Vanguard Journal of Theology and Ministry, Volume 2 (2023), No. 1, pp. 44-59

The Good Shepherd's Covenant:
Shepherd Imagery in Targum Jonathan to Ezekiel 34

Joel D. Bornau, Vanguard College Alumni.[1]

ABSTRACT: *The present essay is an excerpt, with significant alterations, of the author's 2023 MA thesis at the University of Copenhagen. The original 97-page inquiry into Targum Jonathan to Ezekiel's theocratic, and therefore Messianic program, offered only one relevant section for our present theme, namely, Ezekiel 34's use of shepherd imagery. The work is divided into two sections: the first introduces the Targumin and contends for a composition date of the first century using linguistic and contextual analysis; the second is a survey of chapter 34's content, exploring themes of judgment, salvation, redemption, and theocracy. The work also investigates the meturgeman's (targum translator) use of Messianic notions already latent within the Hebrew text. For Pentecostals, this does not come as a surprise. Orthodox Pentecostal doctrine proclaims Jesus as the Lamb slain before the foundations of the earth (Rev. 13:8); the Gospel of John records Jesus as saying Moses spoke of him (Jn. 5:46); and on the road to Emmaus, the Gospel of Luke tells us, "Beginning with Moses and all the prophets, [Jesus] interpreted to them the things about himself in all the scriptures" (Lk. 24:26).*[2] *Therefore, the present work, adhering to classical Pentecostal doctrine, is convinced we see Jesus in every doting of the I and crossing of the T, from Genesis to Revelation. This statement moves us beyond the realm of historical analysis and into theological hermeneutics, a transition the present author is all too happy to make. Though there is merit in pressing the Scriptures using more critical methodology, the present work has been amended to be thoroughly confessional, exploring Targum Jonathan to Ezekiel's Christological application of MT Ezekiel's Messianic pastoral imagery.*

KEYWORDS*: Ezekiel, Good Shepherd, Targum, Targum Studies, Targum Jonathan, Ezekiel, Hebrew Bible, Shepherd Imagery*

Introduction

"The Lord is Our Shepherd," the axiom, presents the pastoral persistence of a loving God who has proven Himself relentlessly faithful. Those familiar with the Hebrew cannon will be all too aware of the metaphor's dynamic application. The present work focuses on one pericope, surveying the translation of shepherd imagery in Targum Jonathan to Ezekiel (TgJ Ezekiel). Our aim is twofold: one, to introduce the *Targum(in)*[3] to practitioners and undergraduates of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada (PAOC) who may not yet know of their existence; and two, to emphasize the Messianic

[1] Joel D. Bornau is an author, journalist, pastor, and researcher. He has served in a humanitarian role in numerous conflict zones, aiding the Christian Church in Pakistan, Iraq, Turkey, Egypt, Jordan, Israel-Palestine, and Ukraine.

[2] Article 5 of The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada Statement of Essential Truths (Amended by General Conference, May 2022).

[3] Targumin (or Targum in the singular)

program of Ezekiel 34. The Targumin have proven significant as an expositional tool, particularly when striving to understand a first century context. The present work, therefore, spends the first half introducing the corpus and clarifies common misconceptions regarding their dating. As will be demonstrated, Targum Jonathan to Ezekiel was composed in the first century and functioned as a pedagogical instrument aiding exposition of the Hebrew Bible. Regarding the latter, Ezekiel 34 is Messianic, and the Targum emphasizes this feature with profound lucidity. Though the wording of Ezekiel 34 in TgJ Ezekiel changes, the message is maintained; Messiah is presented as the good shepherd, *par excellence*, emphatically clarifying the Masoretic Text's shepherd imagery. Our analysis of TgJ Ezekiel focuses on divine judgment (vv.1-10); the Lord as Shepherd (vv.17-24); and the eternal covenant of peace (vv.25-31). Through this survey, we get a slight, yet radiant glimpse of Yahweh's sacrificial heart for the sheep of His pasture.

Introducing the Targumin

Targumin are translations of the Hebrew Bible into Aramaic using both a *dynamic equivalence* and *formal equivalence* translation philosophy.[4] It is dynamic, in that there are divergences in the receptor language, indicating some creative liberties on the part of the meturgeman (Targum translator). Targumin are also *formal* in that much of the syntax parallels the Masoretic Text (MT) verbatim. Additionally, and most pertinent for our purpose, is the meturgeman's systematic and seamless addition of commentary foreign to the MT. These divergences and additions open a unique line of inquiry into meturgeman theology, worldview, and therefore audience, providing a wealth of knowledge regarding the religious, social, and political setting of Palestine during the Tannaitic period.

It is likely that Targumin served a liturgical function, originating in the synagogue, and contributing to the weekly readings from the *Torah* and *Nevi'im*.[5] Within the Cairo Genizah, a group of texts have been discovered known as *serugin* (shorthand), which Michael L. Klein identifies as having "one or several opening words of each verse, or just the first letters of each word from the full text of Onqelos,"[6] thereby suggesting the Targumin functioned as a "mnemonic aid for the Meturgeman during the synagogal Torah readings."[7] This hypothesis offers fruitful implications for understanding layman Messianic expectation in the first century. In sum, the translation of the Tanakh and its weekly application in a communal space—such as the synagogue—indicates a degree of intentionality amongst the community to exposit and communicate their sacred texts into the *lingua franca*. Robert N. Bellah describes language—from an anthropological perspective—as being "effective in forming identity in intimate contexts, in families, it also operates at the level of national identity."[8] The very use of Targumin were therefore an intentional instrument of communicating the message and meaning of the Hebrew scriptures.

Targum scholarship is therefore poised for a vibrant avenue of research—with, however, a word of caution. Martin McNamara notes the Targumin "came to the attention of Christian scholars in the West in the early Renaissance period."[9] He laments, they were primarily used as an anti-Jewish polemic in works such as *Pugio fidei aduersus Mauros et Judaeos* by Raymundus Martinus (d. 1290).[10] George Foot Moore agrees with McNamara, and notes, "The Targums had a time of being very much overworked by Christian scholars in consequence of the erroneous notion that they antedated the

[4] Levey, 1975, p. 140
[5] Zetterholm, 2012, p. 93
[6] Targum Onqelos (or Onkelos) is an Aramaic translation of the Pentateuch. Klein, 1994, p. 26
[7] Klein, 1994, p. 26
[8] Bellah, 2011, p. 31
[9] McNamara, 2010, p. 1
[10] McNamara, 2010, p. 1

Christian era; and in particular the Messianic expectations of the Jews in that age were looked for in them."[11] As is humbly put forward in the present work, I believe McNamara and Moore are mistaken; not on grounds of articulating an anti-Jewish polemic, which is regrettably accurate, but on grounds that Moore has miss-dated Targum Jonathan, and they both fail to identify the Targum's Messianic program.

