb appear for the first time in the chapter. The verb, “to stone” is only used in the book of Ezekiel here and in Ezek 23:47. The final clause of Ezek 16:40 likewise contains material unique in the chapter and, actually, unique in the HB. The clause reads, “And they will cut you in pieces with their swords.” The third, masculine, plural verb, “to cut off” is a hapax and is suffixed with the customary second, feminine, singular pronoun. The clause concludes with a prepositional phrase containing the first appearance of “sword” and a third, masculine, plural pronoun referring to the marauding lovers.³⁶⁵

Ezekiel 16:41a contains the final two clauses that utilize third, masculine, plural verbs. These plural verbs, which have occurred since Yahweh gave Jerusalem into the hand of her lovers in 16:39a, indicate the action of the lovers that Yahweh has gathered against her. The verse begins, “And they will burn your houses with fire.” The second, feminine, singular pronoun affixed to “houses” demonstrates again the consistent reference to the woman-Jerusalem. However, dissimilar from the materials in Ezek 16:39 in which the woman’s seized possessions related to the gifts of Yahweh in Ezek 16:10–12 that she subsequently perverted in 16:16–18a, the plural accusative, “houses” appears for the first time in the chapter. Likewise, the verb, “to burn” and the prepositional phrase, “with fire” also emerge for the first time in the chapter. Thus, it is interesting that Yahweh neither gave them materials for the “house,” nor did she pervert a “house” in order to play the harlot.³⁶⁶

³⁶⁵ See the comparable but not exact clause in Ezek 23:47.

³⁶⁶ This observation could be used as evidence that the textual variant witnessed by a few manuscripts of Kennicot and an expansion in the Syriac, namely, “They will burn you with fire,” is the original wording. However, see footnotes to translation of 16:41 in Chapter 1.

The final clause in the series of plural verbs, however, repeats language from earlier in the chapter. The repeated language does not relate to the woman's accouterments like 16:39 but instead echoes the language of judgment contained in 16:38a. There, Yahweh indicated, "And I will judge you according to a sentence..." The verb of that clause, *פָּטַל*, indicated the basic notion of judgment that Yahweh would achieve. The accusative noun, *מִשְׁפָּט*, stemmed from the same verbal root and denoted the ordinance concerning harlotry by which standard Yahweh would hold Jerusalem accountable. Here, however, Ezek 16:41a β reads, "And they will execute judgments against you before the eyes of many wives." Two factors are noteworthy here: First, the noun, "judgments" (*פָּטַל*) stems from the same verbal root but is distinct from the common Hebrew noun appearing in 16:38a, "judgment, ordinance," which is translated above as "sentence." Consequently, in 16:38a, Yahweh announced that he would hold the woman accountable to a standard; here, in 16:41, the "lovers" will execute acts of "judgment" upon her. Second, the clausal construction of the common Hebrew verb, *עָשָׂה*, plus *bet* preposition, plus accusative noun, *פָּטַל*, "to execute judgments against..." occurs for the first time in the chapter but is a common clausal construction in the book of Ezekiel.³⁶⁷ Finally, the prepositional phrase, "before the eyes of many wives" repeats the lexeme, "wife," that appeared three times in Ezek 16:30b β –34 and compared harlot-Jerusalem to an adulterous wife. Significantly, this lexeme, "wife" is the first of three

³⁶⁷ The construction occurs in Ezek 5:10, 15, 11:9, 16:41, 25:11, 28:22, 26, 30:14, and 19. The construction only occurs three times outside Ezekiel in Exod 12:12, Num 33:4, and 2 Chron 24:24, which occurs with *אֵל* rather than *bet* preposition.

terms occurring in 16:41 but otherwise only occurring in the chapter in distinct material in Ezek 16:30b β –34.³⁶⁸

2.2.4.4 Yahweh’s Judgment Will Rest Ezekiel 16:41b–43

Ezekiel 16:41b–43 departs from the actions of Jerusalem’s “lovers” and returns to Yahweh’s requital of Jerusalem whereby she will conclude her harlotrous ways. In Ezek 16:41b, there appears for the first time in the chapter, a first, common, singular, Hiphil, *weqatal* verb, “to cease, rest” indicating Yahweh’s intent to put an end to Jerusalem’s harlotry. The clause reads, “And I will make you stop from playing a harlot.” The precise lexeme, “harlot” appeared twice in the brief section concerning Jerusalem’s backward practice of harlotry in 16:31–34, and once on each of the transitional borders to this section in 16:30b and 16:35. The verbal root itself, “to play the harlot,” which occurred frequently from 16:15–36, makes its final appearance here in the chapter.

With even greater conspicuousness, the Hebrew noun, which indicates the wages of a harlot, אַתְּנָן, occurs in the next clause and most assuredly signals a connection to the portrayal of Jerusalem’s backward harlotry and adultery in 16:31–34. Ezekiel 16:41b β says, “And also, you will not give payment again.” Ezekiel 16:34b reported that the woman gave a payment even though she was the harlot. When her “lovers” have finished their acts of judgment, however, she will cease from her harlotry and no longer give payments. Thus, Ezek 16:41 concluded the acts of judgment, which the lovers

³⁶⁸ The common term, “harlot,” which appears in 16:41b, also appears three times in 16:30b β –33 and also in the transition from this section to the next in 16:35, “Therefore, O Harlot...”

perpetrated, and expressed Yahweh's intent to end Jerusalem's backward acts of harlotry.

The following verse contains four clauses that express the conclusion of Yahweh's judgment. Ezekiel 16:42a begins with a first, common, singular, Hiphil verb, "to rest," which also occurred in 16:39b. There, the lovers would leave the woman "naked and bare." Here, in view of the previous acts of judgment enacted upon the woman, Yahweh's wrath against Jerusalem would rest. The Hiphil, first person verb expresses Yahweh's intent, "And I will cause my wrath against you to rest."³⁶⁹ The *bet* preposition plus second, feminine, singular pronoun indicates that his punishment enacted against Jerusalem would indeed cease at this point. Moreover, the term, "wrath" appeared also in 16:38b within the compound, "wrath and vengeance." Yahweh threatened to give Jerusalem "a bloodletting of wrath and vengeance." Now that this bloodletting would have presumably happened, Yahweh's anger will subside.

Indeed, the second term in the compound, "wrath and vengeance" occurs in the next clause.³⁷⁰ Ezekiel 16:42a β reads, "And my vengeance will turn aside from you." The term, "vengeance" functions as the third, feminine, singular subject of the verb, "turn aside." While the verb appears only here and in an unrelated context in 16:50b, the second, feminine, singular pronoun remains constant and indicates again that Yahweh's retribution against Jerusalem would come to an end. Specifically, the "wrath and vengeance" that Yahweh would give upon Jerusalem in 16:38b would subside once Yahweh had put an end to her harlotry and she no longer (backwardly) gave a harlot's

³⁶⁹ The same collocation occurs in Ezek 5:13, 21:22, 24:31, and similarly 22:20.

³⁷⁰ Ezek 5:13, 16:38, 42, 23:35, 36:6, and similarly 38:18–19.

wage. The chapter's conception of retribution incorporates a cessation of that retribution when Yahweh's judgment has accomplished its purpose.

Ezekiel 16:42b continues in this trajectory, "And I will be calm." The brief, one word clause in Hebrew contains another verb appearing for the first time in chapter. (שקט) Moreover, another first, common, singular, *weqatal* verb expresses the connotation of the verb from Yahweh's perspective. The difference in both clauses of 16:42b, however, consists in the absence of a second, feminine, singular pronoun. The occurrence of such a pronoun has been the constant in almost the every clause of the chapter with the exception of the structural formulas and framework. Not only in 16:42ba but also in the final clause of 16:42b, no second, feminine, singular pronoun appears. Instead, another first person verb indicating Yahweh's perspective takes place, "And I will no longer be enraged." The Hiphil stem of the verb, "to provoke to jealousy" (כעס) occurred in 16:26b in the section concerning Jerusalem's harlotrous ways with her foreign partners. Yahweh accused Jerusalem not only of multiplying harlotries but doing that in order to provoke him to jealousy. The absence of the second, feminine, singular pronoun suggests that the focus upon Jerusalem's role in vexing Yahweh has subsided. The Qal form of the verb—and, of course the negation, also suggests a particular nuance in which Jerusalem is not the provoking agent. Thus, the section expresses the appeasement of Yahweh's wrath against the harlot both in explicit statement of such sentiment and also in the absence of her mention in these final two clauses in 16:42b.

In an unexpected and unusual development, Ezek 16:43 begins what appears to be another motivation for Yahweh's judgment. The appearance of another motivation clause is peculiar for several reasons. First, typical Ezekielian practice utilizes

motivation clauses with conjunctive adverb, לכן, in relative close proximity to one another.³⁷¹ Second, the section concludes with this verse and, therefore, appears quite brief in its motivation and punishment. Third, the preceding verses asserted that Yahweh's wrath would rest and there would no longer be a need for punishment. And finally, from this third observation a fourth follows that the motivation clause, which commences Ezek 16:43 asyndetically and without any Ezekielian formulas, appears to continue from the previous verse in 16:42b in its assertion that Yahweh will no longer be enraged. If understood as a logical continuation from 16:42b, Yahweh would no longer be enraged because of Jerusalem's actions. According to the preceding verses, however, Jerusalem's actions do not engender Yahweh's appeasement, rather the execution of punishment does. While it is possible that the verse states why Yahweh was angry previously (that she forgot the days of her youth) and that he would no longer be angry for that particular reason, the diacritical marks and versification argue against that possibility. Moreover, the correlative clause in 16:43b α would likewise be unnecessary because the purpose of 16:43a would merely be to point out why he was angry in the first place. Consequently, 16:43 cannot be understood as a direct, logical continuation of 16:42, which indicates a cessation of Yahweh's wrath, but—from a synchronic perspective—restates the general aim of the section, the announcement of judgment. Jerusalem's actions are negative in signification; she forgot Yahweh's care and provision, acted promiscuously, and thus suffered the consequences.

³⁷¹ The conjunction, “therefore” last occurred in 16:37 and does not appear again in the chapter. The normal pairing of יען to לכן includes the less frequently occurring, “because of which” (רשע יען) that occurs in 16:43 and in motivation contexts in Ezek 26:2–3 and 31:10. The phrase (רשע יען) does occur outside the context of a motivation clause in Ezek 12:12. Ezekiel 21:9 contains the pair, יען and לכן but Yahweh's own action motivates his response. The adverb, גם, does occur here and one could assume that it is taking the place of the typical לכן.

In view of these considerations, the clause likely expresses another cause for Yahweh's punishment, albeit from a distinct orientation. First, Ezek 16:43 begins with the preposition "because" (אשר יען) and follows with a presumably ancient, conjugated form of the verb, "to remember."³⁷² Specifically, the woman did "not remember the days of [her] youth."³⁷³ In the logical flow of the chapter, this phrase, "days of your youth" can only indicate a time in relationship to Ezek 16:22, which utilizes the same phrase, and subsequently a period alluded to previously in the chapter. In connection, Ezek 16:22 must refer to those days when the maiden was "naked and bare" because of the phrase, "when you were naked and bare," which clarifies the "days of your youth" in 16:22 and likewise occurs in 16:7. Therefore, 16:43a repeats a factor motivating punishment in 16:22, namely, Jerusalem did not remember the days of her youth when she was destitute and Yahweh took her for his own bride.

Second, the next clause presents difficulty due to the denotation of the verb in its pointed stem. The stative verb, רגז, in its Qal stem denotes, "to tremble, be caught in

³⁷² See the Ketiv/Qere and Block's comment (Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 480) about an archaic form as well as his reference to R. Gordis, *The Biblical Text in the Making* (repr. New York: Ktav, 1971), 101–102. Ezekiel 16:22, which also contains the verb, "to remember" and the phrase, "days of your youth," likewise contains the *Ketiv/Qere* concerning grammatical person of the verb. The consonantal text supports a first person reading while the *Qere* supports a reading of second, feminine, singular, obviously referring to Jerusalem. In contrast, the *Ketiv* would read, "And I did not remember the days of your youth," thus referring to Yahweh. It is possible in the case of this scenario, that the phrase, "days of your youth" could indicate a meaning similar to that of Ezek 23:19 rather than the meaning found in 16:22 in which the woman did not "remember the days of your youth" when she was naked and bare. Ezekiel 23:19 imparts an understanding of those "days" as when she was playing the harlot in the land of Egypt. In this case, Ezek 16:43aa would cohere with 16:42 in saying that Yahweh would no longer be angry because he would no longer recall the days of her harlotry in Egypt. Thus, this reading would not convey a motivation of judgment but would instead cohere with 16:42 and state why he would no longer be angry. However, in Ezekiel 16, such a reading would be nonsensical given the fact that there is no information regarding this period in the chapter. Therefore, the sense of this phrase, "days of your youth" cannot express a time of harlotry in Egypt in Ezekiel 16.

³⁷³ The phrase occurs five times in the HB: Ezek 16:22, 43, 60; 23:19; and Hos 2:17 [EVV 2:15].

restless motion.”³⁷⁴ That denotation is usually rejected here in view of the ancient versions.³⁷⁵ Because of these versions, the pointing of the text is emended to a Hiphil, which would read “and you enraged me in all these things.” The clause does contain several elements that guide an understanding of the verb. First, the verb in the clause is unmistakably a second, feminine, singular *wayyiqtol* form of the verb. Therefore, it must refer to a state of Jerusalem from a narrational perspective in relationship to 16:43aα. Second, the *lamed* preposition plus first, common, singular pronoun conveys the relationship of the verb to Yahweh. In other words, Jerusalem did something in relationship to Yahweh. Moreover, the demonstrative phrase, “in all these things” indicates a plural number of incidents, which Jerusalem did before Yahweh. In Ezekiel 16, Jerusalem has, of course, committed acts of harlotry in their relationship to Yahweh. Finally, the correlative in 16:43bα expresses that Yahweh would act accordingly and bring her deeds on her head. Quite naturally, commentators have attempted to understand the verb within that context.

Therefore, if it were not for the Qal reading, the simplest solution would be to read the verb as a Hiphil and thus understand it to indicate that Jerusalem’s harlotrous

³⁷⁴ KB, 1182–83, but see their hesitancy as it concerns Ezek 16:43 at entry 5.

³⁷⁵ See note on v. 43 in Chapter 1. Cf. Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 499, 503–04; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 331; Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 231, who follows F. Hitzig, *Der Prophet Ezechiel* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1847), 111, and the versions; contra Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 288, who retains the Qal and instead proposes that the force of the negation from the previous clause retains its force. Hitzig’s argument from Jer 50:34 does not necessarily follow because it does not concern anger or rage. However, his note regarding Job 12:6 may apply but the construction involves a construct relationship instead of the *lamed* preposition. Moreover, see the treatment in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, eds. G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, Vol 13 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 306, which with regard to the Hebrew root concludes, “There is no trace of semantic development in the direction of the more restricted meaning, “anger.” It is worth noting, however, that in the context of *rgz* the lexical fields “disturbance” and “anger” are mutually exclusive.” See also G.A. Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel* (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1951), 174–76 who has extended notation over the matter. It is clear that the versions are compelled to make sense of the perplexing denotation.

behavior “caused Yahweh to tremble,” that is, “to tremble with rage,” an understanding that coheres well with the notion in 16:42b that Yahweh would no longer be enraged. But, the *lectio difficilior* is obviously the Qal stem of רגז. Moreover, it seems clear that the versions had the same consonantal text before them and were attempting to make sense of it. In light of these text critical observations, one should retain the Qal stem and understand the verb in accordance with the insatiable manner expressed in vv. 28–29. Jerusalem was not satisfied and repeatedly acted in erratic behavior in an attempt to assuage her discontent. The clause would accord with these observations when understood as, “And you were restless before me in all these things.”

There is an additional factor in discerning the clause’s connotation. First, the clause contains the only *wayyiqtol* since Ezek 16:37. The use of the *wayyiqtol* conveys a narrative foregrounding of the clause that expresses the relationship of the *wayyiqtol* verb to the *qatal* verb with which the relative clause begins. In such a schema, the *wayyiqtol* narratively conveys the sequential action to the previous clause. In this case, it epitomizes her many brazen acts after Yahweh had benevolently bestowed safety, riches, and status upon her.³⁷⁶ She had forgotten these days and restlessly pursued her many lovers before her husband’s watchful eye.

The verb in the next clause, Ezek 16:43ba, is also perplexing. Its use in formulaic situations makes it precarious to draw strong conclusions. Additionally, this clause supports an understanding of “were restless” in view of the causal conjunction

³⁷⁶ See Alviero Nicacci, “An Integrated Verb System for Biblical Hebrew Prose and Poetry” in *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007*, ed. André Lemaier (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 102–04, 110–11, and Wolfgang Schneider, *Grammatik des Biblischen Hebräisch*, 2. Auflage (München: Claudius, 2004), 193–95.

אשר יען in 16:43a, which is conjoined to 16:43b by וגם, and also because of the *qatal* form of the verb that 16:43b contains.³⁷⁷ As for the latter, the *qatal* form of the verb often indicates the background or circumstances of the situation.³⁷⁸ If the *qatal* form of the verb articulates a circumstance of this situation, it would read, “and therefore I, look, I gave your way on [your] head.” This reading is peculiar in view of the future oriented, *weqatal* verbs in 16:37–42. But it would cohere with the passage of time related in 16:43a and the adverbial markers in the context of the repeated clause in 16:22–23. It is possible, however, that the *qatal* form of the verse could be a function of a formulaic statement in which case the future oriented context—contra to the *qatal* verbal form—may constrain an understanding of the verb.³⁷⁹

³⁷⁷ For the causal conjunction, see GKC §158a–b and §107q, footnote 1. For the correlative function of גם, see note 143.

³⁷⁸ Allen, in footnote 43c referring to his translation of this verse, alludes to the perplexing use of the perfect here and comments that it seems to be “performative,” *Ezekiel 1–19*, 231. He translates it, “I for my part now hold you responsible,” *Ezekiel 1–19*, 225. Other commentators translate this as a future perfect, “I will have brought your conduct down on my head myself,” Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 499; present progressive, “I am holding you to account for your ways,” Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 272; and perfect, “I also have brought your conduct upon your own head,” Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 331. The formula itself occurs in Ezek 9:10, 11:21, here in 16:43, and 22:31. Ezekiel 9:10 supports a circumstantial perspective of the *qatal* verb because Ezek 9:7–8a, 11 reports the action of punishment after it was commanded. That the action is being accomplished is clear from 9:8a even though it is reported in 9:7b in *weqatal* verb forms. Even if the specific action of “smiting” is not complete, one can discern that the act of judgment is viewed as a circumstance of the prophecy based on 9:11. It reports that the scribe had finished marking penitent individuals. Ezekiel 11:21 indicates a time of “constant duration” in view of the future orientation of the verbs prior to the participle and ensuing *qatal* verb in 11:21; GKC §141e. In that context, this understanding would appear similar in result as Waltke-O’Conner’s “performative,” see Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Conner, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), §30.5.1d, note 17. In the case of Ezekiel 11, the *weqatal* verbs in 11:17–20 announcing gathering and obedience indicate a future action. Subsequently, the verbal form shifts to a participle and then an x + *qatal*. Those whose hearts are walking after detestable things and abominations during this period receive their way on their head. Ezekiel 22:31 more naturally reflects a past tense in view of the *wayyiqtol* form which introduces the sentence.

³⁷⁹ See the forced way that Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 499, and Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 225, translate this clause.

Additionally, depending on the extent to which *אשר יען* governs the correlated action in 16:43b α , the perspective of the clause clearly indicates Yahweh held Jerusalem responsible for her forgetfulness and misbehavior. In this case, the adverb and conjunction, *וגם*, which is translated here as “and therefore,” correlates this formulaic statement to the causal clause.³⁸⁰ Therefore, her punishment is construed as a correlative to her forgetfulness and misdeeds. The verse looks back to the days of Jerusalem’s youth, which she had forgotten. She had forgotten these days of Yahweh’s care and provision, when she was “naked and bare” and unwanted. Indeed, the announcement of judgment, which 16:37–42 expressed, indicated that she would return to the situation of her naked, neglected origins soon enough.³⁸¹ From this perspective, 16:43 merely restates in repeated or formulaic verbiage what 16:37–42 stated previously, namely that Yahweh executed judgment in reciprocal manner to her behavior. In so doing, he brought her deeds upon her head. To state the matter again, although a perspective which views Yahweh’s judgment as past seems odd in view of the *weqatal* verbal forms in 16:37–42, if the motivation was Jerusalem’s forgetfulness, her wanton behavior, along with the inclusion of temporal distance, which is explicit in 16:22–23, a view of judgment that is in the past is less difficult.

Finally, one should allow for a later perspective in this verse in part because it transitions to Ezek 16:44–63. The next section presumes Jerusalem’s demise rather than announces its coming destruction. Moreover, although the temporal aspect may seem

³⁸⁰ That the adverb conveys the notion of correspondence in judgment contexts, see BDB, 169; As an apodosis with “distinctly logical force,” see Waltke-O’Conner, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 663–64.

³⁸¹ This is not an attempt to articulate the so-called “prophetic perfect” for which, see GKC, §106n. It is a recognition that these verses articulate Jerusalem’s return to her former “naked” and neglected state.

out of place, the fact that the book portrays the news of Jerusalem's destruction reaching Ezekiel is enough to warrant a circumstantial perspective here. Additionally, given the tumultuous days and multiple deportations that the population experienced, it is no surprise that Yahweh's judgment is conveyed as a circumstance at this point. In view of these observations, it is clear that the verse looks back in retrospection at Jerusalem's heedlessness. Because of that negligence, Yahweh had brought her ways on her head.

As mentioned above, the clause, “your [their] way on your [their] head, I will give [gave],” occurs in formulaic situations in the book of Ezekiel. The clause occurs in Ezek 9:10, 11:21, here in 16:43, and 22:31.³⁸² The use of the clause often complements another Ezekielian formula, the *Gottesspruchformel*, “utters the LORD, Yahweh.”³⁸³ The *Gottesspruchformel* affirms the material's divine origin in addition to contributing to structural development within a chapter. The two formulaic elements occur together in Ezek 11:21, here in 16:43, and 22:31. Moreover, a third formulaic element, “behold,” (הִנֵּה) which appears in the passage, often occurs with the *Gottesspruchformel*.³⁸⁴ Taken together, these formulae commend a structural transition here in the chapter. In the case of Ezek 16:43b α , not only does the exclamatory particle occur at the beginning of 16:44 but it is quite likely that the rare exclamation, “Look!” (אֵי) in 16:43b α contributes to the structural shift transpiring in the verse. Consequently, there is ample evidence that indicates that Ezek 16:43 is transitioning from the announcement of judgment in Ezek

³⁸² Ezekiel 17:19 does not contain the term, “way.” Ezekiel 33:4 utilizes a different verb than “give” and “blood” rather than “way”.

³⁸³ See above regarding this formula.

³⁸⁴ The *Gottesspruchformel* occurs in conjunction with the lexeme “behold” with possible, intervening Ezekielian formulas or minimal material in Ezek 12:25–27, 13:8, 16:43–44, 16:48–49, 18:3–4, 21:12, 22:12–13, 24:14–16, and 39:8.

16:35–42 to the next section. In summary, Ezek 16:43a–b α attests that Yahweh carried out judgment upon Jerusalem, a judgment that he had executed because she forgot the days of her youth when he had rescued her and took her for his own but she committed flagrant acts of disloyalty. Consequently, he brought her own ways upon her head. Additionally, the formulaic elements of 16:43b α , perhaps most notably the *Gottesspruchformel*, prepares the reader for the upcoming structural development. Prior to the conclusion of the section, however, another clause brings the verse to an end.

Ezekiel 16:43b β queries, “And did you not do this licentiousness in addition to all your abominations?”³⁸⁵ The final word of the verse acts as a fitting conclusion to the first three subunits of the chapter, Ezek 16:3a β –14, 15–34, and 16:35–43. The term, “abomination” occurred in verse 2 as that which Ezekiel was to make known to Jerusalem. The term also occurred in 16:36 as the prophecy transitioned from the indictment against Jerusalem to the announcement of her punishment. Her harlotries, through which she engaged her lovers and enacted “upon the idols of her abominations,” were part of the motivation for which Yahweh would bring judgment upon Jerusalem. The utilization of the term here acts as a fitting segue to the next subunit in view of its frequent usage from 16:44–58.³⁸⁶

Likewise, the word, “licentiousness” sums up the lewd behavior that Jerusalem enacted upon her lovers. The word occurred in Ezek 16:27b saying that the Philistine

³⁸⁵ For the unusual syntax and translation of the interrogative, see the absence of the interrogative particle in 16:56; Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 225; Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 505; and Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 331 translate 16:47 interrogatively as well. See also GKC §150a.

³⁸⁶ The term occurs in Ezek 16:47, 50, 51 (twice), and 58. The verbal root also occurs in 16:52. While there are forty-three occurrences of the noun in the book of Ezekiel, some formulation of the phrase, “all your abominations” occurs nineteen times in the book varying only in matter of grammatical person.

women were embarrassed by Jerusalem's bawdy behavior. The word occurs one final time in the Ezek 16:58, which commands that Jerusalem must yet bear her licentiousness and abominations. The compound makeup of "your licentiousness and your abominations," which also occurs in 16:58, expresses the point here that the chapter has as its subject two distinct, depraved acts: abominations and harlotry. This section expressed condemnation for these distinct acts in its various expressions of harlotry, e.g. the relationships with foreign nations in Ezek 16:26–29 and slaughter of children before idols in Ezek 16:20–21. Both acts take the form of harlotry in the chapter although at times like this final clause in 16:43b, their distinct makeup comes into play.

2.2.5 Daughters Jerusalem, Samaria, and Sodom Ezekiel 16:44–58

2.2.5.1 A Mother and Her Daughters Ezekiel 16:44–45

Ezekiel 16:44–58 introduces a distinct albeit related theme within the chapter. Jerusalem remains at the center of the portrayal by means of the consistent utilization of the second, feminine, singular pronominal forms. Moreover, the characterization of Jerusalem continues to be negative in its outlook of the city in comparison with other characters. However, the focus widens to include new characters along with a novel description of the relationships between each of the characters and ultimately, Yahweh. Interestingly, the theme of harlotry never arises in the remainder of the chapter. Ezekiel 16:44–45 provides a bridge to this new description via its own largely disparate material.

The transition begins in Ezek 16:44a with the exclamatory particle, "behold." As noted above, this particle occurs in conjunction with the *Gottesspruchformel* and often contributes to the structural development of the material. The development comes in the

form of an impersonal, participial subject, “everyone who tells a proverb” of a third, masculine, singular verb of the same root, “to tell a proverb.”³⁸⁷ There is no indication who is speaking or to whom the subject is telling the proverb; only that the proverb is presumably about Jerusalem to whom the second, feminine, singular pronoun refers. The proverb that follows in 16:44b is terse. In merely two words, it says, “Like mother, like daughter.” The connotation is rather obvious. Jerusalem, as a daughter, will act just like her mother. Who was Jerusalem’s mother? The term, “mother” previously appeared only at the beginning of the chapter in 16:3 when Jerusalem’s origins were the topic. The clause stated that her mother was a “Hittite” and implied that this mother was deplorable in view of her abandonment of her daughter. Moreover, the term only appears again in the very next verse in an inversion of the statement of Jerusalem’s origins that began the chapter and an inversion of this proverb. The assertion that Jerusalem’s pedigree was Canaanite in origin is strange indeed given the city’s relationship to Yahweh but the hyperbole matches the accusations of harlotry as well as the upcoming comparison to sister Sodom and Samaria.

The term, “daughter,” on the other hand, appears frequently in the remainder of the chapter, occurring also in 16:45, 46 (twice), 48 (twice), 49, 53 (twice), 55 (thrice), 57 (twice), and 61.³⁸⁸ Although no elaboration of the mother-daughter relationship appears in the chapter, Ezek 16:45 expresses the reason that motivates the proverb. Jerusalem is a daughter of her mother because she showed contempt for her husband and sons. The

³⁸⁷ This verbal root is prominent in this portion of the book of Ezekiel; it occurs as a cognate accusative here in 16:44, 17:2, 18:2, 3, 21:5, 24:3. In Ezek 12:23, it also occurs as an accusative and a verb albeit in two distinct clauses.

³⁸⁸ The use of “daughter” occurred previously in 16:20, regarding the sacrifice of sons and “daughters,” and in 16:27, which refers to the “daughters” of the Philistines.

verb, “to show contempt,” which occurs in the form of a feminine, singular participle, also appears in 16:45b in a characterization of the soon-to-be introduced sisters. A nominal form of the root also took place in 16:5 in a description of why infant-Jerusalem was abandoned in the field, “in contempt for your life.” Otherwise, the verbal root does not appear in the chapter. In addition, a second, feminine, singular, independent pronoun and corresponding pronominal suffix maintain the clause’s relationship to the topic of Jerusalem.

Meanwhile, the assertion that her mother was “one who showed contempt for her husband and her sons” brings clarity to Jerusalem’s own marital relationship with Yahweh. Their conjugality last received attention in two distinct reports of her harlotry, the report concerning the adulterous wife and the report that she slaughtered Yahweh’s sons. The lexeme, “son” appeared in 16:20–21 and the echo of that episode in 16:36, which warranted the announcement of Yahweh’s impending judgment.³⁸⁹ Ezekiel 16:20 stated that Jerusalem had “sacrificed sons and daughters,” which she had birthed to Yahweh. Ezekiel 16:21 variously reported that she “slaughtered my sons.” As for the lexeme, “husband,” (ז”א) Ezek 16:32 compared harlot-Jerusalem to an adulterous wife, who “took strangers instead” of her own “husband.” Interestingly, neither term, “son” nor “husband,” appears again in the chapter after a second occurrence here in Ezek 16:45.

The next clause introduces a new relationship within the chapter. Ezekiel 16:45b says, “You are a sister of your sisters, who showed contempt for their husbands and their

³⁸⁹ The lexeme also appeared in the moniker for the prophet in Ezek 16:2, “son of man” and in reference to her relationship with foreign nations, “the sons of Egypt” and “the sons of Assyria” in 16:26 and 28 respectively.

sons.” The term, “sister” appears for the first time in the chapter here. The book of Ezekiel only utilizes the term in reference to familial relationships in a limited number of passages. Of the twenty-one occurrences of the term that reference familial relationship, nineteen occur in Ezekiel 16 and 23.³⁹⁰ The term dominates the remainder of the chapter, making twelve appearances. The relationship of “sister” and “mother” and the correspondence between these two analogies in 16:45a and 45b is obvious: Jerusalem’s mother acted deplorably to her husband and sons, as did her sisters to their husbands and sons. The common terminology between the clauses includes the terms, “husband,” “son,” the verbal root, “to show contempt for,” and the second, feminine, singular, independent pronoun, referring to Jerusalem. The analogies of Jerusalem to deplorable mother and sisters initiate a rather lengthy comparison between Jerusalem and her two sisters in what follows. But the comparison does not begin before Ezek 16:45bβ returns to the theme of Jerusalem’s mother and expresses Jerusalem’s heritage one final time. The envelope structure engenders a rather obvious association between Jerusalem’s mother and heritage with that association now intended for the upcoming episode concerning Jerusalem and her sisters.

Ezekiel 16:45bβ says, “Your mother was a Hittite and your father was an Amorite.” The beginning of this account between Jerusalem and Yahweh asserted a similar heritage. In Ezek 16:3b, Yahweh said, “your father was the Amorite and your mother was a Hittite.” One difference between these two statements is the reversal of

³⁹⁰ “Sister” also appears in Ezek 22:11 and 44:25. Moreover, the lexeme appears in Ezek 1:9, 23, and 3:13 as a means to describe the association of the wings of the creatures.

mother and father.³⁹¹ Here, the mention of the term, “mother” towards the end of the verse corresponds with its mention at the beginning of the verse. The term, “father” is a nonissue in the chapter, appearing only in 16:3b and here. Another difference between the two statements of Jerusalem’s parentage highlights the material that follows. The second person pronouns, which are suffixed to the nouns, “mother” and “father,” are second, feminine, plural pronouns. Thus, one can see the obvious turn from the singular pronoun, which has consistently appeared in the chapter referring to Jerusalem, to the plural feminine pronoun that prepares the reader for the ensuing account of Jerusalem and her sisters.

2.2.5.2 Jerusalem, Samaria, and Sodom Ezekiel 16:46–47

Ezekiel 16:46 immediately directs one’s attention to Jerusalem’s relationships with her sisters, which the following verses develop. The section is comprised of a negative comparison in which Jerusalem is the more evil sister than either Sodom or Samaria.³⁹² Ezek 16:46a begins, “And your big sister, Samaria, she and her daughters were dwelling on your left.” The nominal clause introduces Jerusalem’s big sister to the north, Samaria. The name of Judah’s notorious counterpart appears here for the first time in the book of Ezekiel.³⁹³ In addition to three more appearances in 16:51, 53, and 55, the name otherwise only appears in the book in Ezekiel 23. Ezekiel 16:46b, on the

³⁹¹ For more on the possible construction known as Seidl’s law, see Beentjes, “Discovering a New Path of Intertextuality: Inverted Quotations and Their Dynamics,” 31–50; S. Talmon “The Textual Study of the Bible”, idem. *Text and Canon of the Hebrew Bible*, 61.

³⁹² Note the relationship of this passage to Jer 3:1–11 and Ezekiel 23.

³⁹³ 1 Kings 16:15–28 reports the establishment of the city although its first mention is 1 Kings 13:32.

other hand, introduces Jerusalem's younger sister. The clause states similarly, "And your younger sister, who dwells on your right, is Sodom and her daughters." The parallelism between sisters is obvious; perhaps most important for the purpose here is the selection of Sodom as a means of comparison.

The name, Sodom, only appears in the book of Ezekiel in this chapter, here and in 16:48, 49, 53, and 55. Although it was mentioned second in the pair of Jerusalem's sisters, it may very well be the most important for a comprehension of the section. First, it receives greater attention in the section. Its sins are recounted in detail as well as its punishment; the material devoted to Sodom extends eight clauses. Samaria, on the other, receives a scant one clause without any detailed description of her sin. Second, a correlation with Samaria would seem quite natural given its reciprocal status to Judah, the land in which the city of Jerusalem was located. The history and connection between the two lands is obvious enough. In contrast, the biblical chronicle of Sodom's activities hardly commends a comparison with the more modern Jerusalem. It is Sodom, however, that receives the more explicit contrast with Jerusalem. The developing analogy within the chapter will yield the best possible reason for why this is so.

Meanwhile, Ezek 16:47a remains ambiguous for the moment concerning Jerusalem's culpability, saying, "But you did not walk in their ways and act according to their abominations." In an almost incidental and nonchalant manner, the text discloses that Jerusalem's two sisters acted inappropriately. Additionally, the mere use of Sodom in such an unlikely comparison suggests that her licentious "ways" were known in tradition. Likewise, Samaria's fall to Assyrian power in bygone days, in any case, would have received attention that her "ways" did not measure up to the national god. And in a

more tangible remark, the text states that Jerusalem did not do their “abominations.” The term, “abominations” introduced the chapter in 16:2; Ezekiel was to proclaim Jerusalem’s abominations to her. Furthermore, the term appeared in the transition to the announcement of Yahweh’s judgment in 16:36 as well as the transition from that subunit to this account of three sisters in 16:43. Were it not for the long list of harlotrous activities in 16:15–34, one would wonder whether Jerusalem might finally be vindicated.

One need not wait long, however, as Ezek 16:47b makes the comparison explicitly negative. “[In a very short time and]³⁹⁴ you acted more corruptly than they did in all your ways.” The initial, problematic words of 16:47b aggrandizes the unfavorable caricature that ensues: in a very brief period, given Jerusalem’s short history, she had erred worse than Sodom and Samaria. The verb “to act corruptly” precedes the comparative *mem* plus third, feminine, plural pronoun that indicates the sisters.³⁹⁵ The prepositional phrase, “in your ways” mirrors the beginning of the verse in which “not in their ways” had Jerusalem walked. Moreover, the chapter had indicated that Jerusalem’s “ways” of licentiousness had humiliated the daughters of the Philistines in 16:27. Additionally, in 16:43, Yahweh had brought her “way” on her head for her many acts of harlotry. The plural noun, “ways” makes one additional appearance in the chapter in 16:61, which exhorts Jerusalem to remember her “ways and be humiliated.” Thus, the reader learns that Jerusalem would appear unfavorable in this analogy similar to her negative comparison with that of a harlot in 16:31–34.

³⁹⁴ See the notes on 16:47 in Chapter 1.

³⁹⁵ The verb only occurs here in the chapter but see the similar Ezek 23:11.

2.2.5.3 The Deeds of Sodom and Samaria Ezekiel 16:48–52

Ezekiel 16:48 opens with another Ezekielian formula, “As I live.” This formula occurs numerous times in the book of Ezekiel, often with the *Gottesspruchformel*, which follows it here as well.³⁹⁶ Although a full examination of the *Gottesspruchformel* lies outside the scope of this project, the use of the formula in conjunction with other Ezekielian conventions indicates structural development and furthermore, an emphasis upon the divine origin of the message.³⁹⁷ In this case, the use of the conjunction “if” (אם) for emphasis after an oath intensifies the trajectory of the comparison between Jerusalem and her sisters.³⁹⁸ The inflammatory message will now turn from a general comparison with both sisters specifically to Sodom. Once again, it appears likely that the inclusion of Sodom in the comparison exposes the notoriety of the nefarious trope. The use of Sodom as an analogue would hardly have been effective if Sodom behaved merely as Ezek 16:49–50 presents. Instead, the hyperbole of Jerusalem’s origins finds its parallel in the hyperbole of her wickedness compared to that of Sodom. Only with the notoriety of Sodom’s sexual deviancy would her comparison to Jerusalem been effective. The

³⁹⁶ “As I live, utters the Lord, [Yahweh].” See pp. 10–12 above.

³⁹⁷ See in particular, Rendtorff, “Zum Gebrauch,” 277–90; Hossfeld, *Untersuchungen*, 39; Schöpflin, *Theologie*, 101–05.

³⁹⁸ The particle “if” occurs after the *Gottesspruchformel* and the formula, “As I live” in Ezek 5:11, 14:16, 20, 16:48, 17:16, 18:3, 20:3, 31, 33, 33:11, 34:8, and 35:6. These occurrences make up all but two occasions of the concurrence of the two formulas together by themselves. For the emphatic nature of the conjunction see HALOT, 60.

comparison with wicked Sodom would have provoked a strong reaction then, in particular, as Sodom emerges from the comparison as the more righteous.

Ezekiel 16:48 continues, “If Sodom, your sister, she and her daughters acted in the manner that you and your daughters acted—” The question breaks off before its correlative is given. Instead the following verses will list Sodom’s “abominations;” her reported actions pale in comparison with other reports of Sodom and Gomorrah in the HB.³⁹⁹ The clause expresses the relationship between Jerusalem and Sodom in parallel fashion. It reports that each entity “acted,” (עָשָׂה) refers to each woman by means of the independent personal pronoun, and includes her “daughters” in the comparison. Ezekiel 16:49a then begins with the exclamatory particle, “Look.” This particle is used in conjunction with oath formulae, “As I live” and the *Gottesspruchformel*.⁴⁰⁰ Moreover, it draws attention to the subsequent list of Sodom’s so-called iniquities, which follows the introductory statement, “This was the iniquity of Sodom, your sister.”

Although occurring frequently in the book of Ezekiel, the term “iniquity” makes its first appearance in the chapter. One might expect to hear about the debauchery associated with Sodom from the chronicle of its demise with Gomorrah in Genesis 18–19. Instead, one finds a rather restrained description of Sodom’s misdeeds. The entire sentence relates the notion that Sodom had abundance in life and showed no concern for those less fortunate. Ezek 16:49b reads, “She and her daughters had pride, an abundance

³⁹⁹ The collocation “Sodom and Gomorrah” occurs in Gen 10:19, 13:10, 14:2, 8, 10, 18:20, 19:24, 28, Deut 29:22, 32:32, Isa 1:9, 13:19, Jer 23:14, 49:18, 50:40, Amos 4:11, and Zech 2:9. The two designations are used as a warning or example outside of Genesis. Outside of Genesis, “Sodom” appears by itself only here in Ezekiel 16 and in Isa 3:9 and Lam 4:6.

⁴⁰⁰ The exclamatory particle occurs in conjunction with these formulas and “if” in Ezek 14:20–22, 16:48–49, 17:16–18, 18:3–4, 33:27–33, 34:8–11.

of bread, and plenty of ease⁴⁰¹ but she did not support the poor and needy.” The characterization, “pride” appears for the first time in the chapter here in 16:49 although it will be used again in reference to Jerusalem in 16:56. The statement that Sodom and her daughters had an “abundance of bread” (שִׂבְעָה) utilizes the same root as did Ezek 16:28–29. On three occasions, that passage described Jerusalem as *not* being satisfied (שִׂבְעָה) even though she played the harlot with the Assyrians and Chaldeans. The third modifier in Ezek 16:49 asserts that Sodom lived in “plenty of ease... but she did not support the poor and needy.” In conjunction with Sodom’s only appearance in the book, a concern for the “poor and needy” appears here for the first time in the book of Ezekiel although the collocation, “poor and needy” returns in Ezek 18:12 and 22:29 to indict those who would not care for them. In contrast to Jerusalem, Sodom’s iniquity has nothing to do with sexual immorality or harlotry and provides the antithesis of Jerusalem’s debauchery.

Ezekiel 16:50 extends the report of Sodom’s deficiency and also her punishment. It reads, “And they were haughty and committed an abomination before me.” The term, “to be high, exalted,” which is translated here as “haughty,” is used here for the first time in the chapter. In contrast, “abomination” appeared at the outset of the chapter in Ezek 16:2, at structural transitions in Ezek 16:36 and 43, and now occurs five times in the comparison of Jerusalem and her sisters. The remaining clause in 16:50b is devoted

⁴⁰¹ There is a plus in the LXX concerning Sodom and her daughters having an advantage. I retain the shorter reading. The singular verbs in the MT at this point reflect the focus on Sodom rather than her and her daughters. The plural reference appears in 16:50.

to Sodom's punishment for her activities. It states simply, "And I removed them when I saw." Thus, Sodom's punishment is stated directly but also without elaboration.⁴⁰²

Ezekiel 16:51 commences with a brief, vague account of Samaria's behavior. A mere clause is dedicated to Samaria before Jerusalem returns as the topic. Ezek 16:51 says, "And Samaria did not commit half of your sins." This statement would surely come as a shock to those who read the account. Samaria's transgressions were particularly notorious as the comparable analogy in Jeremiah 3 illustrates.⁴⁰³ For all her sins bespoken of elsewhere in the HB, here, sister-Samaria does not commit half of Jerusalem's sin and, as a matter of fact, no details of her sins are articulated. The verbal root, "to sin" and its nominal forms appear for the first time in the chapter.⁴⁰⁴ No other account of Samaria occurs in the book of Ezekiel outside of Ezekiel 16 and 23.

Instead of taking an opportunity to belabor Samaria's missteps, the description quickly returns to Jerusalem. Ezekiel 16:51b indicates, "But you multiplied your abominations more than them." The *wayyiqtol* verb returns to the second, feminine, singular form, the first of two such verbs narrating Jerusalem's activity in 16:51b. The precise Hiphil verb "and you multiplied" occurred three times previously in the chapter. This verb in Ezek 16:25, 26, and 29 each relate how Jerusalem, "multiplied harlotries." Here, however, she multiplies abominations. In addition to the dissimilar, "abominations," 16:51b also adds the comparative, "more than them." Forms comparing Jerusalem or her activities with other entities were also utilized in 16:20, 34, and 46 and

⁴⁰² For the possible allusion to Gen 18:21, see Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 289.

⁴⁰³ Jeremiah 3:1–11 contains a similar comparison between sister Israel and Judah.

⁴⁰⁴ The root is prominent in the watchman chapters of Ezekiel 3 and 33 as well as chapter 18.

will occur twice in 16:52. Particularly noteworthy is 16:34 in which Jerusalem is negatively compared to adulterous wives. Additionally, Ezek 16:52 will utilize the comparative forms to reiterate the perspective that Jerusalem acted worse than her two sisters and that they appeared more righteous than her.

The next clause in 16:51b likewise contains a second, feminine, singular, *wayyiqtol* verbal form. It reads, “And you made your sisters appear righteous with all your abominations that you did,” The clause also utilizes an uncommon Piel form of the verb “to be righteous (קָדַשׁ).⁴⁰⁵ In so doing, the clause makes the outrageous claim that Jerusalem’s behavior was so base that nefarious Samaria actually appeared righteous. This verbal root makes the first of three appearances here in the chapter. Moreover, the clause repeats the term, “abominations” used three times within two verses. As stated above, the term “abomination” appeared in the introduction to the written prophecy in Ezek 16:2, at the beginning and ending of the announcement of judgment in 16:36 and 43, and now has made four appearances throughout the comparison of Jerusalem to her sisters. The term will occur one final time in Ezek 16:58.

