

According to V. Webb's classification (1978) the discussed object belongs to the early, fine group of spherical aryballoi, group III - vases in the undoubted form of fruit. Most probably a Rhodian product (Camirus); VIth century B. C. (XXVIth dynasty).

Greenish faience with grey spots. H. - 5.5 cm, Max. D. - 5.9 cm, rim diam. 4.1 cm, orifice diam. 0.9 cm. Inv. No. MNK XI - 38 (Czartoryski Collection). Purchased in Egypt about 1880.

Bibliography: K. Bułtas, CVA Pologne. 2, pl. 2(56)4.

Cf.: V. Webb, Archaic Greek Faience, p. 113, pl. XVIII, 758.

Cracow, 1980

Zdzisław J. KAPERA

BIBLICAL REFLECTIONS OF THE STRUGGLE FOR PHILISTIA AT THE END OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY B. C.

Part II

ANALYSIS OF THE CHAPTER XX OF THE BOOK OF ISAIAH*

The biblical texts are the only non-Assyrian documents to provide information on the history of Yamani's revolt in Ashdod about 712 B. C. However, it must be emphasized that only Is 20, 1-6 is relevant; all other texts sometimes regard as contemporary with the events are of merely secondary importance both because of their disputed chronology and because they represent a special literary genre, oracles against foreign nations, which are one kind of prophetic speeches.

Chapter 20 of the Book of Isaiah, dealing with the defeat of Ashdod, is among those passages of the prophet's extant writings whose genuineness and historical value are beyond question¹. It is generally firmly believed that it contains the description of a real albeit unusual action undertaken by Isaiah at the time of the anti-Assyrian uprising in Ashdod. However, attempts to determine the data of origin of the passage and of its inclusion in the prophet's writings (i.e. Chapters 1-39) are controversial. S. Morinckel believes that the chapter belongs to the third collection of the prophecies of Isaiah, written down by a disciple conventionally designated as R³ about the year 640 B. C.² J. H. Eaton counts the passage among the writings from the 7th century B. C.³ R. B. Scott classifies it as a record written down immediately upon the prophet's death⁴. Recently, the matter has been taken up again by G. Fohrer, who places it on an entirely new

plane. In his opinion, Chapter 20 belongs to the original writings of group F comes from (or rather, being an indirect account, refers to) the so-called third period of Isaiah's activity, that is the years 716-711 B.C.⁵

In G. Fohrer's opinion, the group F of prophecies, which includes Chapter 20, contains most of the material of Chapters 13-23. All those prophecies were directed against foreigner and foreign nations, and although they appear random and unconnected their ordering can be explained on the basis of Egyptian execration texts, which listed nations (or individuals) in a definite geographic order, i.e. South-North-West, with Egypt regarded as the centre. The location of Isaiah's native country was different, so the order of the prophecies is different, too:

14 : 24-27	against Assyria	= east
14 : 28-32	against the Philistine cities	= west
17 : 1-6	against Damascus and northern Israel	= north
18 : 20	against Egypt	= south
22 : 1-14, 15-19	against Jerusalem and the local rulers	= centre

We do not know whether this collection of oracles had any final, summing-up passage. It may have been lost during editorial work on Isaiah's texts.⁶

Although G. Fohrer's proposal does not contribute anything new to the interpretation of Chapter 20 itself, it makes us view the chapter in a different light. It enables us to understand the "transitional" position of the chapter, interrupting the flow of the series of oracles against the nations with the description of a particular symbolic action by Isaiah. If we assume that the F-collection was written down by a disciple just after the prophet's death (that is, at the very beginning of the 7th century B.C.), it is beyond all doubt that he interpolated in the text his memory of a symbolic action of his master's, the sense of which was certainly clear to him.

Having dated the chapter and explained its context we still ought to determine its literary genre. Following the standard terminology, we have to do here with a biographical narrative (as is suggested by O. Eissfeldt⁷). G. E. Wright guesses that Chapter 20 is a fragment of the prophet's biography written down by one of his disciples. A parallel fragment, in G. E. Wright's opinion, can be found in Chapter 7 : 1-9, where Isaiah exhorts Ahaz, king of Judah⁸. Let us further note that O. Eissfeldt draws a clear distinction between the "biographical narrative" (which is exemplified in Chapters 36-39 as well as 20 and 7) and the "personal account in autobiographical style" (such as Isaiah 6, 8, 14, 28-32). Thus, Chapter 20, which is part of a biography, represents one of the three major types of prophetic literature, which also includes autobiographic materials and of course the prophets' speeches themselves⁹.