Targum Jonathan either predates or runs parallel to the first century Jesus movement, making its Messianic notions that much more intriguing, and particularly exciting for any studies addressing the so called 'the parting of the ways.' Prominent Talmudist Daniel Boyarin contends that most (if not all) of the first century Jesus movement's ideas and praxis can safely be understood as belonging to second temple Judaism.[12] However, it is still curious why Levey and McNamara characterize TgJ Ezekiel as "exegetically non-Messianic."[13] I believe this is a mistake. The present work seeks to correct this 'anti-Jewish' polemic and add to the robust picture of theocratic Messianism present in TgJ Ezekiel. Though the figure of Jesus *Christ* and/or *Messiah* (the respective Greek and Hebrew terms for the same word) is foundational to Christian doctrine,[14] it should not be overlooked that the very notion of *Messiah* finds its origin in the pre-'Christian' era.[15] Adela Yarbro Collins contends this approach "must be taken by those of us who view Jesus as a Jew rather than as the first Christian."[16] It therefore seems any bias to restrict the research of Messianism in the Targumin are willfully neglecting a rich theocratic Jewish tradition. For example, the rabbis of the Middle Ages interpreted Ezekiel 17:22-24 as messianic; *Rabbi Shlomo Yitzchaki*, more commonly known as Rashi (d. 1105), in his commentary on Ezekiel, renders this passage "you are the messiah king."[17] *Rabbi David Kimchi, Radak* (d. 1236), too, claims 'Jonathan' (as in Jonathan ben Uzziel, the figure traditionally accredited with the translation of TgJ Ezekiel)[18] understood this passage as being Messianic.[19]

In light of this brief introduction to rabbinic Messianic exegesis, the present work takes the thematically Messianic literature seriously and does not assume a supersessionist, anti-Jewish, eisegetical reading of the Tanakh and Targumin. Rather, I emphatically reject such a mutiny, and it is the present work's aim to access the voice of the meturgeman and respective authors.

Dating and Development

Dating TgJ Ezekiel is a matter of great controversy, and two methods are commonly employed when attempting to isolate the Targum's composition: linguistic and contextual. The early errors in dating Targum Jonathan and Onqelos can be seen in the monumental work of Emil Schürer's *The History of the Jewish People*.[20] Schürer covers the Targumin in last place, within rabbinical literature, after Talmudic literature and the midrashim.[21] However, in Schürer's defense, he does admit the "works which we now possess were preceded by earlier written sources."[22] This seems to be a common misconception, and Paul V.M. Flesher laments, historians dating the Targumin generally place their

[11] Moore, 1962, p. 176
[12] Boyarin, 2012, p. 102
[13] Cathcart, Maher, McNamara, 1990; Levey, 1974, p. 78
[14] Collins, 2010, pp. 2-3
[15] Boyarin, 2012, p. 102
[16] Collins, A., 2011, p. 93
[17] Rashi on Ezekiel 17:22
[18] Megillah 3a 4
[19] Radak on Ezekiel 17:24: "And there are interpretations of this parable about the Messiah, and it also seems to be Jonathan's opinion that he translated, "and I took it from the top of the cedar and I will bring it from the Kingdom of David" (Present author's translation).
[20] Schürer, 1886-1890, p. 158
[21] McNamara, 2010, pp. 2-3
[22] Schürer, 1886-1890, p. 158

composition within the rabbinic period.[23] Kaufman believes the error derives from a number of similarities between the Aramaic of Onqelos and Jonathan, and the Aramaic of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim, but clarifying, "it is by no means the same."[24] Instead of the so called *Galilean Aramaic* of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim, Kaufman suggests the Aramaic in Onqelos and Jonathan should be labeled *Jewish Literary Aramaic* (JLA).[25]

Both Flesher and Stephen A. Kaufman contend JLA was in use from 200 BCE to 200 CE in the region of Palestine.[26] The dialect has also been labeled *Middle Aramaic*, terminology used by Edward M. Cook and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, but corresponding to the same period and geography.[27] It is clear a scholarly consensus has formed, with Kaufman, Cook, Moore, Levine, and Flesher all contending both Targum Onqelos and Targum Jonathan were composed in this dialect and period.[28] Some of the distinct features, according to Kaufman, are infinitives מקטול (peal) and מקטלה (derived stems) changing to מקטל and אקטלה;[29] note the dropping of waw, and mem changing to aleph. Moreover, Cook demonstrates how Targum Jonathan and Onqelos use forms without the he prefix in a normative function, a series he contends matches that of Qumran.[30] In Middle Aramaic, only Syriac and Hatran use the prefix, and by the time of the Late Aramaic period, it spreads to all dialects.[31]Another distinct feature where Onqelos and Jonathan agree with Qumran Aramaic is in indicative forms, such as prohibitions; for the imperfect, Onqelos and Jonathan align with early Syriac as well, which is not the case for other dialects.[32] Finally, Cook notes both Qumran and Onqelos/Jonathan preserve the long vowel.[33] The agreement between the Targumin and Qumran Aramaic leads Cook to contend both corpuses precede 200 CE.[34] Kaufman notes, "What Qumran does appear to make perfectly clear is that as late as the middle of the first century CE, Qumran-like Aramaic, whatever its origin, served as the literary standard."[35] In sum, it appears the linguists have agreed, and we can begin our search for the composition of TgJ within the time frame of 200 BCE-200 CE.[36]

Targum terminus a quo

There are some scholars who attempt to argue for an even earlier Targum *terminus a quo*. Pinkho Churgin contends for a significantly earlier date; his line of argumentation stems from the basic

[23] Flesher, 2011
[24] Kaufman, 1994, p. 120
[25] Kaufman, 1994, p. 123; Wilcox, 1994, pp. 373–374: Wilcox reference to coins found at Masada, dating to the first Jewish Revolt, which bear the inscription, 'The Liberation of Zion,' and a jar with the name 'Aqavia son of the High Priest H[annia]h,' which has led Wilcox to postulate the prevalence of JLA amongst a demographic of more prominent social status.
[26] Flesher, 2011, p 9; Kaufman, 1994, p. 123
[27] Cook, 1994, p. 150; Fitzmyer, 1980, p. 11
[28] Kaufman, 1994, p. 123; Cook, 1994, p. 143; Flesher, 2011, p. 9; Levine, 2005, p. 159; Moore, 1927, p. 174
[29] Kaufman, 1994, p. 129
[30] Cook, 1994, pp. 150–151
[31] Cook, 1994, pp. 150–151
[32] Cook, 1994, p. 152
[33] Cook, 1994, p. 151
[34] Cook, 1994, p. 150
[35] Kaufman, 1994, p. 123
[36] Kaufman, 1994, p. 122: Kaufman writes, "I think that most Aramaists today would assert that Qumran represents literary Aramaic of roughly the turn of the millennium. According to the growing consensus, the primitive basic texts of both Targums Onqelos and Jonathan of the Prophets are supposed to come from Palestine and from the second century CE. Since both of these dialects are obviously earlier."

consideration of when an Aramaic translation would have been needed in Judaea.[37] Though I agree that Targum production would have started to meet Targum demand, Churgin contends Aramaic became the *lingua franca* of Judaea, not during the exile, but during the Maccabean period.[38] It is difficult to know exactly when this transition took place, but the use of Aramaic Ezra could suggest a date prior to 300 BCE.[39] Even the Aramaic in the Elephantine papyri could suggest a date as early as 495-400 BCE.[40] We also read in Nehemiah 8:8, "So they read from the book, from the law of God, with interpretation [מְפֹרָשׁ]. They gave the sense, so that the people understood the reading."[41] Though the evidence at our disposal restricts us to confirm a Targum tradition as early as the 6th century, we may postulate an earlier proto-Targum might have come into being in the centuries that followed. It seems the tradition of translating the Hebrew Scriptures into Aramaic may have had its origins remarkably early in the second temple period. However, any dating of Onqelos/Jonathan earlier than 200 BCE is mere speculation.

