**4Q385 (*Pseudo-Ezekiel*)in the Context of Biblical Restoration Prophecies**

**Introduction**

This article examines how one text rewrites an earlier authoritative text, more specifically how the changes made by 4Q385 (*Pseudo-Ezekiel*) to Ezekiel 37:1–14, as manifested in the introduction of language drawn from other prophets, subtly shift the emphasis of the original prophecy.[[1]](#footnote-2) Essentially part of the different Second Temple period responses to the question of what form expectations for restoration should take, 4Q385 engages the dry bones vision, but also alters its meaning by introducing new materials to Ezekiel’s vision. It achieves this through allusion to specific language missing not only from Ezekiel 37:1–14, but from all of Ezekiel’s restoration prophecies, enlisting the text from Ezekiel 37 both to support its own ideology and to address the questions of when and how this will be realized.[[2]](#footnote-3) This study belongs to the body of research examining of how later texts quote, rewrite, or expand scriptural prophecies.[[3]](#footnote-4) Although many studies have addressed the relationship between *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and Ezekiel 37:1-14 and have contributed to our understanding of the text and its meaning, this discussion will identify for the first time those characteristics common to the places in which *Pseudo-Ezekiel* differs from the biblical text.

4Q385 belongs to a group of manuscripts labeled *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* (*PsEzek*).[[4]](#footnote-5) Various scholars have noted the unique resemblance between *PsEzek* and Ezek 37:1–14, pointing out the additions to the latter found in this text. Using the portrayal of Israel’s restoration in 4Q385as its focus, this article explores how these additions are utilized to reflect a consolatory message. These additions share a common denominator: not only are the terms of redemption used by 4Q385 absent from Ezek 37, they are also conspicuously absent from Ezekiel’s restoration prophecies as a whole. Its author underscores his message by creating a cluster of allusions to Ezek 37:1–14,[[5]](#footnote-6) an authoritative text for the future restoration of the people,[[6]](#footnote-7) while at the same time introducing changes that transform Ezekiel’s “dim view of restoration” into a more optimistic vision of restoration that includes divine love, benevolence, and blessing for his people.[[7]](#footnote-8) 4Q385 then not only addresses the question of when the restoration prophesied by Ezekiel will take place, it provides a more optimistic picture of this restoration. In essence 4Q385 innovatively transforms Ezekiel’s oracle of restoration on two planes by reactivating the question of when restoration will take place and rectifying the “dim” prophecy. In addition to Ezekiel 37:1-14, other biblical verses corresponding to this text have been identified. The following comparison between 4Q385 and the book of Ezekiel as a whole reveals the underlying theme, overlooked in previous scholarship, uniting all of the corrections and changes that distinguish this text from the biblical version.

**State of the research**

Scholars, first and foremost Devorah Dimant, have discussed the connections between the group of fragmentary texts known as *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and the book of Ezekiel and their nature.[[8]](#footnote-9) Based on the links between these texts and Ezekiel’s visions of the chariot, the war between Egypt and Babylonia, and the dry bones, alongside the explicit mention of Ezekiel’s name,[[9]](#footnote-10) shared terms,[[10]](#footnote-11) and themes, the name *Pseudo-Ezekiel* was assigned to these texts.[[11]](#footnote-12)

Dimant notes: "The most salient feature of *Pseudo-Ezekiel* is the conscious effort to model its discourse on the canonical prophecies of Ezekiel […] Furthermore, the author adopts the stylistic peculiarities of the canonical discourse attributed to this prophet […] In this manner the author appropriates the voice of biblical Ezekiel. Thus the author attempts to extend the prophetical authority of Ezekiel to his own interpretations and additions. Yet in spite of the close imitation, slight alterations, additions and sporadic late locutions betray the post-biblical milieu of our composition."[[12]](#footnote-13)

Since the publication of this research, various studies have addressed the question, “what is “biblical Ezekiel”, and have attempted to determine the relationship between the various versions of the text known as “Pseudo-Ezekiel” and form conclusions from them about the development of these texts in particular and the relationship between the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature in general.[[13]](#footnote-14)

The following pages contain intra-biblical comparisons. I have indicated in the footnotes those cases already cited by Dimant. To these I have added other parallel verses not mentioned by Dimant. The methodological explanation for the discrepancies between this list and that of Dimant lies in two criteria used in the comparison: First, Dimant used the entire Hebrew Bible as the basis for comparison without giving preference to parallel verses from Ezekiel. Second, Dimant focused on similarity without taking into account the question of disparity. In other words, in comparison with the corresponding prophecy in Ezekiel in particular and the prophecy of national redemption in Ezekiel in general, what appears in the text in front of us and what is absent (perhaps intentionally)? That is to say, what is the significance of the fact that in this concise text, written with Ezekiel 37:14 in mind, there is a concentration of words atypical of Ezekiel? By means of the following intra-biblical parallels, we will diverge from Dimant’s conclusions and identify the theme that formed the basis of these additions, changes and corrections.

This text belongs to the genre of Rewritten Scripture that expands scriptural tradition though new compositions in biblical style, common (among others) when “transforming Israel's hope.”[[14]](#footnote-16) Among the texts that address restoration, consideration of 4Q385 has the ability to contribute significantly to the discussion, despite its fragmentary condition. Of particular importance are its closeness to the MT, on the one hand, and the changes introduced to the text of the MT, on the other.

As arranged in the MT, the vision of the dry bones (chapter 37) precedes the prophecy to Gog from the land of Magog (chapters 38–39) and the temple vision (chapters 40–48). However, in one LXX manuscript (Papyrus 967) the sequence differs: the dry bones prophecy follows the prophecy to Gog from Magog and precedes the temple vision.[[15]](#footnote-17) Notwithstanding the fact that the location of Ezekiel 37:1–14 may not have been firmly fixed in the Second Temple period, this prophetic unit is clearly part of the larger unit dedicated to the future restoration of the Israelites.