TRANSLATION (after The Jerusalem Bible)

- 1 The year cupbearer-in-chief, sent by Sargon king of Assyria, came to Ashdod and stormed and captured it: / at that time Yahweh had spoken through Isaiah son of Amoz. He said to him, 'Go and undo the sackcloth round your waist and take the sandals off your feet'. The latter had done so, and walked about, naked and barefoot. / Yahweh then said, 'As my servant Isaiah has been walking about naked and barefoot for the last three years - a sign and portent for
- 2 Egypt and Cush - / so will the king of Assyria lead away captives from Egypt and exiles from Cush, young and old, naked and barefoot, their buttocks bared, to the shame of
- 3 Egypt. / You will be frightened and ashamed about Cush in which you trusted, and about Egypt of which you boasted.
- 4 / And the inhabitants of this coast will say, "Look what has happened to those in whom we trusted and to whom we fled for help and safety from the king of Assyria! And now, how are we going to escape?"

The above text of Isaiah 20 is the only fully reliable scriptural source directly informing of the history of Yamani's uprising. Therefore, we shall present a detailed, verse by verse analysis of the text.

Verse 1. As we know, neither Israel nor Judah had an official calendar during the period of divided kingdom, in the first

half of the first millenium B. C. There was no institution of eponyms of the type of the Assyrian lumu. The chroniclers of the time dated events in terms of the reigns of kings. To indicate a data more precisely, they would refer to some roughly contemporaneous event that had made an unusually strong impression¹⁰. The introduction to the Book of Amos is an example of such full dating, with a reference both to the reigns of the rulers of Israel and Judah and to an outstanding contemporaneous event:

"Words of Amos who was one of the shepherds of Tekoa. The vision he had about Israel in the time of Uzziah king of Judah and of Jeroboam son of Joash, king of Israel, two years before the earthquake." (1:1) For the disciple who wanted to date Isaiah's prophecy, the coming of the turtanu to Ashdod, the assault and the fall of the city, constituted such an important contemporaneous event. If we had only the biblical account at our disposal, we could give merely an approximate indication of the date of the conquest of Ashdod, placing it during the reigns of Sargon and Hezekiah. Fortunately, Assyrian sources are of some help: the fall of Ashdod was noted in the official chronicles of Sargon II. The city fell in 712 B. C.

While discussing the initial verse of Chapter 20, O. Kaiser justly observes the discrepancy between that verse and the Assyrian sources as to who led the army against Ashdod. According to Isaiah it was the turtanu, according to Sargon II's inscription, it was of course the king himself. In this connection O. Kaiser, quite unnecessarily, raises the problem of "whether the difference is to be explained by a confused recollection on the part of the bearers of the Judaeen tradition ... or the custom of monarchs of ascribing to themselves the acts of their subordinates"¹¹. The problem was solved scientifically long ago. It was the turtanu, i.e., the commander-in-chief, who came to Ashdod (in accordance with the evidence of Isaiah's disciple). According to a mention in the Eponym Chronicle (Cb⁴)¹², Sargon II was then "līna mâtī", that is in Assyria. H.

Tadmor supposed that the Assyrian king was very busy then in connection with the construction of a new residence at Dur Sharrukin (The Annals 232-243)¹³. It appears, however, that this was not the only matter that kept the king in Assyria: he was absorbed in the same year in problems of the north-western part of Asia Minor¹⁴; he was fortifying and constructing new strongholds on the Urartu border; Melid (Kammanu) was conquered¹⁵.

Verse 2. It contains a number of disputed expression. Already the beginning of the sentence is extremely difficult to understand: בַּעֲתֵּי הַיָּמִים. It has been a matter of dispute for over a hundred years, and scholars still have not reached agreement about its interpretation in the context of the verses 1 and 3. Different solution have been put forward.

