eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/

On the Compositional Models for Ezekiel 38–39: A Response to William Tooman's *Gog of Magog*

Abstract

William Tooman's monograph *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38–39* has quickly become a seminal study of Ezek 38–39. This article examines and critiques Tooman's influential position that Ezek 38–39 were composed by a method called thematic pastiche, which only emerged in second temple Jewish texts. By showing inconsistencies in the limits of what constitutes thematic pastiche and by re-examining the evidence that Ezek 38–39 depends upon Joel 1:6; 2:27; 3:1-2; Isa 62:2; 66:18-19, this article demonstrates that Joel 3:1-2 and Isa 66:18-19 may even reuse Ezek 39:21, 29 as source texts, thus re-opening the search for which texts provide the compositional model for the Gog oracles. As a logical consequence of that finding, this article highlights problems with Tooman's widely adopted proposal, albeit provisional, that Ezek 38–39 dates from the 4th to 2nd century B.C.E.

Keywords

Ezekiel 38–39 — Gog of Magog — inner-biblical exegesis — textual dependence

William Tooman's monograph *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38–39*, published in 2011, is not only an important study of Ezek 38–39, but according to Daniel Block it is 'the definitive work on Gog of Magog.'[1] The book analyses a wealth of prior research on the Gog oracles to offer a fresh perspective on their composition that draws heavily from new understandings of scribal practice and growing knowledge about

---

1 Daniel I. Block, 'Review of Gog of Magog,' *Biblica* 94:3(2013), p. 452; cf. idem., 'The God Ezekiel Wants Us to Meet: Theological Perspectives on the Book of Ezekiel,' in *The God Ezekiel Creates*, ed. Paul M. Joyce and Dalit Rom-Shiloni (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015). For other indications of the widespread influence of Tooman's volume see Michael A. Lyons, *An Introduction to the Study of Ezekiel* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), pp. 69-70, and Corrine Carvalho, 'The God That Gog Creates: "Drop the Stories and Feel the Feelings",' in *The God Ezekiel Creates*, eds. Paul M. Joyce and Dalit Rom-Shiloni (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), pp. 107-31, especially p. 121.

the second temple period.[2] It is now impossible to deal with Ezek 38–39 competently without placing one's argument and findings in conversation with Tooman.

Tooman's work, therefore, not only invites but requires robust engagement from all sides. In this article, I examine and critique two of Tooman's main analytical tools: one, his criteria for determining what qualifies as literary pastiche; and, two, his method for determining the direction of dependence between texts. Irregularities are identified in both cases.

The article unfolds in three sections: first, there is a brief review of Tooman's argument for the composition of Ezek 38–39; second, there is an examination of the limits Tooman places on the category of pastiche, suggesting he omits helpful comparisons within the Hebrew Bible; and third, there is an analysis of Ezekiel's relationship to the key passages outside Ezekiel, with texts from Joel and Third Isaiah providing the case study. Altogether, these discussions strengthen Tooman's argument that Ezek 38–39 is separate from and builds upon pre-existing Ezekiel material, though they simultaneously contest his claims that the compositional model for this work occurs first in Second Temple Jewish parabiblical texts.'[3] The logical implication of the argument, furthermore, draws into question Tooman's provisional, yet widely embraced, remarks about the Gog oracles' date of composition.

I.   Summary of Tooman's Argument

The foundation of Tooman's study—and its undeniable contribution to the understanding of Ezekiel as a whole and the Gog of Magog pericope in particular—is its exploration of connections between Ezek 38–39 and other texts in the Hebrew Bible. This analysis begins with how Ezek 38–39 reuses material from elsewhere in Ezekiel, then moves on to look at evidence concerning how it adopts locutions from the Torah and Prophets. Tooman deduces that Ezek 38–39 'mirrors Ezekiel's idiolect and compositional style' in the service of 'putting an Ezekielian face' upon a later composition that has its boundaries at 38:1 and 39:29.[4] Furthermore, Tooman astutely picks up a thesis from Walther Zimmerli that the Gog oracles

---

2   Tooman is not alone in taking this approach to Ezekiel; see also Anja Klein, *Schriftauslegung im Ezechielbuch: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Ez 34–39* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), pp. 111-69.

3   William A. Tooman, *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38–39* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), p. 115.