As a result of her abhorrent activities in comparison to that of her sisters, Jerusalem will now experience consequences: She must bear her shame. Ezekiel 16:52 begins with “indeed” plus the second, feminine, singular, independent pronoun, “you.” A similar construction appeared in 16:43 when Yahweh indicated his judgment that was reciprocal to Jerusalem’s harlotry.⁴⁰⁶ Here, the construction expresses a correspondence between Jerusalem’s comportment and the repercussions of that comportment especially

⁴⁰⁵ The form also appears in Jer 3:11 when Jerusalem made apostate-Israel appear righteous.

⁴⁰⁶ The clause begins, “And also, I... I will give.”

in relationship to her sisters. These consequences are typical for the book of Ezekiel, as one can discern from lexical usage elsewhere in the book. The clause initially reads, “Also, you, bear your humiliation.” The verse will go on to explain the basis for humiliation in subsequent relative clauses. First, however, it is noteworthy that although the collocation, “to bear humiliation” occurs here for the first time in the book of Ezekiel, it appears two more times in the chapter and also repeatedly in the rest of the book of Ezekiel.⁴⁰⁷ The verb, “to bear” occurs as a second, feminine, singular imperative, which is the first of three imperatives in the verse directed toward Jerusalem.⁴⁰⁸

As a clarification for the basis of Jerusalem’s humiliation, Ezek 16:52a continues with two relative clauses and one direct statement. The first relative clause explains, “Inasmuch as you have mediated for your sisters with your sins.”⁴⁰⁹ The relative clause utilizes a rare Piel form of the second, feminine, singular verb, “to intercede” or “mediate” in the Piel (פָּלַל). The verbal root itself makes its only appearance in the book of Ezekiel. The prepositional phrase, which follows the verb, explains the sense of the relative clause and the purpose for the humiliation that Jerusalem must bear. Jerusalem sinned to the extent that she arbitrated for her sisters before Yahweh. To put the matter another way, Jerusalem’s sin was so grievous to Yahweh that it intervened between the

⁴⁰⁷ The collocation occurs in Ezek 16:52 (twice), 54, 32:24, 25, 30, 34:29, 36:6, 7, 15 (verb used with “reproach” although “humiliation” appears in parallel clause), 39:26, and 44:13.

⁴⁰⁸ For how the verb is used in Leviticus, Numbers, and possibly older legal formulations, see Zimmerli, “Die Eigenart der prophetischen Rede des Ezechiel. Ein Beitrag zum Problem an Hand von Ez. 14:1–11,” ZAW 66 (1954), 1–26.

⁴⁰⁹ For the text critical discussion involving the singular and plural occurrences of “sister(s),” see Chapter 1, the note regarding Ezek 16:45.

sisters and Yahweh. The verbal root, “to sin” appeared twice in 16:51 when speaking specifically about Jerusalem’s sin compared to that sin of Samaria. The term appears in the plural again here in reference to Jerusalem’s sins.

A second relative clause in Ezek 16:52a further explains the situation, “When you acted more abominably than them.” The second, feminine, singular verb indicates Jerusalem’s behavior and underscores the five plural appearances of the nominal form, “abomination,” which the section contains. The verb also appeared in Ezek 16:25 when it indicated that Jerusalem “abhorred her beauty.” Additionally, the comparative appears again, making a direct comparison between Jerusalem and both sisters. Indeed, Jerusalem acted more abominably than both of them. In so doing, the final clause of 16:52a reads asyndetically, “They are more righteous than you.” The verbal root, “to be righteous” appears for the second time. On this occasion, it appears in a Qal, third, feminine, plural form in addition to yet another comparison with a second, feminine, singular pronoun—Jerusalem herself.

Ezekiel 16:52b commences in much the same way that 16:52a began, “And indeed, you.” Moreover, 16:52a commanded Jerusalem to bear her humiliation. Likewise, 16:52b commands Jerusalem with the first of two imperatives, “Be ashamed.” A second imperative follows immediately and repeats the initial command of 16:51a, “And bear your humiliation.” Subsequently, there exists a fair amount of symmetry within the verse apparently in an attempt to emphasize the consequence of humiliation and also the comparison between Jerusalem and her sisters. Furthermore, the two

lemmata in 16:52b, “be ashamed” and “humiliation” will appear again in Ezek 16:63.⁴¹⁰ Finally, the verse ends with an adverbial infinitive, which repeats the Piel verbal form of “to be righteous” and “sister.” The infinitive reads, “as you made your sisters appear righteous.” The verb, “to be righteous” thus appears for the third time in two verses. Moreover, the occurrence of this term here in 16:52b with the additional term “sin” in 16:52a, mirror the usage of each term in 16:51b and 16:51a respectively. Thus the two verses create a rhetorical structure that highlights a comparison between sisters in which the sin of Jerusalem makes Samaria and Sodom look righteous. In conclusion, Jerusalem must bear her humiliation and be ashamed as she is explicitly compared four times unfavorably with her sisters between Ezek 16:47–52.

2.2.5.4 The Restoration of the Sisters Ezekiel 16:53–58

Although the characters remain the same—Jerusalem, Sodom, Samaria, and their respective daughters, the prophecy takes a decided turn in Ezek 16:53. Quite suddenly, the written prophecy develops into a prophecy of restoration, as Yahweh promises to restore Sodom and her daughters, Samaria and her daughters, and Jerusalem. This restoration, in connection with what transpired in 16:52, will transpire in order that Jerusalem will bear her humiliation and be humiliated from all she has done (16:54). Thus, the restoration of Jerusalem’s two sisters along with herself will lead Jerusalem to bear her humiliation, thus cohering with the imperative to do such a thing in 16:52. Moreover, the theme of restoration coheres with the final section with its motif of an

⁴¹⁰ In a variety of combinations, these two lemma appear often in the Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel: Is 30:3, 41:11, 45:16, 17, 50:7, 54:4, 61:17, Jer 3:25, 6:15, 8:12, 14:3, 20:11, 22:22, 31:19, 51:51, Ezek 16:52, 63, 32:30, and 36:32.

eternal covenant, which also leads to Jerusalem bearing her humiliation. (Ezek 16:60–61)

Ezekiel 16:53 begins with a first, common, singular, *weqatal* verbal form from the root בּוֹשׁ. The last time a *weqatal* verbal construction appeared was in Ezek 16:42 near the end of the section concerning the announcement of Yahweh’s judgment. Here, Yahweh announces his intended restoration of the three sisters. It reads, “And I will restore their fortune, the fortune of Sodom and her daughters and the fortune of Samaria and her daughters and a fortune, that is, your fortunes in their midst.”⁴¹¹ The clause utilizes the third, feminine, plural pronoun, which is suffixed to the direct object, translated as “their fortune.” Thus, the clause carries forward the notion of Jerusalem’s sisters. Moreover, each sister is named along with “her daughters,” a practice likewise seen in Ezek 16:46 and 48, which introduced the sister(s) by name. However, a precise understanding of the clause is made difficult because of the possible confusion of verbal roots, בּוֹשׁ and בּוֹשׂ, the wide use of the collocation, “to restore the fortune of” within the Hebrew Bible,⁴¹² and a number of text critical issues.⁴¹³ In spite of these difficulties, the

⁴¹¹ In addition to occurring here in the book of Ezekiel, “to restore the fortune” appears in Ezek 29:14 and 39:25.

⁴¹² For “restore fortunes,” see W. L. Holladay, *The Root Šūbh in the Old Testament* (Leiden, Brill, 1958); Ernst Ludwig Dietrich בּוֹשׂ וּבּוֹשׁ. *Die Endzeitliche Wiederherstellung bei den Propheten*, BZAW 40 (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1925); Eberhard Baumann, “בּוֹשׂ וּבּוֹשׁ. Eine exegetische Untersuchung,” ZAW 47 (1929): 17–44; J.A. Soggin, *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 2, בּוֹשׂ; Hans Walter Wolff, “The Kerygma of the Deuteronomical Historical Work” in *The Vitality of Old Testament Tradition* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1975), 94–5; J.M. Bracke, “šūb šēbūt: A Reappraisal,” ZAW 97, 1985, 233–44; R. Borger, “Zu בּוֹשׂ וּבּוֹשׁ,” ZAW 66, (1954[1955]): 315–16; J.G. McConville, “Restoration in Deuteronomy and Deuteronomical Literature” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*, ed. James M. Scott (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 11–40; Konrad Schmid and Odil Hannes Steck, “Restoration Expectations in the Prophetic Tradition of the Old Testament” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*, ed. James M. Scott (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 41–82; KB, 1382–33, 1385–87, 1427–34.

⁴¹³ See below for discussion and discussion in footnotes for 16:53 in Chapter 1.

context yields several indications of the collocation's purpose in the chapter. First, the *weqatal* indicates a future action of Yahweh. This assertion coheres with two observations: Ezekiel 16:43 indicated that some judgment had already taken place. Moreover, Ezek 16:52 asserted that humiliation and shame were now the consequences that Jerusalem must face. Thus, this action should somehow bring about those results. This leads to the second factor necessary to understand the purpose of "to restore the fortune of."

The second factor indicating the purpose of "restore the fortune of" is its concurrence between Jerusalem and her sisters. All three sisters would be the recipients of such action and explicitly Jerusalem would receive such action in the midst of Sodom and Samaria. Additionally, all three will return to a former state, as indicated in 16:55. The positive perspective of Sodom and Samaria in the passage in comparison to that of Jerusalem does not warrant a negative viewpoint in the action here. Thus, it appears that this future action involves a positive aspect even though it will result in Jerusalem's humility.

This leads then to a third factor that yields the purpose of "to restore the fortune." Ezekiel 16:54 reveals that her restoration and that of her sisters will lead Jerusalem to bear her humiliation and be embarrassed by what she has done. Thus, the restoration will apparently involve an action that causes Jerusalem to acknowledge her past behavior ("in order that you bear your humiliation and will be humiliated from everything that you did when you brought about mitigation for them" 16:54) and humbles her. In addition to Ezek 16:52, which introduced the collocation, "to bear humiliation", this purpose that Jerusalem would bear her humiliation coheres with the remainder of the

chapter, in particular the motif of an “eternal covenant,” which occurs in 16:59–63. The lemma, “to be humiliated,” which appeared in 16:52, occurs also in 16:54 (twice), 61, and 63. The lemma, “to be ashamed,” which appeared in 16:52, occurs in conjunction with “covenant” in 16:63. Thus, the notion that Jerusalem would “bear humiliation” and “be ashamed” plays a significant role in the final two sections of Ezekiel 16.⁴¹⁴

Finally, the last indication of the purpose of the collocation, “to restore the fortune,” relates to the time frame of Jerusalem’s outlook and behavior in 16:56–58. The perspective of Ezek 16:56–58 is one which perceived Jerusalem’s past relationship to Sodom, prior to the revelation of her wickedness, and the reproach of the daughters of Aram. In contrast, the restoration involves a time when Jerusalem would be humiliated from her conduct (16:54), remember her ways and be humiliated (16:61), and remember and be ashamed (16:63).

As stated above, Ezek 16:54 manifests the relationship between the restoration in 16:53 and the consequences of Jerusalem’s abominable behavior stated in 16:52. The dependent clause begins with a subordinate conjunction, “in order that.” The clause reads, “In order that you bear your humiliation.” This conjunction shows the purpose of 16:54 to that of 16:52–53. First, 16:53 stated that Yahweh would restore Jerusalem in the midst of the restoration of her sisters and the conjunction with which 16:54 commences shows the purpose of that restoration: It is done so Jerusalem will bear her humiliation. Moreover, the second, feminine, singular pronoun suffixed, “your fortunes” at the end of 16:53 and suffixed to “your humiliation” at the end of 16:54^{aa} strengthens

⁴¹⁴ These two verbal roots, “to be humiliated” and “be ashamed,” additionally appear together in Ezek 32:30 and 36:32.

the connection between the clauses. Second, the purpose clause in 16:54 illustrates the manner in which 16:52 will be carried out with its usage of the same lemma. Ezekiel 16:52 commanded Jerusalem to “bear your humiliation.” Consequently, Yahweh will restore the two sisters and Jerusalem so that “You will bear your humiliation and you will be humiliated from everything that you did when you consoled them.” Thus, initially Jerusalem’s presence among her ignominious sisters appears enough to humiliate her. Ezekiel 16:54a β –b adds that her abominable behavior, in which she made her sisters appear righteous, is the very behavior by which she will ultimately suffer reproach. Although the verb in the temporal infinitive phrase, “when you brought about mitigation for them” is not used elsewhere in the chapter, the second, feminine, singular pronoun, which refers to Jerusalem, and the third, feminine, plural pronoun, which refers to the two sisters, leave no doubt about their antecedents and, therefore, presume a relationship to the Piel verbs, צדק and פלל used in 16:51 and 52 respectively.

Any reader of Ezekiel 16 now recognizes that Jerusalem’s restoration in the presence of her notorious “sisters” somehow yields her humiliation. The nature and means of her embarrassment is not entirely clear other than her inclusion in such a pair of notorious sisters would presumably embarrass her. Ezekiel 16:55–57 will clarify the reason why her relationship with her sisters operates as the vehicle of her shame. Ezekiel 15:55 begins in summary fashion, “And your sisters,” before the clause concentrates on each of Jerusalem’s individual sisters. The verse continues, “Sodom and her daughters will return to their former state and Samaria and her daughters will return to their former state and you and your daughters will return to your former state.” The three sisters and their daughters appear in the verse as one might expect since the advent of the motif in

16:46. Moreover, the verse includes an occurrence of the verb “to return” for each sister and their daughters. After the introduction of this verbal root in 16:53, along with the fourfold repetition of an associated nominal form, בִּיהַשׁ, the reader is prepared for the term here. The threefold repetition and symmetry of the verb, the proper name, and the phrase, “and her daughters,” however, mirrors the threefold repetition and symmetry of the earlier assertion of restoration in 16:53, thereby drawing a connection between the two verses. Furthermore, the material, which is the same between each verse, highlights that material which is distinct: A former state. The term, קְדֻמָּה, only occurs here in 16:55 in the entire chapter.⁴¹⁵ What is meant in this assertion that each of the sisters would return to a former state? Ezekiel 16:56–57 clarifies the connotation.

Whatever the return to a former state may signify, three factors become clear. First, all three will experience an analogous “return to a former state.” Moreover, the association with 16:53 through the verb, וּבִשׁ, and other shared material commends a direct correlation between the first, singular, future verbal form of Yahweh’s “I will restore” with the return in 16:55. Finally, the intervening 16:54 expresses that the inclusion of Jerusalem with her two sisters results in her bearing her humiliation, although the final section of the chapter associates it with the establishment of an eternal covenant. To clarify the meaning of “return to a former state,” Ezek 16:56 begins with a question, “Was not Sodom your sister such a chronicle upon your lips in your heyday?” The use of the construction, וְלֹא as an interrogative corresponds to the same construction in the structural transition of 16:43b after the report that Yahweh had brought Jerusalem’s ways upon her head. The use of this construction here with Sodom also

⁴¹⁵ The term also occurs in Ezek 36:11.

hints at a rhetorical effect. According to the number of mentions in the prophetic books, the chronicle of Sodom and Gomorrah was likely well known. Thus, the obvious response would be a resounding affirmative.

The term translated, “chronicle” makes its only appearance here in Ezekiel 16 as well as its only appearance in relationship to Sodom in the Hebrew Bible. The prepositional phrase, “in your mouth,” which is translated above as “upon your lips,” specifies that this report of Sodom was in the mouth of Jerusalem. Moreover, it was in her mouth during a period in which Jerusalem was exalted. If one understands the plural form of “exaltation” as intentional, it would seem to connote either a prolonged period of glorious matters or a period in which Jerusalem was extremely exalted. In either case, it must refer to a time when Jerusalem was at her finest and Sodom was a mere mention upon the lips of presumably Jerusalem’s inhabitants. In other words, Jerusalem was enjoying the finest hours of her existence in this period in contrast to Sodom, who was a mere mention on the lips after Sodom’s demise. Now Sodom would make a return to her former state. How or in what manner of state does not seem to be the point at this juncture of the prophecy. But she would return.

As stated above, the threefold symmetry in 16:53 and 55 compels an analogous treatment of each of the three sisters. In other words, Samaria suffered an end and would likewise return to a former state. Likewise, depending on the perspective of the perfect verb in 16:43b α and the perfect verb in 16:58a, Jerusalem is portrayed as having already suffered an end. But she, like Sodom and Samaria, would return. The good news that this prophecy heralded must have been a welcome report to those suffering deportation. However, for now she must bear her humiliation just as Sodom bore humiliation on the

lips of Jerusalem in the period of her glory. What about Samaria? How does her story compare with that of Sodom? Ezekiel 16:57a β includes the reproach of another entity before turning back to Jerusalem.

Ezekiel 16:57 continues the interrogative with an adverbial clause, “Before your wickedness was revealed.” Although a few manuscripts contain “nakedness” instead of “wickedness,” attestation by the major Greek and Hebrew manuscripts and the practice of *lectio difficilior* commend the latter. The Niphal verbal form, “was revealed” occurred in 16:36 and a Piel form appeared in 16:37. Both verbal forms related syntactically to the lexeme, “nakedness,” which occurred in 16:8, 36, and 37 (twice).⁴¹⁶ Here, however, the common term, “wickedness” appears, which also occurs in 16:23. With what time frame then is the clause concerned? The second, feminine, singular pronoun indicates it is Jerusalem’s wickedness that the clause references; indeed, it is prior to the “revealing” of Jerusalem’s wickedness. A precise time frame is difficult to pinpoint in view of the book’s disparaging view of Jerusalem. The lexeme “was revealed” in Ezek 16:57a associates the various indictments of harlotry, which one finds in 16:15–34 and upon which 16:36 and 37 comment, with a revelation of her wickedness. The statement must refer to a time after the city’s rise to prominence but likewise in relationship to the downfall of Jerusalem.

The verse continues with yet another complicated temporal reference but one that is in comparison with the time frame with which the verse began. It was “like the time of the reproach of the daughters of Aram and those all around her, the daughters of

⁴¹⁶ This also explains why some manuscripts contain the term “nakedness” and associate it with the Niphal verbal form, “was revealed.”

the Philistines, those treating you with despite on every side.” A good deal of discussion surrounds the adverbial construction that begins the verse.⁴¹⁷ As complex as the text critical issues are in 16:57 and as much as the commentators diverge on different variants and subsequent understanding, a straightforward explanation may yet be possible. Based on an assessment of the adverbial construction, commentators construe the reference to “the reproach of the daughters of Aram” as an indication of Jerusalem’s current humiliation.⁴¹⁸ As such, they presume that the reference to “daughters of Aram” expresses a contemporary enemy of Jerusalem. This is, of course, a difficult point since there is no indication in the book of Ezekiel that Aram was still a threat to Jerusalem. This conundrum, no doubt, gave rise to the alternate “Edom” rather than “Aram.” (ארם/אדום) Of course, commentators are correct in that Jerusalem’s humiliation is the point of passage. But Ezek 16:56 expresses the notion that Jerusalem too easily derided storied Sodom for its destruction in the past. Sodom’s chronicle had been a report to the former Jerusalemites in bygone days. Now the analogy turns to another example in antiquity before it turns to Jerusalem’s present circumstances.

If correct then, the analogy is that since Sodom faced a humiliation and yet will return to a former state, Jerusalem will as well. Ezekiel 16:57 therefore, occasions another analogy from bygone days with the “reproach of the daughters of Aram.” The term, “Aram” makes its only appearance here in the chapter with one other unrelated reference in the book of Ezekiel in 27:16. Moreover, the common Ezekielian adverb “all

⁴¹⁷ See footnote 107 in Chapter 1.

⁴¹⁸ See the various viewpoints in Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 511, 514–15; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 333, 351–52; Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 273, 290; Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 232, 245–46. Each of these commentators and others expect an adversary for Jerusalem at that current moment.

around” occurs twice in the verse. The first occurrence of this adverb transpires with a third, feminine, singular pronoun suffixed to it and expresses a referent other than Jerusalem. The feminine, singular pronoun most obviously refers to Aram—in spite of the immediately previous construct to the “daughters of Aram,” a feminine, plural designation. Also possible—albeit less likely—is a reference to Jerusalem’s sister, Samaria. Ezekiel 16:55 mentioned both sisters and their daughters and therefore, could supply the antecedent. The intervening 16:56 focused upon the report of Sodom during Jerusalem’s “pride.” Now the writer turns toward a connection with Samaria.

The point of this construct in 16:57a β would indicate a time when Aram faced reproach by those around her, glossed at the end of 16:57a with the “daughters of the Philistines.”⁴¹⁹ The clause may reference the chronicled skirmishes between Judah and Aram, i.e. Syria, in which Israel played a part in 2 Kings 16. 2 Kings 16:9 indicates that in response to Ahaz’s payment, Assyria came against Syria and defeated it. 2 Kings 17:1–6 subsequently reports of Samaria’s downfall in like measure. Interestingly, Syria along with Samaria reproached Jerusalem as well as faced a humiliating defeat. But according to the logic of the analogy, Samaria would yet return to its former state. Before that, however, just like those days when Assyria humiliated Syria and Samaria, Jerusalem must now bear her humiliation.

Regardless, the writer appears to equate these moments of disaster with the humility that Jerusalem would now bear. The final participial phrase, “those treating you with despite on every side” returns the focus to Jerusalem regarding those who would

⁴¹⁹ This likely occurs because of the “hateful, humiliated daughters of the Philistines” in 16:27. For the possible tradition of Syria and Philistia, see Is 9:11–12 or Amos 1:5ff.

now treat her with despite. The second common Ezekielian adverb “all around” transpires at the end of the clause referring to the plural number of entities now treating Jerusalem with despite.⁴²⁰ All three entities, Sodom, Samaria, and Jerusalem faced serious humiliation but they would return from that downfall to a former state of glory.

Finally, Ezekiel 16:58 concludes the subunit with three measures. First, the *Gottesspruchformel* occurs in 16:58b prior to messenger formula in 16:59. As stated above, the use of such formulas together indicate structural division.⁴²¹ Second, Ezek 16:58a completes the command, which occurred twice in Ezek 16:52, for Jerusalem to “bear your humiliation.” It reads, “You, you have borne your licentiousness and abominations.”⁴²² The second, feminine, singular, independent pronoun, occurs here as it also did in 16:52a and 16:52b. The finite verb, “to bear,” in contrast to the imperative forms in 16:52, occurs in second, feminine, singular *qatal* form plus the independent pronoun in 16:58a. Third, the fronting of two accusatives, “your licentiousness and your abominations” likewise draws the subunit to a close. Furthermore, the fronting associates the verbal action with these two significant lexemes from the section, thereby, associating maiden-Jerusalem’s bearing licentiousness and abominations as a particular

⁴²⁰ Ezekiel 16:57 could indicate a time of reproach by Aram and the Philistines against Jerusalem. The phrase, “the daughters of the Philistines” appeared in 16:27 as those who were humiliated by Jerusalem’s licentious deeds. Moreover, they “hated” (אִנְשׁוֹ) Jerusalem in Ezek 16:27. If one does not follow the Masoretic disjunction, the participle “those treating you with contempt” would refer to the daughters of Aram and the daughters of the Philistines. If one does follow the *atmach* here prior to Ezek 16:57b, the apposition in 16:57aβ clarifies that the Philistine women were those who had reproach for the daughters of Aram.

⁴²¹ See pp. 3–13.

⁴²² See the discussion on the grammatical tense, i.e. perfect, construction in Chapter 3 over the section concerning 16:58.

case of the legal “bearing iniquity.”⁴²³ All three sisters perpetrated “abominations” and thus, the verbal root appeared consistently since the close of the previous section in 16:43bβ and throughout the development of this section in 16:47, 50, 51 (twice), 52, and here in 58, where it occurs the final time. Previously, it had occurred only at the introduction of the unit in 16:2 and the transitionally significant 16:36. Moreover, the term, “licentiousness” likewise occurred in 16:27 and 43bβ before it appears here for the final time in the chapter.⁴²⁴

Thus, the section points in two directions. First, Jerusalem is bearing her humiliation and shame for her actions. The *qatal* verb in Ezek 16:58 indicates that Jerusalem is bearing her humiliation and shame at that point; not that she will bear it in the future but rather that it has at least partially transpired and is perhaps ongoing. This assertion leads to the second direction: Yahweh will restore each of the entities. Just as Sodom and Samaria have tolerated a period of humiliation, Jerusalem must also experience a period before Yahweh will restore all three. That is the hope to which the section appeals.

2.2.6 Yahweh Will Establish an Eternal Covenant Ezekiel 16:59–63

2.2.6.1 Ezekiel 16:59–63

The final subsection of the chapter coalesces around the theme of “covenant.” Even so, the section contains language congruent with the rest of the section, e.g.

⁴²³ On the possible adaptation of an older legal formula involving the “bearing of sin,” see Zimmerli, “Die Eigenart der prophetischen Rede des Ezechiel. Ein Beitrag zum Problem an Hand von Ez. 14:1 –11,” ZAW 66 (1954), 1–26.

⁴²⁴ Of its fourteen occurrences in the book of Ezekiel, eight are in Ezekiel 23: Ezek 23:21, 27, 29, 35, 44, 48 (twice), and 49.

“sisters” and “humiliation,” and indeed, the entire chapter, e.g. second, feminine, singular verbal and pronominal forms. The chapter likewise closes in typical Ezekielian formula, which the introduction to this chapter demonstrated. Thus, Ezek 16:59–63 will draw the theme of Jerusalem’s abominable behavior to an appropriate close albeit with a salvific hope.

Ezekiel 16:59 commences with an anomalous occurrence of the messenger formula within the chapter.⁴²⁵ Although the messenger formula appears in 16:59a, it does so only after the clause begins with the conjunction, “indeed,” (וַי). The addition of “indeed” before a typical messenger formula likely emphasizes the divine origin of the prophet’s message while at the same time signaling a structural transition. Moreover, as with its inclusion in an explanatory passage such as Ezek 32:11–14, its use here likely includes explanation.⁴²⁶ In conjunction with the closing *Gottesspruchformel* in 16:58b and the novel reconceptualization concerning “covenant” in 16:59–63, the chapter transitions to the final stage of Yahweh’s treatment of Jerusalem’s abominable deeds.

Subsequent to the messenger formula, one reads, “I will do with you according to what you have done.” The common verb, “to do, make” occurs in *Qere* as a first, singular *weqatal* announcing Yahweh’s future action.⁴²⁷ Moreover, the second, feminine, singular pronoun suffixed to the accusative marker requires that Yahweh be the subject of the otherwise written (*Ketiv*) second, feminine, singular verbal form.

⁴²⁵ The construction, “Indeed thus says the LORD” occurs in 14:21, 16:59, 23:28, 46, 25:6, 26:7, 19, 29:13, 32:11 and 34:11 in MT of Ezekiel. The conjunction וַי is absent in 14:21, 16:59, 23:46, 29:13 in the LXX of Ezekiel and absent in 32:11 in the Syriac version of Ezekiel.

⁴²⁶ Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 213.

⁴²⁷ For the versional attestation, see discussion in footnotes on the verse in Chapter 1.

Commentators have found some warrant for taking the clause as a question, i.e. “Will I do with you according to what you have done?”⁴²⁸ The same verbal root appeared in 16:43bβ without the Hebrew interrogative marker but with another indication that the clause asked a question. This common verbal root will also have practically the last word of the prophecy when Yahweh atones for everything she has “done.” However, the lack of any explicit indicator that the clause is a question, and ultimately, the context suggest that Yahweh will indeed act in reciprocal manner to her behavior although his action will involve further benevolence as well.⁴²⁹

Ezekiel 16:59b clarifies the action according to which Yahweh would act toward her, “You who despised the oath to break the covenant.” Except for the lexeme, “covenant,” this relative clause is absolutely distinct within the chapter. However, in the book of Ezekiel, the collocation transparently relates to the following chapter where it occurs a handful of times.⁴³⁰ The word, “covenant” on the other hand, is made to associate with the covenant in Ezek 16:8, in which Yahweh swears to maiden Jerusalem, comes into “covenant” with her, and she becomes his. The following clause in Ezek 16:60a will make this association explicit. Thus, Yahweh has indicated that he will act toward Jerusalem according to the way she broke the covenant.

The covenant, which she broke, concerns the covenant from 16:8, as the next clause makes explicit. In the logic of the metaphor in the chapter, Jerusalem broke that

⁴²⁸ See Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 226, 232.

⁴²⁹ Ezekiel 16:59aβ begins a chain of *weqatal* verbs that continues throughout the remainder of the chapter. Moreover, in the same way Jerusalem took lovers, Yahweh will include others within his “eternal covenant” that he establishes with Jerusalem.

⁴³⁰ Ezekiel 17:16, 18, 19; see also the comments in the translation and notes to variants as well as the comments on Ezek 16:59–63 in Chapters 3 and 4.

covenant by “playing the harlot” and “taking strangers” as an unfaithful wife. In return, Ezek 16:61a β states that Jerusalem will “take sisters” and 16:61b that Yahweh will “give them as daughters.” Thus, Jerusalem’s “taking” of so-called strangers and Yahweh’s “giving her sisters as daughters but not from your covenant” appears to be the action to which 16:59 refers, “I will do with you according to what you have done.” Ezekiel 16:61a α states that Jerusalem will be humiliated when Yahweh gives her sisters as daughters within his eternal covenant. The result is her “humiliation” (Ezek 16:61) and shame (Ezek 16:63), the precise charge that 16:52 demanded.

Ezekiel 16:60 advances a *weqatal* chain of verbs which began in 16:59a β and continues through the remainder of the chapter. It reads, “I, I will remember my covenant with you in the days of your youth.” The first, singular *weqatal* verbal form indicates Yahweh’s future action in which he will call to mind the covenant. The verb, “to remember” first occurred in 16:22, then in 16:43 where it indicated that Jerusalem had forgotten the days when she was vulnerable in her nakedness and Yahweh had acted benevolently towards her. Here in 16:60a, it is Yahweh who remembers and specifically, he remembers his covenant with her in the days of her youth. The phrase, “in the days of your youth” also occurred in 16:22 and 43 and signals yet another link that Yahweh’s action here in 16:60 counteracts Jerusalem’s failure “to remember.” Thus, Jerusalem failed to recall Yahweh’s benevolent, covenantal action and in fact, “despised the oath to break the covenant” in 16:59b. Yahweh, on the other hand, will recall that covenant and will act in accordance with it in judgment and grace.

The ensuing clause yields another first, singular *weqatal* verbal form. Moreover, the clause elaborates on the covenantal notion found in the previous clause. Ezekiel

16:60b says, “And I will establish with you an eternal covenant.” The verb, “I will establish” appears in the chapter for the first time although it will occur in a similar form in 16:62a in relationship to Yahweh’s covenant. Moreover, although the chapter mentioned a “covenant” in 16:8, it has nowhere alluded to an “eternal covenant.”⁴³¹ Finally, another second, feminine, singular pronoun affixed to lamed preposition indicates that Yahweh will establish this eternal covenant with Jerusalem. Thus, the clausal sequence in 16:60 suggests that Yahweh’s former covenant with Jerusalem motivates the establishment of an eternal covenant also with her. However, it is not until the ensuing verses that the reader discovers what this eternal covenant entails.

Ezekiel 16:61 begins with another *weqatal* verb but instead of expressing Yahweh’s action, the second, feminine, singular verb indicates Jerusalem’s future action. The verse begins, “And you will remember your way.” The verb, “to remember” occurred in the previous verse and indicated that Yahweh remembered his former covenant with Jerusalem although she had forgotten and broken the covenant. Because of the association between the verb, “to remember” and “covenant,” this action of “remembering” in 16:61a complements Yahweh’s action of “remembering” the covenant in the days of her youth in 16:60a. Moreover, according to the series of *weqatal* verbs, Jerusalem will remember in response to the establishment of an eternal covenant, which was sequentially related to Yahweh’s remembering his covenant with Jerusalem. Here in 16:61a, Jerusalem will remember her “way.” The term, “way” appeared in 16:25, 27, 31, 43, and 47 (twice).⁴³² In Ezek 16:27b, the Philistine women

⁴³¹ The phrase, “eternal covenant” is also found in Ezek 37:26.

⁴³² In 16:25 and 31, the term referred to the locations at which Jerusalem built her cultic centers and consequently, they have a different connotation than that connotation intended here.

were humiliated from her “way of licentiousness.” The term appeared in the formulaic transition of 16:43b α , which stated that Yahweh had brought Jerusalem’s way on her head. Finally, the term appeared twice in 16:47, once indicating the actions of Jerusalem’s sisters and once denoting Jerusalem’s ways, in that her behavior was worse than their behavior. This clause is distinct from all of these above in that Jerusalem would now “remember” her way. This new “remembering” would give way to the desired outcome in the following clause.

Ezek 16:61a β says, “And you will be humiliated when you take your sisters, from those who are older than you to those who are younger than you.” The second, feminine, singular *weqatal* verb repeats the verbal root, “to be humiliated,” that has occurred consistently since Ezek 16:52. Ezekiel 16:52 articulated the notion that Jerusalem must bear her humiliation because of her abominable behavior which was so horrible that sisters Sodom and Samaria looked righteous in comparison. Even after the messenger formula of 16:59 introduced the final section of the chapter, the focus on Jerusalem’s humiliation remains. Similarly, the adverbial phrase, “when you take your sisters, from those who are older than you to those who are younger than you,” coheres with multiple occurrences of the term, “sister” in Ezek 16:45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 52, 55, and 56. Moreover, the adjectives, “older” and “younger” similarly modify the term, “sister” in Ezek 16:46. In Ezek 16:61a β , however, the term “sister” and more significantly, the adjectival phrase sisters, “from those who are older than you to those who are younger than you,” are plural, thus indicating that Jerusalem will have more sisters than merely Sodom and Samaria.

Ezekiel 16:61b elaborates on Jerusalem's reception of these sisters. A return to a first, singular *weqatal* verb indicates Yahweh's future action in the clause. It says, "And I will give them to you as daughters but not from your covenant." This common Hebrew verb, "to give" occurred ten times in the chapter in the first, singular form, most of which involved Yahweh's benevolent action in Jerusalem's youth. Additionally, verbs of this root, whose conjugated form was first, singular, *weqatal*, appeared in the announcement of Yahweh's judgment in 16:38b and 39a in the midst of other first, singular, *weqatal* forms.

Besides the addition of the plural forms of "older sisters and younger sisters," a second distinct viewpoint from 16:61a is the term, "daughters." Although the term has consistently appeared with the feminine characters in this section in 16:46, 48, 49, 53, 55, and 57, here the term takes on an additional connotation, as Yahweh gives the sisters "as daughters." In other words, Sodom and Samaria, and other sisters in view of the plural "older sisters to younger sisters," are granted a familial status as daughters of Jerusalem. Here, the meaning of 16:59 comes into clearer view. Yahweh would deal with Jerusalem as she had dealt with him. She despised the oath and broke the covenant acting in humiliation and shame when she took strangers and made her sisters appear righteous; in response, he would make a covenant in which Jerusalem would take her sisters as he gives them bringing about humiliation and shame.

Ezekiel 16:58 concludes with a final assertion, "And not from your covenant." The term, "covenant" first appeared in 16:8 as Yahweh covered the naked maiden with his wing, swore to her, "came in covenant" with her, and she became his. After the messenger formula commenced Ezek 16:59, the term appeared again in a clause, which

asserted that Jerusalem had “despised the oath, to break the covenant.” Subsequent to that reference, Ezek 16:60 contained two occurrences of the term, “covenant.” The first appearance in 16:60a explicitly commented that Yahweh remembered his “covenant” with Jerusalem in the days of her youth. Subsequent to this “remembering,” there appeared a second occurrence of “covenant” in 16:60b, in which Yahweh would establish an eternal covenant. This covenant would impel the stipulated humiliation when Jerusalem received her sisters as her daughters. Moreover, the “my covenant,” which Yahweh announces in 16:62a will likewise impel Jerusalem to remember and be ashamed. Thus, the “your covenant” mentioned in 16:61bβ can hardly be any other than the covenant of her youth when she alone was Yahweh’s bride.⁴³³

Ezekiel 16:62a begins in the same manner as 16:60b with a Hiphil, *weqatal*, first, singular verbal form, “And I will establish.” Moreover, it is a “covenant” that Yahweh will establish here in 16:62a just as he would in 16:60b. The clause differs from 16:60b in that the description of the covenant that Yahweh would establish, is “my covenant with you,” rather than the “eternal covenant,” which is found in 16:60b. Finally, the superfluous independent personal pronoun in the clause draws attention to Yahweh’s action as did the same construction in 16:60a when Yahweh remembered his covenant with Jerusalem in the days of her youth. Thus, the clause reads, “And I, I will establish my covenant with you.” The establishment of this covenant must be distinct from the covenant that Yahweh established with Jerusalem in the days of her youth in view of the

⁴³³ For the full range of possibilities and viewpoints of scholarship, see Ka Leung Wong, *The Idea of Retribution in the Book of Ezekiel* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 48.

future perspective. Moreover, the recurrence of “I will establish” associates this covenant with the “eternal covenant” in 16:60b.

It is interesting to note the different perspective upon Jerusalem in this final section. There has been no mention of “abominations” since 16:58 and, of course, no reference to Jerusalem’s harlotry since 16:41. To be specific, although the requirement that Jerusalem experience humiliation remains, the negative caricature of Jerusalem—so incessant in 16:15–41 and hyperbolic in 16:46–52—has now faded from view. In contrast to those details, which are no longer the focus, one can discern the significance of the material that has remained constant throughout the chapter, namely, pronominal references to Jerusalem. Ezekiel 16:62b is no different in that it also refers to Jerusalem by means of the second, feminine, singular, *weqatal* verbal form.

Thus, Ezek 16:62b begins with yet another *weqatal* verbal form indicating Jerusalem’s future action. What is noteworthy in the clause, however, is the appearance of the common Ezekielian recognition formula. This formula, which transpires in various grammatical constructions, occurs approximately seventy times in the book of Ezekiel.⁴³⁴ It does not appear in the book before Ezekiel 5 nor after Ezekiel 39. Its appearance here is associated with the establishment of Yahweh’s covenant with Jerusalem. The clause says, “And you will know that I am the LORD God.” Consequently, the establishment of this covenant will lead Jerusalem to knowledge of who Yahweh is. The recognition formula that concludes 16:62 will in turn, lead to the sense of humiliation that Yahweh demanded in 16:52 because of Jerusalem’s sin and abominations.

⁴³⁴ For more on this formula, see Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 35–40; Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 38–39.

Ezekiel 16:63a does not begin with the *weqatal* verbal form but instead begins with the subordinate conjunction, “on account of.” Consequently, this final verse of the prophecy connects explicitly to the recognition formula, which concluded 16:62b. The first clause also repeats the verb, “to remember” as the recognition formula will effect a recollection of her former life. The clause reads, “In order that you remember.” This verb occurred in 16:22, 43, 60, and 61. Ezekiel 16:46–52, and 61 indicated that Jerusalem was to remember her way and be humiliated because her actions were so abhorrent that she made her sisters appear righteous, thus mediating for them. The act of “remembering” will also lead Jerusalem to “be ashamed” in the subsequent clause in 16:62a. This sense of shame was also a desired outcome of the injunctions in 16:52 and was parallel to the command that Jerusalem “bear the humiliation,” that was hers because of her behavior. Here, the reader can discern that the “eternal covenant” will ultimately bring about the sense of shame in which Jerusalem will remember her former, abominable ways.

The next clause in 16:63a β reinforces the parallelism from 16:52 in which Jerusalem was to “bear her humiliation” and the reproof from 16:56 in which Jerusalem once held Sodom in contempt. The clause reads, “and no longer will there be any words from your mouth because of your humiliation.” First, the phrase, “because of your humiliation” connects with the verbal root, “to be humiliated,” which occurred in 16:52 (twice), 54 (twice), and 61. Again, the parallel commands in 16:52b were, “be ashamed and bear your humiliation.” As stated above concerning 16:63a α , after the establishment of an eternal covenant, Jerusalem would remember, be ashamed, and no longer open her mouth because of her humiliation. Hence, one discerns how the establishment of “my

covenant with you,” that is, an “eternal covenant” in which Yahweh gives sisters Sodom, Samaria, and their daughters fulfill the demand that Jerusalem bear her humiliation from Ezek 16:52a.

Second, Ezek 16:56 reported that Sodom was a report in the “mouth” of Jerusalem. However, 16:63b indicates in contrast to this sentiment that Jerusalem would no longer “open the mouth” because of her humiliation. Thus, the clause connects the command for Jerusalem to “bear humiliation” with her presumably condescending attitude of sister, Sodom.

The ensuing clause is connected by means of an adverbial phrase, “When I atone for you, for all which you have done, utters the LORD.” The term, “atone” occurs only here in the chapter and does not occur again in the book of Ezekiel except in chapters 43 and 45. Its appearance here is surprising given the paucity of explanation or connection to other chapters. However, the phrase, “for all which you have done” certainly coheres with the remainder of the chapter, in particular the same phrase in 16:54, when Yahweh tells Jerusalem, “you will be humiliated for all which you have done.” Finally, the chapter closes with the *Gottesspruchformel*, immediately prior to the word-event formula in Ezekiel 17:1, which opens the next written prophecy.

Chapter 3

3. Literary Activity in Ezekiel 16

Chapter Two examined the structure of Ezekiel 16 according to the presentation of the chapter within the book of Ezekiel. The analysis demonstrated the unity and coherence of the chapter in accordance with Ezekielian formula as well as the substantial congruence of language and content within the chapter. Even so, various questions and complexities within Ezekiel 16 raise the issue of distinct perspectives and expansionary material. Whether through grammatical observations, lexical usage, conceptual development, or integration of significant lemmata, the chapter exhibits literary activities and productions that emerge from an interaction with pre-existing tradition, oral, or literary material. The following presentation analyzes those distinct perspectives through an examination of the linguistic and content-related materials that develop within the chapter. The analysis proceeds on the basis that these distinctions reveal materials that were integrated into the chapter at different times or from varying perspectives and therefore, provide a means of textual production techniques and plausibly an occasion for a given expansion.

This chapter will begin by addressing material that is congruent within an individual expansion, layer, or perspective, and that presumes or shows the greatest degree of dependence on other expansions, i.e. the latest material. At times, the method of supplementation will become clear through the analysis. Additionally, the chapter will consider elements that may contain lemmata or concepts discernibly incongruent with other materials, thereby suggesting a distinction. Because literary activities within the chapter differ in time of entry, complexity, and confluence, the analysis will proceed

from the latest literary activity to antecedent expansionary materials. In so doing, the analysis will trace backwards each approximate expansion eventually yielding the basic materials of Ezekiel 16. At times, the observations will yield distinct literary activities and purposes. We will consider these aspects of the growth of the chapter in the conclusion and attempt to situate their relative emergence and purpose.

3.05 So-Called Appendices

It is commonly proposed that two developments exist in Ezekiel 16, each of which is somewhat homogenous in constitution, and comprise what scholars generally consider as two appendices to the chapter.⁴³⁵ There is an earlier development of extensive content that is incommensurable with the rest of the chapter and is usually understood as an early appendix comprising 16:44–58. This analysis will argue that this development actually consists of an initial attempt at a chapter-like expansion in Ezek 16:2^(הודיע)–3a^(ואמרתי), [20–23], 36b, 43–58.⁴³⁶ This material recounts Jerusalem's abhorrent behavior but is distinct from her depiction as a harlot. Additionally, its more positive function is apparent from several factors, not the least of which is its focus on the sisters' restoration.

⁴³⁵ See Block, *Ezekiel: 1–24* and Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20* for holistic approaches; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*; Garscha, *Studien zum Ezechielbuch*; K. Pohlmann, *Der Prophet Hesekiel/Ezechiel Kapitel 1–19. ATD 22.1*. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996; and G. Fohrer, *Ezechiel* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1955) for redactionally oriented approaches.

⁴³⁶ Ezekiel 16:20–23 defies a simple explanation of its inclusion with either this expansion or one involving harlotry. For its congruence with this expansion see section 3.2; for its inclusion within a harlotry expansion, see 3.3.