At the end of the 19th century R. Kittel suggested that verse 2 should be treated as a parenthetical expression. If we do not assume that to be the case - he wrote - we face a serious difficulty. The indications of time in verses 1 and 2 would have to agree. Hence, the three-year period of Isaiah's activity could not have taken place. The correct interpretation of verse 2, then, is conditional upon its readings as a later interpolation. The indication of time in question is more general than הַיָּמִים בַּשָּׁנָה and must refer to several years, or more precisely to the threeyear period mentioned in v. 3¹⁶.

O. Procksch regarded the expression in question merely as an approximate indication of time. In his opinion, the beginning of Isaiah's mission took place not at the time of the siege and capture of Ashdod, but at the moment of the outbreak of the uprising, i.e. in the years 711-713 B. C.¹⁷

In 1934 the phrase bā 'ēth hahī' (at this time), appearing in the Books of Kings many times, was analysed by J. A. Montgomery¹⁸, who concluded that it was commonly applied by scribes in archival texts to substitute a definite date of a record.

J. Fischer continued to regard the expression as unclear, denoting "at this time" but not "at this moment". Nor does בְּשָׁנָה

in v. 1, in his opinion, unequivocally indicate that the others events described in Chapter 20 took place in the same year¹⁹.

J. A. Montgomery's ideas were taken up again many years later by B. S. Childs, who attempted to determine the exact meaning of the expression bā'ēth hahf' by analysing all of its instances in the biblical texts. By this method he found that had been recognized by Montgomery. According to Childs, "the expression, when it stands at the head of sentence," (as is the case in Isaiah 20!) "often indicates a break in the continuity of events caused by some new factor. However, the major function of the phrase appears to be one of synchronizing events, often quite loosely, rather than to serve as a substitution for an exact chronological item." Child distinguished the following modes of the use of the expression with past time reference:

- a) to indicate an absolute time in the past (Judg. 11:26, Num. 22:4)
- b) to indicate a specific time in the past in relation to another (Deut. 1:9, Judg. 3:29)
- c) to indicate a simultaneous time (II Kings 8:22, Esth. 8:9)
- d) to indicate general time in the past ("formerly" - Isaiah 20:2)²⁰.

S. Erlandsson has observed recently that bā'ēth hahf' in Isaiah 20:2 "does not allude to the occupation of Ashdod, but is a more general temporal indication to point out parenthetically that Isaiah had already in 713 begun to appear naked and barefoot"²¹. A similar opinion is voiced by O. Kaiser, who believes that "if v. 2 is not to be deleted as a later addition, it must be placed in parenthesis, and the general phrase 'at that time' taken to refer to a period before v. 1".²²

As we can see, even the most expert commentators of Isaiah cannot overcome the chronological difficulties associated with the phrase. It seems that the observations of Childs provide the best starting point; yet, his view that the passage in

question merely points to the past in general terms does not appear correct. It may be conjectured that this view was caused by the difficulties of reconciling the expression with its context, and by the hidden assumption that Isaiah's mission had occurred long before the year of the fall of Ashdod; this, however, is not quite so certain. The outbreak of Yamani's rebellion must have been a surprise for Sargon II, who had just removed Azuri from the throne of Ashdod and raised to the throne Ahimeti, more loyal to Assyria. It must have been even more of a surprise for Isaiah. Thus, his action could only have started after Yamani had sent messengers to Egypt, Judah, Edom and Moab. It was then that Yahweh spoke to Isaiah and prophet started to walk about naked and barefoot on order to warn his people. Therefore, the temporal expression in verse 1 and 2 ought to be treated as closely interconnected. It appears that in v. 2 the phrase bā'ēth hahf' is used in the sense of Childs's variant (c), that is, to indicate the simultaneity of the events described in verse 1 and 2.