4   Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 114.

incorporate 'traditions from various spheres... into a new creation' and provides new evidence to expand this insight into the conclusion that Ezek 38–39 brings together '*textual materials* from various spheres.'[5]

Tooman then argues that this evidence supports 'one of the principle arguments of this monograph, namely, [the Gog oracle] is unlike any other text within the HB. *It is pastiche, an extreme example of a conflate text.*'[6] This conflate nature reveals itself in three features of Ezek 38–39: the passage uses existing texts as *Vorbilder*, with the component sections borrowing heavily from one or two texts,[7] all of which are thematically connected by their interest in the vindication of Israel and the fate of the nations.[8] Tooman argues that the Gog oracle structures itself according to three antecedent texts, specifically, Ezek 28:25-26, Ezek 6:1-14, and Psalm 79:1-4. A wide range of texts provide the locutions on the vindication of Israel and the fate of the nations, though 'the greatest influence on [Ezek 38–39] were, clearly, the book of Ezekiel, the Priestly legal material (including the H code), and texts that the author took to be eschatological or applicable to the eschaton.'[9] Tooman contends that this reuse of earlier material serves two aims: one, the recombination gives the oracle its design and its similarity to the existing Ezekiel material, and two, the recombination implicitly interprets the antecedent material. Considered together, these characteristics mark Ezek 38–39 out as 'thematic pastiche,' the name Tooman chooses as shorthand for this phenomenon.

Tooman suggests the earliest comparable examples for this compositional approach are 'from Second Temple Jewish parabiblical texts.'[10] In support of this claim, he remarks that 'GO [i.e., the Gog oracles] is unlike any other text within the HB… There are no parallels [sic] texts within the HB that have been constructed by means of this same compositional technique.'[11] To further support the relationship between the Gog oracles and the 'Second Temple' period, Tooman maintains that Ezek 38–39 alludes to a number of texts

---

5   Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, pp. 114-15; emphasis original.
6   Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, pp. 115.
7   Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 200, offers the following sections, with their key antecedences in parentheses: 38:1-6 (Num 23–24, Isa 66:19, with perhaps Gen 10 and Ezek 27); 38:7-16 (Isa 10:3-7, Jer 49:30-33); 38:18-23 (Zeph 1:2-18); 39:1-8 (Isa 14:4-21); 39:9-16 (Jer 7:30-34); 39:17-20 (Isa 34:6-7); and 39:21-29 (Tooman intentionally restrains from deciding on an antecedent here).
8   Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 196.
9   Tooman, *Gog of Magog,* p. 196.
10 Tooman, *Gog of Magog,* p. 115.
11 Tooman, Gog of Magog, p. 115.

from that period, specifically, 'Joel, Isa 40–66, and Daniel,' which 'are the most helpful for establishing [the Gog oracles'] date'[12] in the 4th to 2nd centuries B.C.E. Both of these points merit closer scrutiny.

II.   The Category of Pastiche

Locating the 'earliest comparable examples' for the composition of the Gog oracles among 'Second Temple Jewish parabiblical texts,'[13] Tooman comments that '[t]he only cases of true pastiche within the [Hebrew Bible], to my knowledge, are [the Gog oracles] and the Prayer of Daniel (Dan 9.4b-19).'[14] He demarcates the category even more narrowly by excluding Dan 9, stating that 'I am not yet convinced that Dan 9.4b-19 has a principle source text, a backbone, as does every major subsection of [the Gog oracles].'[15] Presumably, the lack of a principle source text for its structure compels Tooman to exclude Neh 9 from the category as well, even though he groups it with the Prayer of Daniel by observing that both depend 'upon an array of antecedent sources.'[16]

Welcome as Tooman's effort to delimit the category of pastiche carefully is, there are indications within his own work that insisting on identifying 'a principle source text' in order to categorize a passage as pastiche is too restrictive. Tooman argues, for instance, that Ezek 38–39 as a whole employs three separate texts to generate its template (Ezek 28:25-26, Ezek 6:1-14, and Ps 79:1-4). So far, so good. When the focus narrows and he examines Ezek 38:1-6, the very first component pericope of the Gog oracles, he recognizes that it utilizes between two and as many as four texts to shape its contents (i.e., Num 23–24; Isa 66:19; Gen 10; Ezek 27). Some flexibility, then, must be necessary in assessing the source texts of a pastiche. What is more, Tooman intentionally refrains from identifying the 'principle source text' for Ezek 39:21-29 because 'there is no specific source text that was the primary inspiration of the pericope.' The willingness to recognize how multiple texts inspire the shape of a later text and the restraint shown not to overstate the certainty with which such antecedents may be identified when dealing with the small details of Ezek 38–39 belies the

---

12 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 271. The list of texts, dealt with below in detail, includes Joel 1:6; 2:27; Isa 62:2; 66:19 (cf. 42:8; 48:11); and Dan 9.
13 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 115.
14 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 201, note 6.
15 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 201, note 6.
16 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 115.

stringency with which he applies the requirement to identify 'a principle source text' for classifying other passages as pastiche.