Aspects of *PsEzek* and its relationship to Ezekiel have been addressed in the scholarship from the time of its initial publication.[[16]](#footnote-18) Two articles from 2014, by Anja Klein and Molly Zahn respectively, devote particular attention to methodological questions. Klein’s paper carefully considers the biblical text in Ezek 37:1–14 and the ways in which it may have been transformed by *PsEzek*. Thus, she pays special attention to the exegetical relationship between the texts and summarizes her methodological discussion by stating: “the vision in Pseudo-Ezekiel forms an external continuation of the biblical account that draws mainly on the latest literary supplementation of the biblical vision in Ezek. 37. The exegetical interest lies in an eschatological interpretation of the biblical account that focuses on the question how the righteous will be recompensed and when this will happen.”[[17]](#footnote-19) I suggest here that this significant contribution to the understanding of *PsEzek* has overlooked some of its complexity and the additional challenges that a close reading of this text demonstrates. Although I agree with Klein that *PsEzek* addresses the eschatological challenges of its time, I believe that the extent to which *PsEzek* changed and added to the authoritative text on which it is based requires further examination. *PsEzek* is primarily a revision of the prophecy in Ezekiel on which it relies, created by combining this text with language not found in the book of Ezekiel.[[18]](#footnote-20) Although *PsEzek* cannot in my opinion contribute to our understanding of the development of the text of *biblical* Ezekiel, it can be seen as an additional, advanced, “external” stage of the development of the “latest literary supplementation” (Zahn) or " biblical Ezekiel" (Dimant) to the book of Ezekiel.[[19]](#footnote-21)

Zahn’s comprehensive methodological study is chiefly concerned with rewriting processes.[[20]](#footnote-22) In addressing how the relevance and authority of the Ezekiel traditions are evidenced elsewhere in the text, she concludes: “*PsEzek* reframes Ezekiel’s prophecies so as to answer more clearly the all-important questions of ‘how’ and ‘when’ they would be fulfilled … it seems fair to say that providing an actualizing interpretation of some of Ezekiel’s major prophecies appears to constitute a major goal of the work.”[[21]](#footnote-23) I concur with Zahn’s approach, which views *PsEzek* asan actualizing interpretation of Ezekiel’s prophecies. I suggest, however, that we can arrive at a more refined understanding of how, by introducing additional biblical expressions, the author of *PsEzek* interpreted the unique attitude toward Israel’s restoration found in Ezekiel 37, which neither clarifies nor states whether and when the divine word will be fulfilled.

I propose that it is this lacuna that the author of *PsEzek* seeks to fill. *PsEzek* clearly reads and interprets Ezek 37, on the one hand; on the other hand, it deliberately reuses elements found in other biblical prophecies of restoration, using them to reshape and expand thedry bones vision in order to create a new, harmonious text, adding missing elements and making the divine answer relevant. This is the case whether we adduce that the author of *PsEzek* thought that the prophet and the people perceived the absence of these elements in the prophetic oracle and were therefore unable to abandon their despair, or if the need to supply what was missing arose at a late date, in the author’s day.

**The Dry Bones Vision**

The following section undertakes a lexical analysis of the text of 4Q385*.* Based on the numerous topical and linguistic similarities between Ezekiel 37:1–14 and 4Q385, scholars have demonstrated that the eschatological hopes voiced in 4Q385 derive from the vision of the dry bones and are grounded in its theological outlook. In rewriting Ezekiel 37:1–14, it diverges from it by incorporating and underscoring redemptive elements that are missing from the original text.[[22]](#footnote-25) This text evidently reflects the fundamental longing for redemption that was part of Second Temple period thought, the aspiration for fulfillment of the ideological expectations and divine promises reflected in prophetic oracles. Immediately on publishing the text, Dimant noted that the longing for the resurrection of the dead that arises from the text is concrete, not metaphorical, as shown by the people’s benediction that offers thanks for an already accomplished event (even if only in the vision).[[23]](#footnote-26) Because the most detailed prophecy concerning the future restoration of the people is found in the book of Ezekiel, it is not surprising that it served as the basis for a text that aimed to respond to the question of when this prophecy would be realized. In seeking to rectify Ezekiel’s prophecy, its author based himself on an earlier, authoritative text, as Greenberg points out: "This passage, probably the best known of Ezekiel's prophecies deserves its fame. It conveys a powerful, inspiring message of national restoration in a rhetorically perfect vehicle.[[24]](#footnote-27) The fragmentary condition of 4Q385, and our lack of knowledge, prevents us, however, from determining whether this new text gained authoritative status of its own.

To illustrate this point, I have distinguished between *the text of 4Q385 that is linguistically derived from Ezekiel 37:1-14—marked by italics*—and the sections of the text where *PsEzek* is linguistically distinct from Ezekiel {37:1-14?}—marked by underlining.[[25]](#footnote-28) Unmarked text reflects a shared lexicon with Ezekiel but not a direct quote, or connecting material. **Bold type represents words typical of Ezekiel, but which are not directly quoted from Ezekiel 37:1–14**.[[26]](#footnote-29) The remaining words are found in other prophetic books, but not in Ezekiel.

***4Q385: Text and Translation***

1. [כי אני יהוה[ הגואל̇ עמי לתת להם הברית
2. [ואמרה יהוה [*ראיתי* **רבים מישראל** אשר אהבו את שמך **וילכו**
3. ב֯דרכי] לבך וא[לה מתי יהיו והיככה ישתלמו חסדם ויאמר יהוה
4. אלי אני אראה את בני ישראל **וידעו כי אני יהוה**
5. [ויאמר [בן אדם *הנבה על העצמות ואמרת* וידבקו[[27]](#footnote-30) *עצם אל עצםו* ופרק
6. ]אל פרקו ויה[י כן֯ *ויאמר שנית הנבא ויעלו עליהם גדים ויקרמו עור*
7. ]מלמעלה ויהי כן [ *ויאמ֯ר שוב אנבא על ארבע רוחות השמים ויפחו רוח֯*
8. ]*בהרוגים* ויהי כן [ ו̇י̇קומ֯ו̇ עם רב אנשים ויברכו את יהוה צבאות אשר
9. [חים ו[ אמרה יהוה מתי יהיו אלה ויאמר יהוה אל]י זה]
10. [לך האות בטרם יהיו הד]ברים יכף *עץ* ויזקף[ ]

1. [For I am YHWH] the redeemer of my people, giving to them the covenant.

