

anticipation of 'all men' being drawn to Jesus when he is lifted up. In brief, the Gentiles did not know Christ in the flesh, but they are the heirs of the Kingdom of the Spirit which begins with his death.

In conclusion it is worth noting that this close connexion between the death of Jesus, the rejection of the Jews, and the admission of the Gentiles, was perhaps an important factor in the development of the idea of an Atonement. If the veil is done away in Christ at His death, and the Gentiles, being sinners, are thereby reconciled and made heirs of the Kingdom, then the death itself must have had an atoning efficacy. And have we not here a possible explanation of St Paul's anxiety in his Epistle to the Romans to prove that the Jews, not less than the Gentiles, were all 'under sin', and were 'justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus'?

M. KIDDLE.

EZEKIEL'S DENUNCIATION OF TYRE (EZEK. xxvi-xxviii)

R. KRAETZSCHMAR (*Handkommentar z. A. T.*, EZECHIEL, Göttingen, 1900, page 203) notices apparently with surprise the fullness of detail with which Ezekiel's prediction of the fall of Tyre is given. Israel, he says, never had much to do with Tyre, 'except perhaps commercially', why then this exceptional fullness of treatment? He replies that Tyre is now being besieged, as was Jerusalem shortly before, and that Israel looks eagerly and jealously for a much worse fate than that of Jerusalem to overtake Israel's enemy. Ezekiel (says Kraetzschmar) proves himself in his discourse to be a true son of his own people. The prophet is accused of a perverted patriotism.

Surely this account of the matter is seriously incomplete. In the first place, though our scanty records tell us little, it is certain that Israel felt the pressure of Tyre on her border very keenly for hundreds of years. The inhabitants of Tyre, known under the general designation of 'Zidonians', were by no means quiet neighbours. In Judges iii 3 the Zidonians are mentioned along with the Canaanites and the Philistines and other peoples as rivals who were to 'prove' Israel. So again in Ezek. xxviii 24 'Zidon' is regarded as 'a pricking brier' and 'a grieving thorn' in the side of the house of Israel. The words call up a vision of the formidable cactus hedges which bound the fields in Western Palestine. Thus with hostile front did the Phoenician cities cut off Israel from the sea and straiten her upon her western border.

A more serious criticism of Kraetzschmar is that he has failed to notice the opposition on the religious side which Tyre must have

called forth from JEHOVAH's prophet. Kraetzschmar is content to accept the *Schadenfreude* (malicious pleasure) of Tyre over the fall of Jerusalem as the sufficient and only cause of Ezekiel's indignation against the Phoenician city (xxvi 2, 3). But the prophet himself mentions a second cause and one which must have weighed equally with him in delivering his scathing philippic. Tyre was a rival to Jerusalem in respect of its Temple and of its god: it was a case of altar against altar and of Baal against JEHOVAH (xxviii 1-19). As early as 1903 Professor Bevan pointed out (*J.T.S.* iv 500-505) that the Tyrian temple was probably the prototype of the Solomonic: indeed we find that Ezekiel can hardly refer to the Tyrian sanctuary without using language which applies equally well to the temple of Jerusalem. *Imprimis* the king of Tyre has like Solomon (1 Kings iii 4; viii 5, 22, 54 f.) a priestly character. He was probably a priest-king.¹

Through his priestly character the king has 'come to be' (a literal rendering of the Hebrew) in the Tyrian temple, which Ezekiel describes as 'Eden the garden of God'. The connexion between temple and garden is quite obvious to the Eastern mind. A 'temple' in the ancient East was not a building but a sacred enclosure round a (small) shrine. The earliest Semitic sanctuaries were gardens planted in oases where the unexpected fertility of the soil suggested to the Semite the presence of a beneficent deity.² The Solomonic temple preserved the memory of Eden the garden-sanctuary, for its walls were adorned with figures of guardian Cherubim (cf. Gen. iii 24), palm-trees, and flowers (1 Kings vi 29, 32).

