Dalit Rom-Shiloni[1]

Ezekiel and Jeremiah: What Might Stand Behind the Silence?

This paper brings up a long standing question in the study of Ezekiel and his (or, the book's) relationship to Jeremiah. The silence between the prophets is but a key opening the door to a large hall filled with a great variety of historical and literary-textual connections. Having reexamined the long list of suggested parallel phrases and passages (from R. Smend [1880] to R. Kasher [2004]) from the methodological standpoint of intertextuality and allusion, the study reveals the complicated relationships between the books in their different layers. Beyond points of agreement, one profound issue of disagreement is highlighted, which leads to the suggestion that the silence between Ezekiel and Jeremiah covers over a great ideological disagreement between the two contemporary prophets of YHWH. Hence, the silence between the prophets and their books is a highly eloquent one.

A hypothetical scenario: if Jeremiah had arrived in Babylon after 586 B.C. E., would he be included among those whom Ezekiel had designated as the פלטה, those survivors taken out of Jerusalem after its final destruction: those who were to serve as object lessons to the Jehoiachin Exiles, those whose very appearance and "ways" would show why God had had to destroy Jerusalem, and so cause them to be consoled (Ezek 14:21–23)?

Ezekiel and Jeremiah are the two major prophets of the years before and after Judah's destruction and at the beginning of the Babylonian exile. Yet neither refers to the other, either by name or obliquely, through explicit responses to the other's claims. This paper starts by laying out the problems concerning the possible relationships between the two prophets themselves and between their books, and aims at examining the different textual connections between the books. The discussion concludes by narrowing down major topics of agreement while focusing on one specific topic of disagreement in a multi-layered conceptual framework that I believe allows us to suggest possible solutions to the enigma of the loud silence.

I. Specifying the Problem

At face value, there would seem to be no problem with the silence maintained between the two prophets. Throughout the prophetic literature, the extremely individualistic nature of the prophetic role seems to work against explicit communication between prophets. To illustrate this well-known phenomenon, suffice it to mention Haggai and Zechariah, who according to Ezra 5:1; 6:14 both participated in the reconstruction of the Second Temple. The date formulae in Haggai and Zechariah clarify that the prophets were active in Yehud within approximately the same months of the second year of Darius (520 B.C.E.), though in their extant writings they never refer to each other.[2]

There is another way in which looking at Haggai and Zechariah may shed light on Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Haggai, and even more so Zechariah, have long been acknowledged as relying on "the former prophets" (Zech 1:4; 7:12). Although they do not name those to whom they refer, they each allude to specific prophecies (mainly those of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah), or utilize in their own prophecies prophetic patterns and genres found in these predecessors.[3] Furthermore, this allusive character of both Haggai's and Zechariah's prophetic writing is not restricted to isolated prophetic traditions; they also appear to bring together multiple texts from diverse sources within biblical literature.[4] This allusive usage of biblical literature formulates theological and ideological deliberations between each of the prophets and their contemporaries. The option of a shared discourse

---

2 Of Haggai's nearly three months of prophetic activity, from the sixth month to the ninth, see Hag 1:1, 15; 2:1, 10, 19. Zechariah's first prophecy is dated to the eighth month (Zech 1:1; and then 1:7; 7:1). As another example one may look at the different attitudes toward the Temple in Haggai as opposed to Isaiah 66. See E. Assis, "The Temple in the Book of Haggai," *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 8 (2008): 5 n. 9.

3 What started as a great fallacy of Haggai and Zechariah, each of whom 19th and 20th century scholarship regarded as mere imitators, has turned out in the last few decades to be one of their strengths, thanks to the studies of R.A. Mason, *The Books of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977); J.E. Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation in Haggai and Zechariah* (JSOTSup. 150; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993); R. Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue: Inner-Biblical Allusions in Zechariah 1–8 and 9–14* (Abo: Abo Akademis Förlag, 1996); M.J. Boda, "Zechariah: Master Mason or Penitential Prophet," in *Yahwism after Exile: Perspectives on Israelite Religion in the Persian Era* (ed. R. Albertz and B. Becking; Studies in Theology and Religion 5; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2003), 49–69; idem, *Haggai, Zechariah* (NIV Application Commentary Series; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004); and for Haggai, see J. Kessler, *The Book of Haggai: Prophecy and Society in Early Persian Yehud* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

4 See M.R. Stead (*The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8* [LHB/OTS 506; New York: T & T Clark, 2009]), who finds the reuse of "multiple sources" to be one of the main characteristics of Zechariah's writing.

by the early six century in both Jerusalem and Babylon is intriguing. Accordingly, might intertextual literary relationships between Ezekiel and Jeremiah (and other textual references they evoke in general) be the keys to revealing possible connections between the prophets and their followers?

The expectation that some kind of contact existed between Ezekiel and Jeremiah is based on the following indications:

A. Each of them recognizes their time as a period of intensive prophetic activity, marked by fierce polemics over both status and message (Jer 14:13–16; 23:9–40; 27–29; Ezek 13). Jeremiah mentions by name some prophets who were active in Babylon (Jer 29:21, 24) yet says nothing about that one prophet, Ezekiel. Is it reading too much into the text to wonder whether, when he quotes the Jehoiachin Exiles' saying: הקים לנו יהוה נבאים בבלה "The LORD has raised up prophets for us in Babylon" (Jer 29:15), Jeremiah is referring obliquely to (and putting down) Ezekiel?[5] Indeed, according to Ezekiel's own call narrative, he was called to his prophetic mission on the Kebar River in Babylon (Ezek 1:1).

B. Jeremiah and Ezekiel have quite similar personal backgrounds, as members of priestly families commissioned to prophesy (Ezek 1:3; Jer 1:1). Scholars have noted the differences in their descent, and even claimed a rivalry between their priestly families, since Ezekiel was of Jerusalemite, perhaps even of Zadokite, origin and Jeremiah was of the priests of Anatoth (Jer 1:1), who are said to have descended from Abiathar.[6] Whatever the relations between their clans, we may assume some basic resemblance in their education and in their intellectual and spiritual formation.[7]

---

5 For the polemic tone of this quotation, see W.L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 2* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 143; J.R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21–37* (AB 21B; New York: Doubleday, 2004), 355.

6 J. Scharbert, "Würdigung der Prophetie Jeremias und Ezechiels," in *Die Propheten Israels um 600 v. Chr* (Köln: J. P. Bachem, 1967), 459–478, esp. 466–469; C.T. Begg, "The Non-Mention of Ezekiel in Deuteronomistic History, the Book of Jeremiah, and the Chronistic History," in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation* (ed. J. Lust, BETL 74; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986), 340–343. D.I. Block (*Ezekiel 1–24* [NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 9 n. 3) mentions this biographical detail; and see his treatment (pp. 290–291) of the information about Yaazaniah son of Shafan (Ezek 8:11), one of Jeremiah's great supporters in Jerusalem (Jer 26:24; 39:14; 29:3; 36:10–12), whom Ezekiel mentions as one of the leaders of Jerusalem's abominable cultic behavior. Block finds this mention to specify this one sinful exclusion of that pious and devoted family of Jeremiah's supporters. But could Block's perspective be understood here as harmonizing?

7 Thus R. Kasher, *Ezekiel 1–24* (Mikra LeIsrael; Tel Aviv: Am Oved; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2004), 47.

C. The likelihood of connection between the prophets may also stem from the socio-political situation of the Judean communities from the early sixth century B.C.E. and onwards. Both Jeremiah and Ezekiel express in their individual prophecies the highly tense and even hostile relationship between the two Judean communities, the community left behind in Jerusalem and the Jehoiachin Exiles in Babylon (Jer 22:24–30; 32:6–15; Ezek 11:1–13, 14–21; 33:23–29).

Both this personal data and the antagonism between the communities in Babylon and Jerusalem suggest the strong possibility that Jeremiah and Ezekiel would not only have known of each other by name, but also would have been aware of each other's prophetic activity. If so, what are we to make of the silence of each in relation to the other? I want to propose that we investigate this silence itself as another datum in the struggle between the two Judean communities, in Babylon and in Judah, a conflict that we can trace back to the prophets themselves and follow on through the editorial strands of their books.[8]

Specifying the significance of the prophets' silence in this way suggests that the relation between them should be addressed at the historical, sociological, and literary levels.

The most basic questions that address the historical context of these prophetic personages are: Did Ezekiel know Jeremiah? Did he hear him or read his prophecies in Jerusalem prior to 598 B.C.E.? Did he come to read his scrolls only when Ezekiel arrived in Babylon?[9]

On the sociological level, studying the two books brings to the fore two independent struggles in which both prophets may be said to participate. First, both are in conflict with opponents, whom they treat as false prophets (Jer 23:9–40; 27–29; Ezek 13, etc.). On this first struggle, Jeremiah and Ezekiel seem to take similar positions, and thus could have been important

---

8 On Ezekiel's central role in this struggle see my earlier discussions: D. Rom-Shiloni, "Ezekiel as the Voice of the Exiles and Constructor of Exilic Ideology," *HUCA* 76 (2005): 1–45; idem, "Exiles and Those Who Remained: Strategies of Exclusivity in the Early Sixth Century BCE," in *Shai le-Sara Japhet: Studies in the Bible, its Exegesis and its Language* (ed. M. Bar Asher, D. Rom-Shiloni, E. Tov, N. Wazana; Jerusalem: Bialik, 2007), 119–138 (in Hebrew). I have addressed the complicated picture in Jeremiah in idem, "Group-Identities in Jeremiah: Is It the Persian Period Conflict?" in *A Palimpsest: Rhetoric, Stylistics, and Language in Biblical Texts from the Persian and Hellenistic Periods* (ed. E. Ben-Zvi, D. Edelman and F. Polak; PHSC 5; Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias, 2009), 11–46.