2. [And I said: YHWH ] *I have seen* **many from Israel** who have loved your name

**and walked**

3. in the ways of [your heart. Th]ese when will they come to be, and how will

They be recompensed for their piety and YHWH said

4. to me: I will see Israel **and they will know that I am YHWH**.

5. [And he said*:] Son of man, prophesy over the bones, say* and stick bone to bone and joint

6. [to its joint And it wa]s so. *And he said a second time: Prophesy, and sinews will*

*come up over them and be covered with skin*

7. [from above. And it was so]. *And he said: I prophesy again, over the four winds of the heavens, and blow breath*

8. [*into the dead*. And it was so.] And stood up many people, and they blessed YHWH of hosts who

9. [life *vacat* And] I said: YHWH, when will these come to be And YHWH said to m[e: this]

10. [ is your sign before will be these] t[hings] *a tree* shall bend and shall stand [ ]

**Scriptural Reuse in *PsEzek***

Table 1 below places the text of 4Q385alongside the parallel biblical expressions. The italicized words in 4Q385 mark text that is also found in Ezekiel 37, and the parallel MT text is cited in the adjoining column.[[28]](#footnote-31) Words typical of Ezekiel that appear in chapter 37, but which are not unique to this book, are shown in bold type. The remaining unmarked words belong to the prophetic literature as a whole, but are not typical of the book of Ezekiel. The bracketed MT text is similar to, but not identical with, Ezekiel 37. Identification of biblical texts other than Ezekiel used by the author of 4Q385 complements the writing process described by Zahn,[[29]](#footnote-32) and is consistent with her overall conclusion: “There are instances where *PsEzek* uses language familiar from scripture without appearing to refer to any one passage, a technique familiar both from expanded editions of scriptural books and other rewritten compositions.”[[30]](#footnote-33) Underlined text indicates reuse of words or phrases found elsewhere in the prophetic literature, in which *PsEzek* alludes to other redemption prophecies. [[31]](#footnote-34)

Table 1: 4Q385and the MT: A Comparison

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sources | MT | 4Q385 |  |
| Not in Ezekiel  Ezek. 37:26? | ]וְכָרַתִּי לָהֶם בְּרִית שָׁלוֹם בְּרִית עוֹלָם +וּנְתַתִּים [ | הגואל̇ עמי  לתת להם הברית | 1 |
| Ezek. 37:8  Ezek. 37:2  Isa. 56:6  Ezek. 37:24 | וְרָאִ֜יתִי  [העצמות רבות]  וּֽלְאַהֲבָה֙ אֶת שֵׁ֣ם] +בִּבְרִיתִֽי[  [וּבְמִשְׁפָּטַ֣י יֵלֵ֔כוּ] | *ראיתי*  **רבים** מישראל  אשר אהבו את שמך  **וילכו** | 2 |
| Not in Ezekiel | חֶ֙סֶד֙ | מתי יהיו[[32]](#footnote-35)  והיככה[[33]](#footnote-36) ישתלמו חסדם | 3 |
| Ezek. 37:20–21  Ezek. 37:6,13,14 | ] וְלִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל[ +[לְעֵינֵיהֶם ]  ]וִידַעְתֶּם כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה[ | אלי אני אראה את בני ישראל[[34]](#footnote-37)  **וידעו כי אני יהוה**[[35]](#footnote-38) | 4 |
| Ezek. 37:3  Ezek. 37:4  Ezek. 37:7 | ]בֶּן אָדָם[  הִנָּבֵא עַל הָעֲצָמוֹת  עֶצֶם אֶל עַצְמוֹ | **בן אדם**  *הנבה על העצמות[[36]](#footnote-39)*  *ואמרת* *עצם אל עצםו* ופרק | 5 |
| 37:7  Ezek. 37:8 | ]וְנִבֵּאתִי כַּאֲשֶׁר צֻוֵּיתִי[  וְהִנֵּה עֲלֵיהֶם גִּדִים  וַיִּקְרַם עֲלֵיהֶם עוֹר | **ויאמר שנית הנבא**  *ויעלו עליהם גדים*  *ויקרמו עור*[[37]](#footnote-40) | 6 |
| Ezek. 37:9  Ezek. 37:9 | ]וַיֹּאמֶ… הִנָּבֵא..הִנָּבֵא [  מֵאַרְבַּע רוּחוֹת בֹּאִי הָרוּחַ | *ויאמ֯ר שוב אנבא על*  *ארבע רוחות השמים[[38]](#footnote-41) ויפחו רוח֯* | 7 |
| [Ezek. 37:10] | ]וַיַּעַמְדוּ עַל רַגְלֵיהֶם[ | ו̇י̇קומ֯ו̇ עם רב אנשים[[39]](#footnote-42)  ויברכו את יהוה צבאות אשר*[[40]](#footnote-43)* | 8 |
| [Zech. 1:12] | ]עַד מָתַ֗י[ | אמרה יהוה מתי יהיו אלה | 9 |
| Ezek. 37:15–19 | ]קַח לְךָ עֵץ אֶחָד[ | ברים יכף *עץ* ויזקף[[41]](#footnote-44) | 10 |

Line 1: The first example of *PsEzek*’s use of terminology different from that of Ezekiel comes from the opening of the fragment which begins with a description of God’s actions: **הגואל** עמי לתת להם ה**ברית** “Redeemer of my people, giving to them the covenant.” Based on a paradigm of divine redemption, it introduces the word גאולה “redemption,” which is not found in Ezekiel.[[42]](#footnote-45) It is, however, characteristic of Isaiah (41:14, 44:24, 48:17, 49:7,[[43]](#footnote-46) 54:8, and elsewhere).[[44]](#footnote-47) The introduction of new words to the opening line demonstrates that the text is not just an extension of the text in Ezek 37, but rather charts an independent path. Additionally, in Ezekiel the word ברית “covenant” is found primarily in negative contexts that relate to its violation by the Israelites (16:8, 59).[[45]](#footnote-48) However, the Ezekielian notion of a new covenant may have been reformulated in 4Q385, through the transformation of the next prophetic unit in Ezekiel (37:26), with the addition of הגואל עמי.[[46]](#footnote-49) Divine recall of the covenant appears a number of times in Ezekiel, but its establishment is a unilateral divine act, stressing that the Israelites do not fulfill their covenantal obligations (16:60–62; 20:37).[[47]](#footnote-50) This will also be the case in the future (34:25; 37:26), when, according to Ezekiel, the Israelites will continue to violate the covenant (44:7).[[48]](#footnote-51)