Bearing this in mind, it is difficult to exclude Neh 9 from the category of pastiche as Tooman does. Consider Mark Boda's conclusion that Neh 9 fuses various tradition complexes into 'a coherent whole,'[17] namely, a 'recitation of history'[18] that draws its boundaries from traditions contained in 'a Pentateuch closely related to our present collection.'[19] Boda outlines this compositional model by comparison with Hugh Williamson's analysis of Ezra 9, which Williamson shows is creating a mosaic of many passages from a body of authoritative texts one can call scripture by appealing to three principle prior texts.[20] These features resemble Tooman's concepts of scriptural reuse and adoption of a source text for both textual structure and content.

Indeed, within these limits it is possible to argue that the book of Ezekiel contains another example of pastiche that may have encouraged the working method of the Gog oracles' author. Many scholars have noted that Ezek 20 relies upon a historical periodization shared with the exodus tradition, though it differs notably in the way it presents YHWH's decision to cast the people out of the land (20:23-24) and in its evaluation of the legal stipulations YHWH gives to Israel (20:25). Risa Levitt Kohn demonstrated how frequently and pervasively Ezek 20 adopts locutions from both the Priestly and Deuteronomistic traditions in each historical stage that the *Unheilsgeschichte* addresses.[21] C. A. Strine builds on and expands Levitt Kohn's findings, demonstrating that Ezek 20 uses the Deuteronomistic divine oath 'as I live' (חי אני) and the Priestly 'lifted hand' formula (נשׂא יד) to structure its contents.[22] Adopting the more flexible approach to identifying what texts qualify as thematic pastiche substantiated above, there is good reason to classify Ezek 20 as pastiche. Ezekiel 20 at least comprises a seminal text in a move towards the compositional technique that Tooman identifies in Ezek 38–39. Acknowledging that Ezek 20 functions as a precursor to

---

17 Mark J. Boda, *Praying the Tradition: The Origin and Use of Tradition in Nehemiah 9* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), p. 196.
18 Boda, *Praying the Tradition*, p. 24.
19 Boda, *Praying the Tradition*, p. 196.
20 Specifically, Deut 7:1-3; 11:8; 23:6; 2 Kings 21:16; Isa 1:19. H.G.M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1985), p. 137; cf. comments on the whole passage at p. 129.
21 Risa Levitt Kohn, *A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile and the Torah* (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), pp. 96-104; for further evidence of Ezekiel's reuse of language from elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible see Michael A. Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code* (New York: T & T Clark, 2009).
22 Strine, *Sworn Enemies*, especially pp. 269-83.

the compositional technique employed in the Gog oracles strengthens one of Tooman's primary findings, namely, that Ezek 38–39 'mirrors Ezekiel's idiolect and *compositional style*' in the service of 'putting an Ezekielian face' upon its material.[23]

Further evidence that Tooman's definition of pastiche may be too narrow comes from Strine, who argues that the *Vorbilder* of Ezek 38–39 could be the Mesopotamian text Enūma Eliš. In contrast to Tooman, who looks for the Gog oracles' *Vorbilder* only within the Hebrew Bible, Strine builds on his earlier work identifying links between Ezek 17 and Enūma Eliš to argue that Ezek 38–39 in particular and Ezek 38–48* as a whole[24] models its plotline on Tablets IV to VI of the Babylonian myth.[25] Even if scholars are not persuaded by Strine's argument, this work highlights the importance of looking beyond the Hebrew Bible and later Jewish texts to locate potential *Vorbilder* for Ezek 38–39. Such a broad perspective is particularly necessary with Ezekiel, which prompted Moshe Greenberg to call its author a 'polymath' with knowledge of a wide range of Mesopotamian and perhaps Egyptian text and iconography.[26]

In sum, this section demonstrates that the criteria Tooman offers for the category pastiche unduly restrict what passages qualify. Tooman excludes from the consideration at least two texts—Neh 9 and Ezek 20—that necessitate broadening the context for the emergence and dating of the compositional technique he identifies in the Gog oracles well beyond 'Second Temple Jewish parabiblical texts.'[27]

III.   Evidence for Ezekiel's Dependence on Joel, Isaiah, and Daniel

The second criteria Tooman employs to maintain that the compositional model for Ezek 38–

---

23 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 114, emphasis added.