9 On this historical angle, see further below; and W.L. Holladay, "Had Ezekiel Known Jeremiah Personally?" *CBQ* 63 (2001): 31–34. Another question on the same page may be addressed from the opposite direction: Did Jeremiah know of Ezekiel, commissioned to prophecy only five years after his deportation? This paper, however, focuses on Ezekiel and his book. Nevertheless, attention is given to literary connections between the editorial strands of both Jeremiah and Ezekiel. See below.

supports for one another. Still, they keep silent.[10] But, a second internal conflict of this era, which runs through both prophetic books, is that between the Jehoiachin/Babylonian Exiles and Those Who Remained in Judah. This bitter conflict finds the two prophets on different sides of the divide.

Finally, in the literary sphere, questions arise that take into consideration the multiple layers of composition within each of the books. Thus, did Ezekiel know a written form of the prophecies of Jeremiah? If so, what might it have contained? Or since each of the prophetic books had gone through procedures of compilation and editorial stages, is Ezekiel only aware of an edited form of Jeremiah, already containing some editorial layers? Alternatively, or in addition, could there be a later connection between the editorial level(s) of Jeremiah and those of the book of Ezekiel? And are the seeming connections between the historical prophets in fact purely literary ones crafted by the circles of their followers and tradents?

The question set forth in this paper: "What might stand behind the silence?" brings us, therefore, to face core issues in the study of these two books. To limit my exploration, I am interested in our ability to explain this silence through an examination of the textual and literary connections between Ezekiel and Jeremiah.

II. Ezekiel and Jeremiah: Scholarly Observations

Acknowledging the silence between the prophets, scholars of both Jeremiah and Ezekiel have attended to this issue, drawing implicit connections between the prophets and their books through verbal similarities, resemblances in imagery, and shared themes and conceptions. For the sake of this study, I have examined the full list of suggestions raised by R. Smend (1880), G. Fohrer (1952), J.W. Miller (1955), W. Zimmerli (1979), W.L. Holladay (1989), and R. Kasher (2004).[11] While this examination is cer-

---

10 H. Leene, "Blowing the Same Shofar: An Intertextual Comparison of Representations of the Prophetic Role in Jeremiah and Ezekiel," in *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as a Historical Person, Literary Character and Anonymous Artist* (ed. J.C. DeMoor; OTS 45; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 175–198. Leene suggested a correlation of Jeremiah to Ezekiel (and not vice versa). See below, p. 10.

11 R. Smend, *Der Prophet Ezechiel* (2d ed.; Leipzig: Hirzel, 1880), xxiv; G. Fohrer, *Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel* (BZAW 72; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1952), 135–140; J.W. Miller, *Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels Sprachlich und Theologisch Untersucht, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Prosareden Jeremias* (Assen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereiens Neukirchen Kreis Moers, 1955); W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1* (trans. R.E. Clements; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979; German original, 1969), 44; Holladay,

tainly not exhaustive, and may be supplemented by other commentaries and studies,[12] I believe it gives a representative overview, which thus allows a reevaluation of the data.[13] But before discussing some examples of the literary connections, it is worthwhile to summarize these scholars' understandings of the relationship between Ezekiel and Jeremiah.

In his commentary on Ezekiel, Smend (1880) pointed out the great influence of "other prophetic scriptures" (Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Zephaniah) on Ezekiel, but he considered that the greatest influence of all comes from Jeremiah. Thus, Smend presented a long list of over sixty parallel passages in Ezekiel and in Jeremiah.

Fohrer (1952), addressing the major problems of the book of Ezekiel, discussed the relationships between the two prophets, arguing that Ezekiel is clearly influenced by, and mostly dependent upon, Jeremiah. But when it came to discussing specific passages, Fohrer put forward thirty cases divided into three groups: in eighteen cases he found no connection whatsoever between the Ezekiel passage and the Jeremian parallel;[14] in six cases Fohrer accepted the possibility that Ezekiel knew some ideas similar to those of Jeremiah, though the verbal similarities were few;[15] in an additional six cases Fohrer found a literal dependence of Ezekiel upon Jeremiah, and thus assumed that Ezekiel must have had these passages in writing.[16] Based on this data, Fohrer concluded that Ezekiel had heard Jeremiah's prophecy back in Jerusalem prior to 598 B.C.E., and was highly influenced by his thought. He knew some of Jeremiah's prophecy by memory, but in other cases, according to Fohrer, Ezekiel must have had a written form of Jeremian prophecies. His literary dependence on Jeremiah was thus restricted to this early stage in Jeremiah's prophetic career.[17]

Jeremiah 2, 81–84; Kasher, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 47–54. The full data on possible parallels between the books is tabulated in this article's appendix, which may be reached at http://humanities.tau.ac.il/segel/dromshil.html.

12 Sporadic comments in the appendix refer to D.I. Block, *Ezekiel 1–24* and *Ezekiel 25–48* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); H. Leene, "Ezekiel and Jeremiah: Promises of Inner Renewal in Diachronic Perspective," in *Past, Present, Future: The Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets* (ed. J.C. DeMoor and H.F. Van Rooy; OTS 44; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 150–175; H. Leene, "Blowing the Same Shofar" (see n. 10), 175–198; and C. T. Begg, "The Non–Mention of Ezekiel" (see n. 6), 340–343.

13 Reevaluation of the suggested parallels is briefly summarized, under "Evaluation Notes" in the two right-hand columns of the table in the appendix. See at the link, n. 11.

14 For Fohrer's eighteen cases of "keinerlei gegenseitige Berührung vorliegt" between Ezekiel-passages and that of the Jeremiah's, see *Die Hauptprobleme*, 135–137.

15 Ibid., 137.

16 Ibid., 138.

17 Ibid. (138–140) invested great efforts in rejecting as inadmissible C.C. Torrey's observations on Pseudo-Ezekiel.

Smend's list became a great resource and point of departure for Miller in his monograph *Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels Sprachlich und Theologisch Untersucht, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Prosareden Jeremias* (1955). Miller addressed Smend's sixty-two examples, rejecting forty-one of them as unacceptable for different reasons[18] and leaving only twenty-one examples, some of which he still regarded as doubtful.[19] Miller posed the major question as: what text of Jeremiah could we presume Ezekiel to have read? (p. 4). And while theoretically this question should be asked vice versa as well, Miller noted that by the time Ezekiel had started to prophesy, Jeremiah was already in his thirty-fourth year of prophetic activity.

In fifteen cases, Miller did find examples of common themes (pp. 86–12): in prophecies against the false prophets (Jer 14:11–16; Ezek 13); in the prophets' calls (Jer 1; Ezek 1–3); in historical passages (Jer 3:6–11; Ezek 16, 23); in parallel legal speeches (compare Jer 15:1–4; 16:1–18; 13:1–14 with Ezek 14:12–23; 24:15–27; 15); in Jeremiah's deliberation over the current religious state of affairs (7:16–28), which is echoed in Ezekiel's great vision of the abominations in Jerusalem (Ezekiel 8); in the words of consolation in Jeremiah 30–31, which accord with the consolations of Ezekiel in chapter 33 onward; and in the reversal of Jeremian judgment prophecies into words of salvation in Ezekiel (compare Jer 8:1–3 and Ezek 37:1–14). Miller also established connections between Ezekiel and specific segments of the book of Jeremiah. He argued that Ezekiel must have had a Jeremian text in front of him, which Miller assumed contained prose speeches from the scroll of Baruch in the form it had prior to 597 B.C.E.; the consolation prophecies of Jeremiah 30–31; and possibly also Jer 23:1–2; 23:23–40 (p. 119). Regarding other verbal similarities, shared images and word groups, Miller found examples which testify that Ezekiel was greatly influenced by Jeremiah. Yet he repeatedly classified these resemblances as stemming from common usage of that period, and thus as validating the contemporaneousness of the two prophets (in his words, "Jeremia und Hesekiel Zeitgenossen waren," p. 117); he did not find those passages to indicate the clear literary dependence of one upon the other (pp. 116, 119, and passim).[20] Miller also raised the possibility that Ezekiel was in the audience of Jeremiah in Jerusalem, and considered this possibility to explain several

---

18 Miller, *Das Verhältnis*, 1 and n. 2–5.

19 Ibid., 2 n. 1.

20 Ibid. (*Das Verhältnis*, 117) mentions this contemporaneousness to be of great value in doing away with Torrey's Pseudo-Ezekiel theory.

examples.[21] Similarly, he assumed that Ezekiel was aware of Jeremiah's letter to the Exiles (Jer 29:1–7, and see below), presumably via his priestly connections or through the discussions held within the exilic community (pp. 95–96). On the theological level, Miller found that common points of view unite these great prophets. For instance, he identified commonalities in their conceptions of the past (pp. 140–145), their ethical perspectives on the present (pp. 147–155), and their concepts of individual retribution (pp. 168–172). Miller highlighted the areas in which Ezekiel carried on his predecessor's ideas and further adapted them to create his own proclamation. In his concluding remarks on the theological resemblances between the two prophetic books, Miller said that they reflect Ezekiel's conviction that the message of his Jerusalemite predecessor (like those of other earlier prophets) should continue to be proclaimed in the Golah (p. 184). According to Miller, differences between the prophets are the result of differences in their personalities and experience as well as in their circles of influence (*Wirkungskreis*) and times of activity, with Jeremiah being active mostly before the destruction and Ezekiel after the deportation.