Line 2: The root רא"ה is typical of the book of Ezekiel and appears in the opening of many descriptions of what this prophet “sees.” The word ראיתי occurs in Ezek 37:8 and its use creates a link between this chapter and 4Q385*.* רבים מישראל may also echo the many bones (העצמות רבות) mentioned in Ezek 37:2 and the rarity of the word רבים reinforces the proposed connection to Ezekiel. The end of the line, וילכו, is similar to Ezek 37:24.[[49]](#footnote-52)

However, the focus of this line is אשר **אהבו את שמך** “who have loved your name.” Love (אהב) as a term is not used positively in Ezekiel. The root אה"ב is only found in Ezekiel in the description of Jerusalem fornicating with her lovers in chapters 16 (vv. 33, 36, 37) and 23 (vv. 5, 9, 22). This motif appears in Deut 10:12. The precise locution אהב + שם “to love the [divine] name” is unique in the prophetic literature, found only in Isa 56:6; it appears, in similar form, in Ps 5:12; 69:37; 119:132. [[50]](#footnote-53)

Line 3: ישתלמו חסדם “recompensed for their piety.” The actions of רבים מישראל “many from Israel” (line 2) are described as “their piety.” The root חס”ד, piety, does not appear in Ezekiel.[[51]](#footnote-54) Its absence is particularly striking given the dozens of occurrences in different contexts, including the redemption of the people, in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, and elsewhere.[[52]](#footnote-55)

Line 8: ויברכו את ה' צבאות “and they blessed YHWH of hosts.” *The Israelites’ blessing* of God is also not found in Ezekiel. The root בר"ך, to bless, appears only twice in the book of Ezekiel, but with respect to different subjects. The first is Ezek 3:12, when the prophet hears a great roaring sound: “Blessed is the Presence of the Lord, in His place” (3:12). The second is found in the description of the divine granting of future prosperity to the Israelites: “*I will* make these and the environs of My hill a blessing: *I will* send down the rain in its season, rains that bring blessing” (34:26). This apparent shift of the function of blessing from God to the Israelites is one of the significant divergences by *PsEzek* from the book of Ezekiel.

Line 9: The language of the question “until when” מתי יהיו אלה is unique. It bears some thematic resemblance to Zechariah 1:12, in the angel’s inquiry as to when Jerusalem will be rebuilt עַד מָתַ֗י אַתָּה֙ לֹֽא תְרַחֵ֣ם אֶת יְרוּשָׁלִַ֔ם.[[53]](#footnote-56) Thus, although the prophetic books do not attest to the people wondering when restoration would take place, examination of these Second Temple period texts shows that their authors harbored expectations of divine redemption of the people at that time.

Line 10: This line is truncated, but the words preserved correlate with the second part of Ezek 37. Scholars correctly view vv. 15–19, where the prophet sees a joint tree of Judah and Ephraim, as a separate prophetic unit*.* However, based on the uniqueness of the image of the tree, and the thematic correspondence between it and the description of a tree standing tall and upright in the future in 4Q385,[[54]](#footnote-57) I suggest that, taken together with the shared terminology with Ezekiel noted above, this fragmentary last line in 4Q385 may perhaps allude to the prophecy that follows the vision of the dry bones in Ezekiel 37.

I propose that 4Q385’s introduction of terminology from outside the book of Ezekiel*—*in particular the terms redemption, love of God’s name,recompense for piety, and the Israelites’ blessing of God, as well as the limited use of the term ‘covenant’—is not accidental. Despite the extensive attention to restoration in his oracles, Ezekiel refrains from depictions of salvation. Consider, for example, Baruch Schwartz’s description of Ezekiel’s bleak portrait of YHWH’s judgment of Judah, the prophet’s generally pessimistic view of the Israelite people, and conclusion that Ezekiel’s restoration prophecies reflect a dim outlook.[[55]](#footnote-58) From the prophecy itself it is unclear as to whether or not Ezekiel was persuaded that the divine word would be fulfilled. At the beginning of the oracle, God asks Ezekiel: “Can these bones live again?” To which Ezekiel replies, “O Lord GOD, only You know” (37:3). This cannot be taken as a positive answer.[[56]](#footnote-59) Later in the prophecy we learn from God’s words to the prophet that the people as well are not convinced that the bones will be revived: “They say, ‘Our bones are dried up, our hope is gone; we are doomed’” (37:11). In presenting the divine response to the uncertainty voiced first in the reply and subsequently in the quotation of the people’s comment, the prophecy repeatedly reiterates the divine promise that the dry bones will *live* (vv. 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14) and concludes with the fact that the divine word will be fulfilled: “Then you shall know that I the LORD have spoken and have acted” (37:14). There is, however, no further quotation of the *prophet*’s words in the oracle. On the contrary, Ezekiel underscores that he is simply relaying what God has commanded him to say (vv. 7, 10), and there is repeated emphasis on the fact that God is commanding him to prophesy (vv. 4, 9, 12). Thus, this prophetic unit reflects and attests to the divine word as conveyed to the prophet. It does not, however, contain any statement of this oracle’s acceptance, the time of its future realization, or of the abandonment of despair by the prophet or the people.

This examination, which underscores the appearance of terms used in 4Q385 not found in Ezekiel and their thematic correspondence to prophecies of restoration elsewhere, indicates that *PsEzek* is a postbiblical interpretation in which both the similarities to, and the differences from (by way of additions), Ezekiel 37:1–14 are significant. These adjustments are both lexical and theological (ברית, ברך וגאל). They can be explained as a shift from the emphasis on autonomous divine action in Ezekiel, as evidenced by the descriptions of redemption enacted solely by God and at his initiative, (37:5, 6, 12–14) to reestablish that the "ברית," although initiated by God, receives a response from the people who do not remain passive, as evident in 4Q385(line 8): “many people, and they blessed YHWH of hosts.” As opposed to unilateral divine activity on behalf of the people in Ezekiel, irrespective of whether or not they have repented, in *PsEzek* there are righteous people to whom God responds. In addition, despite the fact that only a few words have been preserved at the end of the extant text of *PsEzek*, based on the uniqueness and thematic correspondence of this image, I suggest that this last line may provide a glimpse of the continuation of 4Q385. Ezekiel 37:15–25 is a unique prophecy because it both unites all parts of the nation (Judah on the one hand and Joseph and Ephraim on the other) and incorporates a ברית שלום (37:26; found once more in Ezekiel 34:25). It opens with the image of a tree, which may have been reused in the image of the tree standing upright at the end of *PsEzek;* this perhaps suggests that the prophecy continued in this vein.