An ancient sanctuary was protected against profanation by an enclosing wall: to this Ezekiel (xxviii 13) alludes in the words, 'Of every precious stone was thy defence', *not*, as EV, 'thy covering'.³ But the prophet goes beyond this general statement: he specifies nine varieties of precious stones. As we scan them we note a striking fact: they are identical with the nine varieties which formed the first, second, and fourth rows of the jewels carried on the breastplate (עֶפֶד) of the Aaronic high priest (Exod. xxviii 17 ff; xxxix 10 ff.). The stones of

¹ Ithobaal, the Ethbaal of 1 Kings xvi. 31, was priest of Astarte (Josephus, *contra Apionem*, i. 18). On a sarcophagus of *circa* 300 B.C. a certain Tebneith describes himself as 'Priest of Astarte and king of the Zidonians son of Eshmunazar priest of Astarte and king of the Zidonians'. Tehneith and his father are priests first, and kings secondly. Tebneith and Eshmunazar were kings of Zidon, but it is unlikely that Zidon differed much in polity from her younger sister Tyre.

² *J. T. S.* iv. 503.

³ מַסְכַּתְךָ, 'thy defence' is akin to סִבְתְּךָ (Gen. xxxiii 17) a *sariba*, a fence of thorn, constructed for the defence of cattle; cf. Job i 10, הֲלֹא עָשִׂיתִי, 'Thou hast made a hedge about him'.

the third row are not represented in Ezekiel's list according to the M.T., though they appear in the LXX. Whichever text we adopt we cannot doubt that Ezekiel sees a connexion between the protecting breastplate of Exodus and the protecting wall of the Tyrian temple. That the wall is said to be built of different kinds of precious stones is of course an instance of hyperbole, but the description has parallels in Hebraic writings, e.g. Isa. liv 11 f., 'I will lay . . . thy foundations with sapphires. And I will make thy pinnacles of rubies, and thy gates of carbuncles': cf. Rev. xxi 18-21. Further, in xxviii 13 Ezekiel says that the Tyrian king came to be in Eden the *garden* of God; in v. 14 that the king came to be in the *holy mount* of God. This second phrase suggests another parallel between the temple on the Tyrian cliff and the Jewish temple on Mount Zion. Is then the prophet of JEHOVAH equating Solomon's temple with a heathen sanctuary?

Surely we must accept a very different conclusion: *The Tyrian temple, the prototype of Solomon's temple, is not* reckoned by Ezekiel in its origin as heathen, nor the priest-king as an idolater. The king being full of wisdom and perfect in beauty (Ezek. xxviii 12), was created to be in the garden of God on the holy mountain of God; he was anointed to be the guardian cherub of the place, but through pride in his prosperity and a misuse of his wisdom he sinned, and for punishment was by divine decree cast out of the holy mount (xxviii 15-17).

The priest-king was cast out of the mount of God as one polluted, and the sanctuary which he was given to guard was involved in his pollution; the Tyrian temple fell from its former state of purity. 'Thou hast polluted thy sanctuaries' (מקדשך, τὰ ἱερά σου: xxviii. 18), the prophet cries against the guardian cherub. The reference is no doubt to the idolatry practised there. So a second ground for Ezekiel's philippic against Tyre is his belief that the Tyrian temple (which at one time served as a pattern when the Jerusalem temple was being built) has now become a seat of idolatry, a reproach to the younger sanctuary. And its priest-king, who was once (like Adam) in a state of primal innocence (xxviii 15), has now fallen from his high estate through pride.

But Ezekiel has another count, in his indictment of Tyre: Tyre has grown rich by traffic, and has incurred the guilt which belongs to the trafficker. The attitude of the prophets towards wealth is of great interest. They draw a sharp line of distinction between two kinds of wealth. On the one hand there is pastoral and agricultural wealth: the increase of this wealth is due to the blessing of God; those who have it, have it as a reward; it is an honourable possession. No prophet would condemn it. But it is otherwise with wealth gained by buying and selling; in the language of Isa. xxiii 15-18 it is 'the hire

of a harlot'—Tyre being the harlot for her commerce with the nations. Such wealth is not to pass into other hands: it is an 'accursed thing': like the spoil of Jericho it must be dedicated to JEHOVAH (קדש ליהוה).

The earnestness of Ezekiel's denunciation of Tyre is due to the fact that Tyre was outstanding as a merchant city and moreover she was Israel's near neighbour. (Babylon perhaps was the only city within Israel's purview to be compared with Tyre for eminence as a centre of trade.) So completely indeed has Tyre been accepted by the prophets as the type of a city of traffickers that she has given the name of her sea-coast (כנען, 'Canaan') to be used as a common noun with the sense of 'traffic' or 'trafficker(s)'. So in Ezek. xvi 29 Chaldea herself is described as a 'land of traffic' (R.V. marg., כנען). In Hosea xii 8 (7, E.V.) Israel is denounced in the words, 'He is a trafficker (כנען); the balances of deceit are in his hand;' and in Zech. xiv 21 it is said, 'There shall be no more a Canaanite (R.V. marg. "a trafficker") in the house of JEHOVAH.' It is indeed to be noticed that the prophets are as uncompromising in denouncing Israel herself for the wealth she has acquired by foreign trade. So in Isa. ii 6 ff. the prophet complains that his country is filled¹ from the East—that his people strike hands (make bargains) with strangers—and that their land is full of silver and gold (unnatural wealth!).