24 C. A. Strine, 'Chaoskampf Against Empire: Yʜᴡʜ's Battle Against Gog (Ezek 38–39) as Resistance Literature,' in *Divination, Politics, and Ancient Near Eastern Empires*, eds. Alan Lenzi and Jonathan Stökl (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), pp. 98-108, works with the form of Ezekiel that has Ezek 38–39 preceding Ezek 37—the arrangement known from P967 (on which, see Ashley S. Crane, *Israel's Restoration: A Textual-Comparative Exploration of Ezekiel 36–39* [Leiden: Brill, 2008] and Ingrid E. Lilly, *Two Books of Ezekiel: Papyrus 967 and the Masoretic Text as Variant Literary Editions* [Leiden: Brill, 2012])—and leaves open the extent to which Ezek 40–48 includes all the material known from the MT.

25 Strine, 'Chaoskampf,' pp. 87-108; cf. C. A. Strine, *Sworn Enemies: The Divine Oath, the Book of Ezekiel, and the Polemics of Exile* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013), pp. 230-43.

26 Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37: A New Translation With Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1997), pp. 395-96.

27 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 115. Perhaps Dan 9:4b-19, which Tooman also excludes, should feature in the list too, though Tooman correctly observes that there are issues in identifying a relationship between it and a prior text. Further discussion not possible here remains necessary to determine this point.

39 only emerges in the 4th century or later is literary dependence. Specifically, he argues that Ezek 38–39 adopts material from Joel 1:6; 2:27; 3:1-2 and Isa 14; 62:2; 66:19. In each case, there is either insufficient evidence to sustain Ezekiel's dependence on those texts or strong arguments that Ezek 38–39 contains the antecedent passage.

(a)   Connections between Ezek 38–39 and Joel

Tooman posits a connection between the Gog oracles and the three passages from Joel (1:6, 2:27, 3:1-2). Tooman recognizes that the link between Ezek 38:11 and Joel 1:6—based upon the phrase עלה אל ארץ ... השקטים—is weak, admitting both that Joel 1:6 lacks the word השקטים found in Ezekiel 38:11 and also that 'Jer 49 is the probable source of the expression.'[28] Obviously, the mere repetition of the phrase 'go up against a land' cannot be determinative for establishing dependence. Tooman also contends there is a connection between Ezek 39:7 and Joel 2:27 via the divine title קדוש בישראל. Yet, Tooman can only include Joel 2:27 at the very end of a long list of passages that use the familiar title קדוש ישראל as a 'conferre.'[29] Even that loose association may overstate the case. Joel 2:27 includes the statement that 'I am in the midst of Israel' (בקרב ישראל אני), but this phrase neither functions as a divine title nor includes the modifier 'holy one,' the key features of Ezek 39:7. Since the more similar phrase 'Holy One of Israel' features prominently in Isaiah and because the resemblance between Ezek 39:7 and Joel 2:27 is so weak, no conclusions regarding dependence are possible here.[30]

Only Joel 3:1-2 remains. The locution שפכתי את רוחי, as Tooman notes, 'occurs only in Joel 3.1 and Ezek 39.29,'[31] which does suggest a relationship between the two texts.[32] But how can one determine the direction of relationship between two texts when there are no other comparisons and this phrase forms the only link between two pericopae? Tooman

---

28 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 98.
29 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 100.
30 It is worth noting the full content of Joel 2:27a, which reads 'You shall know that I am in the midst of Israel; I am Y<small>HWH</small> your god, and there is no other.' The opening statement is reminiscent of the *Erkenntnissaussage* so prominent in Ezekiel, but Tooman fails to employ this similarity in his argument so far as I can see. Even including this similarity, I cannot see that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that Ezek 39:7 depends upon Joel 2:27.
31 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 101.
32 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 194, note 237; cf. Klein, *Schriftauslegung im Ezechielbuch*, p. 298.