This terminological consideration showed that the extant text of 4Q385 supplies answers to two layers that went unanswered in Ezekiel: the first, the attitude of the prophet and the people to the divine prophecy, which contains no description of acceptance on the prophet’s part. He merely relays it as commanded. In 4Q385 the cut-off dialogue continues and the people’s desire is clarified because they accept the divine word and expect its fulfillment.

The second stratum in Ezekiel which is explicated in 4Q385 is redemption. Indeed the people are resurrected, but there is no closeness between God and his people. By introducing missing terminology, the author of 4Q385 fills this lacuna and reminds the reader that the divine-Israelite bond is based on a covenant that encompasses love and mercy.

***PsEzek* in historical context**

The discussion of the historical context of *PsEzek* views it in the context of a broader spectrum of texts from the Second Temple period that contain motifs of resurrection and restoration.*[[57]](#footnote-60)* In pointing out the significant differences between *PsEzek* as a whole and Ezekiel, Dimant notes that the extant text does not fully repeat everything found in Ezekiel’s prophecy in chapter 37, and concludes: “Although some elements of this portrait are taken from the biblical figure, the keen interest in eschatological events and the emphasis on the fortunes of the righteous are concerns typical of the Second Temple era.”[[58]](#footnote-61)

Taking this a step further, I suggest that the terminology used in 4Q385 was not simply familiar to the author,[[59]](#footnote-62) but was deliberately chosen. On the one hand, 4Q385 was certainly familiar with the text of Ezekiel 37 and alluded to its biblical form; on the other hand, by reusing terminology that reflects different motifs, similar to those found elsewhere in the Bible, itdeliberately reshapes the MT biblical Ezekiel prophecy. Ezekiel’s restoration prophecies have been described as follows by Baruch Schwartz: “Thus, Ezekiel predicts, YHWH is bound and determined to embark on a most ungracious project of forced rehabilitation, in order to correct the failures of history once and for all and ultimately to derive the satisfaction for which he has striven for so long. For his people, this is anything but a relief.”[[60]](#footnote-63) It was this somber impression that the author of 4Q385 sought to “correct” by departing from the theocentric focus of the restoration prophecies in the book Ezekiel, where God acts to sanctify his name in the eyes of the nations and not for the Israelites’ sake, replacing it with a more loving covenantal relationship. The author of 4Q385 imposed a different perception by inserting terms found in the oracles of other prophets, one that reflects Second Temple period concerns. This perhaps illustrates an attempt to actualize prophecy in the Second Temple period, an attempt that may be attributed to elements of Second Temple Jewish society who experienced incongruity between their expectations and the reality, aspiring to a different reality. This text does not reflect the continuing process of expansion of "biblical Ezekiel" as a literary work, but is a separate composition belonging to a genre of postbiblical writing that reflects disappointment with Ezekiel’s restoration prophecy and with the existing Second Temple. It provides a glimpse of the expectations of certain parts of Jewish society for the overturning of Ezekiel’s “dim view” of restoration, placing Ezekiel 37’s prophecy in a more positive light, and illuminating their future hopes.

Moreover, we must consider the historical context of the book of Ezekiel. Although the question of the date of its composition and editing are largely shrouded in mystery, recent decades have seen the emergence of a growing consensus regarding the historical context of his prophecies. It is likely that Ezekiel, who prophesied in exile, and was not present at the time of the destruction of the temple, did not himself witness the state of Jerusalem’s residents during the torturous years of famine and the burning of the temple.[[61]](#footnote-65) Therefore, these events had less impact on Ezekiel’s prophecy than on that of other prophets, like Jeremiah, who directly witnessed the tribulations of Jerusalem’s residents. This perhaps explains the lack of consolatory aspects in Ezekiel’s prophecies, their focus on the return of the Israelites to the land of Israel.[[62]](#footnote-66) It was this void that the author of *PsEzek* sought to fill with a consolatory message of a renewed divine-Israelite covenant.

Furthermore, the texts addressing bones in Ezekiel and their interpretation differ from what emerges from the interpretation of the bones noted here in4Q385. First, in Ezek. 1–24 (“the chapters of rebuke”), God scatters the bones of the sinners in the vicinity of their worship (6:5), and the people’s bones are cooked in the city on the eve of the destruction (24:4–5, 10). In Ezek. 37:1–14 (the vision of the dry bones) the response to the God’s question as to whether the bones in the valley will live is “you know” (37:3). But, notwithstanding linguistic similarities there is a fundamental difference in content between Ezekiel and 4Q385. Ezekiel ends pessimistically: “They say, ‘Our bones are dried up, our hope is gone, we are doomed’” (37:11).4Q385, on the other hand, expresses hopes for the realization of this prophecy. Its author wonders about the future reward for those who love God, who have not yet merited God’s grace in exchange for walking in His ways. In response, God instructs the prophet to revive the dry bones, an event that will occur in the end-time. Although this is not a sectarian text,[[63]](#footnote-67) it seems that the author continued to count toward the end-time even while the Second Temple still stood; a calculation that itself relied on the prophecies in the book of Ezekiel.[[64]](#footnote-68)

The similarities between *PsEzek* and the MT book of Ezekiel teach us about the worldview of their composers. It is only natural that the book of Ezekiel, which contains the most detailed descriptions of the end-time in the Prophets, should become the basis of descriptions of redemption, even though as found in the book of Ezekiel these prophecies uniquely lack redemptive and consolatory elements. Thus, we see that 4Q385, the most complete fragment of *PsEzek*, stressed and developed motifs whose perceived absence it identified in those chapters. By interpreting the prophecies in the book of Ezekiel, and inserting what he viewed as the missing elements of redemption, love, piety, and blessing, perhaps the author of *PsEzek* hoped that, through these additions, they would indeed merit the actualization of the prophecy.[[65]](#footnote-69)

}לגבי שאלת ההתייחסות לביקורת הקורא-- אינני מכירה את ספרות המחקר בנושא ולא יכולה להביע דעה לגביי הביקורת עצמה. אבל על פני הדברים אני לא מרגישה שיש מספיק התייחסות לטענות הקורא. אפילו אם הביקורת לא מוצדקת את חייבת להתייחס בצורה מפורשת ומפורטת לכל אחת מהן.