Zimmerli (1979) responsibly articulated the methodological procedure to be followed, saying "it is best to deal with the purely literary-critical question of the dependence of the prophet on written documents after the tradition-historical question."[22] Zimmerli mentioned Ezekiel's familiarity with Amos (cf. Ezek 7:1–9 and Amos 8:1f); Hosea (cf. Ezek 16 and Hosea 1:2; 2:4–15); Isaiah (cf. Ezek 5:1–4 and Isa 7:20; Ezek 1–2 and Isa 6; Ezek 22:17–22 and Isa 1:22–26); and Zephaniah (Zeph 3:3–8 and Ezek 22:23–31). Only then did he raise the question of whether Ezekiel was familiar with Jeremiah's preaching, a question he categorized as "a special problem."[23] Zimmerli enumerated major common themes and phraseological resemblances, recognizing both the similarities and Ezekiel's own contributions and developments. Adding to Miller's suggestion that written Jeremian scrolls were at Ezekiel's disposal, Zimmerli contributed the following observation:[24]

We come to the conclusion that Jeremiah's preaching was known to Ezekiel. Some of this supports the further view that words which Jeremiah did not proclaim publicly came to him in a written form.

---

21 Ibid. (117) mentions: Jer 18:8—Ezek 7:26; Jer 6:14—Ezek 13:10; Jer 9:9—Ezek 6:1; Jer 5:1–6—Ezek 22:30–31.

22 Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 41.

23 Ibid., 43–44.

24 Ibid., 45.

According to Zimmerli, then, Ezekiel's acquaintance with the confessions of Jeremiah (e.g., Jer 15:16 and Ezek 2:8–3:3), illustrate that the transmission of these passages was in writing, since Jeremiah is presumed not to have delivered these confessions orally.

In his commentary on Jeremiah, Holladay (1989) gave a list of the parallels under the rubric of "Jeremiah's impact on Ezekiel." He found Smend's list useful, but in his own study brought only twenty-five examples. Twenty of them refer to materials in Jeremiah that Holladay dated to before 600, thirteen of which are materials he considered to belong to prophecies postdating Jehoiakim's burning of the first scroll. This schema allowed enough time for Ezekiel to "have gained his knowledge of Jeremiah's material through a copy of the latter's scroll either in Jerusalem before 598, in Babylon after 598, or both."[25] Holladay preferred the possibility that Ezekiel had heard Jeremiah personally in Jerusalem. Ezekiel's familiarity with Jeremiah's confessions brought Holladay even to suggest a personal acquaintance with the latter, a connection maintained while in Babylon through the priests Jeremiah mentions as active in the area (Jer 19:1–20:6; 29:24–32; 37:3).[26]

In a fairly recent commentary, Kasher (2004) presented in great detail similarities in language and style (phraseology and imagery), shared motifs, and the two prophets' attitudes in relation to several theological and political issues: retribution, the future relationship of God and Israel, David's kingship, the future of the Northern Kingdom, the borders of Jerusalem, the city's new name, the attitude towards the remnant in Jerusalem and Judah,[27] the struggle with false prophets, the similar attitude toward Babylon (which goes hand in hand with their mutual objections to any pro-Egyptian policy), and finally the future of Judah's neighbors. Kasher concluded his list by pointing out the relations between the imagery and its tangible meaning (Jer 15:16 and Ezek 2:9–3:2), and the prophets' parallel utilization of lists (as in Jer 46:9 and Ezek 30:5, etc.). Kasher argued that this wealth of resemblances shows clear linkages between the prophets, despite their presumed rivalry based on their distinct priestly backgrounds. Therefore, he accepted as reasonable the previous suggestions that Ezekiel had learned Jeremiah's prophecies either orally, prior to his

---

25 Holladay, *Jeremiah 2*, 82–84.
26 Idem, "Had Ezekiel Known Jeremiah Personally" (see n. 9), 31–34.
27 Kasher (*Ezekiel 1–24*, 52) argued that both prophets agree that the Jehoiachin Exiles in Babylon are the seed from which the new people of Israel will emerge (Jeremiah 24, 29; Ezek 11:14–21; 33:23–29); but Kasher also argued that Ezekiel had gradually developed his anti-Jerusalem attitude. I profoundly disagree with this observation, and this will be discussed below, pp. 26–27.

deportation, or in writing, while in Babylon.[28] As a general observation, Kasher found those profound and numerous similarities to reflect the two prophets' similar intellectual education.[29]

A different point of view was suggested by D. Vieweger (1993).[30] Realizing that the similarities between the two books cannot be explained solely as a result of Ezekiel's personal experience of hearing Jeremiah in Jerusalem before 598/7, Vieweger addressed the complex literary evolution both books had gone through, arguing that the relationships between them had continued over a period much longer than the prophets' careers. He thus suggested that Jeremianic traditions in the book of Ezekiel are only in a minor degree the result of Ezekiel's own activity. Rather, Ezekiel's school and disciples of Jeremiah were responsible for introducing Jeremianic traditions into the Ezekiel corpus. While Vieweger recognized that there were many more references to Jeremiah in Ezekiel than vice versa, he suggested that the opposite direction of influence obtained as well; i.e., Ezekiel materials in the book of Jeremiah were also introduced by Jeremiah's disciples (as in Jer 24:6 and Ezek 11:19; 36:26–28). Vieweger traced the mutual motivation of the two circles of disciples to the desire not only to establish their own master's legacy, but also to cooperate in bringing the two prophetic collections into closer ideological accord.[31]

H. Leene followed Vieweger and considered the directions of influence as moving from Ezekiel to Jeremiah. In two studies Leene limited his search to two important contexts in Ezekiel. The first study investigated the promises of inner renewal found in the consolation prophecies in Ezekiel and Jeremiah.[32] Leene reconstructed the diachronic order of the prophecies placing Ezekiel 36 and 11 at the early formative stage of this notion of internal transformation, followed by Jeremiah 24, and then by chapters 30–31. Deutero-Isaiah supplies the absolute yardstick for determining the relative order of the passages, as according to Leene, it is influenced by Ezekiel, and then in turn influences the consolation prophecy layer in Jeremiah. In his second study, Leene focused on the prophetic role in Ezekiel and Jeremiah, including the struggles with the false prophets

---

28 Ibid. (47) also rejected as less reasonable the possibilities that the similarities stem from Ezekiel's earlier location in Judah; he also suggests that there might have been a Jeremianic-Deuteronomist redaction of Ezekiel.

29 Ibid..

30 D. Vieweger, *Die literarischen Beziehungen zwischen den Büchern Jeremia und Ezechiel* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1993).

31 Ibid. added another very interesting conclusion regarding the assumed Deuteronomic redactional level in Jeremiah, which he finds to be much more limited than usually suggested. See his discussions on Jer 32:37–41 (ibid., 92–94) and Jeremiah 24 (ibid., 94–98).

32 Leene, "Ezekiel and Jeremiah " (see n. 12), 150–175.

discussed repeatedly in both books.[33] The study allowed Leene to substantiate further his concepts of relative order and direction of influence (from Ezekiel to Jeremiah).

These studies, then, suggest fairly clear evidence of indirect connections between the prophets (and/or their presumed schools), and some even proceed to suggest direct influence of one prophet on the other. K.W. Carley adequately summarized this scholarly approach:[34]

[T]he similarities between the two [Ezekiel and Jeremiah], which go beyond what we might expect on account of the common influences of contemporary speech and thought forms, suggest that the younger prophet is to be regarded in a sense as disciple, concerned to continue and extend his teacher's work among his fellow exiles. Ezekiel was the heir to a long prophetic heritage, which in his period was expressed most forcefully and fully, so far as we know, in the prophecies of Jeremiah. It was for the continuation of that heritage that Ezekiel knew himself to be authorized and he strove to maintain it. Thus it is only to be expected that his prophecies should reflect Jeremiah's so clearly, even though there were important differences between the situations to which the prophets addressed themselves.

These perceptions of agreement between the two prophets (which usually minimize their differences) strengthen further the cogency of this question about the lack of any explicit connection between them. Zimmerli, for instance, phrased the question: "Why then has Ezekiel never mentioned the earlier Jeremiah in his book, when he was so clearly influenced by so much of his preaching?" He answers by positing that "the Ezekiel tradition" (apart from Ezek 11:1–13) *never* mentioned other persons by name. Then Zimmerli broadens the question to ask whether Ezekiel at all knew of his Jerusalem colleague active in Jerusalem among those who had remained there, but he seems only to be able to propose that Ezekiel includes Jeremiah among those whom he mentions as mourners over the city's abominations (Ezek 9:4).[35]

Reading Zimmerli's hesitating and obscure answers, however, suggests that we need to take another path to explain the silence. What if this silence is not one of agreement and full continuity, but rather one of occasional disagreement and disjunction?

Attending to differences between the prophets, J. Scharbert, for instance, suggested that their different priestly backgrounds (i.e., their respective involvement [or noninvolvement] in the liturgy and cultic procedures of the Jerusalem Temple) were added to profound psychological dif-

---

33 Leene, "Blowing the Same Shofar" (see n. 10), 175–198.

34 K.W. Carley, *Ezekiel among the Prophets: A Study of Ezekiel's Place in Prophetic Tradition* (SBT 2/31; Naperville: Allenson, 1975), 77.