The expression וַיִּדְבָּר has also been subject to discussion. Basically, the extant texts of Isaiah say that Yahweh spoke thorough Isaiah (literally, through the hand, that is through the mediation of Isaiah). (This version has recently been attested by the Qumran manuscript 1QIs^a.) It must be born in mind, however, that other manuscripts confirm the reading "Yahweh spoke to Isaiah". The phrase: וַיִּדְבָּר seems to suggest that Yahweh spoke to a third party; yet, in the light of the context and of the Septuagint translation it ought to be understood as saying that Yahweh spoke to Isaiah, who carried out his order²³. The strange language of the revelation described in v. 2 prompted O. Kaiser to believe that the verse was composed rather late²⁴.

In v. 2, like in other places in the Book of Isaiah (cf. Isa. 1:1, 2:1, 13:1, 37:2, 38:1), the prophet is called "the son of Amoz", that is, as it were, by his "full" name. Perhaps this, as well as the exact description of Isaiah's clothes, was to stress the importance of his vocation as a prophet.

By Yahweh's order Isaiah was to take the sackcloth **שִׁטְמָה** off his loins and the shoes **נַעֲלָיו** off his feet. The sackcloth, or rather a kind of cloak made of camel's hair (cf. Mark 1:6, II Kings 1:8), tied with a belt, served primarily as a piece of clothing (but see Gen. 42:25 and Jos. 9:5, where it serves as a sack). In addition, the sackcloth was customarily used during lamentation (cf. Isaiah 37:1) and was a sign of mourning (cf. Isaiah 3:24 and 15:3)²⁵. In the opinion of A. S. Herbert the sackcloth **שִׁטְמָה** was a garment typical of the guild of prophets or of cultic prophets. To support this view, Herbert refers to a characteristic passage from Zechariah (13:4): "When that day comes, every prophet shall be ashamed of his prophetic vision; they will no longer put on their hair cloaks to utter their lies"²⁶. According to Herbert, Isaiah deliberately put on his prophet's clothes in order to emphasize his vocation. By wearing them he also indicated that he was mourning the "death" of Ashdod²⁷. Then, by Yahweh's order, Isaiah took off his outer garments and his shoes, and walked about naked and barefoot (as is stressed in v. 4) to indicate the manner that the captives would go into exile. Let us further note that for Israel bare feet were a sign of suffering (2 S 15:30, Mi 1:8, see also Ezk 24, 15:23).

We can now see how carefully each detail of the prophet's symbolic action was planned.

The phrases "naked" and "barefoot", and especially the former, are also controversial. It was still H. Renan (and others followed him in this) who stressed the fact that complete nakedness was meant²⁸. This opinion shocked many of Isaiah's commentators and is still outrageous to some of them. E. Power still maintains that the word "naked" means in this case "without the outer garment", for a sackcloth was usually put on during lamentation, and it should be distinguished from the narrow girdle retained or put on after the sackcloth had been taken off²⁹. In P. Auvray's opinion, on the other hand, the "nakedness" presented no problem in the geographical and moral climate of 8th century Palestine³⁰.

Also O. Kaiser emphasizes the fact that while nakedness was regarded as an outrage in Israel (cf. Gen. 9:22 and 3:10), it was not surprising in the case of prisoners and fugitives (cf. 2 Ch 28:5, Am 2:16, Mi 1:8)³¹. P. Auvray is right, then, in saying that what could really shock the prophet's contemporaries was the length of time that Isaiah showed his nakedness in public³².

Verse 3. In this verse Yahweh calls Isaiah "his servant". In this way it is stressed that the prophet's symbolic action is an act of obedience to Yahweh. Previously, Isaiah had answered to the Lord's calling "Whom shall I send? ..." with "Here I am, send me" (Isa. 6:8). As he had then obeyed the order to walk naked and barefoot for three years. To many commentators, this has seemed improbable, and they have considered the description pure invention³³. This, as P. Auvray says, is an easy but unacceptable solution, in view of the fact that realism was one of the inherent features of the prophets' teaching. Other commentators have thought that Isaiah's action was interrupted, that he appeared naked and barefoot only from time to time. P. Auvray does not exclude this possibility, but he emphasizes the fact that the text says nothing about it. He suggests that tradition may have tended to bring into prominence the prophet's symbolic act, to enhance the impression it left, and to draw a parallel between the prophet's mission and other events (such as his three-year period of political activity). Auvray concludes that this is a problem we cannot solve and that we must reconcile ourselves to our ignorance³⁴. It seems, however, that the three years mentioned were the actual period during which Isaiah was warning his people. The prophet symbolically presented the possible results of active participation in the anti-Assyrian coalition. Many commentators of Isaiah, including O. Eissfeldt, share this view³⁵. Of course, they put forward various dates between 714 and 711 B. C., the shortest period being proposed by O. Kaiser, who writes about fourteen months of Isaiah's action³⁶. What constitutes the

real temporal framework of Isaiah's action is the actual course of events: Yamani's uprising and the siege and fall of Ashdod marking the beginning, and the extradition of Yamani to Sargon II the end of the action.