Levey agrees with our aforementioned linguists, asserting the terminus a quo was sometime during the Maccabees and can be assigned between 200 and 150 BCE.[42] This argument is further supported by *Leviticus Targum: 4Q156*, from Qumran, consisting of two small fragments from Lev. 16:12-15 and 18-21, which, according to Merino, contains Aramaic from the Hasmonean period and indicates a Targum to the Pentateuch tradition already in the second century BCE.[43] In addition to Targum Leviticus, three fragments of *Targum Job: 4Q157* have been discovered in Cave 4, and a scroll: *11QtgJob*, in Cave 11, indicating a Targum to the Ketuvim may have also existed in the Qumran community.[44] This has led Hengel, Kaufman, Levey, and McNamara to contend the 'roots' of Targum Onqelos/Jonathan go back to at least the first century BCE.[45] Cook is slightly more conservative, stating "the present state of Onqelos and Jonathan as representing, by and large, the original text; that is, I make no presupposition in favor of a Proto-Onqelos."[46] In sum, Cook believes there was no standardized Targum before Onqelos/Jonathan, and believes the copies we currently have are more-or-less originals. And finally, Cook is so sure regarding the current state of paleographic and archeological evidence, he takes the "origin of Onqelos and Jonathan as preceding 200 CE as a given."[47]

Targum terminus ad quem

Now that we have established a possible *terminus a quo* of Onqelos/Jonathan, we need to address the *terminus ad quem*. Levey suggests a date sometime after the Arab conquest of Babylonia (640-41 CE),[48] or even during the Arabic translation of the Hebrew Bible into Arabic by Saadia Gaon (892-942 CE).[49] To arrive at this assumption, Levey claims to have identified an 'anti-Islamic' apologetic in TgJ 2 Samuel 22:32: לֵית אֱלָהָ אֶלָּא יְיָ (there is no god but Yahweh), contending it is an exact rendering of the

[37] Churgin, 1927, pp. 37-38: Though we agree, that targum production would have been to meet targum demand, Churgin contends Aramaic became the lingua franca of Judaea, not during the exile, but during the Maccabean period. This is not clear, and the transition seems to have begun during the exile. For example, Nehemiah 8:8 has Ezra 'translating' the Law for the Assembly.
[38] Churgin, 1927, pp. 19-20
[39] Moore, 1927, p. 29; Hengel, 1994, pp. 162–163
[40] Levey, 1971, p. 190
[41] The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version, 1989, Ne 8:8
[42] Levey, 1971, p. 190
[43] Merino, 1994, p. 61; Also see Levine, 2005, p. 160
[44] Merino, 1994, p. 61
[45] Hengel, 1994, p. 174; Kaufman, 1994, p. 129; McNamara, 2010, pp. 2-3; Levey, 1971, p. 190
[46] Cook, 1994, p. 150
[47] Cook, 1994, p. 150
[48] Levey, 1971, p. 193
[49] Levey, 1971, p. 193

Arabic *Shahada*: لا إله إلا الله (there is no god but Allah).[50] There are a few problems with this line of argumentation; first, and perhaps most obvious, it is not inconceivable that two semantic languages would develop similar phraseology to express a basic monotheistic confession. The Peshitta, for example, also renders this passage, "Because there is no god besides the Lord":

ܡܛܠ ܕܠܝܬ ܐܠܗ ܐܚܪ ܐܠܐ ܡܢ ܡܪܝܐ[51]

(*mettūl delayt elāh levad men māryā*)

Furthermore, TgJ 2 Samuel has a textual variant כ''',[52] which subsequently weakens the phonetic parallel between TgJ and the *Shahada*. Levey's argumentation for a *terminus ad quem* in the Gaonic period follows a similar methodology (comparing Gaon's Arabic syntax with that of Onqelos/Jonathan) producing no convincing results.[53] For Cook, the final redaction for Onqelos/Jonathan can be no later than 256 CE, when variant reading traditions from Nehardea ceased to exist.[54] This seems to be the most reasonable proposal. In sum, it may be impossible to assert with empirical certainty when Onqelos/Jonathan emerged from the final hands of redaction. Much depends on the degree to which the translation was revered as sacred or holy. Based on the lack of external historical references beyond the Roman era, and the continuity of linguistic form, we are inclined to agree with Cook and humbly purpose Onqelos/Jonathan remained relatively unchanged since at least 256 CE.

Within this window, TgJ Ezekiel 39:16 offers us a clue as to a possible origin; here the meturgeman renders the MT's הֲמוֹנָה (the crowded one) as רוֹמָי (Rome), thereby equating Rome with Gog.[55] This has significant eschatological overtones, implying the meturgeman understood the final eschatological war of Gog and Magog as being with Rome.[56] We therefore cannot purpose a date before Pompey's leadership, when, as Freyne writes, "Jerusalem was made a tributary city and so the Jews, confined within their own borders, received *autonomia* or self-government in accordance with the Roman principle of *libertas*, as was customary for a *civitas stipendaria*." (63 BCE).[57] However, it is unlikely such an event immediately rendered an association between Rome and Gog. It is indeed possible the relative degree of religious freedom granted under the Roman principle of *libertas* was welcomed when compared to the tyrannical Seleucid rule, or the factious society under the Hasmoneans.

In late 40 BCE, Herod the Great was proclaimed 'king of the Jews' by the Roman Senate by motion of Antony and Octavian.[58] Three years later, in the summer of 37 BCE, Antigonus was removed and Herod entered "the possession of his sovereignty."[59] Roman rule quickly began to mirror its

---

[50] Levey, 1971, p. 192

[51] Leiden Peshitta (Leiden: Peshitta Institute Leiden, 2008), 2 Sa 22:32. Also see Bruce D. Chilton, The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum, vol. 23, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), p. 6.

[52] Sperber, 2004, p. 677

[53] Levey, 1971, p. 193: Levey compares Gaon's translation of Ps. 28:32 to Tg. 2 Sam., saying it is "assertive rather than interrogative, just as the Targum does" (p. 193), a remarkably weak argument. Furthermore, he looks at Is. 11::4b, contending that רשיעָא (rassī)—which correctly translated means wicked—to be Armilus, writing "the name Armilus is either a disguised or 'Aramaized form of Romulus" (p. 194). In light of the overwhelming evidence for dating Onqelos/Jonathan to the period corresponding to Middle Aramaic, these arguments fail any critical attestation.