The second development, Ezek 16:59–63, constitutes a second appendix that presumes materials 16:1–42 and 43–58.⁴³⁷ Once analyzed, it becomes rather clear that this so-called appendix builds upon a few significant overtures from previous material and stems from an even later perspective. This analysis will begin with this expansion in 16:59–63 before proceeding to the more thorough chapter-like expansion of Ezek 16:2^(הודיע)–3a^(תמרת), [20–23], 36b, 43–58. The analysis will utilize observations already noted in Chapter Two that provide evidence for literary activity and distinct viewpoints in these two expansions.

3.1 Ezekiel 16:59–63 The Eternal Covenant

Assertions in Ezek 16:59–63 clearly presume materials from other sections of the chapter as one can detect for the following reasons. First, although constructed from collocations in Ezekiel 17, Ezek 16:59–60 alludes to Jerusalem’s covenant-marriage to Yahweh that first emerged in 16:8. Second, Ezek 16:59 condemns Jerusalem for her covenantal violations presumably in view of her many harlotrous liaisons, which 16:15–41 heralded. Third, the term “sisters” occurs in 16:61 and otherwise only appears between 16:45–51 (eleven times), therefore assuming the sister-metaphor concerning Jerusalem, Sodom, and Samaria. Moreover, the achievement of the eternal covenant, announced in 16:60, will result in “humiliation” and “shame,” two abasements that Ezek 16:46–58 demanded. Perhaps not surprisingly, since 16:59–63 constitute the final five

⁴³⁷ The commentaries are virtually unanimous in this conclusion although they diverge in the precise provenance; see Block, *Ezekiel: 1–24*, 64; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 333–34; Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 292, 294–95, 304–05; Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 233–35; Gustav Hölscher, *Hesekiel: Der Dichter und das Buch* (Giessen: Von Alfred Töpelmann, 1924) 96–97; G. A. Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1951), 180–81.

verses of the chapter, the section builds upon the materials that come before it. In what manner does the section take up earlier material? Furthermore, if indeed 16:59–63 contain elements congruent with the rest of the chapter, how does it then exhibit distinct literary activity that emerges from those preceding materials? We will address these questions in turn below.

Ezekiel 16:59–63 takes up Yahweh’s positive posture towards Jerusalem that initially emerges in 16:53–58. Yahweh indicates in v. 53 ff. that he will restore the three sisters to their former state. Subsequently in 16:59, after an anomalous messenger formula—itself a possible indication of an expansion, Yahweh declares his equitable but gracious response towards Jerusalem (and Sodom, Samaria, and their daughters) in spite of her covenant violations. Yahweh says, “And I will do with you according to what you have done.” Thus, Yahweh’s plan will somehow take up Jerusalem’s misdeeds—she took strangers—as his words adumbrate a reciprocal action. Instead of vengeful retribution, Yahweh’s action will include a response of grace that incorporates Sodom and Samaria and results in the called-for humility and shame from 16:44–58.

Additionally, 16:59 indicates that Jerusalem “despised the oath, to break the covenant.” We will deal with this in greater detail below but the reference to a covenant engages the lexeme and concept that first emerged in 16:8, although it will extend the notion in a distinct manner. Moreover, the following verse, 16:60, makes explicit reference to the covenant of Jerusalem’s youth with Yahweh. In so doing, 16:60a excerpts the phrase from Ezek 16:22a and 16:43a, “the days of your youth” in which Jerusalem “forgot” (זָכַר) Yahweh’s benevolent care. However, unlike Jerusalem, Yahweh “will remember” (זָכַר) his covenant with Jerusalem “in the days of [her] youth.”

In this manner, the author of this expansion utilizes the verb, “to remember” and the prepositional phrase, “in the days of your youth” but makes the subject of it Yahweh instead of Jerusalem, quite unlike her forgetful, wanton deeds in 16:22 and 43. In contrast to Jerusalem’s heedlessness, he does remember the days of her youth and his covenant with her and will establish an eternal covenant in response. Thus, his covenant with her, which she despised in her licentious behavior “forgetting the days of her youth,” prompts Yahweh to act not only on her behalf but also that of her sister-daughters. Thus, the expansion utilizes the same phraseology and lemmata from previous material in the chapter, albeit in an adapted manner, to extend the notion of covenant in this section. Moreover, it incorporates material from ch. 17 in order to articulate congruence within Ezekiel 16, e.g. reference to the covenant in the days of her youth, but also to develop content in a new manner, e.g. the eternal covenant.

Finally, the comparison with Sodom and Samaria in 16:43–58 gives the author of vv. 59–63 an opportunity to incorporate the “humility and shame” that 16:52 enjoined with this supplemented perspective of a covenant. It is Yahweh’s eternal covenant that will, in the end, cause Jerusalem to “remember,” something she had failed to do previously. The eternal covenant will accommodate Jerusalem’s sisters, albeit unlike the restoration, they will assimilate as daughters; moreover, this covenant will ultimately bring about the recognition formula in 16:62. All of this is achieved so that in the final verse, 16:63, Jerusalem will finally “remember, and be ashamed,” and experience a “humiliation.” Thus, in 16:61 and 63, these consequences will effect the humility and shame called for in 16:43–58. In this manner, 16:59–63 takes up previous materials and expands upon them in order to express the notion of an eternal covenant.

We now turn more pointedly to the second question above regarding the manner in which 16:59–63 exhibits distinct literary characteristics from preceding materials. In addition to the anomalous, structurally significant formula, “Indeed thus says the LORD,” the section’s unique lemmata and developed concepts exhibit expansions upon the chapter’s initial foci.⁴³⁸ First, the section characterizes Jerusalem’s disobedience in a manner unique to the chapter; she acted in covenantal disobedience. This characterization has long been recognized as bearing striking similarity to Ezekiel 17 rather than the many, previous indictments of harlotry in Ezekiel 16. Ezekiel 16:59 asserts that Jerusalem broke the covenant. The lemmata used in the collocation, “despise the oath, to break a covenant” (ברית פרר אלה בזה) occur 4 times together in the book of Ezekiel: here in 16:59 and 17:16, 18, and 19.

An analysis of Ezekiel 17 lies beyond the scope of this investigation but the chapter begins with an allegory and proceeds with a prophecy that elucidates how the king of Babylon came to Jerusalem and captured the royal family.⁴³⁹ He “cut a covenant” with a ruler from the royal family in Jerusalem but afterwards, this ruler sent a messenger to Egypt for help and therefore, “broke the covenant.” Consequently, just as this ruler despised the oath, broke the covenant, and will not escape Babylon’s wrath, so he will not escape Yahweh’s wrath for “despising the oath and breaking the covenant” of Yahweh. To put the matter another way, the entire chapter of Ezekiel 17 leads to and

⁴³⁸ See the syntactical anomaly of the messenger formula and the use of “utters the LORD” mentioned above, Chapter Two.

⁴³⁹ For a complete analysis, see Hölscher, *Hesekiel*, 97–104.

develops a context from which these lemmata cannot be easily extracted without destroying the plot and theme of the chapter.

Given this observation and the remaining analysis below, it becomes clear that the expansion in Ezek 16:59–63 utilizes this rare collocation from Ezekiel 17 in order to expand upon the concept of covenant in 16:8. This expansion is obviously subsequent to Jerusalem’s indictment for harlotry in 16:15–42 and abominable sin in 16:43–58 not the least of which is because it presumes Jerusalem’s violations. Given its use in Ezekiel 17, the author could have seen an opportunity not only to integrate his expansion into the existing sequence of literary prophecies but also to develop the case that Yahweh yet had plans for Jerusalem’s future. Moreover, given Jerusalem’s dalliance with foreign paramours in 16:26–29, the chapter’s relationship with the theme of ch. 17 may have similarly contributed to the expansion. Thus, besides the message of the eternal covenant, Jerusalem’s tenuous relationship with Persia may be actuating the expansion. Furthermore, although the expansion could be later than the moment of sequencing between Ezekiel 16 and 17, it is unlikely that it is prior to it given the use of such a rare collocation in both chapters.

The use of the collocation, “despise the oath to break the covenant” toward the end of Ezekiel 16 in conjunction with the other distinct lemmata and developed concepts in vv. 59–63 provide other evidence for distinct literary activity within Ezekiel 16. Thus the analysis lays bare the literary techniques in which the author expands upon the notion of covenant and creates cohesion between chapters. In a usage drawn from Ezek 17:18, Ezek 16:59b alters only the grammatical person to indicate that Jerusalem “despised the oath, to break the covenant.” Accordingly, 16:59a says that Yahweh will

deal with Jerusalem according to what she has done. Likewise, this collocation in which someone acts in correlation to another transpires throughout the book and demonstrates again that the author incorporates familiar language from the book.⁴⁴⁰

What did Jerusalem do? How will Yahweh's actions correspond to hers?

Although his actions are enigmatic, Yahweh will do three things: he will remember his earlier covenant, he will establish an eternal covenant, and he will give Sodom, Samaria, and other sisters as daughters. Jerusalem will respond with the purposed humiliation and shame, a requirement of the restoration in 16:44–58, when she takes these new daughters. When construed according to its relationship with indictments of harlotry and abominable sin materials in Ezekiel 16, Yahweh will act towards Jerusalem according to how she acted when she “despised the oath, to break the covenant.” She “took strangers” (Ezek 16:32) and “gave gifts” to her lovers. (Ezek 16:33) Now Yahweh would act in reciprocal manner. Yahweh will “give” Jerusalem's sisters to her as daughters in the eternal covenant. She will “take her older sisters and her younger sisters.” (Ezek 16:61) This will bring about humiliation and shame demanded in 16:52.

More than merely the development of content demonstrates authorial activity. Some form of the following constructions are found within ch 16 or otherwise in book of Ezekiel: “despised the oath to break the covenant”, “do according to which someone does”, “days of your youth”, “I/you will remember”, “be humiliated”, “older and younger sisters”, “you will know that I am the LORD”, and “utters the LORD.” Other than in 16:60 and 62, the collocation “I will establish a covenant” occurs in priestly material

⁴⁴⁰ The construction in Ezek 16:59a reads “תִּישַׁע רִשְׁכָּא... תִּישׁוּעַ.” Similar constructions indicating corresponding action occurs in 24:22 and 35:11. Similar constructions occur in 5:9, 14:23, 16:48, and 20:21 but without the notion of reciprocal action.

in Genesis 9, 17, and Exodus 6. Moreover, it occurs in the Holiness Code in Lev 26:9.⁴⁴¹ Incorporation of collocations from earlier in the chapter, book, or canon, at times verbatim usage, divulges the practice of this particular writer.

As described above, the development of the notion of “covenant” also suggests distinct literary activity. In what can only be described as a marriage, Ezekiel 16:8 describes how Yahweh covered the maiden’s nakedness, swore to her, “came into covenant” with her, and she became his.⁴⁴² The chapter goes on to castigate Jerusalem for her harlotry and abominations with no other occurrence of the term, “covenant” until 16:59. The absence of any negative, explicit mention of “covenant” in the accusation and judgment of harlotry and abominations in 16:15–52 and the lack of any positive mention in the positive view of restoration in 16:53–58 hints at the expansionary nature of judgment and salvation in the final verses of 16:59–63. One would expect many denunciations of her adulterous behavior and its effect upon the covenant but with the exception of Ezek 16:32 and *Wiederaufnahmen* in 16:38a and 41aβ, there is little if any presumption of marriage in the chapter besides Ezek 16:8 and 60 nor is there explicit mention of a violation of any covenant until 16:59.⁴⁴³

Likewise, one would have anticipated an association between restoration and covenant but it fails to materialize until the enigmatic 16:61–62. The overwhelmingly positive perspective in vv. 59–63 highlights its unique outlook with its “eternal

⁴⁴¹ See Christoph Levin, *Die Verheißung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt* FRLANT 137 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 222–34.

⁴⁴² For the full range of opinions, see Wong, *Retribution*, 32–50; cf. Brian Neil Peterson, *Ezekiel in Context: Ezekiel’s Message Understood in Its Historical Setting of Covenant Curses and Ancient Near Eastern Mythological Motifs* (Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick, 2012), 195–96.

⁴⁴³ See below for the integration of adultery into the chapter.

covenant,” “my covenant,” and the chapter’s only occurrence of the recognition formula. While the negative roots, “to play the harlot” or “abomination” respectively predominate in previous sections, they are nowhere present in 16:59–63. Only the more restrained terms, “to be humiliated” and “be ashamed” appear in 16:59–63. Any recollection of harlotry or abomination seems strangely absent even amidst anticipation of shame and humiliation in 16:61, and 63.

One can discern another development by means of a conceptual shift in Sodom and Samaria’s relationship to Jerusalem and whom Yahweh will include in Jerusalem’s familial relationships. As noted above, the plural term “sisters” occurs in 16:61. This occurrence would be of little consequence if it only referred to “sisters” Samaria and Sodom. However, the clause uses the plural adjectives “older ones” and “younger ones” to modify “sisters.”⁴⁴⁴ To put the matter another way, Jerusalem suddenly has older sisters and younger sisters—not only Samaria and Sodom—which Yahweh will give to Jerusalem as daughters.⁴⁴⁵ Ezekiel 16:46–56 spoke of “old sister, Samaria” and “younger sister, Sodom” but it did not portend multiple older sisters and multiple younger sisters. Presumably, one should consider this an aspect of restoration from 16:53–55 but the root, בּוֹשׁ, does not appear in vv. 59–63, which is itself another lacuna that suggests distinct literary activity.⁴⁴⁶ In any case, the population of Yahweh’s family

⁴⁴⁴ Hölscher, *Hesekiel*, 97.

⁴⁴⁵ One might possibly understand in this reference to “older sisters” and “younger sisters” a designation of “Sodom and her daughters” and “Samaria and her daughters.” Such an understanding seems unlikely, however, since Sodom and Samaria are described as sisters, a description that their daughters do not share in 16:44–58. Furthermore, it is improbable that Samaria’s daughters would then be described as “older sisters.”

⁴⁴⁶ Interestingly, the root, בּוֹשׁ, so significant for the three sisters in 16:53–55, does not even occur in relationship to the eternal covenant in 16:59–63.

suddenly grows. Moreover, in the restoration, which is described in 16:55, each of the sisters “returns to their former state” but in 16:61, the other sisters become daughters of Jerusalem and apparently participate in “my covenant” in 16:62.⁴⁴⁷

Finally, one notes the first appearance of the lemma, “to atone” in the final verse of the chapter, 16:63. To draw a definite conclusion between its appearance and the distinct literary activity in the section would be premature. However, its first appearance at this juncture in the chapter—indeed, in the book, must strike one as odd. In the entire book of Ezekiel, the lemma only occurs here and in Ezek 43:20, 26, 45:15, 17, and 20. There has been little adumbration of a means for such reconciliation in Ezekiel 16. Ezekiel 16:51–54 describes how Jerusalem mediated, justified, and consoled Sodom and Samaria by means of her own abominable behavior but this hyperbole fails to delimit Yahweh’s expunction of Jerusalem’s sin. In these ways, 16:59–63 exhibits distinct literary characteristics from those materials that precede it. The section takes up lemmata from chapter 17, from earlier sections of the book, and from the chapter’s composition in order to expand upon the notion of covenant and restoration.

3.2 Ezekiel 16:2^(הודע)–3a^(ואמרתי), [20–23], 36b, 43–58 Abominations, Restoration, and Sister Metaphor

Similar to the appendix in 16:59–63, the material concerning Jerusalem’s abominations and her sisters comprises an approximately homogeneous expansion. Moreover, with the exception of the appendix in 16:59–63, this expansionary material gives the chapter its approximate, present shape. In addition to the manner in which this

⁴⁴⁷ Cf. Hölscher, *Hesekiel*, 97; Wong, *Retribution*, 48.

expansion reworks material from earlier editions of the metaphor, there are basically three types of evidence through which one can discern the distinct constitution of the material. First, the material utilizes a unique group of lexical stock that on occasion, signals association not only with passages inside the chapter but also outside of it. In conjunction with this observation, the material lacks key lexical items from other sections, in particular, the tropes, “to play the harlot” and “covenant,” which one finds repeatedly in 16:15–41 and 59–63 respectively.

The second type of evidence that signals the expansionary nature concerns a peculiar syntactical construction and unexpected grammatical form in a transitional set of clauses. And third, subtle distinctions in content exhibit variations in motif and intention, thereby signaling important purposes in the appropriation of earlier content and textual material. This unit will present this evidence in three steps: lexical usage, grammatical and syntactical observations, and developments in concepts. In the analysis of these steps, it will become evident how the expansionary materials integrate lemmata and concepts from 16:1–42 in order to expand upon these earlier texts. We now turn to a discussion of these points through which one discerns the production of a germinal chapter.

3.2.1 Ezekiel 16:2^(הודיע)–3a^(ואמרת), 20–23, 36b, 43–58 Lexical Choices

As stated above, this expansion provides the basic contour of the chapter—minus the ending in 16:59–63. This assessment follows most simplistically from its usage (or lack) of particular terminology, e.g. “abominations” (or negatively, “to play the harlot”). But the observation concerning distinct lexical stock involves more than merely

counting particular lexemes. It concerns how the author uses the lexemes and with what other words and motifs he associates them. This section will present the basis for why this expansion is distinct from others on the basis of unique lemmata and how those words are used with other lexemes.

3.2.1.1 The lexeme “Abomination”

An initial perception that one observes related to lexical usage is the term “abominations.” The term occurs most densely in the main body of this expansion in 16:43–58, where it makes six appearances. It only occurs outside of that section in the introductory verse, 16:2, and the transition from accusation to punishment in 16:36.⁴⁴⁸ For reasons of lexical choice and content, about which I will say more below, 16:36b appears also to be a part of this expansion. These considerations leave 16:2 to analyze initially. When one observes how 16:2 utilizes “abominations” together with other particular elements occurring in different contexts, it becomes evident that 16:2 also comprises this expansion. We now turn to an analysis of these elements.

3.2.1.2 “Abominations” and its Coherence with the Command to “Make Known”

The introductory verses offer an interesting situation to the reader. On the one hand, Ezek 16:1 opens up like so many of the book’s chapters with the word event formula. Ezekiel 16:2 continues the typical Ezekielian prophecy with the vocative, “Son of man” before the chapter takes its characteristic turn. At that juncture, the verse

⁴⁴⁸ The term also appears in the MT in 16:22 but for text critical reasons, it appears to be an addition; see Chapter One.

continues with the imperative, “make known to Jerusalem her abominations” and in conjunction with typical imperatival style continues in 16:3a α with a *weqatal* of the common verb, ואמרת. Thereafter, Ezek 16:3a β returns formulaically to add the messenger formula, and a repetition of the recipient of the prophecy, “Thus Yahweh says to Jerusalem.” What can we discern from the imperative in 16:2, “Make known to Jerusalem her abominations?” This clause signals a characteristic feature of the expansion.

First, the clause interrupts otherwise common Ezekielian formulae: the word event formula, the vocative, “son of man,” the *weqatal* verb, “and you will say,” and the messenger formula. In so doing, it provides a characteristic quality to the introductory verses. Otherwise, the opening would be similar to what one reads in Ezek 7:1–2, “And the word of Yahweh was to me saying, “And you, son of man, thus Yahweh says...”” Here then in 16:2, the expansion finds an opening in the introductory formulae in which to insert a characteristic element that will thereafter nuance the chapter and open the way for a development concerning abominable Jerusalem. This observation is not to say that other chapter-prophecies lack characteristic elements that the opening verses adumbrate among the formulae. Indeed, many chapters do. However, the point obtains that the unique elements that the imperative in 16:2 introduces, in this case, are taken up in vv. 43–58 rather than what follows in vv. 3a β ff. In other words, these characteristic elements in the opening verses indeed cohere with elements found mainly in one set of material and specifically not with other materials within the chapter. The term, “abominations,” is not used in the accusation section of vv. 15–34 and only appears once

in the announcement of judgment in 35–42.⁴⁴⁹ Moreover, the term never occurs in the final section addressing the eternal covenant. In contrast, the verbal root, “to play the harlot” occurs twenty-one times in the accusation and announcement of judgment but never occurs otherwise in the chapter. This contrast in the use of key terms indicates the different foci of the sections and portends this chapter-producing expansion.

In addition to the mere use of the term, “abominations,” another consideration involves with what other words and expressions this particular term often occurs. If the term is used elsewhere in collocation with other lemmata or grammar, it could indicate affiliated Ezekielian expressions. This observation may then assist in determining the lemmata used in this particular expansion. In Ezek 16:2, “abomination” occurs with the command for Ezekiel to “make known” Jerusalem’s abominable ways to her. Are there other contexts in which the collocation is found? As Chapter Two expressed, a similar collocation appears in three other contexts. In Ezek 20:4, Yahweh tells Ezekiel to “make known the abominations of their fathers” to a group of elders. This appearance of “abominations” is the only occurrence in the chapter and therefore, does not appear as a central theme. However, the prominent Ezekielian term “idols” (גלולים), which appears in the expansionary material in 16:36b, the phrase “idols of your abominations,” and an inflected term indicating child sacrifice (העביר) appearing in the expansionary material in 16:21,⁴⁵⁰ occur in Ezekiel 20 as features of their abominable behavior that Ezekiel was

⁴⁴⁹ This sole occurrence is in 16:36b, which also belongs to this chapter-making expansion.

⁴⁵⁰ I am aware of the charge of circular reasoning underlying this statement that 16:36b and 16:21 contain particular words and therefore, are from distinct perspectives even though they are situated in the midst of other material contexts. However, there are additional reasons to assert that these verses are from this expansion and not from another apart from mere lexemes. See the paragraphs below concerning Ezek 16:20–23 and 36b. Even so, although one must weigh lexical usage carefully, it is a valid and valuable element that forms part of the basis for these conclusions.

to declare to them.⁴⁵¹ In contrast, the *leitmotif* of the accusation and announcement of judgment in Ezek 16:15–42, the lemma, “to play the harlot,” only occurs once in Ezek 20:30.

Moreover, Ezek 22:2 uses the same collocation, “make known abominations” and does so in the context of other lemmata that this expansion in Ezekiel 16 utilizes.⁴⁵² After typical introductory formulae, Ezek 22:2 states that Ezekiel is to “make known” to “the city of bloodshed her abominations.” Ezekiel 22:3–4 repeat that it is because of her “pouring out blood” and “making idols” for which she is guilty. Moreover, Ezek 22:6–12 associates the “pouring out blood” with “committing abominations,” “being unclean in licentiousness,” and other oppressive acts. Thus, the abominations, which Ezekiel is to “make known,” involved “blood,” “idols,” and “licentiousness,” three terms that occur within and are characteristic of the expansionary material in 16:36, and 43–58.

Ezekiel 23:36 also utilizes “abominations” with an imperative. The verb, however, is not a Hiphil of the verb, “to know,” (עד) rather it is the Hiphil verb, “to declare.” (גג) The nuance, however, appears similar enough in both situations for comparison. Ezekiel was to communicate to his audience their abominable behavior. Even more so than in Ezekiel 20 or 22, Ezekiel 23 seems particularly related to Ezekiel 16. An analysis of the precise relationship between Ezekiel 16 and 23 involves a great deal of material between the two chapters and is beyond the scope of this analysis. Such an analysis could indicate more specifically whether this material arose from the same

⁴⁵¹ The term, “idols” occurs in Ezek 20:7, 8, 16, 18, 24, 31, and 39 (twice). The Hiphil verb, “to cause to pass through,” occurs in 20:26 and 31 although 20:31 appears to be a scribal addition.

⁴⁵² The form of the verb in 22:2, a *weqatal*, is dissimilar from the verb in 16:2, 20:4, and 23:36, which utilize imperative forms. However, given the use of the *weqatal* in Hebrew with imperatival force, this dissimilarity does not negate the comparable lexical situation.

expansion or in what direction the dependence may be. However, at the very least, one can observe that the chapters mirror one another and do so in ways that buttress the argument here. The argument is that the term, “abominations,” and lemmata syntactically or contextually associated with it assist in identifying expansionary material in Ezekiel 16. Therefore, whether the similar material in Ezekiel 23 stems from dependence upon or association with Ezekiel 16 or whether Ezekiel 16 is dependent upon Ezekiel 23, the similarities reveal material consistent with the expansion.

In the case of Ezekiel 23, it is interesting to note that the content that arises in 16:44–58 concerns a comparison of sisters, the exact plot of Ezekiel 23. One of the sisters in each case is Samaria and the other is Jerusalem, while Sodom makes its only appearance in Ezekiel 16. Moreover, in each case Jerusalem is compared negatively to her sister(s) as one who “corrupted her ways [lust] more than them [her].” (Ezek 16:47b, 23:11a) The licentious sister, who commits abominations, is Jerusalem! Additionally, there are a number of terms and phrases, which are common to Ezekiel 23 and this particular expansion in Ezekiel 16.⁴⁵³ However, a simple solution does not necessarily obtain. The key term, “abominations” only occurs in the imperative clause in 23:36. Moreover, the central motif in Ezek 16:15–42, “to play the harlot” occurs often in the metaphor of the two sisters in Ezekiel 23 although minimally after the imperative in 23:36. As noted above, the root, “to play the harlot,” does not occur in this expansion in Ezekiel 16. One could explain these factors by the conflation of the harlotry motif and

⁴⁵³ Words in common are “idols,” (גלולים) “licentiousness,” (זמה) “to remember the days of her youth,” “to slaughter sons,” “sons which they [you] birthed to me,” and “cause them to pass through [the fire] to them.” Interestingly, although the context is clearly child sacrifice in 16:21 and 23:37, neither clause contains the accusative “fire.”

the sister metaphor in the composition of Ezekiel 23:1–35, which, in contrast, transpired in distinct material in Ezekiel 16. This hypothesis would explain the inclusion of both elements in Ezekiel 23 while also corroborating the distinction between these materials in Ezekiel 16. However, the elements of Ezek 23:36–49 do not easily fit with that hypothesis and must remain unsettled here.⁴⁵⁴

One other observation arises from the relationship of the imperative, “make known” plus accusative, “abominations” in the four passages. Yahweh’s instruction for the prophet in Ezek 22:2 and 23:36 to inform his audience of their abominations generates immediate accusations against the recipient. The imperative in Ezek 20:4 launches the prophecy into a brief prologue before accusations begin three verses later. Thus, it would appear that the command naturally coheres with its immediate context in these three settings. Each command generates prompt accusations. In contrast, the command for Ezekiel to make known Jerusalem’s abominations to her in 16:2 does not generate accusations until 16:15, a full twelve verses later. This placement of the command into the introductory formulae long before any actual declaration of “abomination” gives the appearance of a chapter-like expansion. Fittingly, accusatory elements in the form of second, feminine verbal constructions immediately appear when this particular expansion picks up in 16:43 and 47, thus confirming the similar makeup of the expansion.⁴⁵⁵

⁴⁵⁴ It is plausible that Ezek 23:36 ff. comprises an expansion upon earlier forms of the chapter.

⁴⁵⁵ Ezekiel 16:44–46 introduces sister Sodom and Samaria by way of the Ezekielian proverb device.

In summary, we have noted that the term, “abomination” coheres with the chapter’s composition, structure, and other occurrences of the term. Moreover, the term’s use in the command for the prophet to “make known” Jerusalem’s abominations exhibits similar patterns of lemmata, genre, and plot as do other passages that utilize the collocation. This observation corroborates the perception that terminology in Ezek 16:2^(הודיע)–3a^(תאמר), 20–23, 36b, 43–58 belongs to an expansion that utilizes similar patterns.

But what is the purpose of a proclamation of abominations? Why does an author expand Jerusalem’s accusation of harlotry and announcement of judgment to encompass abominations? If 16:43–58 contains no accusation of harlotry—and in reality, hardly a specific accusation at all—what material does the expansion appropriate in order to achieve a rudimentary chapter? Before we address this particular question, other lemmata exhibit indications of an expansion that yields insight into the augmentation of earlier material and help one understand the purpose of the expansion.

3.2.1.3 “Abominations” and its Relationship to “Jerusalem” and her Origins

Another factor exhibiting the sign of expansion is the relationship between “abominations” and a concern with Jerusalem’s familial heritage in Ezekiel 16:3–4. After the command to make the abominations known, Yahweh says to Jerusalem in 16:3, “Your origin and birth were from the land of the Canaanite. Your father was the Amorite and your mother was a Hittite.” The initial word in 16:4 then repeats the term, “birth,” before proceeding with the pathetic circumstances surrounding Jerusalem’s birth. The term, “origin” does not appear again in the chapter although the topic of her

parentage returns in the transition from harlot to sister in 16:44–45. In Ezek 16:45bβ, the statement concerning Jerusalem’s origin is reversed, “Your mother was a Hittite and your father was an Amorite.” The reversal suggests expansionary activity known as Seidel’s law.⁴⁵⁶ Moreover, the pronouns, which are affixed to “mother” and “father” in 16:44, are second, feminine, plural pronouns whereas the corresponding pronouns in 16:3 are second, feminine, singular. In other words, Jerusalem and her sisters are the antecedents in 16:44 whereas only Jerusalem herself is the antecedent in 16:3.

One can query whether the expansion includes the initial description of Jerusalem’s heritage in 16:3aβff. or whether that initial description was part of earlier material in the metaphor of Jerusalem’s harlotry in the chapter. If indeed, the inverted quotation from 16:45bβ regarding her parentage is an example of Seidel’s law, it strongly suggests that it is an expansion upon the initial description in 16:3.⁴⁵⁷ The author sees within the initial description of her progenitor a way in which to associate the proverb, “Like mother, like daughter” as well as the metaphor of Jerusalem and her twisted sisters.

Additionally, the content following the initial description in 16:3 commends the inclusion of Jerusalem’s heritage at that point. This content deals with the birth and abandonment of the infant on the open field. From this perspective, birth necessitates a mother and father. Jerusalem’s ignoble beginnings appear at the outset of the chapter with her heritage issuing from Canaanite origins. Jerusalem could not lay claim to any

⁴⁵⁶ See the discussion over these verses in Chapter Two for literature.

⁴⁵⁷ For the expansionary characteristic of inverted quotations, see S. Talmon, “The Textual Study of the Bible,” 321–400, in particular, 360, 366.

special provenance. Moreover, it is possible that the account incidentally relates to practices of exposure and adoption in the ANE.⁴⁵⁸ If so, the nameless parents, who cast the young infant girl to the field, contribute to the depiction that no one loved Jerusalem from the beginning. Only Yahweh, in his benevolence, did so.

Also associated with the statement of her origin, are the two occurrences of the city's name in 16:2 and 3 when the proper name does not appear elsewhere in the chapter. Ezekiel 16:2 states, "Son of man, make known to Jerusalem her abominations" and verse 3 reiterates, "and say, 'Thus says the LORD to Jerusalem.'" The close proximity of the repetition of the city's name raises the possibility of an expansion or doublet. Without the clause, "Make known to Jerusalem her abominations" and the Ezekielian formula, "and say," the remainder would read, "Son of man, thus says the LORD to Jerusalem, your origin and birth..." The prophecy would then proceed to her origins in Ezek 16:3a β -5. This suggestion corresponds to the construction one finds in Ezek 7:2a, "And you, son of man, thus says the LORD to the land of Israel."⁴⁵⁹ If this explanation is correct, it would corroborate the presence of the expansionary clauses, "Make known to Jerusalem her abominations and say."

⁴⁵⁸ For the evidence and the literature, see Malul, "Adoption of Foundlings," 97-126.

⁴⁵⁹ While the reiteration of a proper name is not atypical in Ezekiel, usually it occurs as a vocative rather than an object. See the reoccurrence of "Mountains of Israel" in Ezek 6:2,3, "forest of the field of Negev" in Ezek 21:2, 3, "land of Israel" in Ezek 21:7, 8, "Tyre" in Ezek 26:2, 3 and multiple occurrences of "Tyre" in 27:2-3, "Sidon" in Ezek 28:21, 22, "Pharaoh" in Ezek 29:2-3, "Shepherds of Israel" in Ezek 34:2 (three times), 7, "Mount Seir" in Ezek 35:2, 4, "Mountains of Israel" in Ezek 36:1,4, 22, "bones" in Ezek 37:4, "Gog" in Ezek 38:2, 3, 39:1 (twice). The prophecy against "Ammon" in Ezek 25:2, 3 represents a situation similar to that of Ezekiel 16. Additionally, the remainder of examples of prophecies in the book of Ezekiel, which utilizes a proper name, only contain one occurrence of the proper name.

Furthermore, there is no presumption that Jerusalem is a daughter or sister in Ezek 16:4–42. Although she has a day of birth, she is not called a “daughter” until 16:44 when the proverb transpires that likens her to her mother. The term, “mother” only occurs in 16:3 and the transitional bridge, 16:44 and 45. Notably, the term, “sister,” which is the other central term in this chapter-making expansion besides “abomination,” does not appear prior to the transitional bridge, 16:44–45. After the transition in vv. 44–45, it occurs twelve times between 16:45–61. A discussion of Jerusalem’s children likewise does not appear in 16:4–43—except in the obviously distinct material concerning child sacrifice in 16:20–23 and 36b, about which we will go into greater detail below.⁴⁶⁰

At the transitional proverb in 16:44, those who tell a proverb about Jerusalem say, “Like mother, like daughter.” For the first time in the chapter, Jerusalem is explicitly a daughter. Furthermore, Jerusalem’s mother abhorred her husband and her sons. The implication is that, like her mother, Jerusalem also abhorred her husband and sons. It is plausible that the author of 16:45 saw within the construct relationship describing the infant in 16:5, “abhorrence of your soul,” an apt manner in which to describe the character of the mother’s treatment of husband and sons, i.e. “Like mother, like daughter.” In the description in 16:45, not only are mother and daughter involved but also for the first time in the chapter, Jerusalem is a “sister of your sisters.” Her sisters also abhorred their husbands and sons. Jerusalem is their sister so, according to

⁴⁶⁰ Briefly as it relates to familial relationships, a discussion of Jerusalem’s sons (and daughters in 16:20) appears at three places: 16:20–21, 16:36b, and 16:45. Characteristics of this chapter-making expansion, which relate Jerusalem’s “abominations” and otherwise deplorable behavior, appear in 16:22 [MT], 16:36b and 16:47. Jerusalem’s daughters figure only once in a passing comment in collocation with “sons” in 16:20 before occurring another fifteen times between 16:44–61. Otherwise, the assumption of Jerusalem’s children is absent in the harlotry and adultery motifs that dominate 16:4–43.

the logic of the proverb, she is like them in their misbehavior towards their husband and their sons. The remainder of 16:44–58 will focus on the sisters without returning to the issue of parentage. Of course, in addition to the significance of familial personages in the chapter-like expansion, other developments also appear. In considerations below, it will be obvious that expectations concerning the type of judgment and hope of restoration were not presumed in the harlot metaphor.

From these observations, three conclusions emerge. First, in contrast to the conclusion above that 16:4–42 does not presume that Jerusalem is a daughter and has sisters, clearly 16:43–58 does assume Jerusalem’s parentage, harlotry and adultery. Statements in 16:44–45 concerning Jerusalem’s abhorrent treatment against husband and sons presume knowledge of Ezekiel 16:3–43. Besides the same lemma, to abhor, they presume the explicit accusations of harlotry and adultery that Jerusalem committed against her husband, Yahweh. Moreover, they cohere with the abominable practice of child sacrifice they perpetrated against “sons and daughters” in vv. 20–21.

Second, even considering that Ezek 16:43–58 presumes 16:3–42, the focus of this germinal chapter-making expansion is not on Jerusalem’s vile behavior against Yahweh. Unlike vv. 15–34, this expansion does not address how Jerusalem perverted Yahweh’s gifts and spurned his devotion. Instead, the material that negatively compares Jerusalem’s abominations with the abominations of Sodom and sin of Samaria found convenient concord with Jerusalem’s multiplication of harlotries. Such concord is discerned towards the end of the comparison between Jerusalem and her sisters when it indicates in 16:51b α , “And you multiplied your abominations.” (תועבותיך—את ותרבי) Three times in 16:25, 26, and 29 Jerusalem is accused, “And you multiplied your

harlotries.” (תזנותך-את ותרבי) In this way, the harlotries that Jerusalem multiplied with her lovers are taken up into the comparison with Sodom and Samaria so that the reader conflates her unnamed abominations with her harlotries.

Indeed, the section generically expresses Jerusalem’s misdeeds so that they are worse than Sodom and Samaria. Without knowledge of the accusations of Jerusalem’s metaphorical idolatry, harlotry, and adultery and reference to her sacrifice of her children, it is mere speculation to presume what Jerusalem’s abominations are based only on 16:44–58. No specific accusations arise within this section regarding Jerusalem’s behavior. In 16:44–58, Jerusalem multiplies her abominations more than her sisters, she sins worse than them, she makes them appear righteous, her bad behavior mediates for them, but there are no specific details about harlotry, adultery, or even a covenantal relationship between Yahweh and Jerusalem. The account of Jerusalem’s abominations in comparison to her sisters in 16:44–58 would be practically baseless without the unfolding of specific behaviors in 16:3aβ–43.

Third, the reference to familial relationships in Ezek 16:44–45, in particular, “mother” “sisters,” and “daughters” exposes the incorporation of material from the harlot metaphor. Unlike 16:4–42, in which there is virtually no discussion of familial relationships, the expansion of 16:43–58 requires comment up these extended kinsmen. Hence, the incorporation of the proverb performs a bridge between the harlot section and “abomination/sister” material of 16:2, 43–58. The proverb first references Jerusalem’s mother before turning to her sisters. At the end of 16:45, the bridge returns to Jerusalem’s mother in a reversal of the statement in 16:3. After vv. 44–45, the terms, “mother,” “father,” “sons,” and the verbal root, “to abhor,” do not appear again in the

chapter, which instead focuses on Jerusalem, her sisters, and their daughters. Now the reader is able to discern the incorporation of Jerusalem's sisters in the chapter. At this juncture it becomes clear that the discussion of Jerusalem's parentage in 16:3a β –5 provided the perfect opportunity to interject the proverb of Jerusalem, the daughter, and her mother, which at the right moment would lead into the larger conversation of Jerusalem and her sisters.

In addition to a bridge, the proverb in 16:44–45 no doubt served other purposes. First, it also reinforced the perception for the reader that Jerusalem had a Canaanite heritage. In so doing, it not only destroyed any pride or expectation based upon pedigree—in accordance with the command to “bear humiliation”—but likewise accords well with the inclusion of Sodom. Moreover, Jerusalem's loathsomeness of her sons and her husband sustain the accusations in 16:20–21 and 30–34. Thus, the statements in 16:44–45 cohere with Jerusalem's sacrifice and slaughter of her children. Second, the inclusion of the lemma, “proverb” and the aphorism, “Like mother, like daughter” likewise comprises material that makes for easy incorporation. Ezekiel 12:2, 17:2, 18:2, 3, and 24:3 all use a verbal form of the root with the corresponding nominal form as a literary device to articulate a statement regarding the people of Judah. Moreover, Ezekiel 24:3 reports that prophet himself was one who spoke in proverbs. In this way, Ezekiel 16:44 utilizes the figure of speech to ease the transition to the abhorrent sister.

In summary, the term, “abomination” occurs once at the beginning of the chapter in 16:2, in 16:36b, and then at the transition to the story of Jerusalem and her sisters in 16:43 before occurring five additional times between Ezekiel 16:44–58 in the description of Jerusalem and her sisters. The term, “sisters,” which occurs twelve times, similarly

only appears after the bridge in 16:44. Likewise, the reiteration of Jerusalem's parentage in the figure of a proverb suggests the adoption of the statement of Jerusalem's progenitors, which is found at the outset of the chapter, in order to ease the transition to this expansion with distinct terminology and content.

3.2.1.4 "Abominations" and Material from the Original Metaphor

Besides the conflation of Jerusalem's abominations to that of her many harlotries and the proverbial material related to Jerusalem's parentage, what other materials comprising the metaphor of Yahweh and the infant-maiden harlot (16:3a β –19, 24–36a, 37–42) compel the chapter-making expansion declaring Jerusalem's abominations and their future restoration (16:2^(הודיע)–3a^(ואמרת), 20–23, 36b, 43–58)? Or, understood from the perspective of the chapter-making expansion, what previously existing material of the metaphor does it integrate into the rudimentary attempt at a chapter? Each of the points explained below propose a motivation bringing about the expansion. At the outset, the nominal form, "abominations" (תועבה) appears to echo the verb in 16:25, "And you abhorred your beauty and you opened your feet to everyone who passed by." (תעב) The nominal forms thus seem to reflect the verbal form from which the metaphor of harlotry itself stems. At some time between this original metaphor comprising 16:24–25 and the many occurrences of "abominations" in the chapter-making expansion, several expansions enumerating different acts of harlotry stem from this portrayal of Jerusalem producing illicit cultic locations, that is, "abhorring her beauty" and thereby, committing metaphorical harlotry in her illegal cultic activity.

3.2.1.5 The Function of the Clause, “You did not Remember the Days of your Youth”

The repeated utilization of the clause, “You did not remember the days of your youth” also adumbrates the expansionary material in Ezek 16:2^(הודיע)–3a^(ואמרתי), 20–23, 36b, 43–58. Not merely through the repetition of a clause, this case also demonstrates the verbatim use of material in order to provide a linkage and context to other expansionary content. The clause relating Jerusalem’s memory lapse first appears in Ezek 16:22. Jerusalem had forgotten her former days when she was “naked and bare” and “kicking about in [her] blood.” Ezekiel 16:22 incorporates these two phrases from 16:6 and 16:7 in an effort to assimilate the expansionary content in 16:20–21 regarding the slaughter of children.⁴⁶¹ Aware of the atypical language and content of 16:20–21, the author utilizes these two clauses from existing material in the metaphor in order to achieve the merger of the expansion within the rudimentary prophecy. Thereupon, he uses the clause regarding Jerusalem’s forgetfulness to provide a reason for her behavior that varies from other grounds such as can be found in 16:26bβ or 16:30a. In the case of the chapter-like expansion, Jerusalem acted wantonly because she forgot her destitute situation and Yahweh’s benevolent actions in her youth.⁴⁶² Consistent with this diminished perspective of Jerusalem’s debauched behavior in 16:22, Ezek 16:23 blandly summarizes the view of her behavior with one of only two occurrences of the common

⁴⁶¹ For the expansionary nature of this material concerning sacrifice of children, see below.

⁴⁶² Although I will deal with it again later, it is interesting to note in this connection that the MT contains a plus in this context. In MT, Ezek 16:22 begins, “And with all your abominations and your harlotries, you did not remember the days of your youth.” The construction, “your abomination and...” are absent in the OG and thus, the OG appears to reflect a more original text. If this scenario is correct, one could posit that a scribe sensed the connection between child sacrifice and “abominable” behavior and thus inserted the term as an accurate descriptor of Jerusalem’s behavior.

noun, “evil” in the chapter.⁴⁶³ Prior to an occurrence of the *Gottesspruchformel*, Ezekiel 16:23 summarizes, “And it was after all of your evil...” before breaking off into virtual silence while awaiting her punishment.

The verbatim clause stating Jerusalem’s lapse of memory occurs again in Ezek 16:43a. Other indications of expansion appear in this verse also and together intimate that the repetition of this clause also has to do with expansionary content. A following section will describe more fully the awkward conjunction with which 16:43 begins and will discuss the development in content that is present in the verse. The point here is that precisely where one sees other indications of expansion, the clause, “You did not remember the days of your youth” appears a second time. As such, the clause repeats the reason behind her bawdy behavior. She simply forgot her deplorable origin and destitute circumstances of her birth. In this manner, the final motivation in 16:43 for Yahweh’s punishment before the chapter transitions to the sister metaphor relates no explicitly harlotrous, idolatrous, or adulterous behavior; quite simply, Jerusalem forgot Yahweh. Corresponding to this abstraction, Yahweh merely brings her deeds on her head. Although a great deal of detail concerning Jerusalem’s future punishment had likewise materialized in 16:37–41, Ezek 16:43b formulaically generalizes, “I gave your way on [your] head.” Here then, the verbatim repetition of the clause provides a reason why Jerusalem had committed harlotries and likewise occurs at another transitional juncture, thereby attesting to the expansionary content.

In conclusion, in conjunction with these observations and as we noted above, terminology provides the first window into the distinct nature of the materials. The term,

⁴⁶³ The same descriptor occurs in 16:57.

“abomination” and material associated with it has provided an initial indication of an expansion. Additionally, a repetition of Jerusalem’s parental heritage within a proverbial trope revealed a bridge between this expansionary material and an earlier expression of Jerusalem’s debauchery. Finally, a repeated clause attested to a distinct explanation for Jerusalem’s wickedness. Thus, these lexical choices and repetitions have given evidence of an expansion comprising this material and revealed the integration of the material into its current setting. These observations do not yet reveal the purpose for which the expansion was made. For that, other indications, e.g. the term, “to restore,” or the motivation-conjunction, “on account of” will provide accompanying material to reveal the purpose that brought about the expansion. Before we comment on that, however, the analysis turns to grammatical and syntactical considerations.