35 Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 45–46.

ferences of personality between the two.[36] C.T. Begg argued that the question should be addressed particularly to the book of Jeremiah, since this book does mention other prophets by name, but does not refer to Ezekiel. Begg explained the silence as reflecting genuine hostility between the prophets and their disciples that goes back to "competing clerical groupings, i.e. non-Zadokite 'Levites' and Zadokites, respectively," rivalries that characterize the exilic and postexilic eras.[37]

In the following discussion I will take a different route that goes beyond personal or familial backgrounds. Having reviewed the thorough and thoughtful studies that have addressed the various challenges raised by this data, I will now add my understandings of these issues. As a starting point, I would first like to comment on the methodology that I will use to reevaluate the suggested parallels. I will then highlight one thematic and theological issue of disagreement between the prophets (and their books).

III. Literary Relationships: Echo, Influence, and Allusion

Verbal similarities, resemblances in imagery, and shared themes and conceptions have brought scholars to notice parallels between the two books. Closer examination of the texts, however, shows among them a great diversity that permeates the entire spectrum of textual relationships from influence, to echo, to literary allusion.[38] The first two are very fluid concepts, and indeed seem to require an assumption of Ezekiel's acquaintance with Jeremiah's words (heard or written). But literary allusion is much more restricted in its definition, and thus may be of importance for the present investigation. In her influential essay, Z. Ben-Porat defined literary allusion as follows:[39]

(107) The literary allusion is a device for the simultaneous activation of two texts. The activation is achieved through the manipulation of a special (108) signal: a sign (simple or complex) in a given text characterized by an additional larger "referent." This referent is always an independent text. The simultaneous activation of the two texts thus con-

---

36 J. Scharbert, "Würdigung," 459–478.

37 Begg, "The Non-Mention of Ezekiel" (see n. 6), 342.

38 For the differences accepted here between intertextuality and influence or allusion, see B.D. Sommer in his monograph, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Contraversions; Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 6–31, esp. 6–10; M.A. Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code* (LHB/OTS 507; New York: T & T Clark, 2009), 48–50.

39 Z. Ben-Porat, "The Poetics of Literary Allusion," *Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 1 (1976): 105–128, esp. 107–112. Ben-Porat's definition was used by both Sommer (*A Prophet Reads Scripture*) and Lyons (*From Law to Prophecy*).

nected results in the formation of intertextual patterns whose nature cannot be predetermined. … (110) Identification of the marker's larger "referent," the evoked text, is mandatory for intertextual patterning beyond the modified interpretation of the marker itself.

The crucial point I want to call attention to in applying Ben-Porat's definition to the relationships between Ezekiel and Jeremiah is that, by alluding to an earlier text, the author intentionally activates the evoked text in its original larger context, beyond the actual marker (the similar phrase) that called attention to the option of intertextual literary relations in the first place.[40]

The bulk of the parallels between Ezekiel and Jeremiah does not qualify as true literary allusions. Most of the Ezekiel passages that indeed show similarity of expression to Jeremiah, such that they could have been markers for an evoked text, do not signal a true literary connection. These passages do not activate the Jeremian passage(s) in any allusive, interpretive, way; rather, they might be said to indicate "echo" or "influence."[41] B.D. Sommer defines literary "echo" as follows: "The echo alters nothing in the interpretation of the sign itself, though the presence of a familiar phrase makes the text more interesting."[42] "Influence," however, shows the viewpoint or reflection of, or ideological dependence on, an earlier text, but it does not depend on specific verbal connections between the texts, and in this respect it is even more remote from a literary allusion. Influence may thus entail "less word-for-word reliance on the source as the new text restates the older material largely in its own words."[43] Indeed, this level of resemblance may be discerned in the many examples of shared imagery and common conceptions that draw Ezekiel close to Jeremiah yet do not show any deliberate action of accommodating one text to the other.

To illustrate more clearly the distinction between allusive literary dependence and sheer resemblance (echo or influence), I suggest that three different types of textual relationships obtain between passages in Ezekiel and in Jeremiah.

---

40 This important observation goes beyond the more general definitions, such as those of C. Baldick, "Allusion," *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms* (3rd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 6; M.H. Abrams, *The Norton Anthology of English Literature* (6th ed.; New York: Norton, 1993), 8; and see Nurmela, *Prophets in Dialogue* (see n. 3), 23–37.

41 These examples are classified in the Appendix as having "No allusion/literary dependence;" see the link in n. 11 above.

42 Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture* (see n. 37), 14; and see further the discussion on p. 14–15 for differences between echo and allusion.

43 Ibid, 23; Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy* (see n. 37), 50–51.

A. *Verbal or idiomatic resemblances* show a lack of allusion or literary dependence. Two idioms that are peculiar to Jeremiah and Ezekiel may suffice: (1) The designation of the land of Israel as צבי ("most desirable") is used by both prophets as epithet for the promised land God had given to his people (Ezek 20:6, 15 and Jer 3:19).[44] But beyond the quite similar superlative descriptive pattern, Ezekiel does not reflect the particular Jeremian context of the term, but adds this attribute to the more common description of "the land flowing with milk and honey;" (2) The phrase נקעה נפש מעל ("His/her soul recoils from," i.e., "rejects in disgust") is repeated four times in Ezekiel 23 (vv. 17, 18, 22, 28).[45] Thrice the agent of the disgust is Oholibah reacting against the many lovers by whom she had defiled herself, and in v. 18 it is God who turns away from her in disgust, as He had before from her sister Oholah.[46] This idiom is otherwise known only from Jer 6:8 (הוסרי ירושלים פן תקע נפשי ממך) where the prophet rebukes Jerusalem for social sins committed in its midst and threatens it with divine desertion and desolation (vv. 6, 7). These two examples (among others) illustrate the broader phenomenon.[47] While there is clearly a shared vocabulary that brings Ezekiel close to Jeremiah and that may be the result of their contemporaneousness (as argued by Miller and others), there is no literary dependence between the passages. Therefore, the relation between these passages should be described as one of echo or influence rather than literary allusion.

B. *Literary allusions.* By way of comparison, there are indeed a few prophecies in Ezekiel that I would classify as literary allusions—that is, passages where Ezekiel seems to carry forward, develop, and transform phrases or themes found in Jeremiah. Such may be (1) the reference to eating the scroll (Ezek 2:8–3:2), where Ezekiel develops and concretizes the Jeremianic notion of God putting his words into the prophet's mouth

---

44 M. Greenberg (*Ezekiel 1–20* [AB 22; New York: Dobleday, 1983], 364) explains that צבי is taken from the Aramaic צבא ("desire"); compare to the more usual and less accurate translations of צבי as "fair," "glorious," "splendor." Greenberg argued further that this epithet, which appears also in Jer 3:19, belongs together with ארץ הצבי (Dan 11:16, 41), ארץ חמדה (Jer 3:19; Zech 7:14), and ארץ חפץ (Mal 3:12)—that is, to relatively late epithets that have replaced the traditional ones, such as that used by Ezekiel in Ezek 20:6. Zimmerli (*Ezekiel 1*, 408) said simply that the idiom "appears to have arisen in the time immediately before Ezekiel."

45 M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37* (AB 22 A; New York: Dobleday, 1997), 479. נקע נפש מעל, discussed here is indeed peculiar and different from נקע (ירך) of Genesis 32. See Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 208.

46 Zimmerli (*Ezekiel 1*, 487–488) considers 23:18b to be a secondary addition interrupting the context of vv. 17 and 19.

47 To mention other *hapax* expressions that link Ezekiel and Jeremiah, see, for instance, אנק חלל (Ezek 26:15; 9:4, 24:17 and Jer 51:52); התפלש באפר (Ezek 27:30 and Jer 6:26).

(Jer 1:7; 15:16); but all these passages refer back to Deut 18:18.[48] (2) Along the same lines, but with implicit polemical intentions, Ezekiel's conception of restoration, which includes internal transformation prior to the reinstitution of the covenant between God and the Exiles (11:18–20; 36:26–28), expands and transforms Jeremiah's conception of the new covenant (Jer 31:33).[49]

C. *Utilizations of the same pentateuchal traditions.* Some resemblances between Ezekiel and Jeremiah actually cover up quite independent allusions to and interpretations of pentateuchal legal traditions. There are six such quasi-similarities that appear to connect Ezekiel with Jeremiah, but in fact present independent inner-biblical interpretations of pentateuchal legal traditions, mostly from Deuteronomy:

(1) The phrase בעונו ימות is found in Ezek 3:18, 19 and Jer 31:30, though each of the prophetic passages suggests a separate and independent utilization of Deut 24:16 (לא יומתו אבות על בנים ובנים לא יומתו על אבות איש בחטאו יומתו "Parents shall not be put to death for children, nor children be put to death for parents: a person shall be put to death only for his own crime."). The common trait is that both prophetic passages transfer the human realm of Deut 24:16 to that of divine retribution. But beyond that, there is no real connection between the two prophecies.[50] Ezek 3:16–21 expands this concept to the collective of "Beit Israel," stereotyping the prophet's addressees as "wicked man" and "righteous man."[51] The passage discusses the current prophetic role as a "lookout" (צפה), someone required to make the

---

48 I doubt that Ezekiel's prophecy on the leaders of Israel as shepherds (Ezek 34:1–16) is another example of a literary allusion to Jer 23:1–4. The two prophecies indeed share the theme and imagery and understand God as the true shepherd, but they show hardly any verbal similarities that might signify that Ezekiel is activating the Jeremian prophecy. Leene ("Ezekiel and Jeremiah" [see n. 12], 172) counted this resemblance among those passages that show that the direction of influence goes from Ezekiel to Jeremiah.