[54] Cook, 1994, p. 150

[55] Ezek. 39:1. Also see Churgin, 1927, p. 28; Ribera, 1996, p. 119

[56] Levey, 1974, p. 86; Churgin, 1927, p. 26

[57] Freyne, 1998, p. 59

[58] Hoehner, 1972, p. 7; Also see Ant. 14.381-385; Bell. 1.282-285

[59] Ant. 14 470-480; Bell. 1 349-352. "The conquest of Jerusalem is conflictingly dated. According to Dio it occurred in the consulship of Claudius and Norbanus in 38 BCE. But according to Josephus it occurred under consulship of Marcus Agrippa and Caninius Gallus in the 185th Olympiad on the day of the fast, on which day Pompey had captured Jerusalem twenty-seven years earlier (Jos. Ant. 14.488)" (Hoehner, 1972, p. 7).

forgone Seleucid predecessor, and in 27 BCE emperor Octavian, who called himself *Divus filius*, assumed the title of 'Augustus.'[60]

There was further reason for Jewish discontent under the rule of Herod the Great; in the same year (27 BCE) Octavian assumed the title of Augustus, Herod constructed a temple in the city formally known as Samaria, dedicating it to the cult of the emperor.[61] Josephus tells us there was not a place in the entire kingdom where Herod had not erected something in honour of the emperor.[62] Furthermore, Herod's use of eagle imagery would have undoubtably evoked eschatological fervency in a Jewish apocalyptic imagination.[63] It is indeed possible under these increasingly despotic, and in a Jewish religio-political perspective, blasphemous turn of events, warranted an association between Rome and eschatological Gog. It is therefore probable the earliest *terminus a quo* for TgJ Ezekiel is 37 BCE at the 'coronation' of Herod the Great.

In addition to Herod, one other figure may be a candidate for the meturgeman's association of Roman and Gog, namely, emperor Caligula (d. 41 CE).[64] Josephus informs us he demanded the Jews call him 'theos'.[65] Furthermore, Caligula gave the order to have a statue of himself set up in the Temple, which aroused such an uproar amongst the people that it could have quite possibly turned into a revolt had not he been assassinated.[66] There is little doubt such an event brought back the collective memory of Antiochus' worship of Zeus in the Jerusalem temple,[67] and in January 41 CE, Caligula was finally murdered.[68] We suggest, just as the Qumran designation of 'wicked priest' was used in reference to Seleucid and Hasmonean antagonists, so too was *Rome* employed in TgJ Ezekiel 39:16 to reference the actions prompting Rome's emperor cult in Judaea. This timeline begins to align with the traditional narrative that Targum Jonathan was composed by Jonathan ben Uzziel, the student of the first century Rabbi Hillel who lived under the rule of Herod and Augustus.[69] Linguistically and geopolitically, the

---

[60] Hengel, 1976, p. 100

[61] Ant. 15.292, 296; Bell. 1.403

[62] Bell. 1.407

[63] Hengel notes: "The eagle also appears in the Jewish apocalyptic literature of the period as the sign of the imperial rule of Rome (It was a political metaphor even in the Old Testament; see Deut. 28:49; Is 46:11; Jer 48:40; 45:21; Hab 1:8. The text in Habakkuk is interpreted in 1QHab 3.8 as applying to the Kittim (that is, to the Romans)…The vision of the eagle in 4 Ezra 11 is more clearly a reference to Rome and it is therefore quite possible that the zealous pious Jews who destroyed this offensive figure and paid for this act with their lives saw in it the symbol of a hated rule and at the very least the intrusion of Hellenistic symbols and conceptions into the sanctuary. The revolt which broke out with elemental violence after Herod's death assumed such dimensions because many Jews saw in the claim of the Roman emperor to rule a threat to the purity of the Jewish faith. It was feared that the bad times of Antiochus Epiphanes might return." (1976, p. 101)

[64] Hengel, 1976, p. 342

[65] Hengel, 1976, p. 101: Ant. 19.284

[66] Hengel, 1976, p. 106: Bell. 2.184-203, Ant. 18.261-309

[67] 2 Macc. 4:23-50; Freyne concludes it was the Menelaus' 'extreme Hellenising' policies which allowed for the worship of Yahweh in the Jerusalem temple to be assimilated to that of the Zeus Olympius cult and the Jewish religious observances outlawed (1998, p. 36); Also see 1 Macc. 1:44-51; 2 Macc. 6:1-5; 13:3-8. Furthermore, M. Stern contends Menelaus was the scapegoat, whose death "appeased the wrath of the Jewish community" (1976, p. 566). After the rule of Seleucus IV Philopator in 175 BCE, Antiochus IV, became the antithesis, par excellence to Jewish theocracy, he marched against Jerusalem in 170-169 BCE and in 167 BCE offered Pagan sacrifices on the temple alter (2 Macc. 6:1-2). 1 Macc. 1:10-15 records the compromise made with Antiochus Epiphanes. Jason the high priest is primarily to blame, and 2 Macc 4:7-22 recounts his hellenistic reforms. Furthermore, this is referenced by the author of Dan. 11:31, where the 'daily sacrifice' was abolished by the setting up of the abomination of desolation. Also see 1 Macc. 1:54 which records this event as happening on the 15th of Kislev in 167 BCE (Babota, 2013, p. 61). Furthermore, M. Hengel popularised the notion that much of second temple apocalypticism, including Daniel, was written by the Hasidim (Hengel, Martin. "The Hasidim and the First Climax of Jewish Apocalyptic" in Judaism and Hellenism I, (1974, pp. 175-218). Also see Freyne, 1998, p. 36

[68] Hengel, 1976, p. 342

[69] Churgin, 1927, p. 9

evidence points in this direction, and we therefore are inclined to take the *Bavli* at its word, and actually ascribe authorship to Jonathan ben Uzziel.[70]

Judgment and Covenantal Fidelity in TgJ Ezekiel 34

Ezekiel prophesied from 593-571 BCE, addressing the Babylonian exilarch under the rule of Nebuchadnezzar II.[71] At first glance, the book of Ezekiel seems inapproachable, confined by rigorous barriers of judgment and exile. The prophet's prevailing antipathy towards Israel reminds readers of the Hebrew Bible's most foundational component: Israel cut covenant with a holy and just God who requires covenantal maintenance.[72] It is therefore in Ezekiel's most poignant proclamations that we see slight, yet radiant, glimmers of hope—emphatically contrasted by the judgment in which they emerge. Ezekiel is therefore empathetic, considering himself as a prophet *amongst* the people in plight, using the phrase תָּוֶךְ (in the midst) one-hundred and sixteen times, significantly more than any other author of the Hebrew Bible.[73] The book is ultimately optimistic, extending the promise of a perfect kingdom, thereby comforting those in exile.

Condemnation of Israel's Shepherds (vv. 1-10)

Ezekiel 34 begins with Yahweh's condemnation of the 'shepherds' of Israel who have led the people astray (v.2). For Collins, the reference is likely to the priestly authority during the exile.[74] No doubt, the Targumist may also have second temple priests in mind as well. The meturgeman first changes the MT's 'shepherd' (v.2) to 'leaders;' in fact, the pastoral metaphor is clarified by *leader* throughout the entire chapter. Ezekiel poignantly articulates the coming destruction of Israel's leadership, judgment that will entail the desolation of Jerusalem. The section aligns with the macro narrative of Ezekiel, particularly chapter 21. As Block writes, "[Ezekiel] hereby envisions the imminent fall of Jerusalem, an event in which no Messiah shall interfere. Ezekiel has taken an ancient word, on which his audience had staked their hopes, and transformed it into a frightening prediction of doom."[75] This 'ancient' word, according to Block, is Ezekiel 21:27 (HB Eze. 21:32): עַד־בָּא אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ הַמִּשְׁפָּט (until he comes whose right it is),[76] which he contends is a terse reference to Gen. 49:10: עַד כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילֹה (until Shiloh (tribute/peace) comes to him).[77] For Block, Ezekiel's use of Genesis 49:10 is "not about tribute and subordination of the world to Judah, but the judgement of Judah by the world's principal representative."[78] This 'judgment' is a common theme in the apocalyptic corpus, and can be seen in other contexts, such as MT Ezekiel's use of הַצְּפִירָה (thread, wreath; decline, end, doom) in Ezek. 7:7.[79] Similar phraseology appears in MT Isaiah 28:5: לְעֲטֶרֶת צְבִי וְלִצְפִירַת תִּפְאָרָה (garland of glory, and a diadem of beauty).[80] In TgJ Isaiah, the meturgeman explicitly translates this passage messianically: "In that *time the Messiah* of the LORD of hosts will be a *diadem* of *joy* and a *crown* of praise, to the remnant of his people."[81] Whereas in TgJ Ezekiel, the meturgeman translates the passage theocratically: "*The*