3.2.2 Grammatical and Syntactical Observations

3.2.2.1 16:43 An Unexpected Motivation

By all accounts, a transition occurs at some juncture between Ezek 16:43 and 16:44.⁴⁶⁴ Commentators normally consider the transition to occur at 16:43bβ or 16:44a. The proposal that a transition occurs at 16:43bβ coheres well with the analysis above

⁴⁶⁴ Zimmerli sees vs. 43 as an addition and a new unit starting in vs. 44, *Ezekiel I*, 347–48. However, he does indicate that “v43ba appears to mark the original conclusion of the section which precedes,” and that “the remaining clause v. 43bβ has subsequently been added as a transition for the proclamation of judgment in vv. 35–43ba to the fresh reproach in vv. 44ff,” 347–48. Cooke opines that vs. 43 “may be an addition, incorrectly worded,” but ends the unit with 43 and begins the next with vs. 44, Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 175. Allen divides the unit at 43bβ and states the final clause of vs. 43 “speaks from a later point in history,” Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 243. Block and Greenberg seem content simply to divide the units between vv. 43 and 44, Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 503–04; Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 292–93. Hölscher sees all of vv. 35–43 as a “distorted continuation of the Ezekielian picture,” because of the absurdity that a broken-hearted husband would engage his wife’s lover to execute judgment against the wayward wife, *Hesekiel*, 94. Still, he breaks the section between vv. 43 and 44 and strikes 43bβ as an addition.

based upon terminology. Ezekiel 16:43b β asks, “And did you not do this licentiousness in addition to of all your abominations?” The term, “abominations” occurs predominantly in 16:44–58 while “licentiousness” occurs again in collocation with “abominations” at the conclusion to the expansion in 16:58. However, there is nothing incongruent with the analysis above and the assertion that a transition occurs at the commencement of 16:43. If the evidence commends it, a transition that includes 16:43a would explain several peculiar features of 16:43. For example, the motivation clause that commences 16:43 awkwardly connects the series of future oriented verbs concerning the appeasement of Yahweh’s anger in 16:42 with another motivation for punishment in view of Jerusalem’s forgetfulness and misdeeds. After the motivation clause containing a *qatal* and a sequential *wayyiqtol*, the apodosis articulates the consequence of her forgetfulness and misdeeds with an $x + qatal$ construction in 16:43b α . In what follows, we will consider why a transition occurs at 16:43a and why the entire verse belongs to the expansion found in Ezek 16:2^(הודיע)–3a^(ואמרתי), 20–23, 36b, 43–58.

First, rarely in the book of Ezekiel does an accusation-announcement of judgment structure end on the actual motivation and announcement of judgment clauses. Of the forty occurrences of “because” (יען) in the book of Ezekiel, only here in 16:43 and in Ezekiel 13 does a motivation clause and its consequence end the paragraph. But Ezekiel 13 is peculiar for its own reasons. The situation in Ezek 13:22–23, the final verses of the chapter, is distinct from the situation in Ezek 16:43 in that the verbs subsequent to the adverbial conjunction (לכן) in Ezek 13:23b are *weqatal* forms, a typical Ezekielian form and one indicating future orientation.⁴⁶⁵ Additionally, Ezek 13:23a begins with

⁴⁶⁵ See below in 3.2.2.2 for more analysis; the typical motivation situation yielding a consequence (with the exception of 16:43) utilizes *weqatal* verbal forms subsequent to the motivation

“therefore,” (לכן) the typical conjunction introducing the consequence whereas 16:43b uses the adverb, גם.⁴⁶⁶ Finally, although Ezek 13:22a contains the motivation (ען) and Ezek 13:23a–b α contains the consequence, the final clause of 13:23 ends quite normally for the book of Ezekiel with the recognition formula. Thus, Ezekiel 13 fits a normal pattern for motivation and consequence clauses in the book of Ezekiel.

In contrast to these typical features of Ezekiel 13, the unexpected placement of the motivation clause in Ezek 16:43a near the end of the section appears out of place. An earlier motivation clause in 16:36a already accrued a consequence clause in 16:37 with conjunctive adverb and ensuing *weqatal* verbal forms representing actions from Yahweh himself as well as the actions of others that would carry out the punishment. These *weqatal* clauses transpired up through 16:42 finally articulating what would be the completion and satisfaction of Yahweh’s wrath. Unlike these *weqatal* clauses after the conjunctive adverb, the verbal construction in the apodosis in 16:43b α is an x + *qatal* form, which by itself is normally considered to indicate circumstantial information or perfective aspect.⁴⁶⁷ For this reason, Chapter Two suggested that the verse emerged from a distinct perspective motivating Yahweh’s punishment that had, in reality, already been executed. However, because 16:43b α is formulaic and occurring in an apodosis, “Therefore I, look, Your way on the head, I gave,” the construction could stem from the

clause and adverbial conjunction, לכן. Occasionally, subsequent to the conjunction, a participle begins the verbal sequence and progresses with a *weqatal*.

⁴⁶⁶ The collocation ען/גם also occurs in Ezek 5:11 and 23:35 so its appearance here is not altogether unusual although see Chapter Two for more analysis.

⁴⁶⁷ GKC, §106d–e; A. Nicacci, “An Integrated Verb System”, 111; Schneider, *Grammatik*, 182, 197.

use of traditional language.⁴⁶⁸ We will discuss the form of the verb in greater detail below but the immediate point here relates to a transition based on the motivation clause. As Chapter Two demonstrated, the use of formulae in the book of Ezekiel often indicates transition.⁴⁶⁹ Taken in conjunction with the *Gottesspruchformel* in 16:43b α , it appears that transition occurs earlier than 16:43b β or 16:44. Moreover, the formula is a correlative to the adverbial conjunction and therefore, one must view 16:43a–b α as a unit. Subsequently, the motivation in 16:43a interjects another incentive for Yahweh’s judgment after the prophecy had already articulated the appeasement of Yahweh’s wrath.⁴⁷⁰

3.2.2.2 16:43b α An Accomplished Punishment

A discussion in Chapter Two began regarding the form of the verb in 16:43b α . Although we must be cautious in view of the use of the clause as a formula and an apodosis, it seems unlikely that the form of the verb expresses anything other than a circumstance of the city’s situation. The use of so-called tenses in Hebrew grammar is still a debated issue.⁴⁷¹ In this case, tense concerns the verbal form and its placement in a

⁴⁶⁸ The formula occurs in various syntactical constructions in Ezek 9:10, 11:21, 16:43, 17:19, 22:31, and 33:4. Ezekiel 33:4, which utilizes the verb היה rather than נתן , is the only construction that uses *yiqtol*.

⁴⁶⁹ See Chapter Two, 8–12, and Section 3.2.2.2.

⁴⁷⁰ See the rather intriguing ways that the commentaries translate 16:43, in particular 16:43b α ; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 331; Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 499–500; Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 272; and Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 225.

⁴⁷¹ For a recent examination on the significance of verbal constructions in Hebrew, see John A. Cook, *Time and the Biblical Hebrew Verb: The Expression of Tense, Aspect, and Modality in Biblical Hebrew*, LSAWS 7 (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2012).

Hebrew clause. Although the use of the prophetic perfect⁴⁷² and perfect performative⁴⁷³ are possibilities, it would seem that in the case of Ezekiel 16, interpretive frameworks constrain these understandings of this particular verb rather than a particular form.⁴⁷⁴ Is it possible that a preconceived view of how these prophetic units were produced has required that a textual unit stem from a particular, singular point in time and has compelled these conceptions of the Hebrew verb in 16:43b α ? If, on the other hand, the text in question issues from various temporal vantage points, the need to constrain a consistent verbal perspective throughout a passage—even as in this case when the verbal form is different—fades away. We will have much more to say about a retrospective viewpoint upon punishment below. At the very least, the tumultuous days of Ezekiel’s prophetic career in which Jerusalem finally met her end could produce this multifaceted perspective upon what was once a future punishment but now in view of the expansion, a past punishment.

The section above highlighted the repeated clause, “And you forgot the days of your youth” occurring in 16:22 and 43. It asserted that this repetition has to do with additional evidence that suggests 16:20–23 and 16:43 emerged in relation to this

⁴⁷² GKC §106n.

⁴⁷³ Waltke-O’Conner, §30.5.1d, note 17.

⁴⁷⁴ Cooke translates it, “[T]herefore also, behold, I have (or will) set thy way on ‘thy’ head,” and goes on to explain his translation by saying, “i.e. I will lay on thee a recompense for thy deeds,” Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 175. He also feels the tension between a past and a future recompense. Block translates it rather awkwardly as a future perfect, “I will have brought your conduct down on your own head myself,” Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 499–500. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 272, translates it as a performative, “[S]ee, I am holding you to account for your ways.” Allen says similarly, “I for my part now hold you responsible for your behavior,” *Ezekiel 1–19*, 225. Zimmerli translates the clause as a perfect, “habe ... gebracht,” Zimmerli, *Ezechiel 1*, 333. Hölscher sees it as a past event because of the absurdity of a wounded husband bringing the lovers of his wayward wife against her. Instead he asserts that motivating the hand of a redactor are the Babylonians, who are the perpetrators of the punishment in the destruction of Jerusalem, *Hesekiel*, 94, 96.

expansion. Additional evidence commending this material's inclusion involves a development in content between harlotry and the sacrifice of children, which we will discuss below. This additional evidence will suggest that Ezekiel 16:22–23 comprises a sort of summary statement that integrates this related—albeit distinct—development concerning child sacrifice to Jerusalem's harlotrous, idolatrous behavior.

Nonetheless, as it relates to the perspective of time, Ezek 16:22–23 includes three temporal markers that express a retrospective viewpoint regarding her actions and time: the phrases, “days of your youth,” “when you were,” and the clause, “And it was after all your evil.” These temporal markers are syntactically connected to the first appearance of the clause in which she “did not remember the days of your youth” in 16:22. They indicate the passage of time between the harlotrous actions in vv. 20–21 and her youth when she was “kicking about in blood,” a phrase appropriated from 16:6, and when she was “naked and bare,” a phrase appropriated from 16:7. More precisely, these temporal markers portray a lengthy period after the harlotry began in 16:15 until the sacrifice of children in 16:20–21 in accordance with the so-called narrative world of the chapter. If it came at the very end of the description of Jerusalem's harlotrous behavior, one might expect these temporal indicators. However, after the retrospective summary in 16:22–23, the description continues much the same as it did prior to vv. 20ff. at 16:24ff. Reports that Jerusalem persisted in manufacturing unsanctioned cultic locations and committing harlotry continue until 16:34. Thus, this retrospective viewpoint disrupts a constant machination of idolatry with a sequential order of time within the narrative.

This would hardly be noteworthy if the clause, “you forgot the days of your youth” did not appear a second time. But it does occur again and its second appearance

emerges subsequent to numerous other accounts of harlotry, thus depicting another lengthy period of time between the statement of 16:22 and the next occurrence at 16:43. Moreover, as we will discuss below, its second appearance transpires in the context of other indications of temporal dislocation, therefore exhibiting signs of a vantage point similar in retrospect as 16:22–23. Additionally, 16:22b contains two previously used clauses in what appears to be a transparent attempt to integrate the pericope, 16:20–23.⁴⁷⁵ Hence, the clause, “you forgot the days of your youth” indicates not merely a passage of time within the narrative but is associated with distinct temporal moments from which the materials are incorporated.

The analysis now turns to the temporal vantage point of Ezek 16:44–63, which as pointed out above also issues from an unmistakably distinct point of view. First, Ezek 16:44–63 knows nothing of a future punishment in the manner of 16:37–42. Rather, it mandates a mere embracement of humility before announcing salvation. Nowhere is Yahweh issuing judgment, gathering lovers, or revealing nakedness nor are there assemblies of lovers wreaking havoc and stripping Jerusalem of her misused gifts that she received from Yahweh. Rather, the remainder of the chapter in 16:44–63 assumes a realized punishment and therefore, it should come as no surprise that the temporal vantage point of the transitional 16:43 is after a phase of Yahweh’s punishment against Jerusalem has already transpired. To put the matter another way, once the transitional

⁴⁷⁵ The re-use of these previously used clauses falls short of a “resumptive repetition.” However, they do indicate the attempt to verbally incorporate otherwise independent material. For *Wiederaufnahme* as a compositional technique in Ezekiel, see C. Kuhl, “Die „Wiederaufnahme“ - ein literarkritisches Prinzip?”, in *ZAW* 64 (1952), 1–11. For the use of the technique in general, see Shemaryahu Talmon, who references Kuhl’s work above in, “Polemics and Apology in Biblical Historiography—2 Kings 17:24–41,” 57–68, in *The Creation of Sacred Literature: Composition and Redaction of the Biblical Text*, NES 22, ed. Richard Elliot Friedman (London: Univ. of California, 1981), 58–59.

purpose of 16:43a is acknowledged, a circumstantial viewpoint of Yahweh's punishment coheres quite perfectly with 16:44–58.

Additionally, it is the articulation of Yahweh's appeasement that yields this future hope of restoration. Once Yahweh's wrath has rested and his vengeance turned aside (16:42a), restoration is possible. Thus, Ezek 16:43 says, "Because you did not remember the days of your youth when you were restless before me in all these things and therefore I, look, I gave your way on [your] head." The next clause reminds Jerusalem that she had indeed practice her misdeeds and abominations. Here, one learns that Yahweh's requital is indeed complete thus preparing the way for Jerusalem's restoration. Moreover, it is quite plausible that this circumstantial perspective establishes a veracity that what the next section will likewise foretell will also come to pass. We will have more to say about that anticipation in the conclusion to our analysis.

3.2.2.3 16:43b α Formulae and Transition

Chapter Two demonstrated the significance of formulae for structure and for transition in the book of Ezekiel. Two important formulae occur in Ezek 16:43b α : "I gave your way on [your] head" and "Utters the LORD." The latter formula is utilized in conjunction with other formulae as a means to transition between sections. The former formula occurs subsequent to the adverb, כֵּן , which in this case expresses the correlative to the motivation in 16:43a.⁴⁷⁶ Thus, if it is the case that formulae indicate transition and these formulae transpire in a correlative consequence clause, then the motivation clause in 16:43a must begin the transition. As indicated above, the $x + qatal$ verb type, which is

⁴⁷⁶ The construction $\text{כֵּן} \dots \text{עָן}$ occurs in the book of Ezekiel only here, Ezek 5:11, and 23:35.

utilized in the formula, does not permit a strong conclusion as to its indication of the temporal view of punishment because of the possibility of formulaic construction of the clause. However, the use of the formula itself as a means to indicate punishment is quite distinct from earlier descriptions of punishment in vv. 37–42. The manner in which Ezekiel 16:37–42 articulated the punishment conformed to Jerusalem’s perpetration of acts that were unbecoming of Yahweh’s bride. In other words, her punishment was cast in terms fitting of Yahweh’s gifts to her and her use of those gifts for idolatrous purposes.

Unlike that punishment, the punishment articulated in the formula is just that: formulaic without descriptive terminology. As noted above, the formula, “Your way on your head, I gave” occurs several times in the book. Moreover, 16:43 repeats the clause, “You did not remember the days of your youth,” without any reference to the lewd acts found otherwise in the accusation and announcement of judgment. Finally, the *wayyiqtol* clause, “And you were restless before me in all these things,” is likewise nondescript and offers very little characterization of actual deeds. Thus, it gives the appearance of distinct perspective from that of the 16:37–42 in which the punishment uses terminology conforming to the accusation in 16:15–34.

Moreover, the latter formula, “utters the LORD” is used in various ways to assist in providing structure for a passage. It can be used with other formulae to initiate, conclude, and even mediate two parallel members.⁴⁷⁷ As Chapter Two expressed, the formula occurs nine times in the Ezekiel 16. Given the analysis in Chapter Two concerning the *Gottesspruchformel*, the formula, “I gave your way on [your] head,” the

⁴⁷⁷ See Chapter Two, pp. 9–12, 92–97; in this chapter, see the discussion regarding the formula again in 3.3.2.4.

motivation and consequence clauses in 16:43, which are distinct from other motivation and consequence clauses in 16:36–42, and the lemmata in 16:43b β that are congruent with the expansion, the evidence strongly commends that 16:43 belongs to the expansion found in Ezek 16:2^(הודע)–3a^(ואמרת), 20–23, 36b, 43–58.

3.2.2.4 16:58 Jerusalem “Has Borne her Licentiousness and Abominations”

In Ezek 16:58, the expansion regarding Jerusalem, her sisters, and their abominations concludes in a similar manner as it begins in Ezek 16:43. Ezekiel 16:43b β asks, “And did you not do this licentiousness in addition to all your abominations?” Then, after the metaphor of Jerusalem and her sisters, 16:58 concludes with a clause that fronts the two terms with which 16:43b β ended, “Your licentiousness and your abominations, you have borne.” What is interesting for our purposes is not primarily the almost-inclusio frame that this clause provides for the expansion but rather the *x + qatal* formulation of the clause. Most commentators translate the clause as a strong obligation, using “you must bear,”⁴⁷⁸ or as a future indicative, “will bear.”⁴⁷⁹ Neither Block nor Greenberg comment on the use of the perfect but simply translate it as something that Jerusalem “must” face. Allen and Cooke, who found it necessary to comment on the use of the perfect here—thereby indicating an oddity to its use—translate it as a “pf of future certainty.”⁴⁸⁰

⁴⁷⁸ Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 511–12; Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 273.

⁴⁷⁹ Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 226, 232, who quotes Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 178.

⁴⁸⁰ Allen, *ibid.*; GKC, §106 m–n.

Perhaps most interesting of all is Zimmerli's comment and understanding of the verbal form. He comments on the fact that it is "used indicatively" in 16:58 but then translates it as an obligation, "You must (now) bear your immorality and your abominations, says Yahweh."⁴⁸¹ In an article, Zimmerli analyzed the content of the clause and how it reflected older legal usage.⁴⁸² Here, it is possible that the clause's relationship to traditional language could influence the verbal form. However, of the thirty-seven occurrences in the HB of the collocation, "to bear iniquity," (עֲוֹן נִשָּׂא), the *qatal* is only used in Ps 32:5 and 85:3, both instances referring to the past action of Yahweh's forgiveness. In all other occurrences, nine of which are in Ezekiel, the *qatal* is never used but instead one finds *weqatals*, *yiqtol*s, and participles.⁴⁸³ Furthermore, in contrast to the traditional legal language of "iniquity" or "sin," Ezek 16:58 utilizes the terms, "licentiousness and abominations," which, as pointed out earlier, are characteristic of this expansion. Hence, the utilization of the *qatal* in 16:58 warrants further examination.

As indicated above, the debate over time, aspect, and function, and verb tense persists. GKC notes that a perfect verb can denote future in two instances: in a promise that assures it will happen, e.g. especially promises made by God, and where someone speaks with such confidence that "in the imagination of the speaker, [it is] already

⁴⁸¹ Zimmerli writes that it is "used indicatively," Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 352, while he translates it, "You must (now) bear..." 333.

⁴⁸² Zimmerli, "Die Eigenart der prophetischen Rede des Ezechiel. Ein Beitrag zum Problem an Hand von Ez. 14:1–11," *ZAW* 66 (1954), 1–26; idem. *Ezekiel 1*, 164, 305, 352.

⁴⁸³ Ezek 4:4, 5, 6, 14:10, 18:19–20 (slightly different syntax because "iniquity" is connected via preposition, ׀), 44:10, and 12.

accomplished.”⁴⁸⁴ The former does not apply to the situation in Ezek 16:58 but the latter is a possibility and is, in fact, apparently the connotation for which Allen and Cooke translate the clause.⁴⁸⁵ Other recent attempts to explain a non-introductory *x + qatal* in direct speech describe it as “the secondary line, or background” information when the tense transitions from the main-level communication.⁴⁸⁶ If such is the case here, it would again indicate that Jerusalem had already begun to experience humiliation for her behavior, similar to Sodom and Samaria described in 16:56–57, who had experienced humiliation in bygone days. Given the use of the *x + qatal* here in contrast to other uses of this traditional language in the HB, “to bear iniquity/sin,” is it likely that the form in Ezek 16:58 is obligatory or future oriented? Indeed, from the perspective of the expansion, merely a future or obligatory orientation of guilt bearing is not possible.

Initially, the description of Jerusalem’s relationship with Sodom and Samaria is cast in the present, or at least in nominal clauses, in 16:46–47. Moreover, because of the severity of Jerusalem’s sin in comparison to her sisters, she is commanded to bear her humiliation. She must bear her humiliation and be ashamed in view of her abominable behavior. Unlike 16:37ff, in which her punishment was future, here, her humiliation is upon her concurrently. One could argue that the intended humiliation was merely a poor reputation brought about by her lasciviousness. Even so, the terms, “humiliation” and “shame” give evidence that she had already entered such a status and was therefore

⁴⁸⁴ GKC, §106 m–n.

⁴⁸⁵ In addition to the *x + qatal*, the fronting of two accusatives provides significant import in the verse. Besides the likely emphasis, the fronting associates the verbal action with two significant lexemes in the expansion and associates maiden-Jerusalem’s bearing licentiousness and abominations as a particular case of the legal “bearing iniquity.”

⁴⁸⁶ Alviero Nicacci, “Integrated Verb System, 111; Schneider, *Grammatik*, 182, 197.

suffering her punishment. Additionally, the comparison of her reputation to that of Sodom in 16:56 and Samaria in 16:57 provides further indication that her punishment had already begun and continued thereupon.⁴⁸⁷

Another more telling indication that Jerusalem was already experiencing the judgment of Yahweh was his promise in 16:53. “And I will restore their fortune, the fortune of Sodom and her daughters, the fortune of Samaria and her daughters, and a fortune,⁴⁸⁸ that is, your fortunes⁴⁸⁹ in their midst.” This statement presumes that Jerusalem—as well as Sodom and Samaria—has experienced something from which she needs restoration. In fact, the “restoration” is linked with her “bearing humility” in 16:54. Because there are no other *weqatal* verbal forms in the section, it is quite inconceivable that her “restoration” is associated with a yet-future destruction. Rather, the destruction transpired and Jerusalem must now bear its humility and shame. In other words, it assumes that Jerusalem has suffered the consequences of which 16:37ff warned. Thus, the *x + qatal* clausal formation in 16:58 must indicate a perfective view of Jerusalem’s circumstance. Jerusalem’s punishment has transpired and likely continues up to the time of the expansion. She has born the consequences of her licentiousness and abominations and now awaits a restoration. Therein lies a significant distinction between

⁴⁸⁷ For the view that Jerusalem’s reputation was suffering akin to that of Sodom and Samaria, see the commentary on this section in Chapter Two.

⁴⁸⁸ Barthelemy, et al., propose that the first person, “and I will restore” (בתיש) which occurs in the Old Greek, is an early attempt at making sense of the pleonastic construction in the Hebrew. As such, they follow the MT and translate accordingly; Barthelemy, *Critique*, 111–12; contra Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 332; Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 511; and Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 231. See Chapter One for more details.

⁴⁸⁹ As certain as one can be in this situation in which the MT has dubious plural/singular endings above, the *yod* most likely indicates a plural in ביתיך.

this expansion and the materials that constitute the basic metaphor and harlotry expansion.

Interestingly, this expansion utilized grammatically appropriate pronouns for antecedent Jerusalem throughout the chapter. Neither this expansion, nor that of Ezek 16:59–63 yielded a confluence of variant pronoun forms for Jerusalem in a single prophecy, a phenomenon that does occur in the book of Ezekiel.⁴⁹⁰ Whatever the conclusion regarding expansions in the chapter, one cannot base that conclusion on the alternation of pronoun forms. Instead, the consistent pronominal forms referencing Jerusalem forge a unified presentation as Chapter Two observed. We now turn to a consideration of the development of content between this expansion and earlier material.

3.2.3 Developments in Content

3.2.3.1 The Perspective of Jerusalem's Punishment

As the discussion above indicates, this expansion presupposes that punishment to Jerusalem has already occurred.⁴⁹¹ A difference in when the punishment transpires helps to indicate the distinct time frame from which the expansion could arise. Furthermore, a development in the motivation for the punishment likewise suggests distinct literary action. Typical Ezekielian formulae assist in the development of structure within a chapter. As such, the formulae in 16:35 signal a major structural progression in the

⁴⁹⁰ See for example the perplexing pronoun forms in Ezek 36:12–15. As it relates to difficult forms in Ezekiel 16, it is possible, however, depending on one's view of the pronominal construction on "your sister[s]" in this expansion, to perceive an issue between the appropriate reference to a single "sister" in Ezekiel 23 and the problematic forms in vv. 45–58; see text critical discussion over the construction in Chapter 1.

⁴⁹¹ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 349; Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 243.

chapter. Ezekiel 16:35–37 moves from the accusation to the motivation and subsequently, to the announcement of punishment. Ezekiel 16:37 turns its attention to the announcement of punishment with the conjunctive adverb, “Therefore,” and the indicator, “Behold!” The nominal clause that ensues initiates a *weqatal* chain that continues through the end of the announcement of punishment in verse 42. Ezekiel 16:43 provides the bridge from the metaphor of maiden Jerusalem and her harlotry to that of Jerusalem and her sisters. The new material in v. 43 ff. takes up another accusation against Jerusalem: she was more perverted than either of her notorious sisters. But there is no announcement of punishment—at least not in the same manner as vv. 37–42. There are no *weqatals* in vv. 44–52 announcing punishment, only *weqatals* in 16:53 ff. announcing restoration and salvation. As mentioned above, the only two verses that one could construe as announcements of punishment involve imperatives that Jerusalem is to bear her humiliation and be ashamed in 16:52 and subsequently, the conclusion to the expansion in 16:58 that she has borne her licentiousness and abominations. Each of these options, however, lacks grammatical and structural forms accompanying announcements of punishment in the remainder of the chapter and in the book of Ezekiel.⁴⁹²

The discussion above revealed from a grammatical and syntactical perspective that the punishment envisioned from 16:43–58 was really not punishment; or if so, it was a much different type of punishment than initially called for in 16:35ff. Ezek 16:43a contained two clauses, which gave the new motivation. These clauses fail to repeat anything from the accusation, motivation, or punishment clauses in 16:15–42 except a

⁴⁹² There is no לכן or גם/יען formulation. Nor are there any *weqatals*.

clause from 16:22, which also stems from an expansionary effort. The clause in 16:22, “You did not remember the days of your youth,” occurs within this series of verses which show signs of expansion. As it pertains to a development in content, however, it is interesting to note that the new motivation clause, “Because you did not remember the days of your youth,” fails to reiterate any explicit accusations from her harlotry, adultery, or her punishment but seems content to say that it was her forgetfulness of an earlier day for which Yahweh punished her. Why did the motivation change from vv. 35 ff. when her punishment was based upon her harlotries and adulteries? The new punishment—which is actually considered a circumstance of forgetfulness in 16:43b α —is accompanied by a second clause, “And you were restless before me in all these things.” As discussed in Chapter Two, the clauses refer to her insatiable drive that drove her erratic behavior and spurned Yahweh’s rescue and benevolence toward the infant- maiden. This indiscriminate obliviousness of Jerusalem was now the motivation underlying her punishment. This change in motivation reveals the expansion upon the harlot motif in Ezek 16:15–42. Thus, the motivation cause in 16:43 signals a subsequent development to earlier motivation for Yahweh’s punishment.

A different construal of punishment and motivation signals a distinct expansion. What role does this development play in understanding the expansion? This expansion, which is quite different from the material in 16:4–42 that remains to be analyzed, exhibits little concern or zeal for Jerusalem’s punishment. It presumes Jerusalem’s destruction and shows awareness that she has undergone a humiliating experience but the purpose of this expansion seems to lie in its hope for restoration.

3.2.3.2 Ezekiel 16:46–58 Abominations Bring about Restoration

Ezekiel 16:46–58 articulates generic statements about Jerusalem’s more abhorrent and sinful lifestyle than Sodom and Samaria. Jerusalem’s comparison with Sodom and Samaria apparently presumes knowledge of her metaphorical harlotry and adultery. Without that knowledge, the section would contain no explicit references to her abominations. Without reference to the abominations, the call for shame and humiliation, as well as the discussion of restoration is meaningless.

More specifically, the transitional verse of 16:43 appends the new motivation to the end of an announcement of judgment and indicates that her punishment has transpired in formulaic verse. With the exception of “[W]hen you were restless before me in all these things,” each of the other three clauses from 16:43a–bα are formulas or verbatim repetition. Ezekiel 16:43 ends, moreover, by rhetorically inquiring about Jerusalem’s “licentiousness and abominations.” In doing so, the author associates all of Jerusalem’s harlotrous idolatry and adultery with the abominations upon which he was about to comment. In effect, Ezek 16:43 not only comments on when and what motivates Yahweh’s punishment but assimilates the many acts of harlotries into this new development concerning Yahweh’s relationship to Jerusalem.

Initially, the accusations in 16:44–51 do not appear to abate. After all, Jerusalem had corrupted her way in a shorter time than Sodom and Samaria had. Samaria did not commit half of Jerusalem’s sins; Jerusalem multiplied abominations. Yes, she made them look righteous. Sodom and Samaria were two entities that had, no doubt, passed from the scene of history. Is the purpose of the comparison merely to shame Jerusalem? This purpose seems explicit in the comparison (16:52) but is there another reason for the

depiction? The comparison leads to another purpose that did not materialize in 16:4–42: hope. The closest thing to optimism arising from 16:4–42 concerned the expending of Yahweh’s wrath and vengeance. Here, however, the three sisters would return to their former state. If Sodom and Samaria could return from such humiliation, so could Jerusalem. Such restoration gave Jerusalem hope that her own abominations would not be the last word but instead, Yahweh’s gracious action would return the city to her former state. Thus, the expansion generically builds upon Jerusalem’s wicked past providing two reasons for her punishment: her humiliation and her restoration. This denouement shows a significant development in the trajectory of the materials in Ezekiel 16.

First, it displays a remarkable turn of events from earlier materials in which no sign of salvation appeared after Jerusalem’s punishment. Second, the restoration involves or includes Sodom and Samaria; these two nations represented the epitome of nefariousness. Although Jerusalem is compared and found wanting, the point remains: If Sodom and Samaria could experience restoration from Yahweh’s hand, perhaps there was hope for Jerusalem. Third, the notion of restoration and the hope embodied in it represent an important historical, socio-cultural, and literary event. A full examination of this development lies outside the scope of this analysis but the inclusion of the development—and its relationship to a pagan Sodom and miscegenetic Samaria—exhibits the literary impress that other literary works in the Hebrew Bible likewise experienced.⁴⁹³

⁴⁹³ For example, James M. Scott, *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (Leiden: Brill, 2001). See also the consideration related to ירשׁ in the conclusion and in Chapter Two concerning Ezek 16:53–58.

3.2.3.3 Ezekiel 16:20–23 Sacrifice of Children

Ezekiel 16:20–23 accuses Jerusalem of taking children that she had borne to Yahweh—thereby presuming the covenant in marriage in 16:8—and sacrificing them to the images with whom she played the harlot in 16:17–19. The passage continues by expressing that she caused her sons to pass through [the fire] to the images. In all of her harlotries and evil, she failed to keep in mind her vulnerable days of infancy and youth when Yahweh rescued her. Through the theme of sacrifice and offering, this passage relates to the offering of food items in 16:18b–19 because of which its inclusion here materialized. Moreover, the passage is congruent with its context by means of the second, feminine, singular verbal forms and pronominal forms, which refer to Jerusalem. Furthermore, the second, feminine, singular verb, “You took...” corresponds to the verbatim forms in vv. 16, 17, and 18 in which the woman took one of Yahweh’s gifts and perverted it for her idolatrous harlotry. Additionally, the passage incorporates a third, masculine, plural pronoun, whose antecedent must be the masculine images in 16:17, which the woman made from her jewelry that Yahweh gave her in 16:11–13a. Thus, the passage is generated in view of the textual framework in which it sits.

However, all is not so neatly congruent. One can discern that the expansion is distinct from its surroundings through the incorporation of the notion of child sacrifice. Each of the other accusations incorporates one of the ways in which Yahweh provided for maiden Jerusalem. Her garments in 16:16a relate to Yahweh’s gift of linen and fine cloth in 16:10b and 13a, her “vessels of splendor” in 16:17a relate to Yahweh’s gift of a crown of “splendor” in 16:12b, “my gold and my silver” in 16:17a relate to

Yahweh's gift of jewelry in 16:12a and "gold and silver" in 13a, her "embroidered garments" in 16:18a relate to Yahweh's gift of "embroidered cloth" in 16:10a and 13a, and her "fine flour, honey, and oil" in 16:19a relate to her "fine flour, honey, and oil" in 16:13a. In contrast to these items, which occur in the metaphor of Yahweh's provision for the young maiden and also in the accusations against her, there are no corresponding adumbrations of her children in the metaphor of Yahweh's provision to which these accusations of child sacrifice correspond. Thus, the normal congruence between gifts and perversion of those gifts suggests that this perversion, the sacrifice of children, emerged from a different context than the other accusations.

Additionally, the fact that this passage is distinct from the surrounding material, material that concerns her many harlotries, becomes evident from the unique viewpoint in 16:20b. The rhetorical question asks, "Is this less than your harlotry?" The comparison with harlotry via the preposition, η demonstrates that the conception of child sacrifice in comparison with the conceptions of harlotry that arise in the verses surrounding 16:20–23 is distinct.⁴⁹⁴ The comparative η denotes a separation between the two objects of comparison, "the removal of a thing from..." according to GKC.⁴⁹⁵ Here, the action of child sacrifice is compared with the notion of harlotry prevalent in the other scenes in 16:16–19. In other words, the act of sacrifice and slaughter of children, although warranting similar rebuke and punishment, is characteristically different from the accusations of harlotry throughout this section. This particular

⁴⁹⁴ A distinction between the "sacrifice of sons and daughters" in v. 20, the "slaughter of sons" in v. 21, and "to pass them through" in v. 21b suggests possible expansions as well.

⁴⁹⁵ GKC §133a–e.

interrogative discloses the separate context from which the expansionary 16:20–23 arises.

Furthermore, as was pointed out above, 16:22 utilizes repeated phrases from 16:6 and 7 as a means to incorporate the expansion. In the MT, the verse begins with a prepositional phrase conflating her “abominations” with a compound object, “your harlotries.”⁴⁹⁶ With her many harlotries she forgot the days of her youth when she was “naked and bare, kicking about in your blood.” The compound adjective, “naked and bare,” occurred in 16:7, describing the pubescent maiden. The participial phrase, “kicking about in your blood,” occurred in 16:6 modifying the infant, who lay abandoned in the field. Taken together, the two elements exhibit the attempt to linguistically network the expansion into its surroundings.

As noted above, an additional characteristic is evident as well in the expansion: a perspective of the passage of time. Ezekiel 16:22 initiates this focus on the passage of time from its outset. The phrase, “with all your harlotries,” provides the perspective of “all” of Jerusalem’s harlotries as if the description of Jerusalem’s harlotries were complete. The next phrase, “you did not remember the days of your youth” likewise articulates the passage of time between her harlotries, her infancy and adolescence, and with it the failure to recall her former state. Finally, 16:23 relates another passage of time with the *wayyiqtol* and following prepositional phrase, “And so it was after all your evil.” These explicit articulations of days gone by express a later perspective from which the expansion emerges, which one does not easily discern elsewhere in the accusations.

⁴⁹⁶ See Chapter 1, notes of v. 22 for the minus in the Old Greek. For the issue of style and conflation, see S. Talmon, “Textual Study of the Bible,” 344–57.

Additionally, 16:23b incorporates the *Gottesspruchformel*, itself a possible indication of expansion, in particular when other structural formulas are absent. When one considers the stylistic conflation of “abominations” and “harlotries”, verbatim collocation incorporated from 16:6 and 16:7, and these adverbial markers, the author’s method of expansion becomes evident.

There remains one final indication that 16:20–23 belongs to this expansion. The use of the term, “abominations,” prevalent in 16:2^(הודיע)–3a^(ואמרתי), 43–58, appears as a key word throughout the expansion. As such, it is interesting that HB contains in 16:22, “And with all your abominations and your harlotries...” However, the gloss “abominations” in 16:22a, does not appear in the Old Greek. If the term should be considered original to this passage, it could provide further evidence that this belongs to the expansion, Ezek 16:2^(הודיע)–3a^(ואמרתי), 20–23, 36b, 43–58, based upon lexical choice in addition to the observations above. On the other hand, it highly suggests that this lacuna indicates that a scribe noticed the material of 16:20–23, considered the terminology conceptually appropriate to this passage, and entered the appropriate term.

3.2.3.4 Idols of Your Abominations and the Blood of Yours Sons 16:36b

Ezekiel 16:36b expands upon material at the end of 16:36a in connection with Jerusalem’s “lovers” and the accusations of Jerusalem’s actions with those lovers in 16:30b–34. In so doing, Ezek 16:36b incorporates the same lexemes and themes that are seen in this chapter-making expansion and the commands “to make known abominations” that were analyzed above. The one responsible for this expansion saw in the motivation of “bronze poured out and nakedness revealed in her harlotries with her

lovers” an opportunity to include within the motivation the charge of child sacrifice and idolatry. Previously, we considered how the term, “abominations” appeared in the command, “Make known to Jerusalem her abominations.” Similar commands appear elsewhere in the book in connection with the term, “abominations” as well as other words and themes that one also finds in Ezekiel 16. Are there other terms that the book of Ezekiel customarily utilizes in collocation with “abominations?”

Indeed, in Ezek 16:36b, a common Ezekielian expression occurs that exhibits characteristics of this expansion. Ezekiel 16:36a initiates the typical Ezekielian message formula and motivation clause after accusations against Jerusalem. The verse warns, “Thus says the LORD, because your bronze was poured out and your nakedness was revealed in your harlotry upon your lovers...” Ezekiel 16:36b continues, “And with all the idols of your abominations and in accordance with the blood of your sons which you gave before them.” Chapter Two presented the various connotations that emerge from unusual occurrence of the term, “bronze.” Moreover, it considered the various associations of the term as it relates to blood and the phrase, “blood of your sons.” We now turn to consider the relationship between the term “idols” (גלולי), the term “abominations,” and the motif of child sacrifice.

First, the analysis above demonstrated that the command that occurs in 16:2, “Make known to Jerusalem her abominations” exhibits similarities to three other imperatival constructions in 20:4, 22:2, and 23:36. Significantly, each of these constructions has direct association with the term “idols” (גלולי). In 20:4, Yahweh told Ezekiel to “make known the abominations of their fathers” to a group of men from the elders of Israel. This command set the agenda for the chapter as it presents a peculiar

albeit selective view of Israel's history up to that point.⁴⁹⁷ The term, “idols,” (גלולי) occurs eight times in the chapter, more than the number of occurrences in any chapter in the HB.⁴⁹⁸ Interestingly, Ezekiel 23, which contains five occurrences of the term, is another chapter containing the command that Ezekiel should declare to the people their abominations. In fact, each generation of Israelites against which Ezekiel speaks in Ezekiel 20, from before the Exodus until that current day, is accused of pursuing “idols,” (גלולי). Moreover, in 20:24, it is specifically “the idols of their fathers” that another generation is pursuing. In other words, the command in Ezek 20:4 has in view the “idols of their fathers” when Yahweh commands Ezekiel to “make known” to the elders “the abominations of their fathers.” Ezekiel is therefore to edify those in his own day by referring to the perverted manner of their fathers. Specifically, Ezek 20:31 warns them, “When you present your gifts, when you cause your sons to pass through the fire, you are defiling yourselves before all your idols up to this day!” (גלולי) Here, the issue of “idols” concerns specific cultic activities related to child sacrifice.

The issue of child sacrifice appeared in Ezek 16:20–23 as it does as well in 16:36b, “and according to the blood of your sons.” The Hiphil verb, “to cause to pass through,” (העביר) and the object of the verb, “sons” occur in Ezek 16:21 and Ezek 20:31. Meanwhile, 16:36b synthesizes all three elements, “And upon all the idols of your abominations and according to the blood of your sons which you gave before them.”

⁴⁹⁷ For a recent consideration of the innerbiblical exegesis and argument of the chapter, see Dalit Rom-Shiloni, “Facing Destruction and Exile: Inner-Biblical Exegesis in Jeremiah and Ezekiel,” *ZAW* 117, (2005) 189–205.

⁴⁹⁸ The term appears in Lev 26:30, Deut 29:16, 1 Kings 15:12, 21:26, 2 Kings 17:12, 21:11, 21, 23:24, Jer 50:2, Ezek 6:4, 5, 6, 9, 13 (2X), 8:10, 14:3, 4 (2X), 5, 6, 7, 16:36, 18:6, 12, 15, 20:7, 8, 16, 18, 24, 31, 39 (2X), 22:3, 4, 23:7, 30, 37, 39, 49, 30:13, 33:25, 36:18, 25, 37:23, 44:10, 12.

Thus, in its castigation of abominations, idols, and child sacrifice, Ezekiel 20 exhibits common language and theme as does Ezek 16:20–23 and 36b. Therefore, the evidence suggests that these passages share a similar perspective. Do the other commands for Ezekiel to “make known abominations” likewise share these elements? We now turn to a second command, Ezek 22:2.

Ezekiel 22 begins by calling Jerusalem a “city of bloodshed,” prior to Yahweh telling Ezekiel to make known to the city her abominations. The relationship with bloodshed and abominations becomes clear almost immediately as 22:3–4 say, “A city, which sheds blood in its midst so that its time comes and which makes idols for itself so that it becomes unclean—in your bloodshed, which you poured out, you are guilty, and with your idols, which you made, you are unclean...” Although the connotation of bloodshed extends beyond child sacrifice in the chapter to that of social injustice, the relationship of idolatry and bloodshed is explicit. As Dan Block writes of these verses, “As in 20:4, Ezekiel is commanded to arraign Jerusalem by declaring (*hoda‘ta*) all her *abominations*... Ezekiel had previously applied the expression primarily to idolatrous practices and sexual offenses. In this text the two usages merge, the *idols* (*gillulim*) of v. 3 representing the former, and the evils named in v.11 the latter. Idolatry and bloodguilt are particularly grave crimes because they strike at the foundation of Israel’s covenant communal life.”⁴⁹⁹ Indeed, sexual imagery, idolatry, and bloodshed merge to form a deplorable portrayal of Jerusalem’s perversion. Thus, Ezekiel 22:2–4 also evince a similar utilization of terms and theme as this expansion in Ezekiel 16.

⁴⁹⁹ Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 704.

Ezekiel 23 exhibits the greatest degree of similarity to Ezekiel 16. As indicated above, the term, “idols” (גלולי) makes five appearances in the chapter. Not only in its shared language but also in its sister trope, it displays a remarkable likeness to Ezekiel 16 that suggests association and even inter-dependence. As it relates to this issue, the command in 23:36 to the two sisters, “And declare to them their abominations,” warranted the examination at the beginning of the section. However, one can say more about its relationship to Ezek 16:20–23 and 36b. In the verse following the command, Ezek 23:37 expands upon the theme of sexual perversion. It says, “For they committed adultery and blood is in their hands and with their idols, they committed adultery and also, their sons, which they bore to me, they caused them to pass through to them for food.” First, the verse associates their abominations with adultery. More specifically, the verbal root, “to commit adultery” occurs twice in 37a, once at the beginning of the clause after כִּי and a second time at the end of the clause. In between these two occurrences are the accusations of bloodshed and idolatry, the two terms that arise in the expansion in Ezekiel 16. In addition, the verse likewise utilizes the Hiphil verbal form, “to cause to pass through, to offer,” in which they offer “their sons, which they bore to me” to these idols. Therefore, the third and final command likewise displays the same linguistic and thematic associations of its passages as does Ezek 16:20–23 and 36b.

In conclusion, the linguistic evidence and developments in content demonstrate that Ezek 16:2^(הודיע)–3a^(ואמרתי), 20–23, 36b, 43–58 arose as an expansion upon the metaphor of Yahweh’s provision for infant-Jerusalem and her subsequent harlotry and adultery. The emphases of this expansion differed from both the expansion regarding the eternal

covenant as well as those materials that preceded it. We now turn to a discussion of those early materials.