1. לגבי החידוש המחקרי. את כן מגיבה בהתחלה, אבל מאד חשוב, ממש חיוני, בסוף המאמר להוסיף סיכום -- פסקה או שתיים בהן את חוזרת על התזה והייחודיות שלה. באותו לשון. "הראיתי את המגמות השזורות בתוך השינויים....והן...." ממש לחפור.
2. לגבי המתודולוגיה – לחזור על הדברים שוב בהערות לטבלאות.
3. לגבי שאר הביקורת – לא שמתי לב לתגובות. חוץ מזה שהכנסת את ההערות שלו לתוך בועות בטקסט. זו לא תגובה.

1. Four Qumran manuscripts contain prophecies and visions from the book of Ezekiel: 4Q385, 4Q388, 4Q386, and 4Q391. In three of these texts there is overlapping material. 4Q385 is the most complete text; therefore, the discussion focuses on this text. See also n. 10 below. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. This preoccupation with historical sequence is found in additional texts in the group termed *Pseudo-Ezekiel,* e.g., ומתי תקבצם*.* (4Q386 1 ii 3) and attests that its author had expectations for the realization of the restoration prophecies during the Second Temple period. See D. Dimant, “A. Pseudo-Ezekiel,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 63-64. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. See e.g. Eibert Tigchelaar’s examination of Jeremiah in the context of the DSS and his stance: “within the larger narrative, Jeremiah’s lament anticipates, and perhaps even enables, the possibility of a new future.” See his “Jeremiah’s Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Growth of a Tradition,” in *Jeremiah’s Scriptures* (eds. H. Najman and K. Schmid; JSJSup 173; Leiden: Brill, 2016), 289-306, quote at 291. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. The text is found in 4Q385 2 (ten lines); 4Q386 1; and in 4Q388 8. The discussion here is based on 4Q385. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. For a characterization of allusions, see B. D. Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: ‎ Allusion in Isaiah 40-66* (Stanford: Stanford University Press,‎ [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. For a recent survey of this topic, see chapter 2 of N. Mastnjak*, Deuteronomy and the Emergence of Textual Authority in Jeremiah* (FAT 2. Reihe 87; Tübingen:Mohr Siebeck, 2016). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. On the authoritative nature of the prophets, in the eyes of the Qumran sect, see M. Segal, “Biblical Interpretation - Yes and No,” in: *What is Bible?* (Editor) (Place of publication: Publisher, 2012), 69. Pls add [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. For the characteristics of the existing texts known as *Pseudo-Ezekiel*,see DJD 30: 7-16. Dimant’s fundamental assumption is that no explicit connection exists between sectarian literature and *PsEzek*¸ it is therefore logical to assume that the expectation of the end-time reflected here does not necessarily reflect only sectarian opinions. See D. Dimant, “*Pseudo-Ezekiel* and the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* in Perspective,” in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies* [editors???] (FAT 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 423-40. On Dimant’s work, see K. Davis, *The Cave 4* Apocryphon of Jeremiah *and the Qumran Jeremianic Traditions* (STDJ 111; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 46-59; and F. García Martínez, “The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (eds. F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne; BETL 192; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 163-76; A. Klein, “Resurrection as Reward for the Righteous: The Vision of the Dry Bones in Pseudo-Ezekiel as External Continuation of the Biblical Vision in Ezekiel 37.1-14,” in *‘I Lifted My Eyes and Saw’: Reading Dream and Vision Reports in the Hebrew Bible* (eds. E. R. Hayes and L.-S. Tiemeyer; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014), 208-10. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Three times, all in 4Q385. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Such as בן אדם, “Son of man,” three times in 4Q385 and 4Q386. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. For an evaluation of these manuscripts, see E. Qimron, *The Hebrew Compositions of the Judean Desert Scrolls* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 2013), 2.85-90; M. Brady, “Biblical Interpretation in the ‘Pseudo-Ezekiel’ Fragments (4Q383-391) from Cave Four,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 88-109; M. Zahn, “Prophecy Rewritten: Use of Scriptural Traditions in 4QPseudo-Ezekiel,” *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 5 (2014): 335-67, especially 340-42; Klein, “Resurrection as Reward,” especially 202-208. For ways in which this text was used in early texts, see G. J. Brooke, “Ezekiel in Some Qumran and New Testament Texts,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 18-21, March 1991* (2 vols.; eds. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1.317-37; M. Popović, “Prophet, Books and Texts: Ezekiel, Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Authoritativeness of Ezekiel Traditions in Early Judaism,” in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. M. Popović, JSJSupp 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 227-51 (and see the bibliography there); Klein, “Resurrection as Reward,” 196-220. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. DJD 30, 10. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Teeter differs somewhat from Dimant on the methodological questions concerning the relationship between the Hebrew Bible and extra-biblical interpretation found at Qumran and their implications for understanding the ways in which the texts developed. See, A. Teeter, “The Hebrew Bible and/as Second Temple Literature: Methodological Reflections,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 20, 3 (2013): 349-377. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. See e.g. W. A. [Tooman,](javascript:open_window(%22http://aleph.nli.org.il:80/F/1T2J5MSUNYKXL7CN41KDYR2GV1MT8M9KLYEJ75HGT4C8HF75XF-07255?func=service&doc_number=000501358&line_number=0007&service_type=TAG%22);) “Transformation of Israel’s Hope: The Reuse of Scripture in the Gog Oracles,” in  *[Transforming Visions:](javascript:open_window(%22http://aleph.nli.org.il:80/F/1T2J5MSUNYKXL7CN41KDYR2GV1MT8M9KLYEJ75HGT4C8HF75XF-07261?func=service&doc_number=000501358&line_number=0019&service_type=TAG%22);)**[Transformations of Text, Tradition, and Theology in Ezekiel](javascript:open_window(%22http://aleph.nli.org.il:80/F/1T2J5MSUNYKXL7CN41KDYR2GV1MT8M9KLYEJ75HGT4C8HF75XF-07261?func=service&doc_number=000501358&line_number=0019&service_type=TAG%22);)* [(eds. William A. Tooman and Michael A. Lyons; Eugene: Pickwick, 2010](javascript:open_window(%22http://aleph.nli.org.il:80/F/1T2J5MSUNYKXL7CN41KDYR2GV1MT8M9KLYEJ75HGT4C8HF75XF-07261?func=service&doc_number=000501358&line_number=0019&service_type=TAG%22);)), 85-110. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
15. Note that this manuscript includes a Greek translation (Chester-Beatty-Scheide, 967), which dates to the second or third century CE, and an early Latin translation, Vetus Latina, found in the sixth- century Old Latin manuscript Codex Wirceburgensis. The absence of Ezek 36:23c–38 sparked a comprehensive discussion of Ezekiel 36-39 as found in the MT in comparison to the translations; see E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3d rev. and exp. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 299-301; J. Lust, “Ezekiel 36-40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript,” *CBQ* 43 (1981): 517-33; A. S. Crane, *Israel’s Restoration: A Textual-Comparative Exploration of Ezekiel 36-39* (VTSupp 122; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 62-86, 207-64; I. E. Lilly, *Two Books of Ezekiel: Papyrus 967 and the Masoretic Text as Variant Literary Editions* (VTSupp 150; Leiden: Brill, 2012). [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
16. See A. L. A. Hogeterp, “Resurrection and Biblical Tradition: Pseudo-Ezekiel Reconsidered,” *Biblica* 89 (2008): 59-69. Regarding the status of these texts during the Second Temple period, see Popović, “Prophet, Books and Texts,” 227-51. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
17. Klein, “Resurrection as Reward,” 219. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
18. Although I agree with Dimant and others who conclude that 4Q385 was a separate composition, it seems to me that the thematic role of the changes incorporated in the text remains relevant even if the text was intended as an expansion of Ezekiel as a literary work. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
19. Current research points to evidence that the text of Ezekiel existed in several forms and suggests that it may have been revised at least once to recalibrate or adjust aspects of Ezekiel’s apocalyptic perspective. See: Lilly, *Two Books of Ezekiel*, 112-115 and Popović, “Prophet, Books and Texts,” 227-51, among others. This question cannot be properly addressed on the basis of the one fragment discussed here. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
20. Zahn, “Prophecy Rewritten,” 335-67. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
21. It is for this reason that *PsEzek* is best understood as a “postbiblical” text, corresponding with the MT text of Ezekiel 37 and not as drawing on its latest supplementation. See ibid., 363. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
22. On the criteria for categorizing such texts, see M. Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 10-28, as well as the bibliographical references there. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
23. See DJD 30, 34. Such an expectation appears in an additional fragment that mentions Ezekiel by name. See 4Q385 4:2-4 (Qimron, *Hebrew Compositions,* 87). A similar question מתי תקבצם is found in 4Q386 1 ii 3. Although only a few fragments have been preserved, they reflect a concrete expectation of the people’s redemption. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
24. M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21-37: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 22a; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 747. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
25. Prophecies and visions of Ezekiel were found in four of the Qumran manuscripts. There is overlapping text in three of them (4Q385, 4Q386, 4Q388); of these the largest manuscript is 4Q385. As presented here, the Hebrew text is taken from Qimron, *Hebrew Compositions*, 2.85, and see the discussion there regarding the combination of the two manuscripts. This text is based on new readings of new photographs. Some scholars also link 4Q387 and 4Q391 to sections of Ezekiel; see Qimron, *Hebrew Compositions*, 90. Since the extant material does not exhibit substantial differences, I have chosen to address the text that preserves the most detail. The English translation is mine, based on existing translations, e.g., DJD 30, 23-24. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
26. MT Ezek as the basis for comparison- DJD 2013? }This needs to be completed.} [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
27. *וידבקו* is a new reading, which can be seen in photo 40.615, and is more accurate than the alternative suggestions. See Qimron, *Hebrew Compositions,* 2.85. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
28. It should be noted that the verses Ezekiel 37:4 7, 9, 10 also have parallels in p 976. Although these variants "arguably reflect two variant Hebrew texts for the Greek tradition," the following comparison will be based on the Masoretic Text. See Lilly, *Two Books of Ezekiel*, 115. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
29. Zahn, “Prophecy Rewritten,” 344-50. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
30. Ibid., 360. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
31. The parallels cited by Dimant in DJD 30, 23-29 are indicated in the following notes.