49 There is a remarkable difference between נתתי את תורתי בקרבם ועל לבם אכתבנה (Jer 31:33) and ונתתי להם לב לדעת אתי (Jer 24:7; 32:38–39); the latter phrasing is much closer to Ezek 11:19 and 36:26. Ezekiel and the non-Jeremian passages of Jeremiah 24, 32:37–41 do not restrict obedience to actually inscribing laws on the heart. I would thus differentiate between two lines of influence. First, from Jeremiah's new covenant (31:31–34) to Ezekiel (11:19; 36:26); and a second independent process is designated in the utilization of Ezekiel by the non-Jeremian passages (Jer 24; 32:37–41). See Rom-Shiloni, "The Prophecy for 'Everlasting Covenant' (Jeremiah 32:36–41): An Exilic Addition or a Deuteronomistic Redaction?" *VT* 53/2 (2003): 201–223; idem, "Group-Identities in Jeremiah" (see n. 8), 11–46; and compare to Leene, "Ezekiel and Jeremiah" (see n. 12), 150–175.

50 See Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 90–97; Deut 24:16 is further alluded to and interpreted by Ezekiel in 18:20, see Greenberg, ibid, 332–333, 337–342.

51 Greenberg (ibid., 95–96) aptly pointed out the collective retribution conception behind Ezekiel's "quasi-legal style" that uses the singular; this has been further developed by P. M. Joyce, *Divine Initiative and Human Response in Ezekiel* (JSOTSup. 51; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

efforts to prevent this harsh yet deserved judgement ("he, the wicked man, shall die for his iniquity, but I will require a reckoning for his blood from you … (19b) he shall die for his iniquity, but you will have saved your own life," 3:18b, 19b). This prophetic role resides on what Greenberg termed as the "'horizontal' collective punishment," which differs significantly from the "'vertical' generational collective punishment" active within the conception of family retribution.[52] Jer 31:29–30, however, centers precisely on that family 'vertical' retribution conception, suggesting a change to occur in the days to come. In that case בעונו ימות is indeed the focus of discussion limiting judgement to the fathers, those who sinned, while saving their (innocent) descendants.

(2) ונמחו מעשיכם (in Ezek 6:6) caused D. Block to suggest that מעשיכם is an ellipsis of מעשי ידיכם, as repeatedly used in Jer 1:16; 25:6–7; 44:8 (all prose, except for once in poetry: מעשה ידי חרש במעצד, Jer 10:3). Indeed, in all these Ezekiel and Jeremiah verses the reference to idols follows the Deutoronomic denigration of other gods as human-made artifacts (as in Deut 4:28; 27:15).[53] It seems, however, that Ezek 6:6 utilizes Deuteronomy in quite a different way than Jeremiah. The explanatory phrases of Ezek 6:6b: למען יחרבו ויאשמו מזבחותיכם ונשברו ונשבתו גלוליכם ונגדעו חמניכם ונמחו מעשיכם ("Thus your altars shall be laid waste and bear their punishment; your fetishes shall be smashed and annihilated, your incense stands cut down, and your handiwork wiped out") are constructed syntactically following Deut 12:3: ונתצתם את מזבחתם ושברתם את מצבתם ואשריהם תשרפון באש ופסילי אלהיהם תגדעון ואבדתם את שמם מן המקום ההוא, using short phrases that list verbs of annihilation followed by the objects that are synonymic nouns of different cultic sites or artifacts. Although there is no one-to-one similarity between Ezek 6:6 and Deut 12:3, the verbs שיבר and נידע occur in both, and מחה seems to stand for איבד את שמם. Jeremiah, on the other hand, in his repeated accusations, ties together several phrases concerning worship of other gods (Jer 1:16; 44:8), in which השתחוה למעשי ידיהם seems to follow the format of the second commandment (see Deut 5:9 and Jer 25:6–7). Thus, Ezek 6:6 does not allude to any of these Jeremian verses, but rather rests directly upon Deuteronomic patterns and themes. It seems, then, that the two prophets were independently influenced by Deu-

---

52 Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 339.
53 Block (*Ezekiel 1–24*, 227 n. 47) adds other occurrences to these Deuteronomy examples: 2Kgs 19:18; Isa 2:8; 17:8; 41:29; 57:12; Hos 14:4; Mic 5:12; Ps 115:4; 135:15.

teronomy, both in terms of their use of this phrase and in their general attitudes toward the worship of other gods.[54]

A similar phenomenon seems to stand behind the other similarities as well: (3) Ezek 6:13 and Jer 2:20 allude to Deuteronomy (e.g., Deut 12:2; and see Hos 4:13) and generally to the Deuteronomistic literature (as in 2 Kgs 16:4; 17:10); (4) Ezek 12:2 and Jer 5:21 allude independently to Deut 29:3 (rather than the references to idols in Ps 115:5; 135:16); (5) The curse formula of Deut 28:26 serves a distinctive role in Ezekiel's prophecy against Pharaoh king of Egypt (Ezek 29:5)[55] on the one hand, and in its several occurrences in Jeremiah (8:2; 9:21) on the other.[56] (6) The Deuteronomic conception of exile to an unknown land (Deut 28:36) occurs in another prophecy against Egypt (Ezek 32:9). This idea occurs twice in Jer 17:4 (|| 15:14) and in 22:28, but there it refers to the Jehoiachin exile. This line of references to Deuteronomy shows itself also in the literary allusions mentioned above; see the clear reference of Jer 1:9; 15:16, and likewise Ezek 2:8–3:3, to Deut 18:18.

All these add up to a clear indication that both prophets are familiar with a corpus of pentateuchal traditions and find them to be powerful anchors with which they can ground their own messages. Yet each prophet's usage of those traditions seems to be independent of the other.[57]

The importance of these examples is broader than just their indication of the use of Deuteronomy. In fact, they call attention to the fact that similarities between Ezekiel and Jeremiah are not necessarily the result of implicit or indirect connections between the two books, but may stem from the prophets' independent use of the same biblical sources. This insight may be extended to the use of other shared sources as well, such as the independent allusions of Ezek 38:20 and Jer 4:23–26 to Genesis 1 and the independent utilization of the quotation "upon the soil of Israel" found separately in Ezek 18:2 and Jer 31:29.

To conclude this section, I want to suggest a much more complicated picture to explain the relationship between Ezekiel and Jeremiah (and

---

54 R. Levitt Kohn called attention to Ezekiel's usage of Deuteronomy (*A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile and the Torah* [JSOTSup. 358; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002] 86–104), though further examples may be added.

55 This convention, known through two variations in biblical literature (see 2 Kgs 9:37, and compare to 1 Sam 17:44, 46), coalesces in Ezek 29:5 and illustrates the independence of Ezekiel in reference to Jeremiah's utilization of this formula.

56 Jeremiah's usage is in fact more similar to that of Prov 7:33; 16:4; 19:7; 34:20.

57 The examples mentioned here are, of course, but the tip of the iceberg in reference to both Ezekiel and Jeremiah's utilizations of pentateuchal traditions. I have brought here those instances that link Ezekiel and Jeremiah in their references to the same traditions and, interestingly enough, most of them allude to Deuteronomic ones.

their subsequent schools). It is indeed reasonable that Ezekiel knew Jeremiah, or knew of him, prior to his deportation, just as it is probable that Jeremiah heard about Ezekiel among the prophets in Babylon. It is even more plausible that there were close connections between their respective schools of disciples in Babylon.[58] They do share language, imagery, and conceptions—mainly in relation to the prophetic role, the status of prophets, and the delegitimization of peace/false prophets. Furthermore, they share basic prophetic formulae, genres, and patterns in their call narratives, judgment and consolation prophecies, disputations, prophecies against the nations, etc.[59] Thus, I accept most of the points of thematic and conceptual agreement discerned by Fohrer and Kasher. Nevertheless, among all these points of agreement, it is rare to find passages in Ezekiel that activate Jeremian passages as their evoked texts (and vice versa). Thus, "echo" and "influence" are indeed the most accurate tags one can usually use to describe the relationships between the prophets and their books. The "echo" and "influence" alike result from both prophets' own activity and were subsequently carried further through the period of the synchronic compilation of their respective prophecies into books by the presumed schools of their successors, who were in even closer proximity to each other in Babylon of the sixth century B.C.E..

These observations lead to still another proposition concerning the silence between Ezekiel and Jeremiah. I propose that this silence is, in fact, a deliberate literary silence. Ezekiel may be influenced by Jeremiah, but he rarely if at all confronts Jeremiah and his prophecies.

Given these lines of parallel but separate discourse in Ezekiel and Jeremiah, it is even more intriguing to address two examples which illustrate profound disagreement between the two prophets.