3.3 Ezekiel 16:1–42 Jerusalem as a Harlot

The observations in the synchronic analysis yield a much different picture of the textual material and constitution of Ezek 16:1–42 than that of the so-called appendices in 43–58 and 59–63. These two expansions, whose first respectively comprises Ezek 16:2^(הודיע)–3a^(ואמרתי), 20–23, 36b, 43–58 and whose second comprises 16:59–63 generally reveal a congruent picture of the textual materials that constitute each expansion. Moreover, the unequivocal reuse of language in these so-called appendices commends various techniques of textual production that is not always present in the materials related to the original metaphor. In fact, many questions arose in Chapter Two regarding the variant materials found within Ezek 16:1–42. The remaining analysis recognizes three general groups of materials in 16:1–42: material related to covenant-marriage and adultery, material related to harlotry, and material related to the basic metaphor, accusation, and announcement of judgment. The analysis of 16:1–42 will begin with materials that presume or show the greatest degree of dependence on earlier layers of material, display evidence of appropriating other Ezekielian material in order to comment upon preexisting texts, or contain lemmata that are incongruent within the scope of the chapter.

3.3.1 Covenant-Marriage and Adultery

3.3.1.1 Ezek 16:40–41 Added Punishment in accordance with Covenant-Marriage Expansion and Accusations and Their Incorporation

In what appears to be the latest expansion of 16:1–42, Ezek 16:40–41 presumes the existence of particular material and perspectives from the chapter regarding different types of sexual deviancy. This presumption of particular material includes later expansions involving the services and payment of a professional harlot, adultery, as well as a redactional layer involving harlotry itself. Additionally, four clauses, Ezek 16:40–41 α , contain discordant lemmata and content that, while presuming sexual promiscuity, are neither congruent with the terminology of the accusation/judgment structure of the chapter nor with the narrative of Yahweh’s early relationship to Jerusalem. Interestingly, this material contains language that has a striking similarity in lexemes and sequence to four clauses in Ezek 23:46 β α , 47 α α , 47 α β , and 47 β β . Finally, Ezek 16:41 α β – β incorporates lemmata from previous material in an attempt to integrate the additional punishment of Jerusalem into the chapter. The following section will consider first the clauses in 16:40–41 α that share lemmata with Ezekiel 23 before turning to the incorporation of material from previous expansions within the verses.

3.3.1.1.1 Ezekiel 16:40–41 α Added Punishment

Unlike other material announcing judgment upon Jerusalem—material that relates to Jerusalem’s harlotrous behavior, her production of cultic locations, or Yahweh’s gifts, Ezek 16:40–41 α introduces new terminology and content to the chapter. Ezekiel 16:40 α begins, “And they will bring an assembly against you.” A similar clause,

speaking of harlotrous and adulterous Jerusalem and Samaria, exists in Ezek 23:46α, “to bring an assembly against them.” The point here is not that one is dependent on another but that in Ezekiel 16, the incorporated content is synthetic and relates to the chapter’s topic only in a general manner. By means of the third, plural, verbal form, the clause in 16:40α clearly presupposes Jerusalem’s “lovers,” which first occurred in 16:36. However, other actions of the “lovers” in 16:37bβ and 16:39 are meant to undo Jerusalem’s harlotrous actions, reverse what Jerusalem previously received from Yahweh, or publicly expose her in the manner in which Yahweh originally found her.

Accordingly, Yahweh reveals her nakedness to her lovers in 16:37bβ in reciprocal manner to the way she exposed herself in 16:36aβ.⁵⁰⁰ Her lovers tear down or destroy the high places and mounds in 16:39aα that Jerusalem earlier built in 16:24–25a. And they strip her of her gifts in 16:39aβ that Jerusalem earlier received from Yahweh’s hand in 16:10 and 12–13α. In stark contrast to these observations, the four clauses in Ezek 16:40–41α contain no terminology that occurs elsewhere in the chapter. From this perspective, these clauses appear foreign to the chapter and relate only at the surface of the chapter’s topic. They presuppose sexual promiscuity and attempt to bring the judgment into conformity with punishment befitting promiscuous women although not in a manner that coheres with the rhetoric and structure of Ezekiel 16.

Thus, in 16:40aβ, the concept of stoning—the terminology is distinct—appears to bring Jerusalem’s judgment in line with the sexually immoral woman in Deuteronomy

⁵⁰⁰ In Ezek 16:39bβ, the harlot returns to the precise manner in which Yahweh found her in 16:7bβ; she was “naked and bare.” (וערירה ערם) If my analysis is correct, however, 16:39 utilizes this collocation first.

22.⁵⁰¹ It would appear rather strange, however, to have an assembly of Jerusalem's lovers, presumably from the group of foreign nations mentioned in Ezek 16:26–29, punish her in accordance with a legal code in Leviticus or Deuteronomy. This conception though is apparently what the addition of Ezek 16:40–41α would have the reader think. In this manner, Ezek 16:40αβ continues the theme of additional punishment. It reads, “And they will stone you.” The clause again presupposes the lovers of 16:36 but envisions them stoning harlot Jerusalem for her promiscuity. A judgment of “stoning” רגם does occur in Lev 20:2 to those who offer up children to Molech, an interesting observation in view of the accusation of child sacrifice in Ezek 16:20–23. From this point of view, this clause(s) could be contiguous or in response to the expansion concerning child sacrifice. The punishment of stoning is meted out to those cases that play the harlot after Molech. (Lev 20:5) Cases of adultery (Lev 20:10), on the other hand, receive death sentences, albeit the method is not articulated. In any case, Ezek 16:40–41α apparently is an attempt to align the punishment with legal practices similar in conception to those found in Leviticus 20 and Deuteronomy 22 for one who sacrifices offspring to Molech and plays the harlot and adulteress. The synthetic nature of the punishment as it relates to Ezekiel 16 is clear from its discordant lemmata.

⁵⁰¹ Contra Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 346, the woman in Deut 22:21 is not an adulterous woman. She is a promiscuous woman. Additionally, the case of the woman in Deut 22:24 is not yet married but only betrothed. The case of a married woman is discussed in Deut 22:22 but without explicit reference to stoning. The terminology in Deuteronomy 22:21, 24 is סקל, not the verb used in Ezekiel 16 and 23, רגם. In any case, the terminology of “adultery” is not used in Deuteronomy 22.

The clause in Ezek 16:40b, “And they will cut you in pieces with their swords” is unparalleled in the HB.⁵⁰² Like the clauses preceding it, the third, plural, verbal form assumes Jerusalem’s lovers from 16:36. Moreover, the second, feminine, singular, suffixed pronoun indicates that Jerusalem will receive the action of the verb. Unlike the clauses preceding it, however, there is little evidence from the HB to suggest the presumption of sexual immorality in view of such punishment. Moreover, as others have noted, the fact that the “assembly” from 16:40aα now has swords suggests a military endeavor rather than the practice of explicitly articulated “righteous men” bearing the sword as in the parallel clause in Ezek 23:45a–46.⁵⁰³ The lack of coherence with other language and content of the chapter gives the appearance of a shallow congruence brought about by pronominal forms.

The final clause containing discordant lemmata transpires in Ezek 16:41aα. The clause reads, “And they will burn your houses with fire.” As Chapter Two indicated, contrary to the other actions of the lovers in which they strip her and seize the accouterments that Yahweh gave her in Ezek 16:10–12 and she subsequently perverted in 16:16–18a, the accusative, “house” appears for the first time in the chapter. Thus, unlike the actions of the lovers in 16:39, which destroys his earlier gifts, Yahweh neither gave Jerusalem materials for the “house,” nor did she pervert a “house” in order to play the harlot. These observations again demonstrate the lack of coherence with other rhetoric and structural elements in Ezekiel 16. Moreover, while the action of burning a promiscuous woman exists in Lev 21:9 and 20:14, the dissimilarities with Ezek 16:41

⁵⁰² The verb is related to Akkadian, *bataqu*, CAD 2:161–65; see Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 499.

⁵⁰³ See Hölscher, *Hesekiel*, 94, et al.

make any connection between the passages merely speculative.⁵⁰⁴ A stronger linguistic relationship exists to those passages that indicate that Babylon burned Jerusalem and her houses with fire.⁵⁰⁵ While the incongruent vocabulary would suggest that Ezekiel 16 depends upon the material otherwise found in 2 Kings, a conclusion regarding direction of dependence would require an analysis of 2 Kings, an examination which lies outside the scope of this chapter. Rather, the point is that the content of the clause is incongruous with other material in Ezekiel 16.

3.3.1.1.2 Ezekiel 16:41a β –b Integration of Added Punishment by means of Materials related to Adultery, Harlotry, and Payment

Ezekiel 16:41a β –b comprises material concerning “wives,” “harlotry,” and “payment” in this expansion related to added punishment. Three clauses that conclude Ezek 16:41 presume the particular accusations and announcement of judgment that transpire in Ezek 16:30b–32, 34, and 38a α . Moreover, the clauses utilize different pronouns, which each relate to the characters within the section: Yahweh, Jerusalem, and the lovers. The first clause, Ezek 16:41a β , says, “And they will execute judgments against you before the eyes of many wives.” The third, plural pronoun, “they” has for its antecedent the “lovers,” which first appeared in 16:36, 37, and by way of pronoun, v. 39ff. The audience before whom the lovers will execute these judgments is “many wives,” an association to “wives” in 16:34. The question ensues, does this clause enter

⁵⁰⁴ Zimmerli wants to see another reference to Leviticus 20, *Ezekiel 1*, 330, note 41a, and 346. However, in Leviticus, it is the perpetrators who are burned and not the house. Moreover, it is the daughter of a priest in Leviticus 21:9 and a man who marries both a mother and a daughter in 20:14 who are burned with fire.

⁵⁰⁵ 2 Kings 25:9 (Jer 52:13), Jer 32:29, 39:8.

into the chapter at the time of 16:39 and the lovers' actions therein reported? Or does it enter into the chapter at the time of 16:40–41α? These “judgments” seem to reflect the actions of the lovers in 16:40–41α rather than the actions of the lovers in 16:39 because these judgments seem to arise in response to the adultery expansion in Ezek 16:30b–34, e.g. adultery, assembly, and stoning, and not to the actions of the lovers in 16:39. In contrast, the actions in v. 39 relate to the metaphor of Yahweh's provision and Jerusalem's perversion of Yahweh's gifts.

Moreover, 16:39b articulates a denouement as Yahweh's punishment against lady Jerusalem has returned her to her original state and thus, the punishment seems complete. If such is the case, an earlier form of the text, whose sequence would proceed from 16:39b directly to 16:41β, in which the lovers execute more “judgments” after Jerusalem returns to her original state, is less likely. Additionally, the term, “wives” does not arise in connection with the motivation, announcement of judgment, and its execution by Jerusalem's lovers in 16:36–39. The term does, however, appear in 16:30–34 and in relationship to “harlot” and “payment.” The nominal form, “harlot” appears in the subsequent clause, 16:41β. Similar to “wives” and “payment”, this term also does not appear from 16:36–39 but likewise emerges in the passage, Ezek 16:30–34.

As indicated above, the next clause in 16:41β also connects to 16:30b–34. It says, “And I will make you stop from being a harlot.” The lexeme, “harlot” occurred four times in 16:30–35. It was in that context that the harlotrous woman was conflated with an adulterous “wife,” the same term found in 16:41β. In the same manner, the final clause of the verse in 16:41β connects to Ezek 16:30–34, making it the third clause in a series to contain a significant lexeme from 16:30–34. It reads, “And also, you

will not give payment again.” The term, “payment” occurs once in v. 31 and twice in v. 34 before appearing for the only other time in the chapter here in 16:41. This clause, along with the previous clause in 16:41b announce Yahweh’s intention to halt the woman’s backwards prostitution and harlotry. Thus, the three clauses from 16:41aβ–b duplicate terms, collocations, and themes from 16:30–34 in order to incorporate the newfound punishment into the chapter. That these clauses belong to this expansion and not an earlier one also emerges in that Yahweh already brought “judgments of adultery” against Jerusalem in 16:38. As such, 16:41aβ conflates these “judgments” with the lovers who have acted in 16:40–41α. It is worth noting the manner in which the author integrated lemma from 16:30–34 in this expansion. These repetitions assist the incorporation of the otherwise extraneous punishment, articulated in 16:40–41α.

3.3.1.2 Ezekiel 16:30b–32, 34, 38α Adultery and the Reverse Harlot

Ezekiel 16:30b–32, 34, and 38α introduce expansive materials that broaden and augment the notion of harlotry in an increasingly negative outlook. The following presentation probes these materials through their presumption of previous elements, incorporation or adaptation of those elements, and their heightening of the desperate depth of Jerusalem’s behavior. For example, in contrast to the obvious portrayal of Jerusalem as a harlot in vv. 4–42, the section in 16:30b–32, 34, and 38α contends that Jerusalem is “not like a harlot.” Indeed, this section will aggrandize Jerusalem’s behavior to the extent that the typical, professional harlot appears meek, fresh, and shrewd in contrast. Two different expansions occur within this section in order to aggrandize Jerusalem’s wicked behavior. Because the expansions appear close in

proximity, concept, and purpose, they will be treated here together. The earliest expansion involves correlating adultery with harlotry while a second conflation compares Jerusalem to other “wives” and states that no one wanted her services as a harlot, thereby requiring Jerusalem to pay in order to ply her services, quite the “reverse” from the typical prostitute. This “reversal” of the practice of professional harlotry integrates a concept from the redactional material concerning harlotry but reorients that material in order to aggrandize her harlotrous ways.

3.3.1.2.1 Ezekiel 16:34 and 16:31 The Unsolicited “Reverse” Harlot-Wife and Her (Lack of) Payment

We will first deal with the latest expansion of this material in 16:30b–32, 34, and 38a α —in a word, “reverse”—in an effort to unveil the latest material within the section, subsequently leaving other elements into which this material was integrated. Ezekiel 16:34 makes a final attempt at stating the absolute depths to which Jerusalem has fallen. In varying degrees of adaptation, the verse incorporates the notions mentioned above, thus indicating its late inclusion: It presumes Jerusalem’s harlotrous behavior, compares her to “wives”, and assumes a hoary career as prostitute necessitating payment merely to lure clientele. Thus, the verse obviously depends upon a great deal of material that has preceded it. As for its presumption of Jerusalem’s harlotry, the verse builds upon an early layer of material that itself reoriented Yahweh’s basic indictment of Jerusalem’s behavior since Ezek 16:15 in order to highlight her harlotrous ways.⁵⁰⁶ Moreover, as we

⁵⁰⁶ For this layer related to harlotry, see below. One particular section of harlotrous actions cohere with the portrayal of the “brazen harlot” who “scoffs at payment”: her relationships with foreign nations described in Ezek 16:26–30a. See below for a fuller description of this relationship.

will discuss below, 16:34 incorporates lemmata from Ezek 16:30b, and 32 that integrates adultery into the concept of harlotry. Finally, the verse reorients a comparison of Jerusalem with that of a typical harlot found in 16:33, a verse that in itself, does not presume the comparison with an adulteress and does not contain common terminology concerning a professional harlot. On the other hand, from a perspective of the previously discussed expansion in 16:40–41, Ezek 16:34 is unaware of any material related to “added judgment” and cessation of harlotry. The apparent lack of awareness of these matters in 16:34 indicates that the material emerged prior to the expansion just described in conjunction with its amalgamation of “wives,” “harlotry,” and “payment” in Ezek 16:41a β –b β .

3.3.1.2.1.1 Ezekiel 16:34

Ezekiel 16:34 begins and ends in a similar manner; it describes Jerusalem’s “contrary” (הפך) behavior to that of wives and harlots. The term, “contrary” or more specifically, “reverse” (הפך) occurs in the impersonal clause with which the verse begins, “With you, it was the opposite of those women in your harlotry.” And it also occurs at the end of the verse, “and as such, you were the opposite.” The construction is a clear envelope structure, which presumably is an attempt to frame in an absolute manner the three notions mentioned above. The initial clause of 16:34a, “With you, it was the opposite of those women in your harlotry,” incorporates the notion of adultery with its utilization of the term, “woman, wife.”⁵⁰⁷ In particular, Jerusalem was the

⁵⁰⁷ I translate the article here as the demonstrative pronoun since the article presumably refers to either the wife of 16:32a or the typical harlot in 16:33a. Ezekiel 16:33, however, referred to הַשָּׂדֵה נָזוּת not הַשָּׂדֵה.

reverse of “wives.” The definite noun, “wife, woman” was last utilized in 16:32, modified by the definite, feminine participle, “one committing adultery.” The utilization of the definite, plural noun here in 16:34a picks up on the notion of a wife who commits adultery against her husband and merges it with the notion of harlotry via the prepositional phrase, “in your harlotry.”⁵⁰⁸

The second clause within the envelope structure, 16:34aβ, asserts a surprising turn of events when it says, “And no one pursues you as a harlot.” The clause utilizes the only occurrence of the Pual stem of נזנ in the HB, thus incorporating the notion of harlotry in the subunit but developing it in order to portray Jerusalem as used up; no one pursued her services. Of course, the entire subunit has recounted Jerusalem’s many harlotrous affairs. The point, however, is limited by the ensuing clause in 16:34bα. Namely, Jerusalem was so desperate that she was required to pay others to engage in her services! The arrangement is clearly backwards from the normal practice and makes no economic sense; the arrangement does, however, emphasize the destitution of harlot-Jerusalem. No longer did her paramours pursue her services. Her hoary career was at the end because what was once her beauty had been spent upon earlier loves. In this manner, the clause presumes Jerusalem’s long career as a harlot seen in her many acts of harlotry from 16:15–29, in particular, her wrongheaded allegiances with foreign powers in vv. 26–29.

Ezekiel 16:34bα interpretively frames this new development stating, “And in the way you gave payment, no payment was given to you.” Upon first glance, this sentiment

⁵⁰⁸ Ezekiel 16:30b merges the two lemmata in a similar manner. I discuss this merging, along with incorporation of the “adulterous wife” material, in greater detail below.

seems to echo 16:33 that Jerusalem gave her gifts and bribed her lovers, a perspective that is virtually guaranteed given the overture in 16:31b and the imagery of Jerusalem's harlotrous liaisons of Ezek 16:26–30a, to which we will return below. Indeed, Ezek 16:34bα draws from 16:33a–bα in two very tangible ways through its statement, “But when you gave payment, yet no payment was given to you.” First, a related conception of converse economics appears in 16:33 albeit in a construction with two hapaxes in 16:33a–bα. (נָדַן and נָדָה) Ezekiel 16:34bα simplifies the notion by substituting the common term for a harlot's fee, אַתְּנָן, for each occurrence of a hapax. In addition to simplifying the conception through a more commonly used term, the term אַתְּנָן only occurs in connection with harlotry whereas the two hapaxes do not necessitate or presume the practice of harlotry.⁵⁰⁹

Second, Ezek 16:34bα reflects the parallel design and makeup of 16:33a–bα and again simplifies it so that it is self-contained as it relates to content. It reflects the makeup of 16:33a–bα by utilizing נָתַן as the verbal action in each clause as well as a nominal form in each clause that relates to נָתַן and denotes remuneration. It reflects the design of 16:33a–bα by utilizing a similar parallel construction:

Ezek 16:34bα *But when you gave payment, yet no payment was given to you.* ABBA

Ezek 16:33a–bα *To all harlots, they give a gift but you gave your gifts to all your lovers*

ABBA

⁵⁰⁹ The term, אַתְּנָן occurs in Deut 23:19, Is 23:17, 18, Ezek 16:31, 34 (2), 41, Hos 9:1, and Mic 1:7 (3). The verse refers to the wages of a harlot although often in a figurative sense as in the book of Ezekiel; cf. BDB, 1072.

Ezekiel 16:34b α is self-contained. Whereas 16:33a–b α includes and therefore requires consideration of three outside referents, “all harlots,” “they,” and “lovers,” Ezek 16:34b α refers only to Jerusalem. Moreover, Ezek 16:34b α construes 16:33a–b α according to its presumption of a lengthy period of harlotry. Although we will discuss it in greater detail below, 16:33 does not presume a lengthy period of harlotry or that she is worn out as a harlot. Moreover, as indicated above, the two hapaxes are not associated with the services of a harlot as is the noun, אַתְּנָן. Thus, Ezek 16:34 presumes the surrounding material but develops it in a way that shows a distinct perspective.

3.3.1.2.1.2 Ezekiel 16:31

Ezekiel 16:34b α contains two of only four occurrences of the term, “payment” (אַתְּנָן) in the chapter—indeed, in the entire book of Ezekiel. A third occurrence likewise appears here in this section while a fourth appearance occurred in the expansion of additional punishment material in Ezek 16:41 discussed above. The third appearance occurs in a difficult clause in 16:31b that similarly conveys the notion that Jerusalem was not like a normal harlot as it concerns a “payment.” The occurrence of the term, אַתְּנָן, within a clause that portends Jerusalem’s converse economic practice of harlotry suggests the same hand at work in this clause as in 16:34. Moreover, as will be shown below, Ezekiel 16:31a takes up the material from Ezek 16:24–25 concerning the production of improper cultic locations and subsequently combines it in 16:31b with Jerusalem’s lack of concern for payment. These brief considerations suggest an expansionary effort in order to incorporate this element into the context. We now turn to a fuller explanation of the integration of 16:31 into the section.

Ezekiel 16:31a begins with the adverbial clause, “When you built your mound at the head of every path and your high place, you made in every square.” The clause commences in an adverbial manner thus immediately noting a temporal dislocation from the accusation in 16:24–25 in which the same lemmata transpire. The first clause, 16:31a α , contains an infinitive of the verbal root “to build” that occurred in 16:24a, and the rare nominal form “mound” that likewise appeared in 16:24a. The difference lies mainly in the form of the verb, which the adverbial infinitive indicates.

Ezek 16:24a *And you built for yourself a mound.*

Ezek 16:31a α *When you built your mound*

Similarly, 16:31a β contains the rare nominal form, “high place,” the verb, “to make,” and the location of cultic production, “in every square,” which transpired in 16:24b. Again, apart from the verbal tense and accompanying syntactical elements, virtually no differences between the two clauses exist.

Ezek 16:24b *And you made for yourself a high place in every square*

Ezek 16:31a β *And your high place, you made in every square*

Additionally, 16:25a α indicates a location for the building of the cultic place, “At every head of a path, you built your high place.”⁵¹⁰ In contrast to this location, Ezek 16:31a

⁵¹⁰ Ezekiel 16:25a combines the accusative of 16:24b with the verb of 16:24a in order to demonstrate that she figuratively “abhorred her beauty and spread her feet” via the parallel descriptions in 16:24.

asserts that Jerusalem built her mound “at the head of every path.” While the difference is minimal for an understanding of the clause, it does point to a reversal of the clausal construction of 16:25a α and thus seems characteristic of a practice known as Seidel’s law.⁵¹¹ If this assessment is correct, it demonstrates again the manner in which expansions take up earlier material and reorient it within a work. Regardless, however, Ezek 16:31a clearly draws upon language of 16:24.

Moreover, Ezek 16:31a is syndetically conjoined to a clause, 16:31b, that conveys the conception of Jerusalem’s converse economic practice of harlotry. Ezekiel 16:31b indicates—somewhat contrary to the chapter’s consistent assertion that Jerusalem played the harlot—that Jerusalem was not like a harlot because she mocked remuneration.⁵¹² The clause says, “And you were not like a harlot, scoffing at payment.” The clause obviously presumes the theme of harlotry so prevalent within the subunit while at the same time aggrandizing Jerusalem’s behavior so that even a normal harlot appears astute. Here then, the third occurrence of the term for a harlot’s wage, אַתְּנָן, appears. Consequently, the verse associates the notion of payment, or in this case, the

⁵¹¹ Named after its discoverer, M. Seidel, “Parallels between Isaiah and Psalms,” *Sinai* 38 (1955–56), 149–72, 229–40, 272–80, 335–55. See also Pancratius C. Beentjes, “Discovering a New Path of Intertextuality: Inverted Quotations and Their Dynamics” in *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible*, eds. L.J. de Regt, J. de Waard, and J.P. Fokkelman (Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1996), 31–50; S. Talmon “The Textual Study of the Bible,” 321–400, idem. *Text and Canon of the Hebrew Bible: Collected Studies* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010), Bernard Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 17–20.

⁵¹² The clause itself is difficult in that it utilizes a *lamed* preposition affixed to a Piel infinitive construct in order to explain how Jerusalem is *not* like a harlot. As Greenberg points out, the difficulty is not so much with the sense of the *lamed*/infinitive construction, which is not uncommon in the HB although different than its normal function of purpose, for which see GKC, §114o, Joüon §124o, but rather in the fact that it explicates the preceding negative clause and thus appears structurally discordant with its surroundings. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 284. The difficulty also lies in the uncommon verbal root of the infinitive. As evidence for the difficulty of the clause, one merely needs to consider the versions and various explanations in commentaries, cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 329.

lack thereof, with previous material concerning construction of false cultic locations.

One can discern that this material is expansionary in that it develops the notion of typical harlotry, which 16:25b asserts of Jerusalem, in the same aggrandizing manner as the “reversed” harlotry of 16:34. One could ask the question, however, why an expansion occurs here? Why would this verse not immediately precede 16:34 if it were intended to introduce such ideas? To answer such questions, one must consider what the verse interjects.

Ezekiel 16:31 interrupts the assimilation of adultery with harlotry in 16:30b and 16:32. Ezek 16:30b ends with an apposition; it juxtaposes the term, “woman, wife” with the noun phrase, “brazen harlot.” The adjective, “brazen” is a hapax and defies a transparent connotation although its denotation is likely restricted by its verbal root. The insertion of 16:31 after “brazen harlot” may see in this opaque phrase an opportunity to elucidate its content by taking up the material in 16:24–25 and intensifying her harlotrous behavior so that she is now worse than a typical harlot. The production of cultic locations was at the heart of Jerusalem’s denunciation and thus a sensible bridge for further comment. Additionally, the verse provides a prelude for the ancillary comment in 16:34. Thus, the portrayal of her multiple acts of harlotry gives way to a description of her in which she has plumbed to an even greater depth than a nefarious harlot.

3.3.1.2.2 Ezekiel 16:30b, 32, and 38aα The Adulteress

The mention of an adulterous wife in 16:32, although similar in promiscuousness to that of a harlot, reveals a subtle shift in perspective within the story. An adulterous

affair presupposes two factors: a marriage and a sexual relationship outside the confines of a marital relationship. Without each of those factors, of course, there is no adultery. On the one hand, Ezek 16:15–36 relate the matters of sexual promiscuity while 16:8–14 express Yahweh’s marriage to Jerusalem and his subsequent care for her. Several questions arise, however, from the analysis in Chapter Two concerning the integration of these materials within their respective contexts. In particular, Ezek 16:8, which is the only verse from Ezek 16:1–58 explicitly—even implicitly except for the verses now under consideration—mentioning and presuming the concept of a covenant of “marriage,” contests and eludes a straightforward cohesion with surrounding material. We will address these issues as they emerge in the growth of the chapter. But a more pressing question arises and is immediately transparent once one recognizes the subtle albeit important distinction between adultery and harlotry.

The phrase, “adulterous woman” does not emerge until late in the account of Jerusalem’s indictment; not until 16:32. The term, “woman, wife” does not occur until 16:30b, a clause that conflates the notion of harlotry with that of a wife. (אִשָּׁה) Why does such an important charge as adultery only arise toward the end of the accusation? Although one would expect many denunciations of her adulterous behavior, with the exception of Ezek 16:32 and its reverberations in 16:38a and 41aβ, there is no presumption of marriage in the chapter besides Ezek 16:8 and 60 nor is there explicit mention of a violation of any covenant until 16:59. If the assertion of the concept of marriage had appeared in 16:8 originally, the accusation of adultery would have surely arisen almost immediately.⁵¹³ Likewise, the lack of any explicit denunciation of

⁵¹³ See below for the integration of adultery and covenant into the section.

Jerusalem's "covenant" violations until 16:59 must indicate the late expansion of the notion of covenant in the chapter. Otherwise, why would adultery, which presupposes such an important notion as "covenant" or at the least, the union of Jerusalem to Yahweh, not be among the first of accusations hurled against Jerusalem? It is to this question that we now turn.

Ezekiel 16:32 reads straightforwardly, "The adulterous wife takes strangers instead of her husband." Containing the only third, feminine, singular verb form in the metaphor of Yahweh's relationship to Jerusalem from Ezek 16:1–43 that refers to a female person, the clause asserts the typical practice of a woman who commits adultery. She engages strangers instead of her own husband. Even without the now-common second, feminine, singular verbal form, the point of the verse seems obvious; Jerusalem is like a wife who copulates with individuals who are foreign to the marital relationship. However, in addition to the rare third, feminine, singular perspective within the metaphor, the verse injects three significant lexemes yet to be encountered in the chapter: "to commit adultery," "husband," and "strangers." Furthermore, an important fourth lexeme appears for the first time two verses earlier in a related clause, 16:30b: "wife." To put the matter another way, four out of the six words in 16:32 occur for the first time in the chapter with a fifth appearing for the first time close at hand in 16:30b. And this observation is in addition to the first appearance of a third, feminine, singular verb form; this occurrence stands in marked contrast to the many second, feminine, singular forms occurring in the chapter. Such a first-time appropriation of content suggests a marked development.

Additionally, such a candid, isolated remark about adultery would presumably necessitate an overture. One locates the overture in 16:30b. But the point still obtains, would not such an accusation of harlotry transpire in 16:15, immediately after the first report of her infidelity? If Yahweh's covenant of marriage was an ingredient in the harlot-metaphor of the chapter, an accusation of adultery would almost certainly have taken place earlier in the indictment if not immediately. This line of inquiry partially reveals the late entry of the notion of "covenant" and the union of Yahweh to Jerusalem within the chapter. Moreover, it also compels another question: If the notion of Yahweh's marriage to Jerusalem is late, why introduce "adultery" here rather than in Ezek 16:15ff? The next section will address how and why the notion of adultery emerges with the term, "wife, woman" (אשה) in Ezek 16:30b.

Ezekiel 16:30a closes the account of Jerusalem's relationship to several foreign partners, her insatiable lust, and her provocation of Yahweh. It concludes the account by asking a question before ending with a *Gottesspruchformel*. Ezekiel 16:30a reads, "What is wrong with your heart, utters the LORD?" The question forges an opportunity to expand the indictment against Jerusalem in an innovative manner. To put the matter another way, the question naturally invokes a response. In keeping with the direction of other material, the response in 16:30b heightens the perspective of Jerusalem's betrayal of Yahweh. It does so not only by expounding on the question in 16:30a but also by deducing a consequence of the recently added covenant language of 16:8 concerning which we will say more below. The expansion regarding Yahweh's covenant with maiden Jerusalem in 16:8, the acknowledgment of which is tellingly absent in 16:15–16:30a, compels a denunciation and punishment; indeed the additional punishment in

16:40–41a arose precisely because of this exigency. Thus, the expansion of 16:30b actualizes the corollary of covenantal and conjugal terminology of 16:8 by introducing the notion of a wife in 16:30b. At the same time, it epitomizes the behavior that is described in 16:25b–29 in which Jerusalem allies herself with foreign nations instead of confiding in Yahweh. Thus, the expansion in 16:30b finds within the harlotrous alliances of 16:26–29 an apt opportunity to intensify the accusation against Jerusalem; she was an adulterous wife.

Before the analysis turns to the adverbial clause in 16:30b, a telling variant reading appears in LXX in 16:30a. The variant apparently recognizes in the dubious MT construction *לבתך אמלה מה* the interpretation, “I would covenant with your daughters.” The MT construction remains an unsettled issue but the point here concerns not so much an answer, but the interpretive makeup and solution of the ancient versions, interpretations, and solutions that demonstrate the tendency to expect concepts of “covenant” at this juncture in Ezek 16:30. According to Zimmerli, the LXX understands *אמלה* from the verbal root *מול*, “to circumcise” and then interprets it as “to covenant.” The Syriac, Vulgate, and LXX^L apparently follow suit but interpret the verb as “cleanse” rather than “covenant.”⁵¹⁴ These interpretations, regardless of their accuracy, highlight the anticipation for which one senses the appropriateness to associate the context with covenantal connotations. The association of “circumcision” with covenant in the context of the chapter perceives the weighty role of Ezek 16:59–63. These translations of 16:30a, which immediately succeed Jerusalem’s harlotrous alliances with foreign

⁵¹⁴ Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 328, contra Block, who reprints *אמלה* so that the verb is understood as *מלא* and it reads, “How furious I am with you!” Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 492, 496–97; for a fuller description, see text critical discussion in Chapter One and Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 229.

nations and which immediately precede the first designation of Jerusalem as a wife, expose the interpretive nature not only of the versions but of the growth of the texts themselves. Similar to the one responsible for the expansion in 16:30b, the LXX translator recognized the breach of covenantal obligations in the harlotrous alliances in 16:26–29 and translated the difficult אַמְלָה accordingly. Thus, it is not difficult to recognize a similar inclination in the expansion to draw out the legitimate consequence of Jerusalem’s adultery-like alliances; namely, Jerusalem herself was an adulterous wife.

Turning directly to the expansion of 16:30b, the adverbial clause states, “When you do all these things, the work of a woman, a brazen harlot.” (שְׁלֹטַת זֹנוּהַ אִשָּׁה) The plural demonstrative pronoun in 16:30b, “all these things,” looks back upon the multiple accounts of “harlotry” that have transpired between 16:15–29. Although there has been no mention of “adultery” up to this point, the portrayals of “harlotrous” alliances with foreign powers instead of Yahweh naturally evoke such behavior. Still, if one presumes the “covenant” of marriage depicted in 16:8, one would have expected explicit denunciation of adultery for Jerusalem’s many promiscuous acts. As argued above, the expansion of 16:8 has given special impetus to describe these alliances as adultery. Consequently, the adverbial clause refers to the harlotrous acts by means of the plural demonstrative pronoun and then attributes these acts to the “work of a woman, a brazen harlot.” The indefinite, absolute form, “woman, wife” (הַיִּשָּׁא) emerges for the first time in the chapter, in apposition to the phrase, “brazen harlot.” This third person, indefinite reference will play an important role in the upcoming definite, third person reference to the harlotrous wife in 16:32.

Given the ambiguity of the term “woman,” its appearance here would not necessarily connote “wife.” If this were the only occurrence of the term, “woman, wife” in the chapter or one of many, then perhaps one could ascribe no intention to its appearance. This occurrence is, however, the first appearance of the term along with two other instances in this immediate context, 16:32a and 16:34aα that deal directly with an adulterous woman-harlot. The fourth and final appearance of the term in 16:41aβ, which was discussed above, was picked up and conflated with other newly introduced material. Moreover, the term in Ezek 16:30b, “woman, wife,” is juxtaposed to the motif of the unit, “harlot,” that is itself modified in an unparalleled and harsh manner, “brazen” in order to deepen the accusation against Jerusalem. The conflation of these two notions, wife and harlot, in conjunction with that of the plural demonstrative pronoun, which must refer to the previous deeds of harlotry, is an attempt to introduce the notion of adultery and merge it with that of harlotry already so prevalent in the chapter.

The fully developed accusation of adultery comes in Ezek 16:32 after an intervening verse, 16:31, which itself was considered above as an expansion upon the concept of harlotry. Ezekiel 16:32 equates Jerusalem’s actions with an adulterous wife. It says, “The adulterous wife takes strangers instead of her husband.”⁵¹⁵ As mentioned above, the third, feminine, singular perspective is rare in the chapter in comparison with the consistent second, feminine, singular actions directly referring to Jerusalem. Moreover, the second, feminine, singular perspective appears in the immediate context of the verse in 16:31b and 16:33b. In view of this grammatically isolated exception, how

⁵¹⁵ For the translation, “instead” for תחת, see Ezek 23:5; cf. BDB, 1065, which perceives the occurrence as on “under his authority.”

does Ezek 16:32 cohere with its surroundings? Ezekiel 16:32 fronts the definite noun, “wife” (האשה) and modifies it with a definite, feminine participle from the root, “to commit adultery.” The grammatically definite construction could indicate two alternative connotations. First, the definite noun האשה could comment directly upon the first occurrence of אשה in 16:30, in which case the entire argument for conflation in 16:30 and here is made stronger.⁵¹⁶ In this case, the third person perspective would be congruent with the adverbial clause in 16:30b rather than its immediate context of 16:31 and 33. If correct, the definite participle likewise augments the view of the wife in 16:30 as well as 16:32 as one whom, although under obligation to her husband, takes strangers.

Another view of the article is also possible: viewing the construction as a reference to a class of women, namely, those who commit adultery. This understanding could also elucidate the use of grammatical third person in view of the second, feminine, singular context. It would similarly expose a developing comparison in which Jerusalem is an unfaithful wife. However, the emergence of the term, “woman, wife,” utilized three times in quick succession in a limited context suggests that the definite article in 16:32a associates directly to 16:30b. Even so, the use of the article to denote a class is not incongruent with the connection to 16:30b, which in either case evokes a similar third person perspective.

Ezekiel 16:32b contains two words that it introduces to the chapter: the terms, “man, husband” and “strangers.” The appearance of the former term “man, husband” (איש) reflects the related term “woman, wife” (אשה) that occurred in 16:32a and 30b. The initial appearance of “woman, wife” in 16:30b occurred in apposition to the “brazen

⁵¹⁶ For the use of the article in such manner, see GKC, §126d, 404.

harlot” of 16:30b; that is, a harlot-woman, who acted domineeringly, as if she had mastery over her husband.⁵¹⁷ (שֹׁטֵט) This description is congruent with the scene depicted in 16:32–33, in which the woman, even though she is under obligation to (תחת) her husband, flaunts her purported autonomy and flagrantly procures her lovers by means of her husband’s dowry.⁵¹⁸ The second term, “strangers” transpires only here in the entire chapter. The term occurs six times elsewhere in the book of Ezekiel. In every other appearance, the term connotes foreign powers into whose hand Yahweh will give a nation for punishment.⁵¹⁹ The term also is associated with the metaphor of sexual partners, idolatry, and the false hope in foreign alliances in Jeremiah 2 and Jer 3:1–13. As such, it is congruent with this context in which the notion of sexual promiscuity within the confines of marriage elucidates Jerusalem’s confidence in foreign powers—into whose hands Yahweh would soon give her—rather than her husband, Yahweh. In other words, with the emergence of “husband” and “procuring strangers,” the verse elucidates Jerusalem’s alliances in 16:26–29 by designating them as the insolent adulteries of a wayward wife.

Ezekiel 16:38α provides the final updating of adultery material within the structure of the chapter. To be more specific, the expansion of Ezek 16:38α recognizes (and thus, presumes) the accusation-judgment framework of Ezek 16:15–34 and 35–43. It therefore, incorporates the language of judgment as a corollary to the accusations of adultery in 16:30b, 32, and subsequent to the “covenant” material in 16:8. The clause

⁵¹⁷ BDB, 1020.

⁵¹⁸ As for the term “gifts” in 16:33 (תּוֹבָנוֹת), see BDB, who attributes it from an Assyrian loan word designating “dowry,” 623.

⁵¹⁹ Ezek 7:21, 11:9, 16:32, 28:7, 10, 30:12, and 31:12.

says, “And I will judge you according to the sentence of an adulteress.” The clause contains the first occurrence of the root “to judge” as a first, common, singular verb, which refers to Yahweh’s action of judgment. Moreover, the related noun “judgment,” translated as “the sentence,” transpires in construct with the presumably singular, feminine participle “woman who commits adultery.”⁵²⁰ Thus, one finds the verbal root, “to commit adultery” a second and final time in the chapter.

3.3.1.3 Ezekiel 16:7–8 Covenant-Marriage

As the discussion in Chapter Two demonstrated, several difficulties emerge from the inclusion of Ezek 16:7–8 within the context of the abandoned infant. The difficulties effectuated a further suspicion that inquires why—if 16:7–8 existed in the original metaphor or subsequent harlot redaction—why did charges of adultery not issue soon after the first accusation of sexual promiscuity? The complexities involving 16:7–8 are worth noting again. First, 16:7 interrupts the dominance of the first person, *wayyiqtol* verbal forms referring to Yahweh’s action in the section. Even when the verbal forms return in 16:8, the lexemes that comprise the verse, do not lexically cohere with the surrounding context as do the lexemes in 16:9. Instead they concern Yahweh’s taking the maiden for his covenant-bride, two notions that do not come into play in the chapter until much later. Furthermore, whereas 16:9–14 concretely expresses Yahweh’s many benevolent acts of giving in language congruent with 16:4–6, the clauses in 16:7–8 contain only one description in which Yahweh “gives her a myriad.” Second, the verbal

⁵²⁰ Vaticanus contains the singular “adulteress.” MT could be a gloss to 23:45 or harmonization to the subsequent plus, “those women who pour out blood.”

forms in 16:7, which interrupt the otherwise consistent reference to Yahweh's action, refer generally to the growth of the infant into a young maiden. Common verbs such as "multiply," "grow," and "come" describe the maturation of the infant into a young maiden. Again, these verbs lack the lexical congruence with 16:4–6 and 9–14.

A third issue also emerges in connection with vv. 7–8. Ezekiel 16:8 commences with a verbatim two clause *Anknüpfung* from 16:6. It states, "And I passed by and I saw you." The repetition gives the appearance of an attempt to integrate the otherwise unparalleled material in 16:7–8. Moreover, this repetition prompts another question: When Yahweh "passed by and saw" the abandoned infant in 16:6, who was kicking in its blood, did he adequately respond to its peril? He surely responded in 16:6b as he charged the infant to live. But did he take any action besides speaking? Does he pick the infant up? Does he dress her or feed her? Interestingly, he does little else in 16:7–8 in direct and explicit literary correspondence to the infant's situation. One might not think anything of this lack of literary correspondence since Yahweh gives her a "myriad" in 16:7 and covenants with the infant-maiden in 16:8. In this sense, he responds to the dire needs of the infant-turned-maiden. But this leads to a fourth issue.

Yahweh responds to the infant's dire situation in 16:4–6 in direct lexical and grammatical correspondence in 16:9. The unnamed parents abandoned her without being "washed with water." Moreover, she was left to "kick about in her blood." Thus, Yahweh does for her in 16:9 what her parents failed to do; "I washed you with water and rinsed your blood from upon you." The question that confronts the reader is whether this occasion should be related to the infant—now grown into a young woman in 16:7–8—or should it relate to the pubescent maiden? The "washing with water" and rinsing "blood"

linguistically fits with 16:4–6 but with the expansion of 7–8, one must consider its coherence with the growth of the young maiden. Naturally, after the mentions of a “time of lovers” and other feminine pubescent matters, the issue of menstruation lies at hand as does virginal bleeding brought about by the consummation.⁵²¹

3.3.1.3.1 Ezekiel 16:4–6 and 9–10 Shared Cultic Language Tradition

Ezekiel 16:4–6 and 9–10 shares language that is common with cultic language. The book of Ezekiel’s relationship to the cult is well known. More specifically, as others have pointed out, the language that depicts Yahweh’s care for and provision to Jerusalem has associations to cultic language in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers.⁵²² The precise nature of this relationship is outside the scope of this analysis. However, as it pertains to the point here, does the shared language between the two corpora indicate the expansion of vv. 7–8? To demonstrate the veracity of this query, cultic concerns or terminology should be present in 16:4–6 and 9–10 while not appearing in 16:7–8. A brief examination of shared collocations and rare terms in these verses, while not in vv7–8, validates the thesis.

Yahweh will cleanse and clothe the maiden in Ezek 16:9–10 largely in a manner consonant with cultic ideals, which is what she appears to lack in 16:4–6.⁵²³ For

⁵²¹ William H. Brownlee, *Ezekiel 1–19*, WBC 28 (Waco: Word, 1986), 225.

⁵²² Besides the well known reconstitution of the cult in chs. 40–48, there is the use of cultic language in various places. For two different expressions of how one might understand the relationship, see Julie Galambush, *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as Yahweh’s Wife* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) and Michael A. Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel’s Use of the Holiness Code* (New York: T & T Clark, 2009).

⁵²³ Besides not being washed, the infant was also not “salted.” Although commentators have put forward various proposals for the purpose of the salt concerning hygiene, it is worth noting that salt was an important ingredient for the sacrifices in Exod 30:35, Lev 2:13, and Num18:19.

example, 16:4 and 9 utilize the collocation “wash with water.” In spite of the natural connection between these two lemmata, this syntactical construction only appears in the HB in connection with cultic practices in the Pentateuch with the exception of its use here and in Job 9:30.⁵²⁴ The collocation is used in Exod 29:4, 30:20, and 40:12, each referring to a requirement when approaching the tent of meeting. More pertinent to the usage in Ezek 16:9 are the occurrences of the collocation in Leviticus 15. The chapter contains regulations for dealing with fluids issuing from the human body. As it pertains to feminine hygiene, Lev 15:19–30 states that the woman who has a flow of blood, whether from menstruation or not, is unclean. Anyone who touches the woman’s articles is unclean and must “wash with water.” Used frequently in legal code related to uncleanness, the collocation’s rare appearance outside the Pentateuch and in the context of a pubescent woman readily evokes a question of shared language.