[70] Megillah 3a 4
[71] Zimmerli, 1979, p. 11
[72] Ribera, 1996, p. 115
[73] Cooper, 1994, p. 29
[74] Collins, 2015, p. 46
[75] Block, 1995, p. 170
[76] Ezek. 21:27 (MT v.32)
[77] Gen. 49:10
[78] Block, 1995, p. 170
[79] The meaning of Hebrew is uncertain (NRSV, 1989: Ezek. 7:7)
[80] Is. 28:5 (NRSV, 1989)
[81] The Aramaic Bible: The Isaiah Targum, trans. Bruce D. Chilton, vol. 11, 1990. Is 28:5

Kingdom has been revealed to you O inhabitant of the land! The time of misfortune has arrived, the day of tumultuous confusion is near, and there is no *escaping* to the mountain *strongholds*."[82]

There seems to be a parallel between Ezekiel's הַצָּפִירָה (MT: diadem/doom) becoming אִתְגְּלִיאַת מַלְכוּתָא (TgJ: the kingdom is revealed) and Isaiah's וְלִצְפִירַת (MT: diadem/crown) becoming לְכְלִיל דְּחַדְוָא וְלִכְתַר ([messianic] wedding crown of joy).[83] The English rendering of these terms, at first glance, appear in complete juxtaposition; however, in second temple Judaism, this does not seem to be the case, 'The day of the Lord' was seen as the coming of perfect justice, and regularly employed through the metaphorical use of matrimony.[84] Divine wrath and divine salvation are therefore two sides of the same coin. For the meturgeman, 'The Day of Yahweh' is grounds for rendering the synonym, 'the kingdom has been revealed to you' (also TgJ Ezek 7:10). [85] Flesher and Chilton contend these passages in Isaiah 28 and Ezekiel 7 suggest we are dealing with a consistent theology of messianic and eschatological judgment.[86] Walther Zimmerli, too, agrees that Ezekiel 7 is referencing 'The Day of the Lord' (יום יהוה) as found in Amos 5:18-20.[87] For Collins, the destruction of the earth in Ezekiel is viewed as punishment for a breach of covenant.[88] In both Ezekiel of the exile, and TgJ Ezekiel, the author/redactor/translator is responding to the subjugation of Israel by foreign nations. Collins poignantly sums up the geo-political struggle:

> Perhaps at this point in the history of Israel and Judah it had become apparent that the threat to a small nation in the ancient Near East was not confined to any one empire. If Egypt did not dominate, then Assyria would, or Babylon, or Persia. Greece and Rome would later be added to the list. So, increasingly in postexilic prophecy, the call is for judgment not on any one nation but on all the nations.[89]

It is in the context of judgment upon the nation state that the Targum's theocratic expectation comes to the fore. The meturgeman realizes the meta narrative of their collective memory and forecasts an eschatological theocracy that will subjugate all nations with perfect justice, mercy, and grace.

In TgJ Ezekiel 34, The first theocratic specification comes in v.8: 'for all the animals of the field'[90] becomes 'all the kingdoms of the earth.' The metaphor is therefore both clarified and retained; the antecedent, 'prey' is preserved by the Targum, and the translation (kingdom for animals) is repeated once more in v.28. The desolation of the people is therefore the result of poor and greedy leadership (vv.2-3), and Yahweh is inclined to offer redemption through Himself as The Faithful Shepherd (vv.11-16). Since the sheep have been scattered (v.5), Yahweh will hold the leadership accountable (v.10). Yahweh promises to look after the sheep and search for the lost members (v.10). The imagery employed is King David, the shepherd of Israel (v.23); but here too, the poet may have in mind factions from the northern and southern kingdoms of Judah and Israel.[91]

---

[82] The Aramaic Bible: The Targum of Ezekiel, trans. Samson H. Levey, 1990, Eze 7:7

[83] דְּחַדְוָא may be rendered 'joy' or 'wedding party' See: LS2 K. Brockelmann, Lexicon Syriacum. Hildesheim: Georg Olms 1982. J M. Jastrow, A dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic literature. New York: Judaica Press, 1989.

[84] Is. 54:5-6; Jer. 33:10-11; Hos. 2:16

[85] The Aramaic Bible: The Targum of Ezekiel, trans. Samson H. Levey, 1990; Also see Levey, 1974, p. 58

[86] Flesher & Chilton, 2011, p. 214

[87] Zimmerli, 1979, p. 201

[88] Collins, 2015, p. 46

[89] Collins, 2015, p. 46

[90] HB Ezek. 34:8 (present authors translation)

[91] Ribera, 1996, p. 111: "The Hebrew expression 'the house of Israel' is normally retained in the Targum of Ezekiel. In one case it is rendered by 'children of Israel' (Tg. Ezek. 3:4) and in another one 'rebellious house' is replaced by 'rebellious people' (3:27). Likewise, the phrase 'sons of Israel' is generally retained. When the MT repeats the

The Lord Becomes the Shepherd (vv. 11-16)

Justice requires grace, mercy, and judgment; Israel and Judah's wayward shepherds are therefore judged and replaced. The process may be described as covenantal maintenance, in that Yahweh has not forgotten His promise, and is faithful to His people. The extent of Yahweh's faithful determination is presented with profound clarity in the Targum's translation of Ezekiel 16:6:

MT Ezekiel 16:6

> I passed by you, and saw you flailing about in your blood. As you lay in your blood, I said to you, 'Live!'[92]

TgJ Ezekiel 16:6

> *And the memory of the covenant of your forefathers came in before Me, so I revealed Myself in order to redeem you, for it was revealed before Me that you were oppressed by your servitude* and I said to you, By the blood *of the circumcision I will have pity* [spare] *on you*; and I said to you: By the blood of the *Passover lamb(s)*[93]*will I redeem you*.[94]

There are several interesting changes and additions on the part of the meturgeman; first, is the imagery of the Abrahamic covenant (Gen 15:18), a ritual no doubt soaked in blood (Gen. 15:9-10). But as Israel has failed to maintain covenantal fidelity (Ezek 34:6), the meturgeman depicts Yahweh as implementing covenantal maintenance. It is by the 'blood of the circumcision' (בִּדְמָא דְמָהוּלְתָּא) that Yahweh has 'pity' (חוס)—which also may be rendered 'spare'[95]—on Israel. The imagery is further drawing on the Exodus narrative, referencing the Passover lamb (Ex. 12:1-7).[96] McNamara notes the Targum's rendering of MT's 'in your blood live' is referring to the blood of the covenant of circumcision, which 'evokes God's mercy;' and 'the blood of the 'Passover sacrifice,' evokes God's redemption of Israel from Egyptian bondage.[97] In sum, McNamara concludes, "Thus circumcision and the Passover are linked together into a bond of love and compassion, which makes God's involvement in the redemptive process inevitable."[98]