    Tooman has addressed the signs of deliberate literary borrowing: uniqueness or rarity, multiplicity, and thematic correspondence. The scriptural reuse identified here (aside from Ezekiel 37:1-14) follows these principles. See W. A. Tooman, “Between Imitation and Interpretation: Reuse of Scripture and Composition in Hodayot (1QHa) 11:6-19,” *DSD* 18 (2011): 54-73. On the form of Ezekiel alluded to by *PsEzek*, see Zahn, “Prophecy Rewritten,” along with her extensive bibliography. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
32. Dimant connects the phrase "ואלה מתי יהיו" to Daniel 8:13, 12. {12:?}(ibid., 25). [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
33. Dimant connects the word "והיככה" to Song of Songs 5:3 and Esther 8:6 (ibid., 25). [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
34. Dimant connects the phrase "את בני ישראל" after the active form of "אראה" with Genesis 41:28 and Ezekiel 40:4 (ibid., 25). [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
35. Dimant notes that the phrase "וידעו כי אני ה'" is characteristic of the style of biblical Ezekiel (ibid., 24, comments, line 1, and 26, line 4). [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
36. Dimant connects this line to Ezekiel 37:4 (ibid., 26). [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
37. Dimant connects the word "ויקרמו" to Ezekiel 37:6,8. (ibid., 27). [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
38. Dinant connects the phrase "ארבע רוחות" together with the word "שמים" to Zechariah 2:10; Daniel 8:8; 11:4 (ibid., 27) [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
39. Dimant connects the phrase "עם רב אנשים" with Ezekiel 37:10 (ibid., 28) [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
40. Although this line does not have biblical parallels it should be noted that elements from this line appear in p967 and perhaps provide additional evidence for this tradition {what tradition}See: Lilly, *Two Books of Ezekiel*, 115. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
41. Dimant connects line 10 to the following prophetic unit in Ezekiel, verses 16-20 (ibid., 29). [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
42. The root גא"ל appears once in Ezekiel, in the description of the exiles surrounding Ezekiel in Babylon (!): “Son of Man, your brothers, the people of גאלתך” (11:15). [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
43. The comparison to Isaiah 49:7 was noted by Dimant (ibid., 24). [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
44. גא"ל occurs 20 times in the prophecies in Isaiah 40-66, in Jeremiah twice (31:11; 50:34), but never in Ezekiel. Concerning unique topics which appear in Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah but are not found in Ezekiel or Jeremiah, see K. Schmid and O. H. Steck, “Restoration Expectations in the Prophetic Tradition of the Old Testament,” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed. J. M. Scott; JSJSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 41-81. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
45. See B. J. Schwartz, “Ezekiel's Dim View of Israel's Restoration,” in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives* (eds. M. S. Odell and J. T. Strong; Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 43-67; idem, “The Ultimate Aim of Israel's Restoration in Ezekiel,” in *Birkat Shalom: Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature, and Postbiblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul* (2 vols.; ed. C. Cohen et al.; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008), 1.305-19. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
46. Regarding the phrase "לתת להם הברית", Dimant cites the Torah literature: Genesis, Exodus and Numbers 25:12 (ibid., 24). However, it seems to me that its context within the book helps us to understand its meaning within the text. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
47. In Ezek 17, the violation of the covenant is attributed to the Israelites, as well as to the kings of Judah, with the text emphasizing that the covenant that was created (v. 13), and was supposed to be kept (v. 14), was violated on four occasions (vv. 15, 16, 18, 19). The idea of a divine-Israelite covenant may reflect a tradition derived from Jer 31:31-34, which turns up in different forms elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
48. The severity of this action is presented in the next verse, the only example in which the word *קדש* appears to describe the severity of the people’s actions which have brought the desecration of the Temple: וְלֹ֥א שְׁמַרְתֶּ֖ם מִשְׁמֶ֣רֶת קָדָשָׁ֑י וַתְּשִׂימ֗וּן לְשֹׁמְרֵ֧י מִשְׁמַרְתִּ֛י בְּמִקְדָּשִׁ֖י לָכֶֽם (44:8). [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
49. Dimant connects the phrase "רבים מישראל"to Esther 8:17, Daniel 12:2 and Ezra 3:12 and the word רבים"” to Malachi 2:6, 8 (ibid., 24). [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
50. Dimant has already noted the connection to Psalms 5:12, 119:132 (ibid., 25).