Not only does Yahweh wash the maiden with water in Ezek 16:9 but he also rinses her blood from upon her. Unlike the collocation “wash with water,” the collocation “to rinse blood” is rare in the HB.⁵²⁵ However, Yahweh saw the infant wallowing in its “blood” and spoke to it in its blood; the phrase “in your blood” appears twice in 16:6. Moreover, the verb utilized in 16:9, “to rinse blood,” is also used in

⁵²⁴ The collocation is used in Exod 29:4, 30:20, 40:12, Lev 1:9, 13, 8:6, 21, 14:8, 9, 15:5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, 21, 22, 27, 16:4, 24, 26, 28, 17:15, 22:6, Num 19:7, 8, 19, and Deut 23:12. In Job 9:30, the text uniquely utilizes the Hithpael. I speak here of occasions in which the lexeme “water” follows the verb “to wash.” Besides the many cultic occasions in the Pentateuch in which “water” syntactically relates to the verb “to wash,” it also precedes the verb “to wash” in three non-cultic occasions: Gen 18:4, 24:32, and 43:24 in which “water” is used to “wash” someone’s feet. The only other occasions in the HB which “water” precedes the verb “to wash” are in 2 Kings 5:12 when Naaman was to wash in the river’s water and Canticles 5:12 referring to the lover’s eyes.

⁵²⁵ The only other appearance of these two lemmata in a clause is in 1 Kings 22:35–38 where Ahab’s blood drains into his chariot after which the chariot is “rinsed” and the dogs lick up his blood.

collocation with “water” in Lev 15:11–12, the same verse and otherwise immediate context of the previously examined collocation “wash with water.” The verbal root “to rinse” only occurs three times in the Pentateuch, each appearance syntactically related to “with water.”⁵²⁶ Leviticus 15:11 states that anyone who comes into contact with a discharge and does not “rinse his hands with water” must then “wash with water.” The close proximity in Ezek 16:9 of the verbal root “to rinse,” used rarely in the Pentateuch, to the term “blood” and the collocation “wash with water,” adduces a shared concern between Leviticus 15 and Ezekiel 16:4–6 and 9.

The final clause in Ezekiel 16:9 likewise contains lemmata in common with a cultic context. In the clause, Yahweh anoints (סִיךְ) the young maiden with oil (שֶׁמֶן).⁵²⁷ The same verb appears in Exod 30:22–33, shortly after Yahweh instructed the Israelites about washing Aaron and his sons with water before approaching the tent of meeting in Exod 30:20. The passage instructs the Israelites how to prepare and use anointing oil (שֶׁמֶן). Occurring only ten times in the HB—and only in these locations in the books of Ezekiel and Exodus—Exod 30:32 instructs the people not to anoint (סִיךְ) just any man with the oil (שֶׁמֶן).⁵²⁸ Exodus 30:33 warns that the oil is for dedicated individuals and anyone who puts it on a “stranger” will be cut off from his people.⁵²⁹ The use of this rare verb in Ezek 16:9 with the term “oil,” neither of which one finds in Ezek 16:3–8,

⁵²⁶ Lev 6:21, 15:11, 12; the root is used four times in the book of Ezekiel, Ezek 13:11, 13, 16:9, 38:22.

⁵²⁷ The verb “to anoint” only occurs in the Pentateuch in Exod 30:32 and Deut 28:40.

⁵²⁸ “Oil” occurs in Exod 30:31.

⁵²⁹ If an association with cultic legal code is established, the use of this language in Ezekiel 16 only adds to the descriptive “lengths” to which the writer goes to illustrate God’s attempt to set Jerusalem apart and Jerusalem’s spurning of his measures.

demonstrates not only language common between cultic legal code and Ezekiel 16 but seemingly the attempt by the writer to portray how Yahweh had acted to sanctify Jerusalem for holy purposes. These examples of dedicated collocations and rare lemmata exhibit awareness of cultic verbiage.

Ezekiel 16:10 similarly begins with terminology appearing in texts related to cultic practice. After washing, rinsing, and anointing the woman, Yahweh clothes her with woven cloth. Both roots “to clothe” and “to weave” frequently appear in legal literature. The Hiphil stem of “to clothe,” which appears in Ezek 16:10a, occurs in Exod 28:41, 29:5, 8, 40:13, and additionally Lev 8:7, 13, Num 20:26, and 28. Each use of the stem deals with dressing or undressing the priest of their liturgical garments.⁵³⁰ Meanwhile, the verbal root “to weave,” which constitutes the nominal form in Ezek 16:10, appears in the Pentateuch only from Exodus 26–28 and 35–39 in texts dealing with the production of cloth for the tent of meeting or the priestly garments. Yahweh instructs the Israelites in Exod 28:39–40 about the “woven” materials, which should make up the priests’ dress. Then in Exod 29:41, he instructs Moses to “clothe” Aaron and his sons in the garments. Yahweh’s act of clothing the woman with woven cloth, terminology in common with cultic practice, demonstrates a common goal of Ezek 16:9–10 and an act that was found wanting in Ezek 16:4. The portrayal in which Yahweh outfits the woman in cultic-related clothing continues in the next two clauses in 16:10. He sandals the woman with a leather (שֶׁתֶּה) only used elsewhere in the production

⁵³⁰ Three other passage in which the word appears are Gen 3:21 when Yahweh clothes Adam and Eve with a tunic (Interestingly, the Israelites are to clothe priests in tunics), Gen 27:15–16 when Rebekah clothes Jacob with Esau’s garments, and Gen 41:42 when Pharaoh clothes Joseph with articles that one also finds in Ezek 16:12–13.

of the tabernacle and binds her in linen (שׁוֹשַׁן), another material used primarily in the production of cultic attire and material.⁵³¹

On the other hand, materials in 16:7–8 do not primarily occur in cultic contexts. While Leviticus does contain ordinances dealing with hair, the collocation, “to sprout hair” only occurs once. Furthermore, the term appears eleven times outside of a cultic context. The collocation “spread my garment,” in which Yahweh covers the maiden in Ezek16:8aβ, appears in Exod 25:20 and 37:9 concerning cherubim who spread their wings over the mercy seat. However, in addition to the difficulty raised by the different grammatical subject, “cherubim” the term appears outside this cultic context an additional ten times and thus, a strong association is not likely.⁵³²

Additionally, there is one other piece of evidence that may suggest the association of Ezek 16:4 and 9 to cultic language. In the MT, Ezek 16:4 reads, “and you were not washed with water for cleansing.” The prepositional phrase, “for cleansing” (לְמַשֵּׁי) does not appear in the OG and thus appears to be a gloss.⁵³³ As for the motivation behind its inclusion in the MT, one can only surmise based on numerous reconstructions that scholars have proposed.⁵³⁴ Commonly understood as a reference to cleansing or

⁵³¹ “Leather” appears in Exod 25:5, 26:14, 35:7, 23, 36:19, 39:34, Num 4:6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 25, and here in Ezek 16:10. The term, “linen” appears 33 times in cultic contexts in Exod 25–39. Otherwise, the term appears in Gen 41:42, Ezek 16:10, 13, 27:7, and Prov 31:22.

⁵³² As for the relationship of “spread my garment” in Ezek 16:8 to Deut 32:11, see Jason Giles, “Ezekiel 16 and the Song of Moses: A Prophetic Transformation?,” *JBL* 130 (2011), 87–108.

⁵³³ See the text critical discussion in Chapter One; see also the commentaries for the range of opinion on this word. Block says that “the versal omissions may have been due to the word’s incomprehensibility,” *Ezekiel 1–24*, 473. While this is possible, the OG did not fail to translate other difficult phrases such as 16:30a or the final word in 16:30. The shorter reading is most likely to be the earliest.

⁵³⁴ G. R. Driver, “Difficult Words in the Hebrew Prophets,” in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, ed. H. H. Rowley (New York: Scribner’s, 1950) 63–64; G. Fohrer, *Ezekiel*, HAT (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955), 83; G. A. Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark,

oiling, its correlation to 16:9 becomes clear, if only by modern scholars.⁵³⁵ The cleansing or oiling is seen as a counterpart to the “anointing with oil” in 16:9. Therefore, the tendency to see reciprocal action in 16:9 to that of 16:4–6 commends a view of the section that originally contained only 16:4–6 and 9ff.

3.3.1.3.2 Ezekiel 16:7–8 The Infant Becomes a Maiden

Returning to the complexities involving the inclusion of 16:7–8 within its context, a fifth difficulty involves the clause, “and came with the finest of ornaments.” Besides the enigma of its connotation, the phrase does not easily conform to the usage of “adornment” in 16:11a in which Yahweh adorns the maiden with jewelry.⁵³⁶ In view of the clear subject, recipient, and accouterments of 16:11, one must ask the question of 16:7aβ where the ornaments come from and precisely what they are. On a related note, the elevation of language in this clause in 16:7aβ as well as others such as 16:7aα, “a myriad, like the sprout of the field I gave you,” 16:8aβ1, “your time was the time of lovers,” and 8aβ2, “I spread my garment over you,” intimate the difference in language constituting 16:7–8 in contrast to the typical Hebrew narrative found otherwise in 16:6–14a.

1951), 162, 166, who deletes it based, in part, on metrical grounds, for which see also Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 323. HALOT cautiously suggests that it is an Aramaism, שעה, following Driver, 650. The reconstructions, which grant priority to an original שעה, lend the strongest evidence to a textually based correlation to 16:9.

⁵³⁵ See E. W. G. Masterman, “Hygiene and Disease in Palestine in Modern and in Biblical Times,” *PEQ*, (1918), 118–19, and the many commentaries who follow him; John William Wevers, *Ezekiel* (London: Nelson, 1969), 120; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 339; Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 237; Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 161–62; Brownlee, *Ezekiel 1–19*, 223. See Greenberg for additional references concerning natal care, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 274.

⁵³⁶ Although the use of the lexeme in vs. 11 could be an indicator that vv. 11–13a belong to the same expansion.

A sixth issue surrounding Ezek 16:7–8 involves the hypersexualized language found in the verses. No fewer than six clauses explicitly relate the maturation of the maiden into a woman of conjugal age. For example, clauses such as “breasts took shape,” “your hair sprouted,” “you were naked and bare,” “your time was the time of lovers,” “I spread my garment over you,” and “I covered your nakedness” exhibit the focus upon pubescence. Notwithstanding these explicit clauses, others likewise adumbrate the sensual nature of the two verses; e.g. the final clause of 16:7 states that she was “naked and bare” and 16:8 begins with Yahweh passing by and noticing her nakedness! Or one thinks of Greenberg’s suggestion that the enigmatic “and came with the finest of ornaments” indicates “signs of sexual ripeness.”⁵³⁷ Of course, the chapter is not reluctant to relate matters of sexuality but nowhere in the context of vv. 4–14 does one find comparable material, thus intimating the unique constitution of 16:7–8.

Finally, this leads to the question briefly noted above: why would the accusation of adultery not immediately materialize after the first accusation of harlotry? Given the explicit reference to covenant and marriage, surely an allegation of adultery would promptly surface at 16:15? In view of these observations and considerations, it seems unlikely that vv. 7–8 were part of the harlot-metaphor. But do these verses cohere with the expansion related to adultery and marriage? It would appear that at least 16:8 does for the following reasons.

First, as pointed out above, Ezek 16:8 repeats verbatim the first two clauses from 16:6. This repetition exhibits the intention to include the material in verse 8 within the surrounding context. Moreover, it begs the questions whether v. 8 was expanded at the

⁵³⁷ Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 276.

same time as verse 7. If 16:7 itself was already expanding upon the metaphor, would there be a need to incorporate that which was already being incorporated? Second and in conjunction with that question, it is interesting that the content of 16:8 only includes material related to conjugality. It does not contain material—although it presumes it—of the same type as v. 7 that focuses on the woman’s growth of so-called ornaments, breasts, pubic hair, and nakedness. In contrast, the closest it comes to articulating anything related to sexuality is the clause, “your time was the time of lovers,” which merely communicates that she was ready to be a bride. Or one could ask the question in this manner: what does the content of verse 7 adduce in contrast to verse 8? Indeed, verse 7 says nothing of marriage or covenant but only about the budding maiden. In contrast, verse 8 portrays material only related to matrimony. Third, the grammar of 16:7 exhibits a focus upon second feminine singular verbal forms and therefore, the action or growth of the woman while 16:8 focuses almost entirely upon the action of Yahweh in marrying the maiden.

Although it is difficult to conclude decisively, it appears that 16:7 contains lemmata that show congruence with the original metaphor of Yahweh and Jerusalem or in the earliest harlot-related redactions of the metaphor. In other words, 16:7, with its hypersexualized language and lemmata, which otherwise appear in the harlot redaction, could emerge in connection with the redaction that portrays Jerusalem as a voluptuous and bawdy woman. Ezekiel 16:8, on the other hand, does not contain language that focuses on feminine pubescence but instead heightens the eventual perversion of Jerusalem by announcing Yahweh’s chivalrous nuptials to the exposed and vulnerable maiden.

Still, the question arises whether these observations are strong enough to warrant the separation of vv. 7 and 8. One could also assert that the repetition with which verse 8 begins turns the metaphor from the infant or even the harlot to the now-maiden Jerusalem. It does so in verbiage that reminds its reader of the connection to the infant but with a specific outlook to the development that has taken place in 16:7. Given this explanation, the repetition in vv. 7–8 demonstrates an attempt to portray the development of Jerusalem's pubescence in terms related to its vulnerability as an infant. In other words, not only does Yahweh rescue infant-Jerusalem but he also "rescues" maiden-Jerusalem. However, as the metaphor unfolds, for neither reason does she respond uprightly to his gracious and loving benefaction. Moreover, if a foundling tradition or legal language from adoption rites underlies the metaphor in 16:3–14, vv. 7–8 definitely interrupt the metaphor. With this understanding one can discern the development in the metaphor. Not satisfied with the story of Yahweh's rescue of infant-Jerusalem and her eventual reckless and rebellious misapplication of his gifts, these verses attest to the emerging practice of couching Israel's relationship to Yahweh as one of covenant. In this manner, the expansion broadens her malefaction as one between a husband and a wife in order to exhibit her rebellion against her covenant relationship with Yahweh. The expansion introduced Yahweh's courtship of Jerusalem in order to heighten her atrocious behavior and to explain Yahweh's punishment through the hands of a military-like assembly of "lovers."

Given the above considerations, it is probable that Ezek 16:7–8 belongs to this expansion concerning marriage, adultery, and punishment fitting adultery. The next

section will propose a harlotry redaction⁵³⁸ to the original metaphor of Yahweh's relationship to Jerusalem. If correct, this harlotry redaction provides a fitting backdrop to the pubescent growth of the infant-maiden that exacerbates her perversion of and idolatrous production with Yahweh's gifts and harlot-like alliances with foreign nations. It is possible that vv. 7–8 could belong to the harlot redaction. This redaction, and in particular, the expansion concerning Jerusalem's alliances with foreign powers, would have generated adumbrations of betrayal in Jerusalem's covenant relationship with Yahweh and thus the need to expand the material in order to include a fitting analogy of such a betrayal, i.e. a marriage covenant. However, as mentioned above, the lack of any indication of covenantal violation at that point suggests that reference to the covenant came after that portrayal of harlotry. Thus, we now turn to the redaction of the metaphor into an extended diatribe against harlot Jerusalem.

3.3.2 Ezek 16:15–19, 16:25b–30a, 33, 35–36aβ Harlotry

3.3.2.1 Summary

Ezekiel 16 has displayed a rather surprising assortment of material thus far. Its latest expansion in 16:59–63 involved the announcement that Yahweh would establish an eternal covenant with Jerusalem. This eternal covenant would accomplish the humiliation that the restoration was supposed to achieve. Moreover, Yahweh would give Sodom and Samaria as well as older and younger sisters as daughters through this eternal covenant. Prior to this expansion, another development gave birth to what could

⁵³⁸ I use the term “redaction” here to indicate the large scale, multiple entries that explicitly concern the lemma, harlotry.

be considered an early edition of the chapter in Ezek 16:2^(הודיע)–3a^(ואמרתי), 20–23, 36b, 43–58. This expansion encompassed material towards the onset of the chapter as well as an appendix of sort, which itself constituted an end. The expansionary material inserted towards the beginning of the chapter, Ezek 16:2^(הודיע)–3a^(ואמרתי), provided a frame to the earliest metaphor as well as earlier expansions involving harlotry and adultery. This frame obliges an understanding of the chapter in terms of “abominations.” Jerusalem had acted more abominably than her sisters, Samaria and Sodom. Her abhorrent behavior had brought on Yahweh’s punishment but it was not the last word. Rather, this expansion looked forward to Yahweh’s restoration of all three of the sisters after their demise. It was this restoration after a demise that would surely engender Jerusalem’s humiliation. Finally, we just considered above an expansion that likely discerned within Jerusalem’s duplicitous alliances an opportunity to indict the metaphorical woman for her adulterous behavior against her covenant-marriage with Yahweh.

Thus, we arrive at the materials that still remain: An original metaphor concerning Yahweh’s custodial care of infant-Jerusalem with her wanton betrayal and impending judgment and a redactional layer that multiplies accusations of harlotries. This latter layer involves a major revision of the basic material in accordance with Jerusalem’s unappreciative productions of cultic venues that utilize Yahweh’s gifts and indiscriminate alliances with foreign powers. What is it that commends the proposal of an expansion upon an original metaphor? Could the materials that remain not be a single entity? Methodologically, the analysis thus far has followed a three-pronged approach in order to adjudicate possible expansions upon other material. First, linguistic data from Chapter Two often indicated complexities within the presentation of Ezekiel 16 itself.

These issues compelled a closer examination of the material in order to discern possible growth or expansion of material. For example, it is interesting that Ezek 16:27, 43, and 58 present Yahweh's punishment of Jerusalem as already completed although the announcement of punishment in 16:37–41 is yet future. These types of observations comprise much of the presentation thus far in Chapter Three.

A second course of analysis noticed materials within the presentation of Ezekiel 16 itself that are less congruent with others than at first presumed. This approach depends upon the content of the material. How does it differ in outlook from other material in the same context? How does it presume content that the chapter has not yet divulged? Or how does it advance ideas extraneous to an earlier declaration. An example of this type of observation arises within the additions of Ezek 16:40–41a. Unlike other material in the announcement of judgment, in which the lovers destroy Jerusalem's harlotrous, cultic productions or Yahweh's gifts, which she perverted, these clauses introduce material extraneous to all other material in the chapter. Thus, they display a uniqueness that one cannot straightforwardly assimilate into the chapter.

A third course of analysis observed possible methods of incorporating new material. Whether it was the *Anknüpfung* from 16:6 that emerges in 16:8 or the possible case of Seidel's law between 16:25a α and 16:31a, the analysis attempted to discern methods in which an author augments the biblical text with other material. This three-pronged approach has left two main remaining deposits of materials.

These remaining deposits of material are the basic metaphor concerning Yahweh and Jerusalem and a thorough redaction that expands the number and type of accusations of harlotry. Still, the substance, materialization, and circumstances of expansionary

material are not easy to adjudicate definitively from a basic metaphor. It is possible that a clause, which we designate as an expansion, belongs with the basic metaphor or vice versa. Still the variations in content and lemmata would strongly suggest that one must posit an expansion upon an original metaphor. Additionally, expansions concerning the different conceptions of harlotry may have arisen at various points in the composition of the prophecy.

3.3.2.2 Consistency of Language Comprising the Structure

At least three reasons emerge that indicate an expansion upon an original metaphor. The first has to do with a consistency of language that comprises the structure of the section. From a synchronic perspective, Chapter Two outlined the structure of Ezek 16:3–43 as following: 16:3–14 Yahweh’s rescue and provision for infant-maiden Jerusalem, 16:15–34 Accusation of harlotry, and 16:35–43 Announcement of judgment. In each of these subunits, similar lemmata and content, which relate to the alleged original metaphor, arise that correspond to the structure of the chapter. This material includes mention of accouterment, statements of Jerusalem’s beauty, and additionally, in the accusation and announcement of judgment structure, her production of cultic locations and indication of sexually explicit behavior—although absent of explicit denunciations of harlotry.

For example, Ezek 16:10 indicates Yahweh’s endowment of Israel with various types of clothing and accessories. Yahweh’s act of clothing Jerusalem is articulated with a Hiphil form of the verb, “to clothe.” (ואלבישך) Moreover, besides these various materials, Yahweh gives her a crown of “splendor” in 16:12. These and other materials

produce for Jerusalem her “beauty,” described in 16:13. Thus, in the coherence of the metaphor, the accouterments are necessary as they are integral for her beauty. Then, in the accusation against Jerusalem in Ezek 16:24–25, she “abhorred [her] beauty” when she built and manufactured cultic “mounds” and “high places.” In doing so, she “spread [her] feet to everyone who passed by.” Consequently, her beauty is an indispensable element in the rhetoric of the metaphor as it connects her production of cultic locations with sexual imagery. Her sexual indiscrimination, in which she perverts her Yahweh-given beauty, takes on the metaphorical portrayal of her idolatry.

Finally, in the announcement of judgment, it is on account of this behavior that Yahweh will gather her lovers and they will strip her of her garments in 16:39. In a reversal of Yahweh’s act of clothing, the lovers’ act of stripping is articulated with a Hiphil form of the verb, “to strip off.” (והפשיתו) Moreover, in v. 39, they take the vessels of “splendor” with which Yahweh endowed her in 16:12. Also, to countervail her production of idolatrous locations at which she performs her indecencies with her clientele, which is described in 16:24–25, Yahweh will now gather those paramours, and they will “destroy [her] mound and break down [her] high places in 16:39. Thus, based on language, one can discern the coherence between the original metaphor, the accusation, and the announcement of judgment.

3.3.2.3 Developing Conceptions of Harlotry

A second basis upon which one can discern expansion upon an original metaphor has to do with the differing conceptions of the so-called harlotry. If the analysis above is correct, the actualization of the metaphor began in the accusation that cultic locations

were produced—quite possibly a very literal act and accusation—by the city, which was portrayed as a bawdy woman spreading her legs. This original metaphor in 16:24–25 linked the production of “mounds” and “high places” in every square and at every head of a path with the “spreading of feet for every passerby” and “abhorring beauty.” Each of these lexemes, translated as “mound” and “high place,” are rare in the HB. While one discerns the negative connotation, it is not possible to know absolutely the denotation. What is more likely in the accusation is the ambiguity of the metaphor to cover various aspects of Jerusalem’s syncretistic practices. In this particular case, she manufactured sacred structures everywhere. Thus, one can discern in this accusation the prohibition against unsanctioned locations of worship. It was at these unsanctioned locations that participants engaged in acts of syncretism and led those participants away from devotion to Yahweh.

In a refinement of this denunciation, Ezek 16:16, 17, and 18–19 describe the procurement of Yahweh’s gifts in order to employ them in the manufacture of false images or to array their false worship. These descriptions resemble the accusation in 16:24–25 but differ in two respects. First, they elevate Jerusalem’s culpability in that she apprehends Yahweh’s explicit, gracious gifts to her and then perverts those gifts in the production and adornment of false images. This distinction is a significant departure from what one discerns in 16:24–25 in which Jerusalem produces her cultic locations but does it without appropriating any of Yahweh’s gifts. This distinction then warrants an important criterion that assists in the delimitation of the basic metaphor and the harlot expansion. That is, Jerusalem not only produced and participated at unsanctioned locations of worship, but she actually took gifts that her benefactor, Yahweh, had given

her and used them to manufacture false images upon which to expend her worship, worship that was due Yahweh alone in view of the rhetoric of the metaphor.

Second, by utilizing the metaphor of Yahweh's custodial care of the infant-maiden, the descriptions in 16, 17, and 18–19 condemn express acts of idolatry. They not only concern the general prohibition against unsanctioned locations of worship, but they explicitly mention “shrines,” (vs. 16) “masculine images,” (vs. 17) and burnt offerings (vv. 18–19). Moreover, after the indication that Jerusalem produced an idolatrous accessory, each description makes the connection to “harlotry” explicit in vv. 16 and 17.

A second group of denunciations against harlotry differ in concept in an even greater way. These denunciations concern Jerusalem's harlotrous alliances with foreign nations in 16:26–29. For example, Ezek 16:26 says, “You played the harlot with the sons of Egypt...” Likewise, 16:28 says, “You played the harlot with the sons of Assyria...” And 16:29 indicates, “You multiplied your harlotries to the land of traders, to Chaldea.” The different concept is obvious: the harlotry is related not to an unsanctioned cultic location, nor with an object that she manufactured from Yahweh's gifts, but rather it is related to a relationship or an alliance through which Jerusalem is led away from fidelity to Yahweh. Whether these denunciations arose as an expansion upon the unnamed “lovers” in 16:37 or the “nations” in 16:14, the distinct content is obvious.

Several other factors also emerge in this subsection. The description of the harlotrous relationships in 16:26–29 still conveys a sensuous essence. The Egyptians are described as Jerusalem's “neighbors who were great in size.” (בשר גדלי) The term is

ambiguous enough but given the sexualized context, it is not uncommon to find commentators who insist on its reference to Egyptians' phallus.⁵³⁹ Another factor concerns the explicit motivation that spurs Jerusalem's harlotrous alliances. She did it, Yahweh says, "to provoke me." This is rather surprising given the other grounds for her harlotrous behavior. As recently as 16:22 (as well as 16:43), Jerusalem prostitutes herself and her children in yet another conceived notion of harlotry because she "forgot the days of [her] youth when she was naked and bare, kicking about in blood." Here, however, it is with the malicious intent to provoke Yahweh.

A consideration of Jerusalem's motivation leads to yet another factor related to her impulse. She was apparently looking for satisfaction. After the description of her relationship to Egypt, her alliances with Assyria and Chaldea materialize in 16:28–29. These descriptions are united by their connection to Jerusalem's "satisfaction" or in this case, lack thereof. She prostituted herself to the sons of Assyria "because you were not satisfied" in Ezek 16:28a and 16:28b says again, "you played the harlot and still you were not satisfied. Ezekiel 16:29 expresses, "And you multiplied your harlotry to the land of traders, to Chaldea, and also in this, you were not satisfied." Thus, the causal clause in 16:28a, followed by related clauses in 16:28b and 29, vocalize a deficiency within Jerusalem herself that lies at the root of her behavior. Indeed, 16:30 inquires, "What is wrong with your heart, utters the LORD."

Another observation regarding these instances that are associated with the verbal root, "to play the harlot," concerns their syntactical incorporation into their respective units. In Ezek 16:26–29, the proper name of each entity is syntactically connected to the

⁵³⁹ Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 495.

leitmotif, “play the harlot.” In other words, the *wayyiqtol* verbal form וַתִּזְנֶי occurs in syntactical coordination with various foreign partners, without whom, the clause and sentence cannot function, e.g., “And you played the harlot with the sons of Egypt.” In contrast, the descriptions of harlotry in 16:15–17 incorporate the verb, “to play the harlot” in what appears to be a synthetic manner. To put the matter another way, in no case of the action described in 16:16–19 is the accusation of “playing the harlot” syntactically connected to the actual description of it in a clause. Instead, the explanation of her action is separated from the accusation of “harlotry” through clausal construction. This manner of incorporation into this expansion is distinct from the way it appears in the multi-clause description of harlotrous alliances with foreign nations, in which the verb זָנָה is syntactically related to other clausal constituents. For example, in the clause which constitutes 16:17b, the *wayyiqtol* verb, “and you played the harlot,” occurs with only one other constituent part, a preposition with third, masculine, plural, pronominal form, “with them.” Additionally, the related, nominal form, “harlotry,” (תִּזְנוּת) likewise occurs in synthetic clauses, e.g. “And you multiplied your harlotry,” a clause that occurs three times. The nominal form also occurs as a synthetic constituent of clauses as in the prepositional phrase at the end of 16:33b, “in your harlotry,” the content of which neither the clause nor the verse requires for sense.

Additionally, one must consider whether v. 14 (or vv.14 and 15) stimulated this expansionary indictment concerning Jerusalem’s alliances with nations or the verse(s) itself constitutes the expansion. Ezekiel 16:14 utilized the notion of Jerusalem’s beauty, brought about by Yahweh’s benefaction in 16:9–13, and asserted that this name became known among the nations. Even though v. 14 makes clear that the “name” was the result

of Yahweh's splendor, Jerusalem relied upon the name rather than Yahweh himself. Ezekiel 16:15 states, "You trusted in your beauty and you played the harlot over your name." The question concerns the role of the term, "nations." The person responsible for the expansion may have seen within that term an opportunity to expand upon this adumbration in vs. 14 by stating that she inappropriately aligned herself with these nations rather than Yahweh. In doing so, she trusted in her reputation among the nations instead of Yahweh himself. However, one could also assert that 16:14 takes the notion of her beauty, situated in the original metaphor of Yahweh's gifts and the maiden's growth, and utilized that notion to incorporate her faithless attempts at autonomy.

3.3.2.3.1 Ezekiel 16:20–23 Another Conception of Harlotry

There is yet another expansion related to Jerusalem's harlotry. It is the expansion related to Jerusalem's slaughter of her children. We discussed this expansion above because it appears to cohere with the chapter-making expansion related to abominations and restoration. However, its relationship to harlotry is obvious—if even conceptually distinct. Ezekiel 16:20 accuses Jerusalem of "sacrificing" her children that she bore to Yahweh, "to them"; in this case, the antecedent is the plural "masculine images." Instead of equating this behavior with harlotry, as did vv. 15, 16, and 17, Ezek16:20 treats it distinctly; it compares this behavior to harlotry. Then, 16:21 conflates that Jerusalem slaughtered Yahweh's sons and "caused them to pass through [the fire]." Although it appears to be a later expansion, its correlation to harlotry is clear, as is its development in concept as well. It likely emerges here at this point in the section because of the context of sacrifice immediately preceding it. Ezekiel 16:18b–19 says, "My oil and

incense, you set before them and my bread, which I gave to you—fine flour, oil, and honey, I fed you—and you would give it before them as a soothing aroma...” The notion of “passing children through the fire,” “sacrificing” on every high hill and under every leafy tree, and offering a “soothing aroma” also appears in the historical review of Ezek 20:26–28. The impulse to expand this idolatrous context with similar content seems consistent enough. Thus, the accusation of child sacrifice appears in this series of other expansions related to harlotry. The harlotry is not the production of cultic locations nor cultic accessories but rather a cultic practice and one that is a well-known biblical trope.

3.3.2.3.2 Ezekiel 16:33 Jerusalem Gives Her Gifts

Ezekiel 16:33 appears in the context of Ezek 16:30b–34 and states that Jerusalem gave her gifts to her lovers. Although the comparison with harlotry is obvious, the accusation that Jerusalem played the harlot is dissimilar from the straightforward accusation that one finds in 16:15,16,17, 26, and 28. Moreover, the normal harlot seems wise in comparison to Jerusalem. The professional harlot uses her assets in order to sustain herself. It should be noted here that the developed conception of Jerusalem’s backwards, effete harlotry and the accusation of adultery is not present in 16:33. Several observations above provided a basis for understanding 16:30b–32 and 34 as expansions upon Ezek 16:33 or other material. In summary, the perspective and terminology of Ezek 16:34, as well as 16:31, provide a development, clarification, and combination of conceptions and lemma, which demonstrate the later expansion of the verse in comparison with 16:30b, 32–33. Ezekiel 16:34 asserted that no one solicited Jerusalem’s services as a harlot. Because of the many earlier assertions that Jerusalem played the

harlot because of her beauty brought about by Yahweh's provision and gifts, this development exhibits a final degree to which the harlot has fallen. Moreover, 16:34b utilized common terminology for the payment of a harlot's services thus clarifying and reiterating two hapaxes utilized in 16:33. Ezekiel 16:31 also utilized this common terminology related to a harlot's remuneration and merged it with collocations related to the production of false cultic locations from Ezek 16:24–25 thus providing a segue into the basic fabric of the metaphor. Finally, Ezek 16:34 combined these conceptions with the subject of harlotry and adultery, which likewise indicated their coalescence in the verse. The coalescence of each of these lemmata in 16:41a α –b and other foreign materials, which demonstrate incongruent developments within the chapter, attest to the latest expansion in 16:40–41.

Second, the juxtaposition of adultery alongside that of harlotry indicated the second expansion in this section. The response of 16:30b to the question recorded in 16:30a, alongside an appearance of the *Gottesspruchformel*, introduced Jerusalem as a “woman, a brazen harlot.” Ezekiel 16:32 described the woman as an adulteress. The recognition that Jerusalem was an adulteress so late into the indictment against her suggested that it was a later expansion. Furthermore, the juxtaposition of the term, “woman, wife” alongside that of the phrase, “brazen harlot” established it as an elaboration upon the harlot imagery to include adultery.

Ezekiel 16:33 exhibits material from the metaphor of Yahweh's relationship with Jerusalem albeit now within the context of expansions in 16:30b–34. In contrast to the grounds for understanding other material in the section as later expansions, Ezek 16:33 shows the same conceptual development as the expansionary harlot material that

narrates Jerusalem's procurement and perversion of Yahweh's gift in 16:16–19 and her disloyal alliances with her paramours in 16:26–29. Ezekiel 16:33b indicates that she “gave presents to all her lovers and bribed them to come into you...” The verse begins by stating that normally, a harlot's patrons “give a gift” to a harlot but not so with Jerusalem. In these two statements, one discerns overlapping concerns with vv. 16–19 and vv. 26–29. In Ezek 16:16–19 she gave Yahweh's gifts in trade for her harlotrous misdeeds while 16:26–29 seems to put names to her illicit patrons whom she paid and bribed! In this way 16:33 acts as a bridge from the harlot redaction to the expansion concerning foreign alliances.

3.3.2.4 The *Gottesspruchformel*

A third indication of a harlot expansion takes place by means of the formula, “utters the LORD.” The formula has caused scholars a considerable degree of consternation over whether it marks the end, beginning, or middle of a speech unit.⁵⁴⁰ Its elasticity in such scenarios commends its practical use as a device that easily integrates or incorporates secondary additions into a context. As Chapter Two pointed out, the formula occurs in 16:8, 14, 19, 23, 30, 43, 48, 58, and 63. When the formula occurs with other formulae, one can discern its use to assist in the demarcation of structural units. Such is the case in 16:43, 58, and 63. In addition, the formula in 16:48 is used in an oath context, thus utilized in another sense.⁵⁴¹ However, in the remaining cases, i.e. 16:8, 14,

⁵⁴⁰ Meier, *Speaking*, 103–113; Schöpflin, *Theologie*, 101–105; Rendtorff, “Zum Gebrauch,” 27–37; Baumgärtel, “Die Formel 290–277” , יהוה נאם.

⁵⁴¹ Rendtorff, “Zum Gebrauch,” 32–34.

19, 23, 30, and in the absence of other specific formulae, the *Gottesspruchformel* corroborates the previous analysis that considers these verses bringing to close expansionary material.⁵⁴² Thus, the *Gottesspruchformel* in 16:8 assists the incorporation of material related to Yahweh's rediscovery of Jerusalem and his covenant-marriage with her. The *Gottesspruchformel* in Ezek 16:23b integrates 16:20–23a, comparing the sacrifice of children to harlotry, utilizing *Anknüpfungen*, and temporal markers and clauses in order to accomplish the expansion. The *Gottesspruchformel* in Ezek 16:30 stands in the middle of two expansionary clauses—precisely the application about which Rendtorff speaks concerning a few occasions of the formula in the book of Jeremiah—that expand in distinct manner the concept of harlotry in Ezek 16:26–30a and 30b–34.⁵⁴³ The distinct concept of harlotry in vv. 26–29 uniquely identifies Jerusalem's motivation as attempting to provoke Yahweh with her foreign alliances, a particularly Deuteronomic notion.⁵⁴⁴ Furthermore, her insatiable appetite drove her to yet other alliances in which she would also not find satisfaction; thus, the formula is a harbinger of Yahweh's word. On the other hand, 16:30b initiates expansions that conflate harlotry with adultery, a foreign concept in the chapter up to that very point.

Additionally, the formula in 16:19 concludes yet another apparent expansion(s) upon the harlot theme. Here, Jerusalem has taken gifts that Yahweh has given and perverted them for her own idolatrous escapades. This additional intimation signals a

⁵⁴² Rendtorff, “Zum Gebrauch,” 34–36; Rendtorff demonstrates the use of this formula with additions (Zusätze) and glosses (Glosse).

⁵⁴³ Rendtorff, “Zum Gebrauch,” 34–36.

⁵⁴⁴ Joo, *Provocation and Punishment*, M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 340.

departure from the basic metaphor in which Jerusalem merely manufactures cultic locations and prostitutes her beauty there. As for the perversion of Yahweh's gifts, the description itself appears to comprise two different sets of materials. First, Ezek 16:16, 17, and 18 each begin with the second, feminine, singular "and you took" (וּתְקַחִי) before expressing a component of Yahweh's gifts that Jerusalem subsequently perverted in sacrilege. The description of these gifts corresponds generally to Ezek 16:11–13a. Second, in a departure from the "and you took," Ezek 16:18b adds, "And my oil and my incense, you gave before them." This departure may seem insignificant if it were not for the fact that there is no corresponding description of "oil and incense" in 16:11–13a.⁵⁴⁵ This departure from the assertion that Jerusalem "took" from Yahweh's gifts and the lacuna concerning these gifts indicates the possibility that this is an expansion.

Ezekiel 16:19 extends the unparalleled material, saying, "And my bread, which I gave to you—fine flour, oil, and honey, I fed you—and you would give it before them as a soothing aroma, and so it took place, utters the LORD, God." This verse likewise contains a few anomalous components: bread and soothing aroma. Again, the lacunae in the description of Yahweh's endowment suggest that the incorporation of these elements is an expansion. Here, one must be cautious as the description, "fine flour, oil, and honey, you ate" exists in 16:13. However, its asyndetic clausal construction there actually intimates that its absence in Yahweh's endowment constrained its inclusion there. Hence, the clause arises in 16:13a β without any other mention of food items or eating. Moreover, the expansions presume the masculine images of 16:17; Ezek 16:18b and 19a β each contain a third, masculine, plural pronoun referring to the masculine

⁵⁴⁵ "Oil" occurs in collocation with "fine flour" and "honey" in 16:13.

images there. The *Gottespruchformel* subsequently, concludes these expressions of Jerusalem's harlotrous behavior in 16:19b.

Our final consideration of the *Gottespruchformel* occurs in 16:14. The lack of other formulae suggests its appearance here is not primarily related to a major structural transition. However, a significant shift in grammar and terminology occurs in 16:15. The Leitmotif "to play the harlot" first occurs in 16:15 prior to appearing frequently in the remainder of this section. Additionally, the second, feminine, singular verbal form begins to occur here, in a particularly negative connotation, and it continues until the next major structural transition after 16:34. In view of the lacunae of other formulae but the significant change in grammar and terminology, the relationship of this *Gottespruchformel* to expansionary material is difficult to adjudicate. The material in 16:14 concerns Jerusalem's beauty and is therefore, associated with 16:13 and her accouterment. On the other hand, the employment of the phrase, "name among nations," looks forward to the expansion in 16:26–30 and the foreign alliances. The term, "nations," appears only here in 16:14 while the term, "name" appears here and then only one other time in 16:15, where it is the first entity in the chapter over which Jerusalem "plays the harlot." Additionally, 16:14b adds, "Because it was perfect in my splendor which I placed upon you." One could surmise that this clause is tautologous if v. 14 is congruent with the original metaphor given the fact that the reader has just been informed that these gifts come from Yahweh's hand. In this case, 16:14b may expand upon the notion of Jerusalem's name or beauty before its use of the *Gottespruchformel*. Regardless, if 16:14 belongs to the original metaphor, its appearance certainly calls for the expansion regarding the nations in 16:26–29.

3.3.3 Basic Metaphor Concerning Jerusalem and Yahweh

The basic metaphor represents an initial attempt by the author to present material in an accusation-judgment framework. Here in the book of Ezekiel, it encompasses not only a rudimentary utterance of an oracular metaphor, but also its formulation along the lines of an Ezekielian, literary formulation. It was this early material into which later expansions were accommodated.

3.3.3.3 Ezek 16:1, 2^(אדם-בן), 3a α ^(לירושלם...כה)–6, 9–14, 24–25a, 37, 39, 42 Yahweh’s Care, Provision, Indictment, and Judgment

The basic metaphor of Ezekiel 16 concerns introductory formulae, (16:1, 2^(אדם-בן)), 3a β ^(לירושלם...כה)) her Canaanite origins and the neglect and eventual discovery of infant-Jerusalem, (3a β –6) Yahweh’s provision for her and her growth into beauty and fame, (16:9–14) her production of unsanctioned cultic locations with its likening to sexual promiscuity, (16:24–25a) a statement of Yahweh’s gathering her lovers in judgment against her, (16:37) their destruction of her cultic locations, (16:39) and the appeasement of Yahweh’s wrath (16:42).

The noteworthy element in these clauses is their coherence with one another based on at least two factors. First, they are obviously interdependent as it relates to logic and coherence. Second, the clausal makeup of the material shares common language with one another. Hence, there are no lemmata that seem to intervene upon the

main movements of the metaphor, unlike the clauses in Ezek 16:40–41, e.g. which break into the accusation-judgment scheme with rare and unparalleled words and content.

The following abridgment shows the congruency of elements:

And the word of the LORD came to me, saying, “Son of Man, Thus the LORD says to Jerusalem; your origin and birth were from the land of the Canaanite. Your father was the Amorite and your mother was a Hittite. As for your birth, on the day you were born your umbilical cord was not cut, you were not washed with water, and you were indeed not rubbed with salt nor were you swaddled. Not an eye took pity on you, to do for you one of these things to show compassion towards you. But you were flung upon the field in contempt for your life on the day you were born. And I passed by and saw you kicking about in your blood, and I said to you in your blood, “Live!” I washed you with water, rinsed your blood from you, and covered you with oil. Then I clothed you with embroidered cloth, put sandals of leather on you, bound you with linen, and covered you with fine material. I adorned you with ornaments and gave bracelets upon your wrists and a necklace upon your neck. I gave a ring upon your nose, earrings upon your ears, and a crown of glory on your head. And you adorned yourself with gold and silver and your attire was linen, fine material, and embroidered cloth. You ate fine flour, honey, and oil; and you became very, very beautiful. A name for you materialized among the nations because of your beauty, for it was perfect in my splendor that I placed upon you,” utters the LORD. But you built for yourself a mound and made for yourself a high place in every square. At every head of a path you built your high place, abhorred your beauty, and spread your feet to everyone who passed by. Therefore, behold I am gathering all your lovers to whom you were pleasing, everyone whom you loved and everyone whom you hated. I will gather them against you all around and reveal your nakedness to them and they will see all your nakedness. I will give you in their hand and they will tear down your mound, pull down your high places, strip you of your garments, take the vessels of your glory, and leave you naked and bare. I will cause my wrath against you to rest and my vengeance will turn aside from you. I will be calm and no longer be enraged.

The heart of the passage emerges from two factors: First, it emerges from the accusation-judgment scheme—the accusation found in 16:24–25 and the judgment found in 37, 39, and 42—which is otherwise prevalent in the book. Second, there is the noticeable essence of the passage in 16:24–25 and 39 concerning the production of cultic sites. Jerusalem builds the sites in the accusation as the metaphor materializes when she “abhors her beauty and spreads her feet to everyone who passed by.” Then in the judgment, Yahweh gathers her lovers to whom she spread her feet against her and

they tear down her cultic sites. The remainder of the basic metaphor flows from this material.

The basic metaphor develops her beauty retrospectively in the description of how Yahweh rescued her and made her beautiful with various accouterments. A possible exception to this proposal surfaces in 16:11–13a. While 16:9–10 emerge naturally from its relationship to vv. 4–6 and their accompanying cultic associations, vv. 11–13a have less of a verbal connection to the surrounding context. Ezekiel 16:11–12 picks up after 16:10 described Yahweh’s act of clothing her with various garments. Expressed in the form of a cognate accusative, Yahweh “adorned you with ornaments.” More precisely, he adorned her with bracelets, a necklace, nose ring, earrings, and finally, a “crown of glory.” Ezekiel 16:13a α subsequently iterates with the same lemma with which 16:11 began, “And you adorned yourself with gold and silver and your attire was linen, fine material and embroidered cloth.”⁵⁴⁶ This occasion is the first that fine metals of gold and silver have appeared. The fabrics, “linen, fine material, embroidered cloth” occurred in 16:9 in the list of materials with which Yahweh clothed her. Ezekiel 16:13a β continues with an asyndetic construction of what the maiden ate, “fine flour, honey, and oil.”