The phraseology of verse 16:6, "*so I revealed Myself in order to redeem you*," seems to imply a connection with the preemptive promise mentioned in 34:11, "Behold, *I am about to reveal Myself*." It is precisely in the revelation of God that Israel and Judah are given a righteous leader. The text may also be a terse reference to Isaiah 65:1, "I revealed myself to those who did not ask for me; I was found by those who did not seek me. To a nation that did not call on my name, I said, 'Here am I, here am I.'"[99] These themes no doubt parallel much of New Testament writings, John's Gospel Prologue and Paul's Colossi Christology immediately come to mind.[100] Therefore, there seems to be an implicit soteriological Christology on the part of the meturgeman which becomes particularly ludic in verse 13, "I will provide" (v.13). The promise is again reiterated in verse 14, "I will *provide*… with *good* provision;

---

word 'house' ('the house of Israel', 'the rebellious house', Ezek. 12:9) Targum Ezekiel usually replaces the second word with 'people'. On a number of occasions, however, Targum Ezekiel adds to or changes the MT by inserting the expression 'the house of Israel' (Tg. Ezek. 17:4)."

[92] Eze. 16:6 (NRSV, 1989)

[93] All other versions have sing., "lamb." (The Aramaic Bible: The Targum of Ezekiel, trans. Samson H. Levey, vol. 13 (The Liturgical Press, 1990), Eze 16:6.)

[94] The Aramaic Bible: The Targum of Ezekiel, trans. Samson H. Levey, vol. 13 (The Liturgical Press, 1990), Eze 16:6.

[95] Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon, Targum Lexicon (Hebrew Union College, 2004)

[96] Ribera, 1996, p. 114

[97] Kevin Cathcart, Michael Maher, and Martin McNamara, eds., The Aramaic Bible: The Targum of Ezekiel, trans. Samson H. Levey, vol. 13 (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1990), Eze 16:6

[98] Kevin Cathcart, Michael Maher, and Martin McNamara, eds., The Aramaic Bible: The Targum of Ezekiel, trans. Samson H. Levey, vol. 13 (1990), Eze 16:6.

[99] Isaiah 65:1, NIV 1984

[100] See John 1:1-18; Col. 1:15-23

and on the *holy* mountain." The Targum's clarification of the *holy* mountain, which is to host Yahweh's redemptive provision, is no doubt a reference to Mount Moriah,[101] bringing the reader to recall the Akedah of Genesis 22; however, in the case of TgJ Ezekiel, the sacrifice is not Isaac, or the temple sacrificial cult, but one who is to come from David.

The Davidic Messiah (vv. 17-24)

In the opening verses of 34:17-24, Yahweh is depicted as reiterating the coming judgment on the wayward shepherds. It is precisely because of the leadership's greed that Yahweh is to "reveal himself" (v. 20), it is therefore the *revelation* of Yahweh that both judgment and redemption are brought to fruition; He promises to "judge *between the rich man and the poor man*" (v. 20b), because the people have been "*oppressed with wickedness and force*" (v.21). It is in this context of divine judgment that Yahweh is said to "redeem My people" (v.22a). The meturgeman has therefore brought the reader to the climax of his presentation and introduces the medium of both salvation and judgment: "My servant David; he shall provide for them and he shall be their leader. And I, the Lord, will be their God, and My servant David shall be king among them. I, the Lord, have decreed it by My Memra" (vv.23-24). Salvation is therefore promised to come through the Messianic office of David, making the monarchical promise both apocalyptic and theocratic.

The establishment of Yahweh's servant, David as king, in general, has no difference in TgJ's use of David when compared to the MT's. Walther Zimmerli has produced one of the most comprehensive and critical studies of MT Ezekiel and identifies this passage as Messianic.[102] The meaning in TgJ is therefore not changed but strengthened. One significant example of this is the meturgeman's translation of MT's נָשִׂיא (prince) to מַלְכָּא (king),[103] emphasising the Targum's Messianic program. Alinda Damsma notes verses 34:23-24 (and 37:24-15) "does justice to the Messianic message of the Hebrew Vorlage. All the Messianic features are preserved within TgJ's conventions."[104] The shepherd metaphor therefore builds on a rich literary tradition already present in the Tanakh, as Block writes, "Ezekiel's identification of the divinely installed king as David is based on a long-standing prophetic tradition."[105] 1 Sam. 16:11-13 informs us when Samuel the seer arrived at the house of Jesse, to anoint David as king, David was tending the flocks in the field; furthermore, Psalm 78:70-71 speaks of David as God's chosen shepherd, imagery which presents an eschatological kingdom during a time of desperate tumult, projecting the hope of an apocalyptic kingdom into the future. The Lord's anointed, therefore, does not refer to a temporal leader/shepherd, but an eschatological and apocalyptic figure.

The Covenant of Peace (vv. 25-31)

The closing remarks of chapter 34 are optimistically eschatological. Verse 25, coming on the heels of the Davidic promise, introduces an enteral covenant of peace that Yahweh Himself is to cut. The reference may also bring Numbers 25 to mind, where Phinehas kills Zimri, the Israelite man, and Cozbi, the Midianite women, subsequently receiving a "covenant of peace" (v.12). It is through Phinehas' actions—purging the land of those who have yoked themselves to Baal of Peor—that the plague is stopped. In the subsequent verse, the covenant of peace is clarified as a "covenant of perpetual priesthood" (v.13). The theme of priest as mediator between wrath and salvation, or plague

[101] 2 Chron. 3; Gen. 22
[102] Zimmerli, 1979, p. 368
[103] Ezek. 34:23
[104] Damsma, 2012, p. 529
[105] Block, 1995, p. 173

and peace, is a theme found elsewhere within the book of Numbers.[106] The priestly role of administering a sacrifice in the covenantal process has already been referenced in Ezekiel 16:60, presenting a consistent theme of atonement throughout the work.[107] However, it is clear, the soteriological application of covenantal fidelity is administered by Yahweh and not the priestly authority. The actions of Phinehas, therefore, becomes a typological antecedent for a true and better sacrifice to come, one that will not only stop the current plague, but render death defeated forever, ushering in a true and eternal covenant of peace.