    For a terminological discussion of Ezekiel’s restoration prophecies, see T. Ganzel, "Ezekiel’s Restoration Oracles: A Terminological Consideration," *Beit Mikra* 58 (2013): 62-74 [Hebrew]. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
51. It appears multiple times, however, in Jeremiah 2:2; 31:20; 32:18; 33:11. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
52. In Ps 62:13 חסד describes God and Israel. The combination שלם+חסד in reference to Israel is found only in Jeremiah 32:18. In this verse however, God shows kindness but also visits the guilt of fathers on their children; no connection can therefore be drawn between the appearances of these two terms in the verse.Dimant similarly connects the word "חסד" here to Isaiah 55:3, Nehemiah 13:14, and Chronicles 32:32. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
53. The presumption here is that when the text differs from the biblical Ezekiel, the author is alluding to other prophetic literature. We cannot however be certain that these allusions were intended or that the author of *PsEzek* was actually drawing on these texts specifically. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
54. For a discussion of this allusion, see Dimant, DJD 30, 28-29. She suggests that it may stand as a symbol for death and resurrection. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
55. See Schwartz, “Ezekiel's Dim View of Israel's Restoration,” 43-67. According to Schwartz, even the few favorable, optimistic verses found in Ezekiel constitute a negligible minority and are most likely later additions. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
56. See: Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21-37*, 742-743: "God's question about the reanimation of the bones highlights its improbability." [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
57. For the continuing discussion of resurrection (among other topics), see [J. D.](javascript:open_window(%22http://aleph.nli.org.il:80/F/TLD47X38JD71A7PTTYGGAX1I5KGKHFADM76DQ6UULCL9A3HD6T-06893?func=service&doc_number=002522045&line_number=0018&service_type=TAG%22);) Levenson, [*Resurrection and the Restoration of Israel:‎ The Ultimate Victory of the God of Life*‎](javascript:open_window(%22http://aleph.nli.org.il:80/F/TLD47X38JD71A7PTTYGGAX1I5KGKHFADM76DQ6UULCL9A3HD6T-06894?func=service&doc_number=002522045&line_number=0019&service_type=TAG%22);) (New Haven:‎ [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
58. Dimant, DJD 30, 11. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
59. Regarding specific phrases, Zahn suggests that the language and imagery “were simply what came to mind naturally for a Second Temple author composing a ‘scriptural’ prophecy.’” See Zahn, “Prophecy Rewritten,” 361. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
60. See Schwartz, “Ezekiel's Dim View of Israel's Restoration,” 43-67; quote at 67. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
61. See, for example, the commentaries of M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20: A New Translation With Introduction and Commentary* (AB 22a; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 11-17; D. I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel Chapters 1-24* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 1-23. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
62. Regarding the possible influences of Ezekiel’s location in exile on the content of his prophecies, see D. L. Smith-Christopher, *A Biblical Theology of Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 75-104. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
63. See note 7. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
64. S. N. Bunta, “In Heaven or on Earth: A Misplaced Temple Question about Ezekiel’s Visions,” in *With Letters of Light: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Early Jewish Apocalypticism, Magic, and Mysticism in Honor of Rachel Elior* (eds. D. V. Arbel and A. A. Orlov; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 28-44; Brooke, “Ezekiel in Some Qumran and New Testament Texts,” 1.317-37. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
65. Davis noted a similar tendency in his *The Cave 4* Apocryphon of Jeremiah, 227-33. [↑](#footnote-ref-69)