⁵⁴⁶ Godfrey Driver and John Miles point out the tenuous connection between “ornaments” in Middle Assyrian laws and Neo-Assyrian records between Sennacherib and his son, Esarhaddon. Still, that context fails to provide a strong connection to a later Ezekielian context, particularly one describing a “husband and wife,” G.R. Driver and John C. Miles, *The Assyrian Laws* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935), 193.

Additionally, a curious clause in 1QapGen, Column 20, line 31 reads, “The king gave her much silver and gold; many garments of fine linen and purple;” cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, Second, rev. ed. (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971), 67. In addition to gold, silver, and particular types of material, there exists in the description of Sarai the terms, beauty, hair, breasts, nose, and perfect, which also occur in Ezekiel 16. Reinhard Kratz pointed out this shared terminology in a conversation in the Spring, 2013.

Finally, the verse concludes stating that she became very, very beautiful with an added remark that she became royalty.⁵⁴⁷

As equivocal as some clauses in 16:11–13 are, the remainder of the basic metaphor develops her loss of some said accouterments as her lovers not only destroy the cultic locations but also strip her of her garments, take her vessels of “glory,” and leave her “naked and bare” in the same state that Yahweh originally found her as she was cast to the field as an infant. Moreover, the “gold and silver” from 13a reappear in the production of masculine images in 16:17 while the “fine flour, oil, and honey” from 13a reappear in the offerings to these images in 16:19. The jewelry from 11–12a is not heard from again in the chapter.

From these observations, two possibilities emerge: either these clauses belong to the development of her beauty from the basic metaphor or they emerge in the harlotry redaction in order to address the materials and production of syncretistic cultic locations and practices. Without further evidence or hypothesis, it is difficult to say more. Thus, the origins of the chapter emerge from its expansionary additions.

⁵⁴⁷ See the text critical remarks on the verse for why I did not include it in the translation.

Conclusion

4. “Harlotry” and its Relationship to History

The introduction of this analysis presented an overview of the history of interpretation of the prophets, in particular, as scholars have articulated an intersection between the prophetic texts and their relationship to historical matters. Next, Chapter 1 posited a resulting text after an analysis of variants in the manuscripts and versions and translated the chapter. Chapter 2 sought to demonstrate the unity of the chapter given various formulaic, grammatical, lexical, and content-related elements albeit with a recognition of the chapter’s complex, constituent parts. Finally, Chapter 3 utilized the findings of the first two chapters as it analyzed the incongruences in the text and textual production in order to articulate the varied inclusion of the constituent textual expansions in Ezekiel 16.

How could these chapters inform an understanding of the history of prophecy and its production in the ancient world? In what ways do the viewpoints represented in the expansions help us understand the politics, theology, literature, and identity of the individuals and communities that actualized the text of Ezekiel 16? Equally important to consider is how the methodology that this volume has employed would fit into the brief survey in the Introduction to this volume? Is the academy now in a better position to understand the occasion, community, and theology of those who produced these texts? How has our understanding of textual production and prophecy, in particular, developed and how does it help us understand more appropriately the culture in which it arose.

Given the preceding analysis, a relative dating of the materials is fairly straightforward. Additionally, one can consider what a particular expansion reveals about the religious or political landscape. Or what does it reveal about the utilization of literature or theology in the book of Ezekiel and prophetic texts in general. Can the innovation between a pre-existing form of the text to an expansionary form disclose the purpose that occasioned it? What is the development in content, or presumably, the theological development from an existing text to the expansionary text? Does that development reveal a setting or circumstance that actualized the expansion and the new textual form? It is this line of questioning that this conclusion initiates. We will consider first the development in content and reasons therein while also discussing possible settings or occasions for the expansions. After a discussion of the results of the analysis, we will comment on the scholarly proposals for the dating of the book of Ezekiel as well as the expansions in Ezekiel 16.

4.1. Ezekiel 16:59–63 From Restoration to Eternal Covenant

First, the latest expansion involves the development from a focus on restoration to that of eternal covenant. As Chapter 3 pointed out, unlike the final verses of the chapter, which focus on the eternal covenant, the earlier chapter-like expansion (16:2^(בְּרִית)–3a^(אֲמַרְתִּי), [20–23], 36b, 43–58) repeatedly emphasizes Jerusalem’s “abominable” ways. Even so, the chapter-like expansion lacks any concrete specifics related to her misdeeds or behavior. The statements in the chapter-like expansion are in contrast to the basic metaphor of the chapter and a redactional layer involving that metaphor in 16:1–42, which explicitly describe the various ways in which lady Jerusalem has played the

harlot. Moreover, the first chapter-like expansion clearly focuses on the sisters' restoration, utilizing that lemma nine times as the focused goal of the expansion. Other reasons exist and are stated in Chapter 3 to discern the expansionary makeup of the texts that are involved within Ezek 16:59–63. What is revealing, however, is that the notion of restoration never appears in the latest expansion in 16:59–63, which chooses instead to focus on the “eternal covenant.” This lexeme “covenant” is mentioned five times in this five-verse expansion. It occurs only one other time in the entire chapter in 16:8 and that use analogizes Yahweh's marital relationship to Jerusalem. In vv. 59–63, the establishment of the eternal covenant ushers in the humility, shame, and participants that Jerusalem's restoration, which vv. 44–58 indicates, would oblige. Furthermore, this “eternal covenant” is in contrast to Jerusalem's early covenant with Yahweh, which she broke. Finally, nothing regarding Jerusalem's harlotry, which is repeated explicitly in 16:1–42, nor her abominations, of which she is accused in 16:43–58, is mentioned in 16:59–63.

These considerations raise the question: What has changed in the situation between the first chapter-like expansion and the latest expansion in 16:59–63? The focus is no longer on the restoration of Jerusalem to her former status. Instead, the focus becomes the eternal covenant. Why would this change take place? The answer could be straightforward: the restoration no longer is the focus. Instead, an eternal covenant becomes the focus and goal. The question then becomes, “Why would this become the goal?” or stated differently, “Why would a restoration of Jerusalem to its former status not be the focal point of hope?” The final chapter of the book of Ezra-Nehemiah may suggest a reason.

The supposed restoration brought about by Cyrus' edict and the return to the land apparently did not yield the sort of theocratic administration for which many had originally hoped. That these hopes were often dashed is also obvious from the individual prophetic texts that constitute the book of The Twelve, e.g. Haggai. The book of Ezra-Nehemiah, however, offers a clear example. Throughout the book, one awaits the completion of the walls and temple so that the restoration of the exiles to the land and cult can be complete. Although the character, Ezra, starts it, the completion does not end with him. The character of Nehemiah finishes the walls and temple in a short amount of time and institutes several practices that appear to usher in a utopian, theocratic society. After confessing and sealing the covenant in Nehemiah 9, they commit themselves to follow the law of Moses. (Neh 10:29–30) They commit not to intermarry with foreigners. (Neh 10:31) They commit not to buy wares on the Sabbath. (Neh 10:32) The people commit to various practices to provide for the work of the temple. (Neh 10:33–34) They commit to provide for the wood offering and other offerings as the law states. (Neh 10:35–37) Moreover, the priest was to be a son of Aaron and the people and all the workers in the temple would not “forsake the house of God.” (Neh 10:39–40) Thus, the Levites would be able to interpret the law and serve in the temple.

And yet, in Nehemiah 13 all the policies that Nehemiah instituted failed to achieve the sort of theocratic bliss that the people were eager to experience. Tobiah, an Ammonite and enemy of Nehemiah, was living in the temple where the Levites and their supplies were supposed to be kept. (Neh 13:7–9) Moreover, the Israelites had not provided for the Levites and therefore, the temple was “forsaken.” (Neh 13:10–11) Additionally, they were violating the Sabbath. (Neh 13:15–23) Also, the men of Judah

married foreign women, a practice forbidden and agreed upon earlier, so much so that even a son of the high priest had married a daughter of Sanballat, another enemy of Nehemiah as well as a Horonite. (Neh 13:23–28) Finally, Nehemiah provided for the burnt offerings and first fruits again, another item that the people agreed to do but had neglected. (Neh 13:30–31) Thus the return to Jerusalem and the cult did not bring with it the obedience and fruitfulness that many of the prophets had anticipated, e.g. Ezek 36:9–12. Scholars have noted the polemics between the deportees in 597 and those who remained in the land in the book of Ezekiel. We will discuss the possible influences these polemics have on an understanding of dating the Ezekielian expansions below. But assuming the late exilic or postexilic period for the Golah oriented redaction or diaspora redaction,⁵⁴⁸ which likely adopted a pro-Persian stance in light of Persian policies towards conquered lands, this later expansion of 16:59–63 reveals the realization that hope for autonomy and theocratic governance lie yet in the future.

Another factor suggests that Ezek 16:59–63 was integrated into the chapter and possibly even into the book rather late. The use of “you who despised [the] oath to break [the] covenant” in 15:59b commends its integration into an already existing Ezekiel 17. There the phrase occurs in Ezekiel 17:16, 18, 19. When commenting on the relationship of the king of Babylon and his vice-regent in Jerusalem, the text indicates that the vice-regent “despised his oath and broke his covenant” when making an alliance with Egypt. These terms and the storyline emerge earlier in the unit when the king of Babylon took one from the royal house, “cut a covenant with him and put him under oath.” Thus, the

⁵⁴⁸ Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann, *Der Prophet Hesekiel/Ezechiel, Kapitel 1–19*, ATD 22,1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 20–22.

context prior to Ezek 17:16 requires the inclusion of these lemmata and their subsequent content. Moreover, after assuring the audience in 17:17 that Pharaoh and his great assembly will not be able to help, the text indicates again in 17:18 that, “he despised [the] oath to break [the] covenant...” Finally, 17:19 uses the terminology again albeit related to Yahweh’s covenant.

Hence, several factors emerge that commend the integration of 16:59–63 into Ezekiel 17 rather than the opposite. First, the lemmata of “despising oath and breaking covenant” are integral to the material in Ezekiel 17 making it unlikely that the entire chapter was generated in order to fit with an otherwise unique clause found in Ezekiel 16. More definitively, their appropriate anarthrous usage in Ezekiel 17 indicates that Ezekiel 16:59 borrowed them from that passage. Otherwise, their implementation in Ezekiel 16 would likely have used the article because the context requires that the mention of “covenant” comes from the same lemma in 16:8 and 60–62.

So what is the point? The return of the deportees and refugees to Jerusalem along with the rebuilding of the temple failed to provide the sort of secure, ongoing administration of the cult and community for which people had hoped and about which prophets and scribes had consistently spoken and written. Apparently, the writer of 16:59–63 recognizes the insufficiency of the Persian policies or theocratic hopes of the returnees and attempts to root the promise of an idealized society in a timeless promise from Yahweh. He picks up on that point and roots it in an eternal covenant, not unlike other occurrences of the collocation in priestly literature and prophetic material in Genesis 9, 17, Ezek 37:26, Is 55:3, 61:8, and Jer 32:40. Thus, the expansion emerges as the realization comes about that the humiliation and shame that landlessness brought did

not end with a return to the land. Disobedience to covenant ideology was still at hand. Strife and rivalry between various groups in the homeland were the norm. Obedience to the former covenant was not enough to compel obedience. Rather, hope for the future must come from some other means. The “eternal covenant” provided just the sort of word of promise for which the writers and other prophets could hope.

4.2. Ezekiel 16:2^(הודע)–3a^(ואמרתי), [20–23], 36b, 43–58 From Harlotry to Restoration

The chapter-like expansion in 16:2^(הודע)–3a^(ואמרתי), [20–23], 36b, and 43–58 turns from a focus on Jerusalem’s explicit, obscene behavior, which emerges in the metaphor in 16:1–42, to focus on the restoration of Jerusalem and her notorious siblings. This sizeable and literarily significant expansion follows the indictment of Jerusalem’s behavior in 16:15–36. Moreover, it is subsequent to the announcement of what Jerusalem’s punishment would be in the future in 16:37b–41. The future orientation of the announcement of punishment in the basic metaphor is clear, arising from the *weqatal* verbs connoting future actions. Finally, the chapter-like expansion follows the announcement of what, at that point, would be Yahweh’s future appeasement in 16:42, which would result from the execution of punishment upon Jerusalem.

The understanding that this literarily significant expansion materializes subsequent to the basic metaphor arises almost naturally from the perspective of this chapter-like expansion. Chapter 3 divulged the perspective of the expansion in the analysis. First, there is the distinct language of “abominations” that constitutes the expansion, occurring six times in 16:43–58, not occurring at all in the expansionary 16:59–63, and otherwise occurring only in 16:2, 22, and 36—each of which appears in clauses having other

evidences of belonging to this particular expansion. While this chapter-like expansion focuses on “abomination” and “restoration,” the basic metaphor repeats the root, “harlotry,” which occurs an amazing twenty-one times in 16:15–41 but never again in the rest of the chapter.

Second, in the metaphor in 16:1–42, Jerusalem’s behavior is asserted in explicitly obscene and idolatrous language even going so far as maintaining that she “spread her feet to everyone who passed by.” This is quite unlike the ambiguous, and in reality, absence of perspicuously sinful behavior in 16:43–58. Third, there is the different perspective of chastisement that she must bear, i.e. “shame and humiliation” in 16:43–58 rather than punishment specifically related to her appearance and accouterments that she receives from Yahweh in 16:4–14, abuses in vv. 15–25, and loses in her punishment in 16:37–39. In the basic metaphor, the woman receives what she deserves and ends in the way she began—naked. In other words, her punishment matches her behavior, thus encompassing a very deuteronomic worldview.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, her punishment from 16:47ff is presumed to have already happened; she has already lost her appearance and status, which is why she needs “restoring.” Thus, her earlier punishment, which 16:37–39 calls for in the future, has already transpired in 16:53ff. She is in the same state as her sisters Sodom and Samaria, both of whom lost their status much earlier. Additionally, the statement in 16:58 that she has “borne her licentiousness and abominations” adduces a view of punishment that is already complete.

So what is the development between the metaphor in 16:1–42 and this chapter-like expansion? Stated simply, the basic metaphor appears to forebode a punishment

primarily in terms consistent with that metaphor; Jerusalem will forfeit her status, which was bestowed on her by Yahweh, because of her behavior. The view is consistent with Ezekielian prophecies that take place before the reported fall of Jerusalem, which is subsequently portrayed in Ezek 33:21. The basic metaphor appears to convey an outlook of retribution that is even prior to a developing deuteronomic theology that explicitly conveys one place of rightful worship, contains lists of blessings and curses for obedience to law codes, and holds individuals responsible for their actions. It is possible that the metaphor of Yahweh's covenant-marriage to Yahweh reflects a sort of deuteronomic understanding although it would be unprecedented according to M. Weinfeld.⁵⁴⁹ Ezekiel 16:42bβ does utilize a typical lemma for Yahweh's provocation (כעס) And yet, the lack of reference to legal codes, blessings, curses, other common deuteronomic language or even a discussion here regarding the loss of possession of the land would indicate that deuteronomic theology remains rather obscure at best. The judgment in the basic metaphor seems to stop short of articulating explicitly the reason for the exile; it merely describes a destruction of cultic locations and judgment in relationship to cultic ideals.

In contrast, Ezek 16:44–58 portrays an outlook that is quite different from this view of accusation-judgment that is seen in the basic metaphor. The chapter-like expansion portrays a community in need of restoration. Thus, it presumes and even looks past the judgment of the basic metaphor and on to a future hope. Any sense of judgment that remains is found in the prodding that Jerusalem should bear her humiliation and acknowledge the shame because of her contempt for her sisters and

⁵⁴⁹ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 82.

apparently the landlessness in which Jerusalem now found herself. Importantly, she awaits a restoration not unlike the two non-states of Sodom and Samaria. Not unlike them, whose defamation Jerusalem herself had participated in according to 16:56, Jerusalem now faced similar humiliation. Interestingly, the structure of the basic metaphor—the reciprocal gift-misappropriation-removal of Yahweh’s gifts—has developed into a sort of shaming in which Jerusalem has been so wicked, she actually made Sodom and Samaria look good. Indeed, Jerusalem, in her bawdy behavior, mediated for her two sisters. The end result is not explicitly Yahweh’s appeasement as it is in the basic metaphor in Ezek 16:42. Rather, it is Jerusalem’s acknowledgment of her shame and humiliation. This perspective presumes that the aforementioned punishment of destruction and burning has already transpired and the restoration awaits for Jerusalem’s acknowledgement of her lowly status.

The writer of this expansion no doubt wishes to fit the twisted sister “proverb”—occurring again in Ezekiel 23 albeit without Sodom—into the preexisting metaphor. Apparently he does so for two reasons: First, Jerusalem no longer awaits punishment; it is past. Now she awaits restoration. And the second reason flows from the first: she must humble herself before she can experience the restoration. She must bear her humiliation and shame. She acted worse than her metaphorical two sisters and like them, she must patiently wait in humiliation until the restoration takes place. This suggests a perspective not inconsistent with the portrayal in the book of Ezekiel in which the enemy had conquered Jerusalem. Their worst fears had been realized. Now they must wait for a return to land. (Ezekiel 36:8–12) How long into the exile could have the writer have

lived? Perhaps the question relates to the overall composition of the book itself or its use of formulae as a means to structure the book itself.

The expansion clearly constitutes integration into the formulaic material that generates the chapter breaks within the book. The use of the material in 16:2–3aα, which the analysis above discusses, demonstrates its inclusion into other formulaic material. Thus, one can assert that the expansion transpires after the word-event formula, “And the word of the LORD came to me” as well as the appellation, “Son of Man.” If the analysis in the previous chapters is correct, the command to “make known to Jerusalem her abominations” could transpire in conjunction with other similar uses of the Hiphil of *נָתַן* in the book of Ezekiel such as Ezek 20:4 and 22:2, in which “abominations” also appears, as well as the similar notion to “declare to them their abominations” occurring in 23:36. The occurrence in 23:36 transpires in a context that negatively compares sister Jerusalem to sister Samaria obviously bearing similarity to the theme in the chapter-like expansion.

If indeed the passage regarding Jerusalem’s sacrifice, slaughter, and passing-through of children in 16:20–23 is to be included in this chapter-like expansion, it may reveal its subtle connection to typical deuteronomic language.⁵⁵⁰ This connection between “abomination” and “to pass through the fire” could yield the distinct context from which this expansion arises in contradistinction to covenant-marriage and the harlot redaction in the basic metaphor. Furthermore, a fuller examination of Ezekiel 20 and 23 could yield a more accurate understanding of the time frame of this expansion.

⁵⁵⁰ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 322–23.

4.3. Ezekiel 16:1–42 A Developing Metaphor in a Literary Framework

Ezekiel 16:1–42 contains the metaphor that portrays Jerusalem as a harlot within a literary framework. As Chapter 2 demonstrated, literary formulas provide a framework for prophetic units while Chapter 3 analyzed how these prophetic units themselves have been expanded. The basic metaphor in Ezekiel 16 consists of Yahweh’s rescue and provision of accouterments for infant Jerusalem, her subsequent spurning of those accouterments by using them to attract and compensate her lovers and build inappropriate cultic places, and Yahweh’s announcement that her lovers would destroy those places as well as strip her of his gifted accouterments, leaving her in the same state in which he found her at the outset of the metaphor. Expansions emerge related to covenant-marriage and adultery (3.3.1), harlotry (3.3.2), and the basic metaphor concerning Jerusalem and Yahweh (3.3.3). The question concerns for what reason and when did the expansions in Ezek 16:1–42 emerge.

4.3.1 Expansions related to Covenant-Marriage and Adultery

How do the expansions within the basic metaphor reveal a purpose and provenance? What content would the passage be missing if this expansion were absent? How does the jump in expression from the emerging content in the expansion disclose information or purpose that was not obviously present beforehand? For this expansion, what emerges as ancillary relates specifically to the notion of covenant and the punishment in light of covenantal breaches. This content is not surprising in light of the

paucity of references to “covenant” in early prophets and its reception and development in later prophets. The discussion below will briefly treat each minor expansion before arriving at the notion of covenant-marriage in general in Ezekiel 16:8.

4.3.1.1 Ezekiel 16:40–41 α Added Punishment

What appears to be the first expansion in this unit relates from three possible motivations. The first motivation may stem from an impulse to show that Jerusalem was or would soon to be punished in accordance with legal precedent recorded in Leviticus 20 and Deuteronomy 22.⁵⁵¹ In relationship to any Priestly material or tradition, this impulse would not be surprising and could demonstrate the desire to establish ethical and community boundaries.⁵⁵² If so, this observation could establish an approximate time frame from which these expansions arose. While the terminology is at variance, the accusation of harlotry could trigger a portrayal of punishment found in those contexts. A second motivation also appears plausible in that Jerusalem’s behavior regarding child sacrifice in Ezek 16:20–22 could trigger the punishment depicted in Ezek 16:40–41. Leviticus 20:2–5 associates child sacrifice to Molech and harlotry (זנה); the “people of the land” must stone (רגם) those who act in such ways.

A reflex to show congruity between Ezekiel 16 and 23 may be a third motivation. Ezekiel 23 no doubt, also has a rich development of expansions; thus a precise answer to the relationship of the two chapters lies outside the boundaries of this

⁵⁵¹ See the discussion in the above analysis.

⁵⁵² Andrew Mein, “Ezekiel as a Priest in Exile” in *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as a Historical Person, Literary Character and Anonymous Artist*, ed. Johannes C. De Moor (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 210–12.

analysis. What development could cause such an expansion? It seems apparent that it relates to the punishment; thus it seeks to justify the devastation that occurred and frame it in conjunction with legal material.

4.3.1.2 Ezekiel 16:41a β –b Integration of Added Punishment by means of Materials related to Adultery, Harlotry, and Payment

A prior expansion likewise relates to an announcement of judgment. It concerns the themes of adultery, backwards harlotry, and payment—themes, which all emerge from 16:30b–32, 34, 38a α . The judgment presumes the plural lovers that Yahweh brought against Jerusalem in order to destroy her inappropriate cultic practices and locations in 16:39. This expansion appears to bring an announcement of judgment in line with the theme of adultery, backwards harlotry, and payment that emerged in the immediately previous expansion. It is possible that the expansion related to adultery, backwards harlotry, and payment as well as this response articulated in corresponding judgment all arose at the same time. However, the theme of judgment in the presence of a crowd of women and the suspension of Jerusalem’s deviant practices suggests that it arose separate from that particular expansion of 16:30b–32, 34, 38a α because the interruption of harlotry and adultery was not in view there.

4.3.1.3 Ezekiel 16:30b–32, 34, 38a α Adultery and the Reverse Harlot

As we stated, this expansion emerges prior to the one above concerning judgment upon these precise actions. But it emerges after an expansion related to Jerusalem’s maturation into a young woman and his covenant-marriage with her. Without repeating

the details of the analysis in the previous chapter, a few points will provide a foundation for questions regarding the occasion for the expansion. Ezekiel 16:30–34 relates material regarding adultery and reverse harlotry. The reverse harlotry in which no one desires her services any longer expresses the forlorn status of Jerusalem and its surrounding areas. Her beauty, strength, and reputation were gone. At one point, she had to pay for her dalliances. Now, even those relationships are spent. The expansion presumes the covenant-marriage expressed in 16:8 as well as the fault for her ill-informed alliances that emerge in 16:26–29. The section likewise aggrandizes what at first, was merely harlotry, so that now Jerusalem is depicted as a worn out harlot that no one desires. However, the expansion does not presume or show an awareness of the additional punishment that the section engendered in which a crowd assembles against her for stoning, cutting, and burning. What setting would these clauses reflect that previously was absent?

The clauses recognize the addition of covenant-marriage that emerged in 16:8. The concept of marriage would have required a comment in relationship to her fornication as well as the punishment that was hitherto absent. Thus, the clauses express the just reality that Jerusalem had suffered for her adulterous affairs. She was used up; similar to a nation that needed to pay for protection and alliance, no one wanted her any longer for her beauty and status. She gave and got nothing in return. The situation seems to reflect the aftermath of war and politics following the downfall of Jerusalem. She was no longer able to pay for protection. Ahaz had at one point sought relief from his enemies from the king of Assyria and paid tribute to him. (2 Kings 16) Not only had he not sought the God of Judah in this situation but had also imported cultic practices from

Assyria. Similar to Ezek 16:20–23, 2 Kings 16 relates the chronicle that King Ahaz “passed his son through the fire according to the abominations of the nations.” Alliance with foreign nations emerge as expansions in the metaphor of harlotry prior to this comment. This unique expansion of the metaphor as adultery and a forlorn woman emerges in view of that trigger.

4.3.1.4 Covenant-Marriage

It is rather challenging to assert a particular occasion or time frame motivating this expansion of 16:7–8 for reasons soon to be discussed. On the one hand, these two verses appear to expand the foundling story, in which Yahweh finds Jerusalem in the field, to include the growth of infant-Jerusalem into a young maiden.⁵⁵³ Similar to Deut 32:10–11 in which Yahweh spreads his wings over “Jacob,” these verses indicate Yahweh’s initiative towards Jerusalem even to the extent of entering into covenant with her, swearing to her, and she becoming his. Other considerations within the overall metaphor in 16:1–43 make it rather obvious that the covenant has reference to a relationship between Yahweh and Israel. However, it is debated whether it relates to the Sinai covenant, referred to in Ezek 20:5, whether it has historical reference at all, or is intended more generally to portray Yahweh’s relationship to Israel without specific

⁵⁵³ For an unconvincing attempt to associate this with ancient tradition, see Robert Bach, *Die Erwählung Israels in der Wüste*, (Bonn, Unpublished Diss., 1951); cf. S. Tamar Kamionkowski, *Gender Reversal and Cosmic Chaos: A Study on the Book of Ezekiel*, JSOT 368 (London: Sheffield Academic, 2003), 92–102. Moreover, Kamionkowski comments not only on the differences between this story and other foundling stories, 97–98, but on the unconvincing parallels between this text and adoption contexts. See her comments in S. Tamar Kamionkowski, *Gender Ambiguity and Subversive Metaphor in Ezekiel 16* (PhD dissertation; Waltham, MA: Brandeis University, 2000); see also Meir Malul’s analysis of legal literature and its application to Ezek 16:7–8 as adoption ritual in “Adoption of Foundlings in the Bible and Mesopotamian Documents: A Study of Some Legal Metaphors in Ezekiel 16:1–7” *Journal of the Study of the Old Testament* 46 (1990): 100–103.

reference to an actual covenant.⁵⁵⁴ Given the voluminous literature and assertions on covenant in the ANE and its relationship to the Old Testament, it would be misguided to use the term “covenant” to assert too specific an occasion or purpose.⁵⁵⁵

Within this metaphor between Yahweh and maiden-Jerusalem, it is obvious that covenant is best described as one approximating marriage.⁵⁵⁶ Ezekiel 16:7–8 expresses a hyper-sexualized tone in which the expansion draws upon the lemma, “ornament” in 16:11 as a trigger to insert the growth from that of the infant, waddling in its blood without clothing, into a voluptuous woman with whom Yahweh will soon consummate the covenant-marriage.⁵⁵⁷ Ezekiel 16:8a then utilizes the collocation detailing Yahweh’s discovery of the infant in the field in 16:6a, “And I passed by you and saw you,” in order to describe his notice of her titillating figure.

What would the occasion be for such an expansion? Without the expansion, the reader would move immediately from 16:6 to 16:9, “And I passed by and saw you kicking about in your blood,⁵⁵⁸ and I said to you in your blood, “Live!” ... And I washed

⁵⁵⁴ See Ka Leung Wong, *The Idea of Retribution in the Book of Ezekiel* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 34–36; Block, *Ezekiel: 1–24*, 483. See also Weinfeld, who says that the notion of husband and wife may have been “latent” in the Pentateuch but in reality the prophets generated it, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 82.

⁵⁵⁵ R. Frankena, “*The Vassal-treaties of Esarhaddon and the dating of Deuteronomy*” in *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, ed. P.A.H. De Boer (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965), 122–54; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *A History of Prophecy in Israel*, rev. and enl. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 88–90; Delbert R. Hillers, *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964) 58–59, *idem*, *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1969), 158–68.

⁵⁵⁶ Block, *Ezekiel: 1–24*, 482–84.

⁵⁵⁷ For a full discussion of the notion of sexuality and gender in this passage, see Kamionkowski, *Gender Reversal*, 103–10.

⁵⁵⁸ MT twice contains the plural noun phrase, בְּמִטָּה. The LXX translates both occurrences with the singular noun ἄμα in the appropriate case. Zimmerli queries whether the Hebrew plurals could result from the bloodletting of Jerusalem in Ezek 18:13, 22:2 already hinted in this passage. Moreover, he likewise points to the issue of uncleanness related to parturition in Lev 12:1–5, which uses a plural form

you with water, rinsed your blood from you, and covered you with oil.” A noticeable congruity exists in the stock of vocabulary between 16:4–6 and 9ff. Of course, the sensual and conjugal makeup of the elevated language in 16:7–8 leaves a noticeable gap in the portrayal of Jerusalem as a budding maiden as well as a young wife. The portrayal of Yahweh’s rescue is limited to the rescue of the infant and clothing of a young maiden without the romantic and erotic connection between the two characters. Moreover, with the introduction of “covenant,” a particular conception of Yahweh’s relationship to Jerusalem emerges. It is a relationship that in itself lacks many of the trappings that deuteronomic expressions of covenant contain. But the development does exacerbate the infidelity of Jerusalem perhaps revealing an early depiction of the covenantal alliance. The notion of covenant interjects expectations into the relationship. While scholarship remains divided on the aspect of retribution in the Old Testament and in Ezekiel, in particular, it is rather clear that the notion of covenant constrains a correlation between disobedience and punishment.⁵⁵⁹ Thus, it is quite probable that a desire to correlate Jerusalem’s destruction with the behavior of the people or at least, with that of her leadership within a covenantal type of relationship brings about the expansion. If correct, this articulation draws on the expansion in vv.26–29 and critiques the mishandling of Jerusalem’s devotion to Yahweh.

of “blood.” One could indicate further that a plural form is also used in each of the 7 occurrences of the term in Leviticus 20, a chapter dealing with various sexual deviances, in particular, intercourse after menstruation in Lev 20:18. Therefore, the singular is translated here as well, presuming that the LXX likewise translated loosely according to the sense that the plural noun connotes merely a bloody scene involving parturition.

⁵⁵⁹ Ka Leung Wong, *The Idea of Retribution in the Book of Ezekiel* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 1–30.

Another possible purpose emerges in the notion of Yahweh's rescue in Ezek 16:7–8. The poem of Deuteronomy 32 also carries with it an argument of Israel's culpability in the midst of Yahweh's rescue and care, an argument similar to Ezekiel 16.⁵⁶⁰ Moreover, Deut 32:7 calls the reader to remember “days of old” in a manner similar to how Ezekiel 16 chides Jerusalem for “not remembering the days” of her youth. (Ezek 16:22, 43) In contrast, Yahweh will “remember” the covenant that he cut with maiden-Jerusalem in 16:8.⁵⁶¹ (Ezek 16:60) In response, Jerusalem will “remember” and be ashamed. (Ezek 16:61, 63) In comparison in Deut 32:21, Yahweh will make his people jealous.

Additionally, the description of Yahweh's care for his benefactor is described similarly in the song. In Deut 32:11, he “spreads his wings” out over him as he does to her in Ezek 16:8. And as he bestows upon her “ten thousand like the sprout of the field” (רַבְבָּה) in Ezek 16:7, “ten thousand” (רַבְבָּה) in Deut 32:30 describes Israel's enemies. Meanwhile, the poetry in Deut 33:2 and 17 describes the myriad (רַבְבָּה) of Yahweh's presence and people. “Ten thousand” in Ezek 16:7 describes Yahweh's blessing; the manner in which Yahweh “spreads his wings” over maiden Jerusalem heightens her debt to him. When she fails to remember this blessing, her folly seems all the more obvious. Hence, the occasion seems to place an added emphasis upon which the call for shame in Ezek 16:52 and 63 would draw.

⁵⁶⁰ Jason Gile, “Ezekiel 16 and the Song of Moses: A Prophetic Transformation?” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130 (2011): 87–108.

⁵⁶¹ Weinfeld lists “to remember the covenant” as phraseology consistent with P, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 330.

The possible association with Deuteronomy 32 yields another complexity to discerning an occasion for Ezek 16:7–8: Authorial activity in the book is replete with prolix echoes of previous scriptural motifs and themes.⁵⁶² Even though Deuteronomy 32 exhibits a similar theme and has verbal elements in common, the expansion in Ezekiel 16:7–8 likely lacks a definite dependence upon the poem.⁵⁶³ The chapter's accord with Deuteronomy 32 could prove similar to its lack of precise relationship to the marriage theme in Hosea 1–3, 4:10–19 and Jeremiah 3:1–8. These texts arguably date rather early in Israel's demise and the relationship could be one of influence or even less interrelated. Regardless of one's thoughts on dependence or association with other texts, the point obtains that the exploitation of terminology or concepts has less to do with a particular occasion or timeframe and more with a broad familiarity with scriptural themes and the stories therein. It seems more apt to describe the writer's use of the misplaced alliances in vv. 26–29—itsself a demonstration of a broad familiarity of scripture as Block points out “The order in which these nations are named reflects the history of Israel's contacts with them”⁵⁶⁴—as the motivation for which he is compelled to describe Yahweh's relationship to Jerusalem as a covenant. This observation leads to

⁵⁶² I use “echo” here with intentional dependence upon Ben Sommer's precise definition in *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 10–17. One could argue, I think, that Deuteronomy 32, Jeremiah 3 or Hosea 1–4, e.g. could be an example of “influence” to use Sommer's distinction between allusion and influence but this is not my point.

⁵⁶³ Contra Giles, who argues that Ezekiel 16 is a prophetic transformation; Giles, “Ezekiel 16 and the Song of Moses,” 87–108. I'm not so certain based on the clear dependence upon and use of other scriptural pericopes within the book; for examples, see Michael A. Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code*, LHBOTS 507 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), *idem*, “Persuasion and Allusion: The Rhetoric of Text-referencing in Ezekiel,” in *Text and Canon*, eds. Bob L. Cole and Paul J. Kissling (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2017), 76–89; William A. Tooman, *Gog and Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique of Ezekiel 38–39* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 85–114, 130–31.

⁵⁶⁴ Block, *Ezekiel: 1–24*, 495.

the conclusion that it indicates less about a specific setting and more about a broad brushstroke explaining Jerusalem's downfall, a common inclination in the literature of the day.

4.3.2 Expansions related to Harlotry Ezekiel 16:15–19, 16:25b–30a, 33, 35–36aβ and the Basic Metaphor

Ezekiel 16:15 initiates a thorough redaction of the basic metaphor involving the key lemma in the passage, harlotry. (זנה) The beauty that Yahweh's many gifts brought about in 16:13 and that promulgated her name in 16:14 become the trigger that the writer uses to integrate her many harlotrous ways. This observation materializes after observing the effectuation of the metaphor in 16:24–25a. "You also built for yourself a mound and made for yourself a high place in every square. At every head of a path you built your high place, abhorred your beauty, spread your feet to everyone who passed by..." Building of mounds and making high places express literal practices for which Israel was guilty. Significantly, the writer generates the metaphor at the point of infusing this basic accusation with the appellation "Jerusalem," the description of how she "abhorred her beauty," and the portrayal that she "spread your feet to everyone who passed by." From there, the basic metaphor materializes including Jerusalem's ignoble birth, rescue, and provision that generates her beauty and reputation 16:3aα–6, 9–14, the fundamental accusation in 16:24–25a, and announcement of judgment in vv. 37, 39, and 42.

After recognizing this material in the basic metaphor, the extraneous material related to harlotry comes into view. The question again obtains, what do the many

descriptions of harlotry add to the basic metaphor? What is absent in the initial metaphor? What ideological content is achieved in the generation of harlot-themed metaphor? When asked in this manner, the answer becomes clear: The harlot-themed metaphor provides an opportunity to extensively enumerate Jerusalem's long practice of idolatry.

The "high places" (במות), which are translated as "motley shrines" in Ezek 16:16, emerge from a similar description as those occurrences reflected in 1 and 2 Kings. There, the term במות occurs forty-one times as the writer goes to great lengths to explain the purpose for the destruction of the Northern and Southern kingdoms. Moreover, the books of Jeremiah and Hosea contain polemics against false worship at different altars, sacrifices, and "high places." The book of Jeremiah contains specific denunciations against the use of "high places" as a place to burn their children in fire. (Jer 7:31, 19:5, and 32:35) The term במות occurs in a deuteronomic context in 17:2–3 in which the prophet chides Judah for their alters "beside green trees and high hills."⁵⁶⁵ The book of Hosea likewise berates Israel's activities at the high places in Hos 10:8. It appears that Ezekiel's use of "high places" comes from a common derision for the day in which the metaphor emerges.

Meanwhile, neither the collocation "masculine images," nor the individual terms involved can be so neatly associated with a particular corpus. Perhaps its closest related passage occurs in Ezek 23:14, "men carved on the wall, images of the Chaldeans." In Ezek 16:17, however, it concerns images constituted with gold and silver, not engraved

⁵⁶⁵ For "high places," see Humphrey H. Hardy II and Benjamin D. Thomas, "Another Look at Biblical Hebrew *bāmōt* 'High place'," *Vetus Testamentum* 62 (2012), 175–88; cf. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 323, 326, 366–67.

on a wall. In contrast, the description of the sacral elements of an offering as a “soothing aroma” in 16:19 occurs as the same collocation in the Pentateuch on thirty-five occasions while the only remaining four occurrences are located in Ezekiel. Interestingly this collocation never appears in Deuteronomy and, of course, not in other deuteronomic books such as Kings, Jeremiah or Hosea.⁵⁶⁶ Instead it appears to be an element closely related to priestly material.⁵⁶⁷

The analysis in Chapter Three elucidated a plausible relationship of Ezek 16:20–23 with the chapter-like expansion related to “abominations.” It is possible, however, that the explicit gloss in v. 21b “when offering them up to them” reflects a deuteronomic impulse.⁵⁶⁸ Even so, v. 20 must arise in connection with the chapter-like expansion because it compares child sacrifice to harlotry; in effect it exhibits their distinct subject matter. Similar to the other redactional expansions, vv. 26–28 also exhibits the inclination to broadly enumerate Israel/Judah’s long history of ill-advised alliances. Clearly, the writer betrays his interest in portraying these as betrayals of Yahweh’s overtures towards his divinely chosen nation. Taken together with the description in v. 33, the “*Höraufruf*” in v. 35, and the comment in 36aβ, the writer completes his portrayal of Jerusalem’s penchant for betrayal.

The point obtains that while the writer of this harlot-themed redaction seems to access traditions known to him, his varied impulses lack adherence to a consistent tradition. Notions related to deuteronomic impulses and phraseology as well as priestly

⁵⁶⁶ The collocation occurs once in Genesis, thrice in Exodus 29, seventeen times in Leviticus, and eighteen times in Numbers.

⁵⁶⁷ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 192–93.

⁵⁶⁸ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 322–23.

concerns suggest someone very familiar with political, religious, and theological literature and traditions.

4.4 Dating Ezekiel

4.4.1 Dating the Basic Materials in the Book

The dating of written prophecies and dating of the book of Ezekiel are not as straightforward as once presumed.⁵⁶⁹ Scholars are in general agreement about when the prophet Ezekiel lived and worked in the period immediately preceding the destruction of Jerusalem and during the exile.⁵⁷⁰ Beginning in the period of Jehoiachin's exile in 597 and continuing after the destruction of Jerusalem in 587, a so-called minimum 'kernel' of Ezekiel's work appears straightforward.⁵⁷¹ To be sure, conservative scholars maintain that the contents of the entire book could have stemmed from the prophet's hand while critical scholars allow that certain parts could have originated with him but later prophets or scribes have expanded upon and composed the book as it now stands.⁵⁷²

⁵⁶⁹ Reinhard Kratz' instruction on this section of the paper is apropos: "To transfer a relative chronology into an absolute one, one has to be clear what theological interpretations we can expect in the immediate historical context of the exile, and of the rebuilding of the temple and what might be a later reflection on the events... one should approach the problem from the other side and move from the differentiation of the various theological concepts towards ascertaining the original historical location." Reinhard G. Kratz, "The Relation Between History and Thought: Reflections on the Subtitle of Peter Ackroyd's *Exile and Restoration*," in *Exile and Restoration Revisited: Essays on the Babylonian and Persian Periods in Memory of Peter R. Ackroyd*, eds. Gary N. Knoppers and Lester L. Grabbe with Deirdre Fulton, LSTS 73 (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 161–62.

⁵⁷⁰ For research post Zimmerli's commentaries in 1969, see Hiebel, who makes a similar statement, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives*, 1–37.

⁵⁷¹ Hölischer, *Hesekiel*, 26.

⁵⁷² For a recent survey of synchronic and diachronic studies of the book of Ezekiel in the scholarly landscape, see Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann, "Ezekiel: New Directions and Current Debates" in *Ezekiel*, eds. William A. Tooman and Penelope Barter FAT 112 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 3–8. Interestingly, modern research has allowed that some of the book stem from the original prophet, e.g. even J. Garscha, *Studien zum Ezechielbuch*, quoted in Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts*, 6, attributes some from the sixth century prophet. But see Anja Klein, *Schriftauslegung im Ezechielbuch*:

Although not the first to analyze the book of Ezekiel from a perspective of literary criticism, Gustav Hölscher is generally recognized as initiating a redaction critical analysis of the book. He maintained that Ezekiel the prophet could have been responsible for poetic material, e.g. Ezekiel 15–19, and the prophecies against the nations, chs. 29–32, in the years leading up to the destruction of Jerusalem and subsequent to it. Hölscher also proposed a redaction of the book and then later supplementations.⁵⁷³ According to Hölscher, Ezekiel himself was unaware of the sole place of Jerusalem as the authoritative location of Yahweh’s worship and therefore prior to any deuteronomic literature.⁵⁷⁴ However, the first redaction of Ezekiel lies close at hand both to the so-called Deuteronomic reworking of Israelite literature as well as the Priestly materials.⁵⁷⁵ Hölscher judged between this Ezekielian redaction and an earlier redaction of Deuteronomy by using the descriptions of the high priest, Zadokite, and levitical priests. After a discussion of research into the then-current scholarship on the redaction of the priestly material in the Pentateuch, Hölscher settles on the fact that, “[D]ann erscheint mir gerade die Priorität des Heiligkeitsgesetzes vor dem

Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Ez 34–39, BZAW 391 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008), 394, who follows S. Herrmann in disallowing that the origin of the book’s composition could come from the prophet’s hand because the historical Ezekiel would not have been in a position to have these kind of expectations of salvation; S. Herrmann, *Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen im Alten Testament. Ursprung und Gestaltwandel*, BWANT 85 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1965), 286–91. It seems too restrictive and without clear warrant to assert that the prophet Ezekiel could not have had expectations of salvation given his use of traditions and his allusion to priestly and deuteronomic texts and notions. If genuine, his reference to the Exodus in “strong hand and outstretched arm” in Ezekiel 20 and his vision of salvation in the new constitution in Ezekiel 11:14–20 if not also 18:31 indicate that he sought hope and a future from the same Yahweh that had been “faithful” to bring destruction. Cf. Hölscher, *Hesekiel*, who maintains that Ezekiel’s mission involved no orientation of salvation but only calamity and ruin in light of Ezekiel’s call, 14–15.

⁵⁷³ Gustav Hölscher, *Hesekiel*, 11–18 for the Ezekielian material.

⁵⁷⁴ Hölscher, 10–11, 17, 19.

⁵⁷⁵ Hölscher, 34.

Hesekielbuche, d.h. natürlich vor dessen Redaktion, als das Natürliche und Wahrscheinliche.”⁵⁷⁶ Clearly though for Hölscher, the redaction of the book of Ezekiel and even later supplementations come from approximately the same time as that of the Holiness code, i.e. sometime in the 5th century.⁵⁷⁷ Apparently, the final additions could have been as late as the mid-fifth century B.C.E. and possibly later but that would be among the latest additions to the book and not from Hölscher’s first redaction.⁵⁷⁸

Contemporary scholarship remains divided on the issue of Ezekielian materials and their relationship to the Holiness code. It is clear from this division that the issues are complex and a compelling basis for scholarly analyses remains elusive. For this reason, any dating of texts that relate to these bodies of literature must be attendant and cautious. The conclusion one draws about their relationship has significant influence on scholars’ dating of independent passages and the stages of the book’s composition. For example, Michael Lyons⁵⁷⁹ goes to great lengths to show that material in Ezekiel is dependent on the Holiness Code while Christoph Levin asserts the opposite,⁵⁸⁰ in the end proposing that the composition of the book of Ezekiel is a product of the 4th

⁵⁷⁶ Hölscher, 30.