There is a further point of religious significance in Ezekiel's indictment. The prophet notes that the possession of special wealth and the sense of power which has accompanied it has filled the prince of Tyre with arrogance unbefitting a mortal man. The strong position of the island fortress 'in the heart of the seas' has confirmed the prince in his arrogance: he cries aloud, 'I am a god (אל, "a strong one"), I sit in the seat of God, in the heart of the seas' (xxviii 2). The prince of Tyre, a potentate self-made by his riches, is a god to himself.

If we ask once more, Why should Ezekiel in Chaldea devote so much attention to the fate of Tyre? an answer can be found. The prophet's heart was in the land from which he had been led captive. But in the land of Chaldea he had become aware of the attraction which the wealthy merchant city of Babylon and the splendid temple of Marduk had for many of his fellow captives. He saw them drawn away from JEHOVAH and towards idolatry (Ezek. xiv 1-3). So if Tyre should triumph over her Chaldean besiegers, he feared lest the Tyrian Baal and the glorious temple of Melkart (Heracles) should cast a similar spell over the poor depressed remnant of his people left behind in Palestine. It was not an idle fear, as the reign of Ahab had proved.

¹ RV adds 'with customs', but the addition limits the sense of the passage unduly.

In any case Tyre was too near a neighbour to be ignored, nor could a prophet of JEHOVAH forget the powerful influence she might exert upon Israel in the cause of another god whom a Christian prophet would call 'Mammon'.
W. EMERY BARNES.

EZEKIEL II 6: 'SITTING UPON SCORPIONS'

Early one morning in the summer of 1919, while I was billeted in a camp on Mt. Carmel, I heard a cry in the neighbouring hut and ran to see what had happened: the occupant, while taking his bath, had sat upon a scorpion which had taken refuge from the water on his sponge and had revenged itself for the indignity by stinging him! This is exactly the danger of which Ezekiel is warned when the Lord says to him אָל (= על) עֲקָרְבַיִם אָתָּה יֹשֵׁב 'thou art sitting on scorpions'; but the English translators, unfortunately following the LXX, have substituted 'thou dost dwell among scorpions' for the true translation. In the original text the *ductus litterarum* is overwhelmingly against the change of אל into בתוך, while in the English translation sense is turned into nonsense. In the East every one lives amongst scorpions, which with other animals are an ever-present pest; the danger which every one wishes to avoid is sitting on them.¹

So much for the scorpions: but what of the 'briers and thorns'? It cannot be supposed with the Revisers that אֲתָּה (= אֲתָּה) פִּי סְרָבִים וְסַלְיָנִים אֲתָּה means 'though briers and thorns be with thee'; for this both involves an ugly mixture of metaphors when taken with the clause just discussed and rests on dubious philology. The first word סְרָב is unique in the Old Testament, and there is no support in any Semitic language for the rendering given above; the root however occurs twice in the Wisdom of Sirach, the verb in (sic) הִכְנַע אֱלֹהִים וְאֵל הָאֵל 'bicker not² with God, but submit thyself unto God'³ and the noun in אִישׁ כֹּרֵשׁ 'a man who stumbles is tripped' (literally 'is snared') 'by everything, (being) refractory(?) and desperate'.⁴ In both passages the text is uncertain and the Greek seems to diverge from the Hebrew; but the Aram. סָרִיב 'refused' 'was disobedient'⁵ and the Syr. ܣܪܒܐ 'reviled' 'rebelled' (cp. ܣܪܒܐ 'reviler' 'babblers', ܣܪܒܐ 're-

¹ A similar danger in the East is that of leaning a hand carelessly on a wall and having it bitten by a snake hidden in a crevice (Am. v. 19). In England the danger is different; there every one tries not to sit on the cat as it dozes in its favourite arm-chair!

² Gk. μὴ ἀντίλεγε in the version of the author's grandson.

³ Ecclus. iv 25.

⁴ *Ibid.* xli 2.

⁵ *Levy Chald. Wtb.* ii 186.