'ōt and mōpēt, a sign and portent, these are the terms in which Isaiah's symbolic action is described in v. 3. Such action was frequently to be taken later by Jeremiah and Ezekiel³⁷, but the mimic demonstration described in Chapter 20 of the Book of Isaiah³⁸ is quite exceptional for Isaiah, the only other instance being provided by the symbolical naming of his sons (Isa. 7:3, 8:1). Its purpose was to provoke his compatriots to continually ask themselves the questions: Why is the prophet still walking naked and barefoot? What does he intend to say thereby? The answer was simple. It was self-evident. Rumours of the events in Ashdod must have been coming to Jerusalem.

Verse 3 and 4 suggest, in O. Kaiser's opinion, that it was only at the end of Isaiah's action that Yahweh revealed to him its symbolic sense. Yet, it is quite obvious that the meaning of walking naked and barefoot must have been clear, at least in part, to the prophet's contemporaries as well as to himself. The sight of Isaiah walking through Jerusalem naked and barefoot was a live "prophetic vision"; it must have reminded the onlookers of the naked and barefooted captives shortly before led out of Ashdod, Gat and Ashdod-Yam. Isaiah was not warning the inhabitants of Ashdod or Egypt, but Ezekiah and anti-Assyrian party in the capital of Judah; he was warning all of his fellow-countrymen.

The symbolic, expressive action by Isaiah, while having common origins with magic, was not a typical magic action taken to bring about the fulfilment of the prophet's wishes. It was a manifestation of divine revelation made to the prophet, and it was undertaken by the order of Yahweh. It must have been an effective appeal for Isaiah's contemporaries, who had a daily familiarity with magic and who had certainly witnessed similar symbolic

acts before³⁹. Let us remember that although Sargon II did mention Judah among the countries Yamani had tried to incite to revolt, it kept away from the rebellion.

Verse 4. This verse contains a very expressive prophecy of the captives and exiles from Egypt and Cush, young and old, naked and barefoot, with their buttocks bared, being led away by the Assyrians. No contemporary Palestinian representations of naked captives are known to us. Even in the reliefs from Sennacherib's palace representing the capture of Lachish and the leading away of its population the prisoners are dressed and bag for mercy of the Assyrian ruler; their wives and children (also dressed) can be seen on carts leaving the town. The only naked figures in the reliefs are the captives who are being flayed⁴⁰. It remains a fact, however, that biblical texts contemporary with the events clearly say in many places that nakedness was a sign of captivity (cf. 2 Ch 28:5, Am 2:16, Mi 1:8)⁴¹.

The phrase gālūt, used to refer to the prisoners led away from Egypt, carries, for O. Kaiser, far-reaching historical implications: it would follow from verses 4 and 6 that the Assyrians not only defeated the Egyptians but also invaded Egyptian territory, thus not only leading away prisoners of war but also deporting members of the population⁴²; as deportations occurred in fact only in the late Sargonide period, under Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, this would mean that the whole story was composed long after the events it describes, probably after the so-called Babylonian captivity. Now, it is true that the term gālūt is a technical expression in the Bible, used to denote deportation (cf. for instance II Kings 25:27, Jr 52:31, Isa. 45:13); this, however, does not deprive Isaiah's speech of its meaning; it does not necessarily mean that Isaiah's hopes were frustrated when the Assyrians did not invade Egypt but merely occupied Ashdod. Consequently, it need not be supposed that Chapter 20 is merely a popular tradition from a later time. The following factors must be taken into account: (1) the high proba-