⁵⁷⁷ Hölscher, 31; see the comment on page 32 as well, “Die Redaction des Hesekielbuches muß vor die Abfassung von Pg gesetzt werden.”

⁵⁷⁸ Hölscher, 35, 40.

⁵⁷⁹ Michael Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel’s Use of the Holiness Code* (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), but note that he resists giving a firm dating of HC although he discusses portions of it and its relationship to pre-exilic matters, 29–35; see also Stephen Cook, “Ezekiel’s Recovery of Premonarchic, Tribal Israel” in *Ezekiel*, eds. William A. Tooman and Penelope Barter FAT 112 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 360–73, in particular, 362–66.

⁵⁸⁰ Levin, *Die Verheißung*, 225–27. Zimmerli’s commentary contains an extensive summary of the discussion up to that point, Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I*, 46–52.

century.⁵⁸¹ Others have suggested even later dates for the final composition of the book, in particular, in view of the book's apocalyptic materials.⁵⁸²

One major issue of late that demonstrates the age and maturity of the book's composition is the repeated assertion that those deportees in 597 are the legitimate heirs of Yahweh's promises. This assertion is in contradistinction from those who remained in the land or went to Egypt after the destruction of Jerusalem.⁵⁸³ This contention suggests a perspective from a point in time that would require some distance from the first deportation in which Ezekiel was a member. It may suggest a date when the multifaceted return to Jerusalem had already begun or taken place. Those deported, or alternatively, those who had returned would have forced the issue of whose theological, religious, and political agenda would prevail in the end: the agenda of those who stayed in Judah and Jerusalem or those who had been exiled in the first deportation of Jehoiachin.⁵⁸⁴

⁵⁸¹ Levin, *Die Verheißung*, 208.

⁵⁸² For a summary of the opinions as it relates to diachronic and synchronic positions, see Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann, "Ezekiel: New Directions and Current Debates," 3–6. Additionally, in his published dissertation, Tooman himself argues that the Gog pericopes were written in the style of pastiche, otherwise similar to Second Temple literature known as rewritten scripture. In his estimation, this could have been as early as the late Persian period but he also discusses authorship of the pericope in the Hellenistic period, *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38–39* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 271–274. See also Reinhard Kratz, *The Prophets of Israel*, trans. Anselm C. Hagedorn and Nathan MacDonald (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 61–64.

⁵⁸³ Pohlmann, "Ezekiel: New Directions and Current Debates", 5–8; *idem*, *Ezekielstudien, Zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Buches und zur Frage nach den ältesten Texten*, BZAW 202 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), 46–87. For a more recent analysis that is similar in that it recognizes the polemic between the deportees and those that remained in the land but differs in date from which this polemic emerges, see Dalit Rom-Shiloni, *Exclusive Inclusivity: Identity Conflicts Between the Exiles and the People who Remained (6th–5th Centuries BCE)* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013).

⁵⁸⁴ Levin, *Die Verheißung*, 197–222; *idem*, "The Origins of Biblical Covenant Theology" in *Re-Reading the Scriptures: Essays on the Literary History of the Old Testament*, FAT 87 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 245–60; Pohlmann, *Ezekielstudien*, 46–87. But the date would not have been as late as the proposals in Ezra-Nehemiah where the discussion is not between the exiles and those who remained in the

However, as Dalit Rom-Shiloni points out, this contention furnishes indications of an earlier composition. The in-group and out-group issues are distinct from other biblical books, e.g. the book of Nehemiah. The contention in that book is between those who had returned—not those who had been exiled—and those who had remained in the land, suggesting a later perspective for the book of Ezra-Nehemiah.⁵⁸⁵ Furthermore, a straightforward solution to this issue in the book of Ezekiel may present itself as occurring in the exilic period. To borrow from Rom-Shiloni, the disputation speeches, which make up a significant amount of material in the first section of the book, Ezekiel 1–24, show a vigorous debate occurring between the groups in the early years of the exile.⁵⁸⁶ Rom-Shiloni provides evidence of strategies to legitimize the Jehoichin exiles as rightful heirs through an actualization of pentateuchal material.⁵⁸⁷ The programmatic use of this literature for means of legitimacy seems less likely in the 4th century B.C. than in the decades following destruction of Israelite culture and subsequent deportations. The book's composition could develop then as aspirations of the return to Jerusalem flourish in the late exilic period. One would have to demonstrate why the literary core of these speeches did not originate with Ezekiel but instead emerged from other scribal interest in the post exilic period.⁵⁸⁸

land but between those who had return and those who had remained; see Rom-Shiloni, *Exclusive Inclusivity*, 33–43, 187–97.

⁵⁸⁵ Rom-Shiloni, *Exclusive Inclusivity*, 155, footnote 50.

⁵⁸⁶ Rom-Shiloni, *Exclusive Inclusivity*, 142.

⁵⁸⁷ Rom-Shiloni, *Exclusive Inclusivity*, 139–97.

⁵⁸⁸ See the critique of Pohlmann's analysis by Rainer Albertz in *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.*, trans. David Green, (Atlanta: SBL, 2003) [German original, *Die Exilszeit*, 2001], 349–50.

Another element in dating Ezekiel involves its relationship to Ancient Near Eastern treaties. There has been a great deal of material produced in Old Testament Studies that detail how particular passages reflect the treaty genre. While it is easy to overgeneralize the influence treaty form plays on particular passages and their ideological content, it is equally apparent that the literature has taken up the treaty genre in its constitution. It does appear that some of the judgments in Ezekiel 16 appear to reflect ANE curse texts and could exhibit signs of origin in the exilic period.⁵⁸⁹ The expansion of these announcements of judgment gives the appearance of adherence to particular ANE treaty curses, some of which are found only outside of the Old Testament. This factor may also indicate an earlier dating for the basic metaphor. But it is rather difficult to point to a particular context from which this borrowing of treaty forms may originate.

Although not as significant for a dating of materials in Ezekiel 16, it is worth noting two factors that commend a later date for the so-called final composition of the book. First, discussion surrounds the notion of apocalyptic literature and the book of Ezekiel. The book clearly contains texts that exhibit commonly recognized traits of apocalyptic literature, e.g. the chapters concerning Gog in Ezekiel 38–39. Also, the visions that the reader encounters in the book indicate that the prophet is taken up into heavenly discussions of divine schemes and action, a key component of apocalyptic texts. The manifestation of apocalyptic literature lengthens the distance between the book in its current form and the ideological interests therein and the events to which the

⁵⁸⁹ Brian Neil Peterson, *Ezekiel in Context: Ezekiel's Message Understood in its Historical Setting of Covenant Curses and Ancient Near Eastern Mythological Motifs* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2012), 173–225.

literature purportedly testifies.⁵⁹⁰ This observation would commend a date in the late fourth or third century B.C.E. for the book's final composition.

Second, the Book of Ezekiel currently exists in two distinct editions. There is the book of Ezekiel testified to in P967 and the text of Ezekiel that the MT witnesses. The edition in P967 allows for a fluid textual shape late into the period and for that reason could evince the late date at which the present book took shape.⁵⁹¹ If these proposals are correct, the final composition of the book could be as late as the third century B.C.E.

4.4.2 Dating Ezekiel 16 and Its Expansions

We turn now to a consideration of dating the material and expansions in Ezekiel 16. The proposed time frames that emerge on the basis of content-related observations should corroborate the expansions that emerge on the basis of linguistic observations. How does the theology or thought reflected in the various expansions belie a particular community or interest active in the exilic or post-exilic communities? In what ways does the use of text or tradition reveal a development in perspective? The three major sections obviously exhibit different interests and commend distinct dates. The basic metaphor and for that matter, all material predating the chapter-like expansion allow for a sixth century provenance.

There is no reason in the content of the basic metaphor itself to suggest that it could not have originated with Ezekiel. While Hölscher maintained that it was the poetry

⁵⁹⁰ For the proposal and literature, see Pohlmann, *Hesekiel, Kapitel 1–19*, 61–62. For Ezekiel 38–39, see William A. Tooman, in particular as it relates to dating, 270–74.

⁵⁹¹ For the importance of this issue as it relates to diachronic and synchronic perspectives, Pohlmann, “Ezekiel: New Directions and Current Debates”, 8–10; idem. Pohlmann, *Ezekiel, Der Stand der Theologischen Diskussion* (Darmstadt: WBG, 2008), 127–29.

that revealed the hand of the prophet himself that criteria alone is no longer sufficient.⁵⁹² This analysis did not investigate the extent to which Ezek 16:24–25a contained elevated language.⁵⁹³ But if we are correct to consider that the actualization of the metaphor of infant/maiden-Jerusalem emerged in the literalistic description of ‘building a mound,’ and ‘making a high place’ likened unto ‘spreading her feet to everyone who passed by’ (Ezek 16: 24–25), then we may perceive a starting point for the materials. The indictment begins in the days leading up to the deuteronomic program but prior to a mature articulation of it. As Hölscher rightly points out, the material stemming from the prophet seems unaware of a solely sanctioned location of the cult in Zion (Ezekiel 23).⁵⁹⁴ Additionally, the basic framework of the accusation-judgment schema appears genuine in the basic metaphor. The infant now turned harlot ends in the same state at which she began—naked. The basic metaphor expresses a rudimentary polemic for why the destruction has occurred in a version of deuteronomic retribution theology. Incidentally, a later expansion in 16:43 articulates this as her ‘ways returning on her head,’ a rather fitting deuteronomic expression.

Moreover, the harlot redaction likewise could have originated from Ezekiel himself. The development in expectation between the harlot redaction and covenant-marriage expansion divulges an approximate timeframe. In this sequence, the many accusations of harlotry predate the notion of covenant but postdate the more hopeful admonition of an early deuteronomic layer in which warning and retribution may yet

⁵⁹² Hölscher, *Hesekiel*, 26.

⁵⁹³ There are obvious parallel items as well as an absence of articles. Yet it does contain *wayyiqtol*s.

⁵⁹⁴ Hölscher, *Hesekiel*, 10–11.

yield obedience.⁵⁹⁵ In other words, the redactional entries related to harlotry and even the basic metaphor recognizes the significance of the purity of the cult and certainly the loyalty to Yahweh, which arises in the late 7th century.⁵⁹⁶ But it predates the role of covenant, which emerges first in the expansion in 16:8 and then subsequent, in the curses or punishment that arise from disobedience in the expansions of judgment in 16:40–41.

Other factors also suggest an origin with the prophet himself. The prophet's likely familiarity with Hoseanic and Jeremianic metaphors of Israel's harlot-like behavior suggest a basis from the prophet himself. The slight echo to these tropes—unlike the use of specific language in the late expansion of 16:59–63 (“despised the oath to break the covenant”) and the reuse of language in the chapter-like expansion (“did not remember the days of your youth,” “naked and bare,” “kicking about in your blood”)—commends a style that appears free when appropriating language. Later expansions tend toward precise borrowing.⁵⁹⁷ As Anja Klein has spoken regarding the well-known expansion in Ezekiel 36, “The example of Ezek 36:26f. has shown that one could speak of literary quotations, which are evidence of an increasing understanding of scripture as a fixed authority.”⁵⁹⁸ Of course, this observation regarding the loose association with metaphors in earlier prophets does not require that it stem from the prophet's hand or a

⁵⁹⁵ For the literature see Levin, “The Origins of Biblical Covenant Theology,” 252–53.

⁵⁹⁶ Reinhard Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*, trans. John Bowden (London: T&T Clark, 2005) [German original, *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments*, 2000], 153–74.

⁵⁹⁷ Tooman, *Gog and Magog*, 270–74; Anja Klein, “Prophecy Continued: Reflections on Innerbiblical Exegesis in the Book of Ezekiel” *VT* 60 (2010), 571–82.

⁵⁹⁸ *Idem.*, 581.

particular date. But to have the metaphor so closely in theme to the likes of Hosea and Jeremiah's similar harlotly/adultery trope or the foundling theme in Deuteronomy 32, without enough verbal collocations to determine precise borrowing, is quite different from the analyses of late additions. On this basis, a date for the basic metaphor and the harlotry redaction originate after the beginning of the prophet's call in 593/2 B.C.E and likely after the destruction of Jerusalem given the announcement of Yahweh's rest in 16:42 but prior to the turn toward covenantal conceptions, for which see the following.

The turn toward the notion of covenant is not easy to pinpoint. Unfortunately, the genre of treaty and covenant in the ANE have not yielded precise details because their influence is so ubiquitous. But what about the conception of Yahweh's covenant with Jerusalem? The two notions of covenant in the chapter yield a continuum but how might this continuum help us discern the temporal relationship of the harlot redaction to the expansion of covenant marriage? The connection between covenant language and the marriage of Yahweh to Jerusalem may prove beneficial. If the connection signals an understanding of centralization program in deuteronomic literature, it would signal a timeframe. Reinhard Kratz thinks it best to discern in an early form of Deuteronomy and the centralization of the cult in Jerusalem an attempt in the early exilic period "as a response to the threatening downfall."⁵⁹⁹ Likewise, Christoph Levin traces the first use of covenant theology in the Old Testament to Jer 7:22–23 wherein the laws of centralization are bound to sacrificial laws and concludes that it is after the mid-sixth

⁵⁹⁹ Kratz, *Composition*, 132.

century B.C.E.⁶⁰⁰ If such is the case, the harlot redaction occurs at some point prior to the middle exilic period before the mention of the covenant somewhere in 560–550 B.C.E.

Can the expansion of covenant-marriage be situated in the social milieu of the exile? On the one hand, the portrayal of Israel/Jerusalem's relationship as a covenant fits easily within a milieu of Ancient Near Eastern marriage, divorce, covenant, and treaty contexts.⁶⁰¹ Given this view, the inclusion of covenant-marriage would also flow naturally in an early sixth century context. Jerusalem—and by extension Judah and even further, Israel—had committed flagrant disobedience against Yahweh and Ezekiel was now portraying it as a marriage relationship to show the full extent of disobedience and disloyalty. Extending the metaphor beyond Yahweh rescuing an infant from certain death and providing for it before the child eventually spurns its benefactor, the metaphor now becomes one depicting a husband and wife. Thus an even more egregious depiction of Jerusalem's wanton deeds in the face of Yahweh's benevolent grace explains the reason and purpose of the destruction of the city.

On the other hand, Levin has noted that the development of covenant conceptions could be even later in the evolution of Israel's religion and theology. He has put forward a post exilic "religio-historical turn" from which the notion covenant emerged in Judaism.⁶⁰² In his assessment, the concept of covenantal obedience stems

⁶⁰⁰ Levin, *Die Verheißung*, 81–82; idem. "The Origins of Biblical Covenant Theology," 252–53; Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2003), 417–419.

⁶⁰¹ Peterson contains a recent proposal for the use of covenant language in Ezekiel, *Ezekiel in Context*, 214–225.

⁶⁰² Levin, "The Origins of Biblical Covenant Theology," 252–56.

from an earlier commitment of the vassal king to obey his suzerain. After the exile, this commitment shifted from its association with the monarchy to the general population. In his estimate, this shift took place in post exilic Judaism.⁶⁰³ If correct, the incorporation of covenant-marriage in 16:8 into the harlot redaction would reflect the depiction of Yahweh's relationship to his people as one of covenant. And yet, because of its association with Jerusalem only, and not individuals within the context of the metaphor, it is difficult to make the connection of which Levin speaks.

Thus, proposals for the emergence of the concept of covenant in the book of Ezekiel range from early sixth century B.C.E. to that of late sixth century or even fifth century B.C.E. How do these proposed dates relate to the appearance of covenantal portrayals in biblical literature? Given Levin's own statements concerning covenant in ANE in the 8th–7th B.C.E. as well as Peterson's proposal of the emergence of covenant, there is nothing incongruent with the biblical storyline and the prophet Ezekiel. Moreover, later expansions of judgment seem to cohere well with the context of treaty curses. The expansion related to the covenant-marriage between Yahweh and Jerusalem seems to fit in the mid 6th–5th B.C.E until strict adherence to ethical standards were in place in P.

The expansions related to adultery, harlot's wages, judgments of adultery and harlotry most likely stem from this same period. They could materialize either as explanations for the exile and downfall of Jerusalem or as particular portrayals of Jerusalem's punishment in accordance with its actions; this understanding favors a deuteronomic strategy and timeframe. In particular, the expansions related to an

⁶⁰³ Levin, "The Origins of Biblical Covenant Theology," 256.

adulteress likely fall under this schema. Expansions that arise as judgments to harlotry and adultery fit as post-priestly additions in which they form part of the theological program of the post-exilic period.⁶⁰⁴ That the post-exilic period appears close at hand can be seen from the chapter-like expansion with its concern for a wider audience than Judah.

The chapter-like expansion deals with the portrayal of Jerusalem as a sister to Sodom and Samaria. Several issues are important when considering a date of the expansion. First, the threat of judgment by various acts of destruction is no longer in view. Instead, a restoration is at hand. This expectation most assuredly means the destruction and devastation brought about by displacement is in the past and a return to a former status with some dignity either awaits or remains elusive. Indeed, the expansion chides Jerusalem to bear her shame and humiliation. Again, this factor seems to reiterate that the stigma of loss of land, abandonment by its god, and deportation is a current circumstance of the expansion.

The hope for restoration did not occur in the years immediately after the first deportation since Ezekiel was so opposed to nationalistic agendas. For the same reason, hope for restoration did not appear after the destruction of Jerusalem. The destruction and exile would be a cleansing while the return would be something that Yahweh accomplished. More likely, the hopes for restoration came with the onset of Babylonian weakening towards the end of the new Babylonian empire or even after the so-called edict of Cyrus when possible hopes of restoration obviously escalated.⁶⁰⁵

⁶⁰⁴ Kratz, *Composition*, 114.

⁶⁰⁵ Albertz in *Israel in Exile*, 45–119, 345–75.

Moreover, if Rom-Shiloni is correct, Jerusalem's ignoble birth and therefore, the status of those who remained in Jerusalem were likened unto the Canaanite populations. However, the thesis that this is located mainly in the first section of the chapter fails to do justice to the *Fortschreibungen* taking place in the chapter.⁶⁰⁶ The thesis actually fits the chapter-like expansion because of interjection of Sodom and Samaria into the portrayal of Jerusalem's Canaanite origins in Ezek 16:3, 45–46. This interjections is connected to the sudden abundant use of “abominations” and “licentiousness” (הַזָּמָה). These factors confirm a polemic against those who remained in Jerusalem. However, it is also paired with the metaphor of sinful sisters in which these two baseborn entities had faced similar situations. Of course, the expansion does nothing for these two entities. But what does it say to those who remained behind in Jerusalem? They were no better than the state of the two sisters, both of whom faced extinction; thus the need for a recognition of Yahweh's saving hand. The dating of the expansion obviously demonstrates a good distance from the destruction of Jerusalem in which hope of restoration seems immanent while the ideal remains elusive. The *terminus a quo* must be the adumbrations of the rise of Persia with the so-called Edict of Cyrus in 539. Although not meaning Jerusalem's liberation and perhaps barely felt immediately, it no doubt ushered in the hope of return to Jerusalem and the need for hegemony from those returning. The *terminus ad quem* for such an expansion could be quite late as the return to Jerusalem failed to live up to its claim. Moreover, the inclusion of Sodom and

⁶⁰⁶ Rom-Shiloni, *Exclusive Inclusivity*, 139–97.

Samaria as co-participants of the restoration could be forerunners of the multi-ethnic state seen in the Persian period policies of Darius I post 515.⁶⁰⁷

Additionally, Jerusalem is paired with Sodom and Samaria, two entities that had suffered ignoble fates. While Jerusalem acted more abominably than they had acted, restoration awaited all three even though Jerusalem must bear a season of reproach. As such, the program that Ezekiel initiated to legitimize the exiles, not only delegitimized those who remained in Jerusalem with this pairing but also established the restoration period—when the exiles would return—as the period for which all things would be made right. That this signals the hopeful signs of the Persian period with its conferral to subdued states a degree of autonomy and religious freedom seems likely.

Another distinction in content had to do with the catalog of grievances against Jerusalem in the first section that are absent in the chapter-like expansion. While she was said to have acted more abominably than Samaria and Sodom, there are in fact, no explicit mentions of any harlotrous or wanton deeds that she committed. These observations support an occasion and place that is markedly different than Ezek 16:3–42 with its list of grievances. Instead, the lack of any list of accusations or judgments because of her behavior reveals what is no longer the prevailing genre. Could it be that ANE suzerain-vassal treaties were no longer the literary milieu in which scribes articulated Yahweh's relationship to Israel? It appears so. Thus, a period in the late 6th-mid 5th B.C.E. is again most likely. This period would be well after the destruction of Jerusalem and even after a period of reflection upon the end of the southern kingdom of Judah. Moreover, it extends after the edict of Cyrus in 539 up until multiple returns to

⁶⁰⁷ Kratz, *The Prophets of Israel*, 66.

Jerusalem had taken place, quite possibly up until the returns of the biblical characters Ezra and Nehemiah had ran their course.

Finally, the last section of Ezekiel 16 concerns the expansion related to the eternal covenant. In Levin's proposal, the turn to a "new covenant," and by extension an "eternal covenant"⁶⁰⁸ appears because "a covenant... should not bear in itself the germ of new failure."⁶⁰⁹ As it pertains to Ezekiel 16, Levin's assessment that the salvation prophecy of an "eternal covenant" subsequently develops relative to the accusation of covenantal disobedience is correct. However, the question is at what point does this take place. The development in content according to this expansion has to do with what expectation its writer wanted promulgate. The expectation of the chapter-like expansion clearly relates to the negative portrayal of Jerusalem in terms equal to that of Canaanite Sodom and Samaria and to the restoration of Jerusalem and her sisters. Whether this relates to the actual city or to the autonomy or status of Judah is not the point. Quite possibly it concerns the agenda that the exiles hoped to rebuild and launch anew for the city and state.

But the point here is the change in expectation in Ezekiel 16:59–63. No longer is the expectation one of restoration; rather the eternal covenant becomes the focus. This leads to the conclusion that for whatever reason, the restoration was no longer viable as a means for accomplishing the desired outcome. Why this change took place is a matter of debate but therein to the chapter emerges an eternal covenant that included not only

⁶⁰⁸ Levin, *Die Verheißung*, 225;

⁶⁰⁹ Levin, "The Origins of Biblical Covenant Theology," 257–58.

sisters, Sodom and Samaria, but also daughters of Sodom and Samaria. Furthermore, the eternal covenant ushers in atonement for sin. At the very least, this transition from hoped-for restoration to eternal covenant clearly points to a late post-exilic period. The multi-national program that the Persian period ushered in brought with it an inclusion of other parties interested in the success of the Judean state, even Persia itself.⁶¹⁰

Perhaps an additional indication from what period this expectation stems is the relationship of 16:59–63 to prospects in Ezra-Nehemiah, which we considered above. The debate of legitimacy between those who were exiled and those who remained in the land is well known in the book of Nehemiah as well as in Ezekiel. The second section of Ezekiel 16 has indications of its involvement in that debate. Here in Ezekiel 16:59–63, however, it appears that the debate is no longer relevant. The inclusion of Samaria in the covenant that Yahweh would establish with Jerusalem is a foregone conclusion. Not only is Samaria included but also Sodom, an entity whose origins are plebeian at best and whose reputation in the period is noteworthy. This observation could suggest a date postdating that of Ezra-Nehemiah when those who were returning had polemical battles with those who had remained in the land and intermarriage was a grievous transgression. The strong rhetoric that the character Nehemiah has for Samaritans and intermarriage is obvious in the book, a book that in its own framework with Ezra-Nehemiah is among the youngest of the Hebrew Bible. The final chapter of the book of Ezra-Nehemiah indicates that the policies that Nehemiah put into place did not work and leaves the question of the effectiveness of the return to Jerusalem.⁶¹¹ If the correspondence with Ezek 16:59–63 is

⁶¹⁰ Kratz, *Prophets*, 65–68.

⁶¹¹ For the composition of the Ezra-Nehemiah book and the possibility that Nehemiah 13 is secondary, see Kratz, *Composition*, 64, and for the composition in general, see 49–86. The later

correct, it reveals an occasion quite late in the post-exilic period after the return had gone through various stages and possibly even into the Hellenistic period when the hope of pseudo-autonomy in the Persian period had since passed. This observation could date the expansion in the mid 4th century B.C.E into the Hellenistic period.

supplementation of Neh 13:1–3 contributes an added complexity. Was it supplemented to ensure that the reader notice the significance that the policies of Nehemiah did not work? Or was it added later to show that there was still work to do in accordance with the Torah? Regardless, the return to Jerusalem was not the only factor in the solution.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albertz, Rainer. *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* Studies in Biblical Literature. Number 3. Translated by David Green. Atlanta: SBL, 2003. Original German publication, *Die Exilszeit*, 2001.
- Allen, Leslie. *Ezekiel 1–19*. Dallas: Word, 1994.
- Bach, Robert. *Die Erwählung Israels in der Wüste*. Bonn: Unpublished Dissertation, 1951.
- Barthélemy, D. *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project*. Translated by Stephen Pisano, et al. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2012.
- . *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament*. Vol. 3. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- Bauer, Hans and Pontus Leander. *Historische Grammatik der Hebräische Sprache des Alten Testaments 1*. Halle: Niemeyer, 1922.
- Bauer, Walter. William Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, Frederick W. Danker. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Baumann, Eberhard. “בּוֹתֵשׁ וּבֵשׁ.” *ZAW* 47 (1929): 17–44.
- Baumgartel, F. “Die Formel *ně’um Jahwe*.” *ZAW* 73 (1961): 277–290.
- Beentjes, Pancratius C. “Discovering a New Path of Intertextuality: Inverted Quotations and Their Dynamics.” Pages 31–50 in *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by L.J. De Regt, J. de Waard, and J.P. Fokkelman. Assen, the Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1996.
- Bernstein, Moshe, J. *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*. Vol. 2 STDJ 107. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *A History of Prophecy in Israel*. Rev. and enl. ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.
- Block, Daniel. *The Book of Ezekiel 1-24*, NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Borger, R. "Zu ברוש ובוש ית/יה." *ZAW* 66 (1954[1955]): 315-16.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Vol. 13. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975. 304–308.
- Bracke, J.M. "šûb šěbût: A Reappraisal." *ZAW* 97 (1985): 233-244.
- Brooke, George J. "Prophecy and Prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Looking Backwards and Forwards." Pages 151–165 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak, eds. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Brownlee, William H. *Ezekiel 1–19*, WBC 28. Waco: Word, 1986.
- Brueggemann, Walter and Hans Walter Wolff. *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions*, Second Edition. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982.
- Childs, Brevard. "Hermeneutical Reflections on C. Vitranga, Eighteenth-Century Interpreter of Isaiah." Pages 89–98 in *In Search of True Wisdom: Essays in Old Testament Interpretation in Honour of Ronald E. Clements*. Edited by Edward Ball, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* Sup 300 (1999).
- . *The Struggle to Understand Isaiah as Christian Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004. 237.
- Clements, Ronald E. *Old Testament Prophecy: From Oracles to Canon*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- Cook, John A. *Time and the Biblical Hebrew Verb: The Expression of Tense, Aspect, and Modality in Biblical Hebrew*. LSAWS 7. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2012.
- Cook, Stephen L. "Ezekiel's Recovery of Premonarchic, Tribal Israel." Pages 360–373 in *Ezekiel*. Edited by William A. Tooman and Penelope Barter. FAT 112. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.
- Cooke, G.A. *The Book of Ezekiel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1951.
- Cornhill, C.H. *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1886.

- Davies, Phillip. "The Dissemination of Written Texts." Pages 35–46 in *Writing the Bible: Scribes, Scribalism, and Script*. Edited by Phillip Davies and Thomas Römer. London: Routledge, 2014.
- Diestel, Ludwig. *Geschichte des Alten Testamentes in der christlichen Kirche*. Jena: Mauke's Verlag, 1869.
- Dietrich, Ernst Ludwig. *גבש ברתש: Die Endzeitliche Wiederherstellung bei den Propheten*. BZAW 40. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1925.
- Driver, G. R. "Difficult Words in the Hebrew Prophets." Pages 63–64 in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*. Edited by H.H. Rowley. New York: Scribner's, 1950.
- . "Ezekiel: Linguistic and Textual Problems." *Biblica*. (1954): 145–159.
- Driver, G.R. and John C. Miles. *The Assyrian Laws*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935.
- Duhm, Bernard. *Israels Propheten*. Second Edition. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1922.
- . *Die Theologie der Propheten*. Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1875.
- . *Das Buch Jeremias*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1901.
- Eichrodt, W. *Ezekiel*. Translated by Coslett Quinn, OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.
- Ewald, G. H. *Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. Frederick Smith. London: Williams and Norgate, 1875.
- Faulenbach, Heiner. *Weg und Ziel der Erkenntnis Christi: Eine Untersuchung zur Theologie des Johannes Coccejus*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 2d rev. ed. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971.
- Floyd, Michael H. "The Production of Prophetic Books in the Early Second Temple Period." Pages 276–297 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak, eds. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Fohrer, G. *Ezechiel*. HAT. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955.

- Force, James E. *William Whiston: Honest Newtonian*. Cambridge: Cambridge Press, 1985.
- Frankena, R. "The Vassal-treaties of Esarhaddon and the dating of Deuteronomy." Pages 122–154 in *Oudtestamentische Studiën*. Edited by P.A.H. De Boer. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965.
- Galambush, Julie. *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as Yahweh's Wife*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Garscha, Jörg. *Studien zum Ezechielbuch: eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung von 1–39*, EHS 23/23. Frankfurt: a.M.: P. Lang, 1974.
- Geiger, Abraham. *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der inneren Entwicklung des Judentums*. Breslau: Hainauer, 1857.
- Gile, Jason. "Ezekiel 16 and the Song of Moses: A Prophetic Transformation?" *JBL* 130, no. 1 (2011): 87–108.
- Gordis, R. *The Biblical Text in the Making*. Repr. New York: Ktav, 1971.
- Greenberg, Moshe. *Ezekiel, 1–20*. AB 22. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Das Märchen im Alten Testament*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1917/23.
- . "Die Propheten als Schriftsteller und Dichter." Pages XXXIV–LXX in *Die Schriften des alten Testaments: Die Großen Propheten*, ed. Hans D. Schmidt (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923).
- Hardy II, Humphrey H. and Benjamin D. Thomas. "Another Look at Biblical Hebrew *bômô* 'High place'." *Vetus Testamentum* 62 (2012): 175–88.
- Herrmann, S. *Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen im alten Testament*. BWANT 85. Stuttgart 1965.
- Hengstenberg, E.W. *Christologie des Alten Testaments und Commentar über die Messianischen Weissagungen der Propheten*. Berlin: 1829.
- Hiebel, Janina Maria. *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives: A Redaction-Critical and Theological Study*. BZAW, 475. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.
- Hillers, Delbert R. *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1969.

- . *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964.
- Hitzig, F. *Der Prophet Ezechiel*. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1847.
- Hofmann, J.C.K. *Weissagung und Erfüllung im alten und im neuen Testamente: Ein theologischer Versuch I–II*. Nördlingen: C.H. Beck'schen Buchhandlung, 1841–44.
- Holladay, W.L. *The Root Šūbh in the Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1958.
- Hölscher, Gustav. *Hesekiel: Der Dichter und das Buch*. BZAW 39. Giessen: Von Alfred Töpelmann, 1924.
- Hossfeld, F.L. *Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Ideologie des Ezechielbuches*. Würzburg: Echter, 1977.
- Joo, Samantha. *Provocation and Punishment: The Anger of God in the Book of Jeremiah and Deuteronomistic Theology*. Berlin: deGruyter, 2006.
- Jouön, Paul. and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 2006.
- Kamionkowski, S. Tamar. "Gender Ambiguity and Subversive Metaphor in Ezekiel 16." PhD diss., Brandeis University. 2000.
- . *Gender Reversal and Cosmic Chaos: A Study on the Book of Ezekiel*. JSOT 368. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.
- Kenyon, Frederic G. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible: Fasciculus VII Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther*. London: Emery Walker Limited, 1937.
- Kiel, C.F. *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*. Vol IX. Repr., Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Klein, Anja. "Prophecy Continued: Reflections on Innerbiblical Exegesis in the Book of Israel." *Vetus Testamentum* 60, Issue 4 (2010): 571–582.
- . *Schriftauslegung im Ezechielbuch. Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Ez 34–39*. BZAW 391. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Koehler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Study Edition. Vol. 1. Edited by Johann Jakob Stamm. Translated by M.E.J. Richardson. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

- Kratz, Reinhard G. *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*. Translated by John Bowden. New York: T&T Clark International, 2005. Original German, *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments*, 2001.
- . *The Prophets of Israel. Critical Studies in the Hebrew Bible*. Translated by Anselm C. Hagedorn and Nathan MacDonald. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- . “The Relation Between History and Thought: Reflection on the Subtitle of Peter Ackroyd’s *Exile and Restoration*.” Pages 152–65 in *Exile and Restoration Revisited: Essays on the Babylonian and Persian Periods in Memory of Peter R. Ackroyd*. Edited by Gary N. Knoppers and Lester L. Grabbe with Deirdre Fulton. LSTS 73. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Kruger, P.A. “Israel the Harlot.” *JSNL* 11 (1983):107–116.
- Krüger, Thomas. *Geschichtskonzepte im Ezechielbuch*. BZAW 180. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988.
- Kuenen, A. *The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel: An Historical and Critical Enquiry*. Translated by Adam Milroy. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1877.
- Kuhl, C. “Die Wiederaufnahme” – ein literarkritisches Prinzip?” Pages 57–68 in *Polemics and Apology in Biblical Historiography-2 Kings 17:24-41 in The Creation of Sacred Literature: Composition and Redaction of the Biblical Text*. NES 22. Edited by Richard Elliot Friedman. London: University of California, 1981. Repr. from *ZAW* 64 (1952): 1–11.
- Ezechiel*. <http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/NRWakademie/papyrologie/Ezechiel/bilder/PT7abr.jpg>, Koln manuscript, University of Koeln. 5/1/17.
- Manuscript-Vat.gr.1209.
http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1209/1166/scroll?sid=e43ffd4219baefc79a68d84b52c90905, Digital Vatican Library. 5/1/17.
- Levin, Christoph. *Die Verheißung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt*, FRLANT 137. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1985.
- . “The Origins of Biblical Covenant Theology.” Pages 245-260 in *Re-Reading the Scriptures: Essay on the Literary History of the Old Testament*, FAT 87. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Levinson, Bernard. *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

- Liedke, Gerhard. *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze: eine formgeschichtlicherminologische Studie*. WMANT 39. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchen Verlag, 1971.
- Lilly, Ingrid E. *Two Books of Ezekiel: Papyrus 967 and the Masoretic Text as Variant Literary Editions*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012.
- Lyons, Michael A. *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code*. LHBOTS 507. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.
- . "Persuasion and Allusion: The Rhetoric of Text-referencing in Ezekiel." Pages 76–89 in *Text and Canon*. Edited by Bob L. Cole and Paul J. Kissling. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2017.
- Mackie, Timothy. *Expanding Ezekiel: The Hermeneutics of Scribal Addition in the Ancient Text Witnesses of the Book of Ezekiel*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Malul, Meir. "Adoption of Foundlings in the Bible and Mesopotamian Documents: A Study of Some Legal Metaphors in Ezekiel 16:1–7." *JSOT* 46 (1990): 97–126.
- March, W. Eugene. "Laken: Its Functions and Meanings." Pages 256–284 in *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*. Edited by Jared L. Jackson and Martin Kessler. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 1974.
- Masterman, E. W. G. *Hygiene and Disease in Palestine in Modern and in Biblical Times*. Palestine Exploration Fund, 1920.
- McConnville, J.G. "Restoration in Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic Literature." Pages 11–40 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- McGregor, Leslie John. *The Greek Text of Ezekiel: An Examination of its Homogeneity*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- McKenzie, Tracy J. *Idolatry in the Pentateuch: An Innertextual Strategy*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010.
- Meier, Samuel A. *Speaking of Speaking: Marking Directing Discourse in the Hebrew Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Mein, Andrew. "Ezekiel as a Priest in Exile." Pages 199–213 in *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as a Historical Person, Literary Character and Anonymous Artist*. Edited by Johannes C. De Moor. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

- Nellen, H.J.M. "Growing Tension between the Church Doctrines and Critical Exegesis of the Old Testament." Pages 802–826 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. Edited by Magne Sæbø. Vol II. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- Nicacci, Alviero. "An Integrated Verb System for Biblical Hebrew Prose & Poetry." Pages 99–127 in *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007*. Edited by Andre Lemaier. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Patton, Corinne. "Pan-Deuteronomism and the Book of Ezekiel." Pages 200–215 in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*. Edited by Linda S. Shearing and Steven L. McKenzie. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Peterson, Brian Neil. *Ezekiel in Context: Ezekiel's Message Understood in its Historical Setting of Covenant Curses and Ancient Near Eastern Mythological Motifs*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012.
- Pohlmann, Karl-Friedrich. *Der prophet Hesekiel/Ezechiel Kapitel 1–19*. ATD 22.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- . *Der Prophet Hesekiel/Ezechiel Kapitel 20–48*. ATD 22.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.
- . *Ezechiel: Der Stand der Theologischen Diskussion*. Darmstadt: WBG, 2008.
- . "Ezekiel: New Directions and Current Debates." Pages 3–17 in *Ezekiel*. Edited by William A. Tooman and Penelope Barter. FAT 112. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.
- . *Ezekielstudien, Zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Buches und Zur Grage nach den ältesten Testen*. BZAW 202. Berlin: deGruyter, 1992.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. "Zum Gebrauch der Formel *nē'um jahwe* im Jeremiahbuch." ZAW 66 (1954): 27–37.
- Reventlow, Henning Graf. *History of Biblical Interpretation: From the Enlightenment to the Twentieth Century*. Volume 4. Translated by Leo G. Perdue. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Rogerson, John W. *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century*. First Fortress Press Edition. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1984.
- Rom-Shiloni, Dalit. "Facing Destruction and Exile: Inner-Biblical Exegesis in Jeremiah and Ezekiel." ZAW 117. (2005): 189–205.

- . *Exclusive Inclusivity: Identity Conflicts Between the Exiles and the People who Remained (6th–5th Centuries BCE)*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Sæbø, Magne, ed. *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. Vol II. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- Sailhamer, John. *Introduction to Old Testament Theology: A Canonical Approach*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995.
- Sandys-Wunsch, John. "Early Old Testament Critics on the Continent." Pages 971–984 in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. Edited by Magne Sæbø. Vol II. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- Scalise, Charles J. "The Sensus Literalis: A Hermeneutical Key to Biblical Exegesis." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 42, no. 1 (January 1, 1989): 45–65.
- Schöpflin, Karin. *Theologie als Biographie im Ezechielbuch: Ein Beitrag zur Konzeption alttestamentlicher Prophetie*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Schmid, Konrad and Odil Hannes Steck. "Restoration Expectations in the Prophetic Tradition of the Old Testament." Pages 41–82 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Schneider, Wolfgang. *Grammatik Des Biblischen Hebräish*. 2nd ed. München: Claudius, 2004.
- Schrenk, G. *Gottesreich und Bund im älteren Protestantismus, vornehmlich bei Johannes Coccejus. ein beitrage zur Geschichte des Pietismus und der helisgeschichtlichen Theologie*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1923.
- Schwagmeier, P. "Untersuchungen zu Textgeschichte und Entstehung des Ezechielbuches in masoretischer und griechischer Überlieferung". ThD diss., Univ. of Zurich. 2004.
- Scott, James M. *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Seidel, M. "Parallels between Isaiah and Psalms." *Sinai* 38 (1955-56): 149–172, 229–240, 272–280, 335–355.
- Shepherd, Charles. *Theological Interpretation and Isaiah 53: A Critical Comparison of Bernhard Duhm, Brevard Childs, and Alec Motyer*. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014.

- Smend, Rudolf. *From Astruc to Zimmerli: Old Testament Scholarship in Three Centuries*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Soggin, J.A. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 2. וִבְשׁ. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Sommers, Ben. *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.
- Steiger, Johann Anselm. "The Development of the Reformation Legacy: Hermeneutics and Interpretation of the Sacred Scripture in the Age of Orthodoxy." Pages 691–757 in *From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*. Vol. II of *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. Edited by Magne Sæbø. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- Stoebe, Hans Joachim. "Gut und Böse in der jahwistischen Quelle des Pentateuch." *ZAW* 65 (1953): 188–204.
- Talmon, Shemayahu. "Polemics and Apology in Biblical Historiography-2 Kings 17:24–41." Pages 57–68 in *The Creation of Sacred Literature: Composition and Redaction of the Biblical Text*. NES 22. Edited by Richard Elliot Friedman. Berkeley: Univ. of California, 1981.
- . "Textual Criticism: The Ancient Versions." Pages 141–170 in *Text in Context*. Edited by A.D.H. Mayes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . *Text and Canon of the Hebrew Bible: Collected Studies*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010.
- . "The Textual Study of the Bible – A New Outlook." Pages 321–400 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Texts*. Edited by F.M. Cross and S. Talmon. Cambridge: Harvard, 1975.
- Teeter, David Andrew. *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Late Second Temple Period*, FAT 92. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Tooman, William A. *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique of Ezekiel 38-39*. FAT 2 52. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3d ed, rev. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.
- . *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2d, rev. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

- Ulrich, Eugene, ed. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*. Vol. 2. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013.
- van der Toorn, Karel. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge: Harvard Press, 2009.
- van der Wall, E.G.E. "Between Grotius and Cocceius: The 'Theologia Prophetica' of Campegius Vitringa (1659-1722)." Pages 195–215 in *Hugo Grotius, Theologian: Essays in Honour of G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes*. Edited by Henk J.M. Nellen and Edwin Rabbie. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Vitringa, Campegius. *Observationum Sacrarum. Libri Sex*. Wibi Bleck: Franequera, 1712.
- . *Commentarius in librum prophetiarum Jesaiae*. 2 Vols. Leeuwarden: F. Halma, 1720. Wall, E.G.E van der. "Between Grotius and Cocceius: The 'Theologia Prophetica' of Campegius Vitringa (1659–1722)." Leiden.
- . *Hypotyposis Historiae et Chronologiae sacrae a M.C. Usque ad finem saec. I accredit Typus doctrinae Propheticae*. Franeker: Joh. Bernard. Hartung, 1722.
- von Rabenau, K. "Das prophetische Zukunftswort im Buch hesekiel." Pages 61–80 in *Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen*. Edited by R. Rendtorff and K. Koch. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1961.
- von Rad, Gerhard. *The Message of the Prophets*. Translated by D.M.G. Stalker. London: SCP Press Ltd. 1968.
- Waltke, Bruce, K. and M.O. O'Conner. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Watson, Wilfred. "The Hebrew Word-Pair $\text{'sp} \parallel \text{qbs}$, ZAW 96 (1984): 433.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003. Previously published by Meridian Books, 1878.
- Westermann, Claus. *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*. Translated by Hugh Clayton White. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967.
- Weinfeld, M. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Wevers, John William. *Ezekiel*. London: Nelson, 1969.
- Whiston, William. "Introductory Discourse." *A New Theory of the Earth, From its Original, to the Consummation of All Things, Where the Creation of the World in*

Six Days, the Universal Deluge, And the General Conflagration, As laid down in the Holy Scriptures, Are Shewn to be perfectly agreeable to Reason and Philosophy. 5th ed. London: 1737.

———. *The Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies.* London: 1708.

Witteveen, Klaas Marten. “Campegius Vitranga und die prophetische Theologie.” *Zwingliana* 19 (1993): 343–359.

Wolff, Hans Walter. *Hosea.* Hermenia xxi. Translated by Gary Stansell. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

———. “The Kerygma of the Deuteronomic Historical Work.” Pages 83–100 in *The Vitality of the Old Testament Tradition.* Atlanta: John Knox, 1975.

Wong, Ka Leung. *The Idea of Retribution in the Book of Ezekiel.* Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Ziegler, Joseph. *Septuaginta* vol. XVI, 1 *Ezechiel.* 3. Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.

Zimmerli, Walther. “Die Eigenart der prophetischen Rede des Ezechiel. Ein Beitrag zum Problem an Hand von Ez. 14:1–11.” *ZAW* 66 (1954): 1–26.

———. *Ezekiel 1–24, I, BK XIII.* Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.

———. *Ezekiel 1.* Hermeneia. Translated by Ronald E. Clements. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

———. *Ezekiel 2.* Hermeneia. Translated by James D. Martin. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.