puts forward six criteria laid out by David Carr.[33] Three of Carr's six criteria draw attention to expansions on the earlier text: he explains that a later text will parallel the earlier text but include pluses, often to fill an apparent gap in the earlier text, frequently placing all this in theophanic speech. The last criterion does not apply here because both Ezek 39:29 and Joel 3:1-2 are divine speech. Observe, however, that Joel 3:1-2 specifies the divine spirit will be poured out on all flesh—further explicated as sons and daughters and male and female slaves—with the result that old men shall dream dreams and young men see visions. The logical conclusion is that Joel expands on the rather succinct statement of Ezek 39:29 that the spirit will be poured out on 'the house of Israel.' Thus, using Tooman's proposed criteria, one can justifiably conclude that Joel 3:1-2 depends on Ezek 39:29, not vice versa.[34] Altogether, this re-examination of the relationship between the Gog oracles and Joel 1:6, 2:27, and 3:1-2 demonstrates that it is highly unlikely that Joel serves as a source text for Ezek 38–39.

(b) Connections between Ezek 38–39 and Isa 40–66

Tooman relies upon two texts from Isaiah—Isa 62:2 and 66:19—to maintain that the 'sudden appearance' of language 'completely unattested elsewhere in Ezekiel' but distinctive of Isaiah in Ezek 39:21 'is due to literary dependence' on Isa 62:2 and 66:19.[35] Both passages require re-analysis.

First, Tooman suggests that Isa 62:2 (along with Isa 66:19, on which more below) is the source for 'all the nations will see,' or as Tooman notates it ‏כל הגוים + ראה‎, in Ezek

---

33 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 34-5. Cf. David M. Carr, 'Method in Determination of Dependence: An Empirical Test of Criteria Applied to Exodus 34:11-26 and Its Parallels,' in Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum (eds.) *Gottes Volk am Sinai. Untersuchungen zu Ex 32–34 und Dtn 9–10* (Gütersloh: Kaiser Gütersloher, 2001), pp. 107-40, especially p. 126. Carr concludes '[a] text tends to be later than its ››parallel‹‹ when it: (1) Verbally parallels that text and yet includes *substantial* pluses vis-a-vis that text. (2) Appears to enrich its parallel (fairly fully preserved) with fragments from various locutions in the Bible (less completely preserved). (3) Includes a plus that fills what could have been perceived as an apparent gap in its parallel. (4) Includes expansive material in character speeches, particularly theophanic speech. (5) Has an element which appears to be an adaptation of an element in the other text to shifting circumstances/ideas. (6) Combines linguistic phenomena from disparate strata of the Pentateuch.' It is important to note that Carr advises caution and the role of scholarly judgment in applying the criteria: 'such criteria are only guides requiring judicious use. Any such tools must still be used with care by someone conscious of a broad range of data and texts relevant to the case at hand.' (Carr, 'Method,' p. 126).

34 This does not necessarily undermine Tooman's claim that Ezek 39:29 fills in gaps it perceived in Ezek 11:19-20 or 37:14. Indeed, it remains possible that Ezek 39:29 did just that, and that Joel 3:1-2 did so again.

35 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 192.

39:21.[36] Ezekiel 39:21 states that 'all the nations will see my [YHWH's] judgments (משפטי),' whereas Isa 62:2 asserts that 'the nations will see your righteousness (צדקך) and all the kings your glory' (וכבודך). Tooman notes this language is similar to Isa 52:10, where it says that 'YHWH bared his holy arm (זרוע) before the eyes of all the nations and the ends of the earth will see the salvation (ישועה) of our God.' Since Ezek 39:21 also speaks of YHWH doing his judgments by 'his hand' (ידי), one can reasonably conclude the links between Isa 52:10 and Ezek 39:21 are more significant. Furthermore, if one harkens back to Carr's criteria for dependence,[37] in which expansion of the antecedent text by the later text figures so prominently, then the expansion of nations in Ezek 39:21 to nations and kings in Isa 62:2 suggests borrowing by Third Isaiah, not by the author of the Gog oracles. Indeed, one might even depart from Tooman entirely, concluding that an author would not require a prior source text to construct a statement that combines a very common verb (ראה) with a phrase (כל הגוים) that is hardly idiosyncratic.[38] Despite an undeniable resemblance between Ezek 39:21 and Isa 62:2, it is more likely either that Ezek 39:21 depends on Isa 52:10 or that it constructs this locution of its own accord.