The House of Israel

In verse 34:31 the meturgeman inserts the phrase, בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל (the house of Israel). There seems to be no obvious grounds for this translation, the only other change is the continued use of עַם (people) instead of the MT's צֹאנִי (sheep). McNamara believes the meturgeman may be implying that Israel is the personification of Adam, of humanity."[108] Though I do not wish to discredit McNamara's theory, it may also be possible the eschatological nature of Ezekiel's theocratic program envisions a restoration of the twelve tribes as was the case under the Davidic dynasty.[109] It seems the historic monarch is again portrayed in a typological manor, providing metaphorical language to describe a future apocalyptic theocracy. The theme is vividly presented using stick imagery in chapter 37, depicting the unification of Judah and Ephraim immediately following the resurrection of the dry bones. It therefore seems the text employs a longing for Ephraim (or Israel) to return and complete the unified eternal monarch. In both TgJ Ezekiel, and the MT, Israel is the focus, with יִשְׂרָאֵל (Israel) appearing no less than 176 times in the MT,[110] and 134 times in TgJ Ezekiel.[111] This is a stark contrast when compared to the mere 13 appearances of יְהוּדָה (Judah) in the MT,[112] and the 15 in TgJ Ezekiel.[113] This parallels a similar Ephraimite emphasis in Jeremiah 31, where Yahweh is depicted as longing for Ephraim, His 'first born son.'[114] In 931 BCE, the Davidic dynasty was divided between the north and the south,[115] and in 722 BCE, Assyria

[106] Num. 16:46-50; Num. 21:4-9
[107] Zimmerli, 1988, p. 220
[108] McNamara, 1990
[109] 2 Sam. 5:1-5
[110] MT Ezek. 2:3; 3:1, 4, 5, 7, 17; 4:3, 4, 5, 13; 5:4; 6:2, 3, 5; 7:2; 8:4, 6, 10, 11, 12; 9:3, 8, 9; 10:19, 20; 11:5, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 22; 12:6, 9, 10, 19, 22, 24, 27; 13:2, 4, 5, 9, 16; 14:1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11; 17:2, 23; 18:2, 6, 15, 25, 29, 30, 31; 19:1, 9; 20:1, 3, 13, 27, 30, 31, 38, 39, 40, 42, 44; 21:7, 8, 17, 30; 22:6, 18; 24:21, 25:3, 6, 14; 27:17; 28:24, 25; 29:6, 16, 21; 33:10, 11, 20, 24, 28; 34:2, 13, 14, 30; 35:5, 12, 15; 36:1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 17, 21, 22, 32, 37; 37:11, 12, 16, 19, 21, 22, 28; 38:8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19; 39:2, 4, 7, 9, 12, 17, 22, 23, 25, 29; 40:2, 4, 2, 7, 10; 44:2, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 22; 45:6, 8, 9, 15, 17; 47:13, 18, 21, 22; 48:11, 19, 29, 31
[111] TgJ Ezek. 1:25; 2:3, 10; 3:1, 4, 5, 7, 17; 4:3, 4, 5, 13; 5:4; 6:2, 3, 5, 11; 8:6, 10, 11, 12; 9:9; 11:5, 15; 12:6, 9, 10, 24, 27; 13:4, 5, 9; 14:1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11; 17:2, 4, 24; 18:6, 15, 25, 29, 30, 31; 19:1, 9; 20:1, 3, 13, 27, 30, 31, 39, 40, 44; 21:15, 17; 22:6, 18; 24:21; 25:14; 28:24, 25; 29:6, 16, 21; 33:7, 10, 11, 20, 28; 34:2, 13, 14, 30, 31; 35:5, 15; 36:1, 4, 8, 10, 12, 17, 21, 22, 32, 37, 38; 37:11, 16, 19, 21, 28; 38:14, 16, 17; 39:2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 23, 25, 29; 40:4; 43:7, 10; 44:6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 22; 45:6, 8, 9, 17; 47:22; 48:11
[112] MT Ezek. 4:6; 8:1, 17; 21:25; 25:3, 8, 12; 27:17; 37:19; 48:7, 8, 22, 31
[113] TgJ Ezek. 1:1; 4:6; 8:1, 17; 21:15, 18, 25; 25:3, 8, 12; 27:17, 48:7, 8, 22, 31
[114] Jer. 31: 9b. Also see Jer. 31:10, 16, 18; Also see 31:31 for the new covenant bestowed on Judah and Israel.
[115] Block, 1995, p. 178: "Ezekiel's interest is not in creating 'a single piece of wood' (עץ אחד), from two pieces (עצים), but 'a single nation' (גוי אחד), from two nations (גוים שני, v. 22a). The preference for the term גוי over עם ('people') is deliberate. The latter, a warm relational term, with undertones of kinship, would have been appropriate in another context, but here the concern is the restoration of Israel as a nation, which requires the use of גוי. Given prevailing ancient Near Eastern perceptions, by affirming Israel's ethnic, territorial, political, and spiritual integrity Ezekiel paints a remarkably comprehensive picture of a mature nation. Ezekiel stresses the restoration of Israel's political integrity by announcing the reversal of 931 BCE, when a single people had de facto become two nations.

desolated Ephraim, making the hope of a restored Davidic dynasty unattainable.[116] The recollection of this event—the judgment for Ephraim's rebellion—is seen in the book of Hosea, *par excellence*. Ephraim is mentioned in Hosea no less than 37 times, and Judah 15.[117] Certainly, the division of the Davidic Kingdom was a traumatic event in Israelite collective memory, a tragedy compounded by the Babylonian exile, and later, Roman occupation. It seems the seer of Ezekiel, and subsequently the meturgeman of TgJ Ezekiel, envisioned a restored, redeemed, and united eschatological theocracy.

God is therefore depicted as not only longing for a restoration of the Davidic dynasty, but of Ephraim's return and redemption. The anthropomorphism attributed to Yahweh is that of a father grieving the loss of his first-born son (Jer. 31:9). Ezekiel 34 therefore demonstrates God's heart, not only for the restoration of nations, but of the individual. One cannot help but be reminded of the parable of the Prodigal Sons (Lk. 15:11-32), or the parable of the Lost Sheep (Mt. 18-10-14), knowing the heart of God is consistently depicted as a good shepherd and loving father, longing for the destitute to be redeemed.

Conclusion

In sum, the dating of Targum Jonathan to Ezekiel, and its Messianic program, provides a window into first-century theocratic, Messianic, and apocalyptic expectation. As we have seen through linguistic and contextual analysis, TgJ Ezekiel was most likely composed sometime in the middle of the first-century CE. The meturgeman's use of Ezekiel 34's shepherd imagery clarifies the Hebrew text, emphasizing meaning while altering syntax and vocabulary. The chapter depicts Yahweh as judge, redeemer, and restorer, granting both apocalyptic and eschatological hope that the God who shepherded David will continue to shepherd His people until He finally appears in glory. Ezekiel 34 also becomes a pedagogical instrument, instructing readers on the qualities of what makes a shepherd/leader good. As we have seen, this implies covenantal maintenance in the form of justice, grace, and mercy; sacrificial atonement; provision of perfect, anointed leadership; and the restoration of the wayward individual and the nation-state, both of which are promised to be perfected in the apocalyptic, eschatological, Kingdom of God—The eternal covenant of peace offered in the person of Jesus.

References

Primary Sources

Josephus, Flavius and Niese, Benedikt. Flavii Iosephi Opera Recognovit Benedictvs Niese. Berolini: apvd Weidmannos, 1888.

Josephus, Flavius and William Whiston, William. The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987.

Leiden Peshitta. Leiden: Peshitta Institute Leiden, 2008.

Radak on Ezekiel. Sefaria: https://www.sefaria.org/Radak_on_Ezekiel.17.24.2?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en

Rashi on Ezekiel. Sefaria: https://www.sefaria.org/Rashi_on_Ezekiel.17.22?lang=bi&with=About&lang2=en

Sperber, Alexander. The Bible in Aramaic based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts, Vol.