bility of a confrontation between the two superpowers of the time, Egypt and Assyria, during Isaiah's action; (2) Sargon II's immediate reaction to the first and second attempt by the Ashdodites to sever ties with Assyria; this testifies to the great importance he attached to Philistea and Palestine, the likely areas of the clash with Egypt; (3) the decline of the rulers of the Delta and the rise of Ethiopia: the fall of Bocchoris and the ascension of Shabako. During this period so rich in political change, just after the Assyrians had led the people of Ashdod into captivity in the same manner as they had led away the people of Israel some ten years before, a literal prognostication of the fate of the Egyptians need not have been an unrealistic prophetic vision, but may have been the effect of Isaiah's deep reflection and acute observation of the contemporary political events⁴³.

Stressing the complete nakedness of the prisoners ("their buttocks bared"), and thus showing the disgraceful condition in which Egyptian prisoners of war would be led into captivity, was to impress the prophecy very strongly on the listeners' minds. As the connection between verses 3 and 4 is obvious, their effect ought not to be weakened, as many commentators have done, by qualifying the concluding words of verse 4, "to the shame of Egypt" as a later gloss⁴⁴. If we look upon Isaiah's speech as a real prophecy, the words appear to be fully relevant. It is disputed whether verses 5 and 6 are still words of Yahweh or reflections of the prophet himself. The question is difficult to decide, but the answer does not affect the sense of the statements made in the two verses⁴⁵. They deal with the consequences of the coming events for those who place their hopes for help in Egypt or Cush.

Verse 5. Those who will be frightened and who will be failed (יִתְּנוּ וְיִבְּשׁוּ) by the Egyptian ally are not mentioned by name. Nevertheless, it is most likely that all those are meant who took the side of Egypt and placed their confidence in Egypt at the moment of Assyrian threat. It is clear that the narrator

counts the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judah in this group⁴⁶. To support this view it is enough to refer to the other mentions of the pro-Egyptian party elsewhere in Isaiah (eg. 30:1ff., 30:6f., 31:1ff., 36:9f.).

Verse 6. When addressing his fellow-countrymen, Isaiah concentrated on their enmity towards Assyria. But the Judaeans in fact stood aloof from the Palestinian events. Those who really participated in them, the inhabitants of the coast, were seized with terror. They were asking themselves: Can we save ourselves from the king of Assyria, without allies and their military help? The dwellers of the coast יֹשְׁבֵי הָיָם (literally, "of this isle") were - as is generally believed - the inhabitants of the coast cities of Philistea (cf. Jr 47:4). It is worth nothing (after T. K. Cheyne and O. Procksch)⁴⁷ that this designation of the inhabitants of Philistea is similar to the contemporary Assyrian term *āšibut tāmḏim* (German "Anwohner des Meeres") used in the Broken Prism A (l. 30)⁴⁸. Perhaps, however, v. 6 refers in fact not only to the Philistines but also to the remaining members of the anti-Assyrian coalition.

The correct reading of v. 6 and, consequently, its explanation, are a complicated matter. The interpretation proposed can be divided into two groups, which we shall call the personal and impersonal interpretations. The former group includes the reading proposed by: F. Delitsch⁴⁹, A. Dillmann, R. Kittel⁵⁰, J. Fischer⁵¹, J. Steinmann⁵², O. Kaiser⁵³, J. Paściak (in the Polish Millennium Bible)⁵⁴, B. Wodecki (in the Poznań Bible)⁵⁵ and the Bible de Jerusalem⁵⁶. The latter group comprises the interpretations of: G. Smith⁵⁷, O. Procksch⁵⁸, J. Koenig⁵⁹, P. Auvray⁶⁰, S. Erlandsen⁶¹, A. S. Herbert⁶², and the Targum of Isaiah⁶³, which also offers the impersonal translation.

It appears that in the impersonal interpretations the words מִבְּטָנוּ and יִסְנוּ are interpreted in the context of the concrete hope (though hope is in fact always an abstract notion) that the Philistines set on Egypt and the country of Cush as a main-

stay and refuge from the Assyrian ruler. On the other hand, the personal readings treat the hope as specifically associated either with the community of Egyptians or Cushites or with some unknown person (only J. Paściak and J. Steinmann⁶⁴ read the text in this latter way). The matter must be stated unequivocally: the text does not allow us to decide whether what was meant was hope itself, a group of people on whom the hope was set or an individual on whom the hope was set.