IV. Underground Ideological Differences between Ezekiel and Jeremiah

One intriguing phenomenon that unites the scholarly discussions on the relationships between Ezekiel and Jeremiah is the restricted place given to

---

58 Rom-Shiloni, "Prophecy for 'Everlasting Covenant,'" 201–223.

59 To mention prophetic formulae that have a much larger distribution in Jeremiah and Ezekiel than in other prophetic literature, see: יהוה (אדני) נאם which occurs 175 times in Jeremiah and 85 in Ezekiel out of its 365 occurrences in the HB; or שמעו דבר יהוה, and הנני אל/עליך which appear in Jeremiah and Ezekiel substantially more often than in the rest of the prophetic books. See Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 35, 222 n. 26.

disagreements between them.[60] As mentioned above, Miller, Scharbert, and Begg did note the existence of differences, but tended to relate them to the distinct personalities and life experiences of the two prophets, as well as to their different priestly backgrounds.[61] I would like to illustrate here an ideological difference that I believe stands at the core of this entire discussion.

In two instances in which Ezekiel and Jeremiah draw on the same Deuteronomic texts and conceptions, an implicit polemic seems to be behind the scenes concerning conceptions of exile and the identification of the genuine remant Judean community.[62]

A. Jeremiah 9:15 and Ezekiel 12:15–16: The Question of a Remnant

Jer 9:15: והפצותים בגוים אשר לא ידעו המה ואבותם ושלחתי אחריהם את החרב עד כלותי אותם

"I will scatter them among nations which they and their fathers never knew; … until I have consumed them"

Ezek 12:15–16: וידעו כי אני יהוה בהפיצי אותם בגוים וזריתי אותם בארצות. והותרתי מהם אנשי מספר מחרב מרעב ומדבר, למען יספרו את כל תועבותיהם בגוים אשר באו שם וידעו כי אני יהוה

"Then, when I have scattered them among the nations and dispersed them through the countries, they shall know that I am the LORD. [16] But I will spare a few of them from the sword, from famine, and from pestilence, that they may recount all their abominable deeds among the nations to which they come; and they shall know that I am the LORD!"

While the phrase הפיץ בגוים connects the two passages, they each refer independently and differently to the same Deuteronomic conception of exile, as it appears in Deut 4:27–28: והפיץ יהוה אתכם בעמים ונשארתם מתי מספר בגוים אשר ינהג יהוה אתכם שמה ("The LORD will scatter you among the peoples, and only a scant few of you shall be left among the nations to which the LORD will drive you"); or with slight variations in Deut 28:36: יולך יהוה אתך ואת מלכך אשר תקים עליך אל גוי אשר לא ידעת אתה ואבתיך ועבדת שם אלהים אחרים עץ ואבן ("The LORD will drive you, and the king you have set over you, to a nation unknown to you or your fathers, where you shall serve other gods, of wood and stone"); and 28:64).

---

60 By the term "disagreements" I mean to take issue with the common and apt observation that Ezekiel developed and carried on messages we find in Jeremiah, as could be assumed, for instance, with regard to the prophetic role in the call narratives. These differences of nuance were clearly demonstrated by Miller, *Das Verhältnis* (see n. 11), 121–185; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 44–46; and Kasher, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 49–54.

61 Miller, *Das Verhältnis*, 184–185; Scharbert, *Die Propheten Israels* (see n. 6), 459–478; Begg, "The Non-Mention of Ezekiel" (see n. 12), 342.

62 On polemics as a special category of influence (different from revision), see Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture* (see n. 37), 26–27.

Jeremiah 9:15, which closes the prophecy of 9:11–15, brings together elements of each of these two Deuteronomic verses. Yet the prophecy clearly deviates from the conception, which considers exile as a place where the people will decline in number and worship other gods but still survive physically. Jeremiah accentuates the elements of disruption and calamity in his conception of exile, predicting that the Exiles will be chased by the sword and totally destroyed.[63] Thus, in contradistinction to the Deuteronomic verses, deportation is a calamitous judgment of total annihilation executed by God.[64]

Jeremiah 9:11–15 (and specifically vv. 12–13, 14–15) is oftentimes considered a late, exilic, non-Jeremian prophecy.[65] This late dating may be even of greater interest, as it makes the prophecy contemporaneous with, or even later than, Ezekiel's prophecies discussed below. For the sake of the present discussion, however, both options for dating the prophecy are possible: it reflects either an ongoing debate between the two communities by way of the two prophets in the early years of the sixth century, or a later phase of that debate among their followers in Persian Yehud and/or in the Babylonian exile. In any event, vv. 14–15 of this prophecy reflect a Judean perspective on the Deuteronomic conception of exile that takes exile to be a final calamitous judgment.[66]

Ezek 12:15–16 seems to utilize the same Deuteronomic conception for an altogether very different message. The clear markers are both הפיץ את- בגוים together with the reference to a scant number of survivors: והותרתי מהם אנשי מספר (compare to ונשארתם מתי מספר בגוים, Deut 4:27).[67] Yet, in

---

63 Ezekiel, however, utilizes a similar concept of total calamity only against Jerusalem; see Ezek 11:10 and note the phrase הריק חרב אחרי in another prophecy against Jerusalem (Ezek 5:2, 12; 12:14; alluding to Lev 26:33).

64 This extreme view that finds God to be the agent of exile and annihilation, in addition to the bringer of the land's desolation (v. 11), occurs in several judgment prophecies (both in prose and poetry; e.g., Jer 7:1–15; 10:19–21; 15:1–4, 5–9). For a fuller discussion, see Rom-Shiloni, "Deuteronomic Concepts of Exile Interpreted in Jeremiah and Ezekiel," in *Birkat Shalom: Studies In the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature and Post-biblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (ed. H. Cohen *et al.*; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008), 101–123.

65 The late dating of Jer 9:11–15 is agreed upon even by Holladay (*Jeremiah 1*, 306–308), who refers to its Persian period context.

66 Compare with W. McKane's reference to what he suggests is a similar presentation of the unknown enemies in Jer 5:15–17 (*Jeremiah I–XXV* [ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986], 207). It seems that the allusion of both passages to Deuteronomy 28 has caused this confusion. Note the significant difference between the two: Jer 5:15–17 describes the invasion of conquest in the land (alluding to Deut 28:49–52), whereas Jer 9:15 refers to the unknown circumstances of exile (alluding to Deut 28:36, 64).

67 The phrase להפיץ אתם בגוים ולזרות אותם בארצות is repeated in Ezek 20:23; 22:15; 36:19; and three times in reference to Egypt (29:12; 30:23, 26).

using this verse to complete his prophecy on the fate of Zedekiah and his people taken by the Babylonians 586 B.C.E. (12:1–16), Ezekiel reinforces his extreme stance against accepting the survivors of that second wave of deportation into the exilic community already in Babylon (Ezek 14:12–23, especially vv. 21–23). Indeed a scant few *will* remain and arrive in Babylon. While they are not said explicitly to be worshiping wood and stone (as in Deut 4:28; 28:36, 64), according to Ezek 12:16, they would continue to practice their Jerusalemite abominations; thus they could never be a part of the Jehoiachin Exiles community.[68] Ezekiel accepts the Deuteronomic concept that considers exile to encompass not only dire physical circumstances, but also spiritual dislocation; surprisingly, however, he transfers this concept to the 586 Jerusalem Exiles, using it to argue that they have been cut off from their religious and national status as people of God and that they are therefore not part of a single community with the other Babylonian Judean enclave, the Jehoiachin Exiles.[69]

B. Ezekiel 28:25–26 and Jeremiah 29:5–6: Hope in exile, or back in the land?

A second pair of conflicting messages, addressing the same issue and using Deuteronomic conceptions, shows itself in the clear verbal resemblances between Ezek 28:25–26 and Jer 29:5–6.[70] The intriguing question is whether the verbal similarity is indeed a marker of a literary allusion between the two passages.

Building houses and planting vineyards designate permanent settlement in Deut 20:5–7.[71] This orderly agricultural routine breaks down in the event of divine afflictions stemming from disobedience to the covenant (Deut 28:30–32). Thus, this imagery appears in prophecies of judgment (Amos 5:11; Zeph 1:13); and in reverse, it plays a role in prophecies of consolation and restoration (Ezek 28:25–26; Isa 65:21–23; Jer 29:5–6).

---

68 A third reference to the existence of a Jerusalem remnant from the deportation of 586 B. C.E., occurs in Ezek 6:8–10; but note the difference, in that these Exiles are allowed the possibility of repentance.

69 For this extreme exclusive stance, suggested throughout the book of Ezekiel in prophecies against Jerusalem and its inhabitants and in favor of the Jehoiachin Exiles, see my essays cited in n. 8 above. Compare with Greenberg (*Ezekiel 1–20*, 217–221) and Block (*Ezekiel 1–24*, 379), neither of whom mentions this connection between Ezekiel and the Deuteronomic conception of exile. Block noted the accusation tone used against the remnant in vv. 15–16, but did not agree that Ezekiel is being exclusivist here.

70 This resemblance is noted not only in Kasher (*Ezekiel 1–24*, 48), but also in Block (*Ezekiel 25–48*, 127 n. 32), who considered it probable that Ezekiel borrowed the imagery from Jeremiah (29:5, 28). Surprisingly, however, this example does not appear on Smend's list.

71 Jer 35:7: ובית לא תבנו וזרע לא תזרעו וכרם לא תטעו ולא יהיה לכם, כי באהלים תשבו כל ימיכם, settlement is negated for the benefit of nomadic life; see Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37*, 596.

Stylistically, the basic pronouncement is easily related to Deut 20:5–7, and the deviations from it are crystal clear:[72]

מי האיש אשר בנה בית חדש <u>ולא חנכו</u> ילך וישב לביתו פן ימות. Deut 20:5–7:
במלחמה ואיש אחר יחנכנו

מי האיש אשר נטע כרם <u>ולא חללו</u> ילך וישב לביתו פן ימות במלחמה ואיש אחר יחללנו.