[116] 2 Kg. 17:6

[117] For reference to Ephraim, see : Hs. 4:17; 5:3, 5, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14; 6:4, 10; 7:1, 8, 11; 8:9, 11; 9:3, 8, 11, 13, 16; 10:6, 11; 11:3, 8, 9, 12; 12:1, 8, 14; 13:1, 12: 14:8. For reference to Judah, see 1:1, 7, 11; 4:15; 5:5, 10, 12, 13, 14; 6:4, 11; 8:14; 10:11; 11:12; 12:2

I-III. The Pentateuch according to Targum Onkelos; the Former Prophets according to Targum Jonathan; the Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan. Third Impression. Brill, 2004.
Targum Jonathan to the Prophets. Hebrew Union College, 2005.
The Aramaic Bible: The Targum of Ezekiel, trans. Samson H. Levey, vol. 13. The Liturgical Press, 1990.
The Aramaic Bible: The Targum Onqelos to Genesis, trans. Bernard Grossfeld, vol. 6. The Liturgical Press, 1990.
The Babylonian Talmud: Megillah 3a. 4-6. The William Davidson Talmud: https://www.sefaria.org/Megillah.3a.6?lang=bi&with=About&lang2=en
The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version. Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1989.
The Holy Bible: New International Version. Hodder & Stoughton, 1984.
The Lexham Hebrew Bible. Lexham Press, 2012.

Secondary Sources

Babota, Vasile. The Institution of the Hasmonean High Priesthood. Brill, 2013.
Bellah, Robert N. Religion in Human Evolution: From the Paleolithic to the Axial Age. Harvard University Press, 2011.
Block, Daniel I. "Bringing Back David: Ezekiel's Messianic Hope" in The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts. pp. 167-188 Baker Book House, 1995.
Block, Daniel I. The Book of Ezekiel Chapters 1-24. Eerdmans Publishing, 1997.
Block, Daniel I. The Book of Ezekiel Chapters 25-48. Eerdmans Publishing, 1998.
Boyarin, Daniel. The Jewish Gospels: The story of the Jewish Christ. The New Press, 2012.
Cathcart, Kevin; Maher, Michael; and McNamara, Martin. eds., The Aramaic Bible: The Targum Onqelos to Genesis, trans. Bernard Grossfeld, vol. 6. The Liturgical Press, 1990.
Chilton, Bruce D.. The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum, vol. 23, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.
Chilton, Bruce D.. "Aramaic and Targumic Antecedents of Pauline 'Justification,'" in The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context, ed. D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara, vol. 166, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. JSOT Press, 1994.
Churgin, Pinkhos. Targum Jonathan to the Prophets (1927). Yale University Press, 1980.
Collins, Adele Yarbro. "Response to Israel Knohl, Messiahs and Resurrection in 'the Gabriel Revelation" in Hazon Gabriel: New Readings of the Gabriel Revelation. pp. 93-97. Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
Collins, John J.. Apocalypse, Prophecy, and Pseudepigraphy: On Jewish Apocalyptic Literature. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2015.
Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon, Targum Lexicon. Hebrew Union College, 2004.
Cook, Edward M.. Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic. Eisenbrauns, 2015.
Cooper, Lamar Eugene. Ezekiel, vol. 17, The New American Commentary. Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1994.
Damsma, Alinda. "The Merkabah as a Substitute for Messianism in Targum Ezekiel" in Vetus Testamentum 62 (2012) pp. 515-533. Brill, 2012.
Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Aramaic Language and the Study of the New Testament" in Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 99, No. 1, pp. 5-21. The Society of Biblical Literature, 1980.
Flesher, Paul V.M. and Chilton, Bruce. The Targums: A Critical Introduction. Baylor University Press, 2011.
Freyne, Seán. Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 BCE to 135 CE: A study of

Second Temple Judaism. T&T Clark Ltd., 1998.
Hengel, Martin. Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period, Vol. 1, trans. By Bowden, John. Tübingen, second revised and enlarged edition. Fortress Press, 1974.
Hengel, Martin. The Zealots: Investigation into the Jewish freedom movement in the period from Herod I until 70 A.D.. Second improved and enlarged edition. T. & T. Clark, 1976.
Hengel, Martin. "The Scriptures and Their Interpretation in Second Temple Judaism," in The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context, ed. D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara, vol. 166, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. JSOT Press, 1994.
Horsley, Richard A.. Jesus and Empire: The Kingdom of God and the New World Disorder. Fortress Press, 2003.
Horsley, Richard A.. Revolt of the Scribes: Resistance and Apocalyptic Origins. Fortress Press, 2010.
Jastrow, J.M.. A dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic literature. New York: Judaica Press 1989.
Kaufman, Stephen A., "Dating the Language of the Palestinian Targums and Their Use in the Study of First Century CE Texts," in The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context, ed. D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara, vol. 166, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. JSOT Press, 1994.
Klein, Michael L., "Cairo Genizah Targum Texts: Old and New," in The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context, ed. D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara, vol. 166, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. JSOT Press, 1994.
Klausner, Joseph. The Messianic Idea in Israel. The Macmillan Company, 1955.
Koch, Klaus. The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A polemical work on a neglected area of biblical studies and its damaging effects on theology and philosophy. Trans. By Margaret Kohl. London: SCM, 1972.
Levey, Samson H.. "The Date of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets" in Vetus Testamentum, Apr., 1971, Vol. 21, Fasc. 2 (Apr., 1971), pp. 186-196. Brill, 1971.
Levey, Samson H.. The Messiah: An Aramaic interpretation: the Messianic exegesis of the Targum. Hebrew Union College Press, 1974.
Levey, Samson H.. "The Targum To Ezekiel" in Union College Annual, Vol. 46, Centennial Issue, pp. 139-158. Hebrew Union College Press, 1975.
Levine, Lee, L.. The Ancient Synagogue: The first thousand years. Second edition. Yale University Press, 2005.
McNamara, Martin. Targum and Testament Revisited: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament, Second Edition. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010.
Merino, Luis Díez. "Targum Manuscripts and Critical Editions," in The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context, ed. D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara, vol. 166, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada Statement of Essential Truths (Amended by General Conference, May 2022): https://paoc.org/docs/default-source/fellowship-services-documents/constitutions/2022/statement-of-essential-truths-2022.pdf?sfvrsn=1874f16a_8
Ribera, Josep, "The Image of Israel According to Targum Ezekiel," in Targumic and Cognate Studies: Essays in Honour of Martin McNamara, ed. Kevin J. Cathcart and Michael Maher, Vol. 230, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Messianism and Apocalypticism in Rabbinic Texts" in The

Cambridge History of Judaism Vol. 4 The Late Roman-Rabbinic Period. ed. Steven T. Katz pp. 1053-1072. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
Schürer, Emil. A History of The Jewish People in the time of Jesus. 1886-1890, T&T Clark.
Zetterholm, Karin. Jewish Interpretation of the Bible. Fortress Press, 2012.
Zimmerli, Walther, Ezekiel: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Vol, I. ed. Frank Moore Cross and Klaus Baltzer, Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Fortress Press, 1979.
Zimmerli, Walther, Ezekiel: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Vol. II. ed. Frank Moore Cross and Klaus Baltzer, Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Fortress Press, 1988.