Second, Tooman comments that '[i]t seems likely that the author's attention fell upon Isa 66.19, in particular, because of its subject matter (eschatological judgment) and its reuse of foreign nations from Gen 10, which the author of [Ezek 39:21-29] also reused.'[39] Again, thematic similarity between the two passages undeniably exists, but that resemblance can only be one part of a larger argument that Ezek 39:21 depends upon Isa 66:19, so more detailed analysis is needed.

It is notable that Tooman focuses on only Isa 66:19, not explicitly excluding 66:18, but not addressing the ways it might figure in the argument. The two verses read:

> [18] For I [YHWH] know their works and their thoughts, and I am coming to gather all nations (כל הגוים) and tongues; they shall come and they will see (וראו) my glory (כבודי). [19] I will set a sign among them and I will send from them survivors to the nations—Tarshish, Put, Lud (who draw the bow), Tubal, and Javan—to the distant coastlands which have not heard my fame and have not seen my glory. They will declare (הגידו) my glory among the nations (כבודי בגוים).

---

36 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 101.
37 For details, see note 33 above.
38 כל הגוים occurs over 60 times in a wide array of settings throughout the Hebrew Bible.
39 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, pp. 192.

Verse 18 includes both the phrase 'all the nations' and the claims that they will see YHWH's glory. This evidence might be added to that which Tooman demarcates in 66:19, specifically, that the nations (גוים) and distant coastlands will see (ראו) YHWH's glory so that the survivors shall declare YHWH's glory among the nations (כבודי בגוים).

The resonance with Ezek 39:21 comes from two phrases Tooman highlights: 'my glory among the nations' and 'all the nations will see.' The verse says:

> I will put (ונתן) my glory among the nations (כבודי בגוים) and all the nations will see my judgments (וראו כל־הגוים את־משפטי), which I did, and my hand (ידי) that I set upon them.

Adding Isa 66:18 into consideration better reflects the numerous links between Isa 66:18-19 and the language of Ezek 39:21, but at the same time it reveals the problems that exist in establishing Ezekiel's dependence upon Isa 66:18-19.

One issue relates to the use of the phrase כבודי בגוים. Ezekiel 39:21 states that YHWH will put (נתן) his glory among the nations, whereas Isa 66:18-19 asserts that the survivors will declare (Hiphil of נגד) YHWH's glory among the nations. In itself, the change of verbs does not undermine Tooman's argument, but it is worth noting this non-trivial difference.

A second, more substantial problem arises from how the two texts differ in their use of the locution containing the verb ראה and the phrase כל הגוים. For Ezekiel, YHWH's actions will cause all the nations to see YHWH's judgments (משפטים), whereas in Isaiah all the nations and tongues will see YHWH's glory (כבוד; v. 18), though at present they do not see YHWH's glory (ולא־ראו את־כבודי; v. 19). It is manifest, then, that the two texts differ on what the nations will see. Thus, all they share is the use of the verb ראה and the phrase כל הגוים. This argument equates to the one used to connect Ezek 39:21 with Isa 62:2, and therefore it is equally incapable of substantiating the Gog oracles depend upon Isa 66:18-19.

Still, the most problematic issue arises from applying Tooman's preferred criteria for determining the direction of dependence between Isa 66:18-19 and Ezek 39:21. Recall that Tooman advocates employing Carr's criteria,[40] three of which consider expansion of the antecedent text by the later text. To begin, Isa 66:18-19 expands upon the audience—Ezek

---

40 For details, see note 33 above.

39:21 has 'all the nations' whereas Isa 66:18-19 has 'all the nations and tongues,' which it further enumerates into five specific groups before adding the 'distant coastlands' as well. Moreover, Isa 66:18-19 explicates the attributes of YHWH observed: Ezek 39:21 has only glory, whereas Isa 66:18-19 has both glory and fame.[41] The evidence, in sum, justifies the opposite conclusion that Tooman reaches: Isa 66:18-19 more likely depends on Ezek 39:21 than vice versa.