ומי האיש אשר ארש אשה <u>ולא לקחה</u> ילך וישב לביתו פן ימות במלחמה ואיש אחר יקחנה.

אשה תארש <u>ואיש אחר ישגלנה (ק: ישכבנה)</u> Deut 28:30–32:
בית תבנה <u>ולא תשב בו</u> כרם תטע <u>ולא תחללנו</u>
שורך טבוח לעיניך ולא תאכל ממנו ... צאנך
נתנות לאיביך... בניך ובנתיך נתנים לעם אחר

בתי גזית בניתם <u>ולא תשבו בם</u> כרמי חמד נטעתם ולא תשתו את יינם Amos 5:11:
ובנו בתים <u>ולא ישבו</u> ונטעו כרמים <u>ולא ישתו את יינם</u> Zeph 1:13:
בנו בתים <u>ושבו</u> ונטעו גנות <u>ואכלו את פרין</u> Jer 29:5–6:
ובנו בתים ונטעו כרמים Ezek 28:25–26:
ובנו בתים <u>וישבו</u> ונטעו כרמים <u>ואכלו פרים</u> Isa 65:21–23:[73]

All of these pronouncements, with the exception of Ezek 28:25, emphasize the activity and its long-term results. Ezekiel 28:25 is the only reference that excludes this repeated verbal pair that designates the consequences ("dwell" and "eat"). This can be at least partially explained by the substitution of ישב for the borrowed H phrase ישב לבטח (Lev 25:18, 19; 26:5; also in Deut 12:10),[74] an expression that denotes permanency and secure settlement and is repeated twice in this context: וישבו עליה לבטח ובנו בתים ונטעו כרמים וישבו לבטח ("and they shall dwell on it in security. They shall build houses and plant vineyards, and shall dwell on it in security").[75]

While these small distinctions do not diminish the phraseological resemblance, they still clearly illustrate that the two occurrences of this phrasing in Ezekiel and Jeremiah rely on a much broader tradition that goes back to those Deuteronomic expressions (Deut 20:5–7) and to their transformation into curses (Deut 28:30)—that is, back to Deuteronomistic conceptions of disobedience and its consequences of war, subjugation, and exile. Furthermore, a closer look at the way this phrase functions in each of

---

72 A. Berlin, "Jeremiah 29:5–7: A Deuteronomic Allusion," *HAR* 8 (1984): 3–11. Berlin (pp. 4, 6–7) suggested "four common elements" between Jer 29:5–7 and Deut 20:5–10. It seems, however, that v. 10 opens a new passage and context that is beyond the evoked context of Jeremiah's letter.

73 Isa 65:21–23 utilizes the two Deuteronomic passages Deut 20:5–7 and 28:30–32, since this Isaianic text reverses the curses of subjugation with the promise of resettlement.

74 Kasher (*Ezekiel 25–48*, 565) mentions only the reference in Deuteronomy.

75 Kasher (ibid) suggests that two options explain the repetition in v. 26: either an *inclusio* aimed at emphasizing this security in the land or a textual doublet: וישבו עליה לבטח ובנו בתים ונטעו כרמים וישבו לבטח as opposed to ובנו בתים ונטעו כרמים.

the prophetic contexts supplies additional arguments for the independent usage of this Deuteronomic phraseology by each of the prophets.

The allusion to Deut 20:5–7, along with the framework of judgment supplied by Deut 28:30–32 (describing the terrible conditions of subjugation), construct Jeremiah's main message to the Jehoiachin Exiles: a message to settle down permanently in their new exilic locations.[76] Moreover, in Jeremiah 29 with the words ורבו שם ואל תמעטו (v. 6b), Jeremiah adds a third Deuteronomic allusion to emphasize marriage and proliferation (v. 6a). In contradistinction to the suggestion that this phrase alludes to the [פרה] ורבה of the priestly blessing (as in Gen 1:22),[77] I would suggest that these words reverse the Deuteronomic conception of exile as expressed in Deut 4:27. Exile is defined there as the place where the people will greatly decrease in number.[78] Jeremiah addresses precisely this danger and distress. Transforming again (and differently) this Deuteronomic conception, the prophet urges the Jehoiachin Exiles to accept their deportation as a permanent position, with no prospect of return.[79] Hence, reversal of the conception of exile is significant, though Jeremiah's letter to the Jehoiachin Exiles is far from being a consoling letter of restoration. The prophet maintains his basic conception of exile as a situation of no return (see Jer 22:10–12, 24–30). Nevertheless, his letter clearly differs from the prophecy in 9:14–15, which takes exile as sheer annihilation.[80]

Ezek 28:25–26, on the other hand, ends the prophecies against the nations in Ezekiel 25–28 with words of consolation to the House of Israel, i. e., to the Exiles (before resuming with oracles against Egypt, chapters 29–32):[81]

---

76 Berlin ("Jeremiah 29:5–7" [see n. 69], 4) suggests that Jeremiah adds a call not to rebel against Babylon (Jer 29:7). I do not find this argument persuasive. Jeremiah's letter to the Jehoiachin Exiles, from the early years of their exile, has attracted a lot of scholarly attention. While vv. 4–7 are accepted as the kernel of the letter, Holladay (*Jeremiah 2*, 139) argues that there is no reason to limit the letter to only these verses; thus, according to him the letter extends over vv. 1–23. See also W. McKane, *Jeremiah XXVI–LII* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), 735–744, 746–748.

77 This is commonly suggested as the message of the letter, though it is not usually understood as a reversal of Deut 4:27; see Holladay, *Jeremiah 2*, 138, 141; and McKane, *Jeremiah XXVI–LII*, 742–743.

78 See Berlin ("Jeremiah 29:5–7," 5), who pointed out the sequence build—plant—wives/children in Deut 20:5–7; 28:30–32; and Jer 29:5–7.

79 Jer 29:10–14 with the prospect of return from Exile does not seem to be a Jeremian passage, but rather an exilic one. See McKane, *Jeremiah XXVI–LII*, 738.

80 These differences of thought do not necessarily compel assumptions on secondary intrusions by diverse authors. Jeremiah (like other prophets) can certainly hold diverse perceptions.

81 Greenberg (*Ezekiel 21–37*, 597) suggested that the last prophecy against Sidon (25:20–24), together with the consolation verses (vv. 25–26), serves as a transitional unit be-

כה אמר אדני יהוה בקבצי את בית ישראל מן העמים אשר נפצו בם ונקדשתי בם לעיני הגוים
וישבו על אדמתם אשר נתתי לעבדי ליעקב. <u>וישבו עליה לבטח</u> ובנו בתים ונטעו כרמים <u>וישבו</u>
<u>לבטח</u> בעשותי שפטים בכל השאטים אתם מסביבותם וידעו כי אני יהוה אלהיהם

"Thus said the Lord GOD: When I have gathered the House of Israel from
the peoples among which they have been dispersed, and have shown My-
self holy through them in the sight of the nations, they shall settle on their
own soil, which I gave to My servant Jacob, <u>and they shall dwell on it in
security</u>. **They shall build houses and plant vineyards**, <u>and shall dwell on
it in security</u>, when I have meted out punishment to all those about them
who despise them. And they shall know that I the LORD am their God."

Consolation means a promise to gather the dispersed from the peoples
and resettle them back onto their own land (likewise in 11:17), the land
promised to Jacob (see further 37:25).[82] Verse 26 describes this return,
embedding the Deuteronomic formula between the repeated phrase ישב
לבטח. The adaptation of the Holiness Code's blessings upon the obedient
people (Lev 26:1–13) is a trait Ezekiel uses also in his prophecy concerning
the covenant of peace (Ezek 34:25–30). Ezek 28:26 is therefore among a
repertoire of passages where the prophet brings together priestly/Holiness
code expressions and Deuteronomic phrases, combining them to proclaim
the reversal of the long judgment of exile.[83]

Like Jeremiah, Ezekiel constructs his prophecies on the same pentateu-
chal materials, activating conceptions of land and exile and evoking tradi-
tional conceptions of covenant in order to invert judgment prophecies
into words of consolation. The phraseological resemblance cannot be
traced to any clear dependence of Ezekiel on Jeremiah. Yet even without
an actual interchange between the two, Ezekiel sends a message to the Je-
hoiachin Exiles that opposes that of Jeremiah. Although there are no clear
indications that Ezek 25:25–26 responds to Jeremiah's letter to the Jehoia-
chin Exiles, these verses clearly overturn the message of that letter. Jeremi-

---

tween the doom prophesied against the nations and the restoration promised to Israel
(chapters 34–37); and he related the intervening unit against Egypt (chapters 29–32) to
"the arranger of Ezekiel's prophecies" (p. 597). But compare Block (*Ezekiel 25–48*, 126),
who found these verses of consolation to Israel to be detached from the immediate con-
text of the verses against Sidon; in his opinion they serve better as a conclusion to Ezek
25:1–26:21. W. Zimmerli (*Ezekiel 2* [trans. R.E. Clements; Hermeneia; Philadelphia:
Fortress Press, 1983], 100) goes as far as considering these verses to be from the "very
late phase in the formation of the book, one which certainly is no longer from the hand
of the prophet himself."

82 For the specification of Jacob as forefather in this "eschatological restoration," see
Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37*, 595; and Block, *Ezekiel 25–48*, 127.