Tooman argues elsewhere that Ezek 39:1-8 draws heavily on Isa 14,[42] remarking that Ezek 39:1-8 draws its 'principle images' from Isa 14:4b-21.[43] Persuasive on this point, Tooman's finding offers little to connect the compositional technique for the Gog oracles with 'Second Temple Jewish parabiblical texts.'[44] For, as Tooman acknowledges, Isa 14:4b-21 originally announced judgment on Assyria and welcomed later (re)appropriation against Babylon in the 6th century B.C.E.[45]

Taken as a whole, then, the evidence of links between the Gog oracles and Isaiah support a relationship between Ezek 38–39 and Second Isaiah, but not with Isa 40–66, Tooman's preferred referent that presumes authorial and editorial work by Third Isaiah. Rather than narrowing the compositional models that inspire Ezek 38–39 to later parabiblical texts, this evidence opens up the possibilities for finding the Gog oracles compositional model, just like the prior discussion of thematic pastiche.

IV.   Conclusion

This article has evaluated the ways Tooman deploys two analytical tools in order to maintain that the Gog oracles rely upon 'Second Temple Jewish parabiblical texts.'[46] The first analytical tool Tooman employs is the category of thematic pastiche. Comparing his definition of the category against his own application of it, I showed that Tooman advocates unduly restrictive limits for what qualifies as pastiche. When the criteria are applied in the

---

41 One might even add sign (אות) from Isa 66:19a.
42 Tooman does mention Isa 34:6-7, but admits the list of sacrificial animals there is 'not uncommon' in the Hebrew Bible, so it cannot be determinative.
43 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 171.
44 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 115.
45 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 173. Cf. Hugh G. M. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 157-75.
46 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 115.

somewhat more flexible manner that reflects the *de facto* function of them in Tooman's analysis, the category broadens to include at least two texts in the Hebrew Bible—including one within Ezekiel.

The second analytical tool Tooman adopts is Carr's criteria for direction of dependence between texts. Reevaluating the evidence, I showed that Joel 3:1-2 is more likely to depend on Ezek 39:29 than vice versa and, second, I explained that the evidence does not support Tooman's view that Ezek 39:21 depends on either Isa 62:2 or Isa 66:18-19. Precisely the opposite: Carr's criteria suggest that these parts of Joel and Third Isaiah more likely draw on the Gog oracles as a source for their contents.

These findings strengthen one component of Tooman's argument while weakening others. Recognizing that the author of the Gog oracles adopts a compositional strategy already nascent in Ezek 20 reinforces the conclusion that Ezek 38–39 'mirrors Ezekiel's idiolect and compositional style' in the service of 'putting an Ezekielian face' upon a later composition that has its boundaries at 38:1 and 39:29.[47] Herein lies perhaps Tooman's most important contribution to the interpretation of Ezekiel as a whole and the Gog oracles in particular.

By contrast, Tooman's conclusion that Ezek 38–39 employs a compositional technique that only emerges among 'Second Temple Jewish parabiblical texts,'[48] a provenance supported by the posited dependence on Joel and Third Isaiah, is not sustained. This critique should not obscure the larger finding, which remains valid: the Gog oracles bear 'the imprint of many other sources.'[49] Tooman's primary contribution remains identifying numerous allusions to other texts in Ezekiel, Torah, and the Prophets, which support the view that the material from 38:1 to 39:29 comes from a single author who is different from the author of the texts within the book of Ezekiel that antedate it. Tooman opens a new phase of study regarding the provenance and interpretation of the Gog oracles, and he conclusively alters how commentators must approach this text.

For all that, one cannot substantiate that the compositional model for Ezek 38–39 only originates among 'Second Temple Jewish parabiblical texts.'[50] Showing both that it is

---

47 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 114.
48 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 115.
49 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 114.
50 Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, p. 115.

impossible for Tooman to maintain the rigor he advocates for the category of pastiche on even his parade example in Ezek 38–39 and also that non-Judahite, non-Jewish texts may offer principle source texts for the Gog oracles, this article demonstrates that a wider field of potential influence for Ezek 38–39 remains open. By logical implication, this finding mitigates Tooman's provisional, yet already widely influential, claim that the Gog oracles were composed during the 4th to 2nd centuries B.C.E. With recourse to neither a firm date for the emergence of its compositional technique nor adequate evidence that Ezek 38–39 depends on Joel or Third Isaiah, the logic supporting Tooman's proposed dating erodes entirely.

As for a fresh, positive argument regarding the provenance of Ezek 38–39, that will have to occur in another forum. When that discussion unfolds, the argument shall have to begin without the presumption of a 4th century B.C.E. or later date for the Gog oracles as Tooman advocates, though it will certainly require scholars to rely heavily upon Tooman's innovative approach to interpreting Ezek 38–39.