83 See Kohn, *A New Heart* (see n. 50), 96–104.

ah's message of accommodation to a permanent exile is replaced with the prospect of return, restoration, and resettlement in the land.

V. Conclusions

This paper brought up a long standing question in the study of Ezekiel and his (or, the book's) relationship to Jeremiah. In earlier scholarly discussions, this question was addressed by focusing on the prophetic personages; attention has gradually moved to the literary sphere and now tends to focus on the development of the two prophetic books.

To ask about the silence between the prophets is but a key opening the door to a large hall filled with great variety of historical and literary-textual connections. In order to clarify these questions, I have reexamined the long list of suggested parallel phrases and passages according to their literary and textual connections. Looking at the data from the methodological standpoint of intertextuality and allusion enabled me to categorize those parallels into the three primary categories of influence, echo, and allusion. It is quite remarkable that the great majority of the presumed parallels between the prophets may only be classified as influence or echo at best, leaving but very few passages which may actually be defined as implicit allusions. This led to the realization that the silence between Ezekiel and Jeremiah connects with a more profound non-communication between the prophets themselves but to a renewal of contact between the circles in Babylon that compiled their respective books.

It is remarkable to note some distribution data concerning the diverse connections between the books. Similarities to Jeremiah occur in almost every chapter of Ezekiel 1–38, but only in a few occurrences in chapters 40–48.[84] A look at Jeremiah reveals, in turn, that these resemblances occur in both poetry and prose passages.[85] It is nevertheless interesting that the

---

84 See the appendix. There were no examples only on Ezekiel 1, 19, 31, 33.

85 The passages from Jeremiah are categorized as Poetry (Po) or Prose (Pr) and ordered by their place in the book. Poetry passages: Prophecies of Judgment: Jer **2**:5; 2:10–11; 2:2; 2:3; 2:7 (2); 2:20; **3**:1(2); 3:19; 3:23; **4**:1; 4:13; 4:18 (2); 4:20; 4:23–26; 4:30; **5**:21; **6**:8; 6:11; 6:17; 6:21; 6:22; 6:24; 6:26; 6:28–30; **8**:12; 9:10; **9**:21; **10**:3; **11**:16 (2); **13**:27; **14**:3; **15**:14; **17**:4; **22**:6; 22:17; 22:22; 22:28; Prophecies against the prophets: **6**:14; **8**:11; **23**:9–40; 23:14; Confessions: **15**:12; 15:16; 15:17; 15:20; **18**:18 (Pr); 18:21; Prophecies of Consolation: **30**:11; **31**:10; **50**:6; 50:19; Prophecies against the Nations: **43**:13; **46**:9; 46:11; 46:14; 46:16; 46:19; 46:25; **47**:4, 7; **48**:2; 48:25; 48:26; 48:28; **49**:7–11; 49:21; 49:31; 49:32; **51**:53. Prose passages, Call prophecy: **1**:8; 1:9; 1:13–14; 1:16; 1:18; Prophecies of Judgment: **3**:6–11; **7**:3, 5; 7:9; 7:17; 7:30; 7:32; 7:33; **8**:1–2; 8:2; 8:1–3; **9**:15; **11**:19; **13**:14; **15**:1(2); 15:3; **16**:1–9; 16:8; 16:14 (2); 16:18; **18**:11; **19**:7; **21**:7(2); **23**:1–4;

distribution of these passages in Jeremiah is concentrated in specific, quite select chapters. This information substantiates the general notion of direction of influence from Jeremiah to Ezekiel. But this is only part of the picture.

Focusing on the ways both prophets (and their books) evoke Deuteronomic passages revealed two salient examples of implicit polemic, in which each of the prophets utilizes the same Deuteronomic traditions. This rhetorical technique that both prophets oftentimes use to evoke pentateuchal, prophetic, and psalmodic literature is only rarely used between these two books. This study shows that while Ezekiel is certainly influenced by Jeremiah in language, imagery, and conceptions, he hardly ever uses literary allusions to confront Jeremiah. But it seems that Ezekiel's usual practice in polemicizing against Jeremiah's prophecy is to allude independently to the same passages, the same Deuteronomic conceptions, in order to construct a profoundly different alternative.

The examples to an implicit disagreement between the prophets are part of a much broader deliberation that reveals itself in the two prophetic books in reference to the fates of the two Judean communities during the early decades of the sixth century (and subsequently through the Persian period). Conflicts over issues of group identity appear after 597 B.C.E., as mutual hostility kindles between Jerusalem and its inhabitants, on the one hand, and the Jehoiachin Exiles, on the other, (Ezekiel 1–24 in general, and specifically 11:14–21, over against Jer 32:6–15). This polemic involves contradictory predictions of the fortunes of the last two Davidic kings, Jehoiachin and Zedekiah (compare Jer 22:24–30 to Ezekiel 17), and opposing definitions of the remnant of the Judean people (see Ezek 11:1–13, 14–21 versus the definitions of שארית יהודה in Jeremiah 40–41). Major conceptions and traditions are drawn into a theological deliberation over conceptions of covenant, land, and exile, and the profound differences between Ezekiel and Jeremiah in the use of these traditions cannot be overlooked.

A more coherent picture of this silent antagonism between the prophets becomes clearer once the contrasting messages in the book of Jeremiah are recognized as reflecting two antagonistic strands of traditions: on the one hand, the pro-Judah strand of the prophet and his Judean tradents and, on the other, a pro-Golah stance assigned to the Babylonian/Golah redactory

---

25:6–7; 25:15; **26:**13; **34:**20; **36:**3 f; **44:**8; prophecies against the prophets: **14:**13–14; 14:14–16; **23:**9–40; 23:33; 23:31–32; **27:**9–10; **28**; **29:**5, 28; Prophecies of Consolation:**24:**7; **31:**19; 31:29; 31:30; 31:33; **32:**37; 32:38–39; 32:40; **33:**5; 33:8; Prophecies against the Nations: **44:**30.

level(s).[86] These two strands in Jeremiah apply to two distinct lines of connections between the books of Ezekiel and Jeremiah. Agreements in theme and ideology, as well as verbal similarities, may first be referred to the prophets Ezekiel and Jeremiah in the early decades of the sixth century. The significant issue that remains under debate is the struggle of who should be considered to be "the true people of God." A second line of agreements in both theme and ideology as well as verbal similarities may thus be traced between Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah, and the Babylonian editorial strands of Jeremiah (written by the Deuteronomistic editors or by others).[87] This second layer of Babylonian similarities demonstrate the influence of Ezekiel's circles on the evolution of the book of Jeremiah, enforcing a message of consolation and hope to the Babylonian Exiles. To set aside the "Babylonian connections" between Ezekiel and the non-Jeremian materials in Jeremiah leaves a great gulf between the prophets themselves. It seems that their disparate locations, Jeremiah in Jerusalem, Mitzpah, and finally Egypt, and Ezekiel in Babylon, signal much more than the geographical distance separating them. Both Jeremiah and Ezekiel served their respective community and identified with it in such a way that direct communication between them was not possible.

The silence between Ezekiel and Jeremiah thus covers over a great ideological distance between the two contemporary prophets of YHWH.

To answer the question of what might stand behind the silence, I would suggest, on the one hand, that it might denote embarrassment like the embarrassment Jeremiah felt in face of Hananiah's prophecy. In that case, Jeremiah could not know for sure whether Hananiah was indeed a true or a false prophet, he walked away silently (Jer 28:11b); only later was this unknown detail clarified by God (vv. 12–17). Could the silence between

---

86 The pro-Judean Jeremian level over against the pro-Golah one, was suggested and discussed by C.R. Seitz, *Theology in Conflict: Reactions to the Exile in the Book of Jeremiah* (BZAW 176; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989); and C.J. Sharp, *Prophecy and Ideology in Jeremiah: Struggles for Authority in Deutero-Jeremianic Prose* (Old Testament Studies; London: T & T Clark). On the two contrasting levels within Jeremiah, see also G. Wanke, *Untersuchungen zur sogenannten Baruchschrift* (BZAW 122; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971), 91–133; K.F. Pohlmann, *Studien zum Jeremiabuches* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978).

87 The Babylonian editorial level in Jeremiah indeed activates contemporaneous phraseology and conceptions of the Babylonian-exilic ideology. This may explain the stance of Jer 30:11. See Rom-Shiloni, "Prophecy for 'Everlasting Covenant'" (see n. 55), 201–223; idem, "Group-Identities in Jeremiah" (see n. 8), 11–46. On Babylonian-exilic ideology, see idem, "From Ezekiel to Ezra-Nehemiah: Shifts of Group-Identities within Babylonian Exilic Ideology," in *Judeans in the Achaemenid Age: Negotiating Identity in an International Context* (ed. G. Knoppers, O. Lipschitz and M. Oeming; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 127–151.

the two prophets stem from a similar lack of confidence in each regarding the message of the other, since they expressed such different messages concerning those crucial issues of identity that were emerging in each of the separate and distant Judean communities during that dramatic era?

A second option to explain the silence may be based on their mutual great respect. Ezekiel, whether exposed to Jeremiah in person or through his writings, found himself in the subsequent years of exile holding to substantially different positions than his highly esteemed predecessor. His implicit polemics against Jeremiah were well hidden, but the two proclaimed clearly opposite messages. Hence, it seems indeed that this silence between the prophets should be perceived as a highly eloquent one.

Dalit Rom-Shiloni
Senior Lecturer of Hebrew Bible
Department of Hebrew Culture Studies
Tel Aviv University
dromshil@post.tau.ac.il