Depending on the interpretation of the context of v. 6 different authors put forward one of the three solutions listed above. Each solution seems to follow from a close association of verse 6 with the preceding verses, especially verses 3 and 5.

But is this the correct approach? Let us indicate an alternative solution, based on the translation of J. Steinmann and J. Paściak. Let us assume that verses 5 and 6 are a fragment of a different speech than verses 3 and 4. Let us ignore the question whether the speaker is Yahweh, Isaiah, or his disciple (editor). Considering the internal data of verses 5 and 6, we can gather that:

- (1) some group of people will be terrified at the deed of their hope, the Cushites
- (2) they will be ashamed about Egypt
- (3) someone on whom they set their hopes, to whom they resorted for help, suffered a fate that could not be avoided.

We must ask ourselves who or what was connected with these events. We may suppose that two persons could be concerned: Yamani or his Egyptian protector. O. Procksch seems to follow the former suggestion⁶⁵. But although Yamani was disappointed by the Cushitic ruler (Shabako extradited him to Sargon II), which may have aroused fear in the Philistines (or members of the coalition) and filled them with shame at the weakness of Egypt (or rather, of the rulers of the Delta), it was not on him that the allies had set their hopes, but rather on Egypt.

The only possible choice, then, is Yamani's Egyptian protector, Bocchoris.

On this assumption, all the elements of verses 5 and 6 of the prophecy can be justified. The invasion of the Delta by the Cushites must have aroused fear about the fate of Yamani's coalition and embarrassment at Egypt's helplessness. The burning of Bocchoris by Shabako, mentioned by Diodorus, must have bred despair. In this situation, there was no one on whom the Philistines could rely for support. The extradition of Yamani to Sargon II marked the end of all hopes for an anti-Assyrian direction of Shabako's foreign policy. Hence, we ought to adopt the concrete, personal reading of the verses 5 and 6, thus separating them from the rest of the prophecy.

NOTES

* The present article is the next part of so far unpublished dissertation The Rebellion of Yamani in Ashdod: A Study in the History of Philistia Between c. 713-709 B.C. defended at the Jagiellonian University, Cracow, in 1978. Cf. Summary published in the *Folia Orientalia* 20 (1979), pp. 313-314, and the articles: Was Ya-na-ni a Cypriot? *Folia Orientalia* 14 (1972-73), pp. 207-218 and The Ashdod Stele of Sargon II, *Folia Orientalia* 17 (1976), pp. 87-99 and Biblical Reflections of the Struggle for Philistia at the End of the Eight Century B.C. A. Analysis of Chosen Passages of the Book of Isaiah, Part I [in:] *Prace Historyczne* vol. 70, Kraków 1981, pp. 11-28.

¹ Cf. O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament. An Introduction, Oxford 1965, p. 314: "Certainly genuine section".

² S. Mowinckel, Die Komposition des Jesajabuches Kap. 1-39, *Acta Orientalia* 11 (1933), pp. 267 ff.

³ J. H. Eaton, The Origin of the Book of Isaiah, *Vetus Testamentum* 9 (1959), pp. 138-157.

⁴ R. B. Y. Scott, The Book of Isaiah Chaps. 1-39 [in:] The Interpreter's Bible, Nashville 1956, vol. 5, pp. 151 ff.

⁵ G. Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament, London 1970, p. 365.

⁶ Compare the analysis of this group of Isaiah's writings by G. Fohrer, The Origin, Composition and Tradition of Isaiah I-XXXIX, The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society 3 (1961-2), pp. 61-81 and the summing-up of his argument in the Introduction..., pp. 367 f.

⁷ O. Eissfeldt, op. cit., p. 149.

⁸ G. E. Wright, Isaiah, London 1964, p. 60. Similarly in J. Köenig, Le Livre d'Isaïe [in:] La Bible. L'Ancien Testament, Paris 1959, vol. II, pp. 64 f - note to Is 20,1. He describes Chapter 20 as part of a small collection compiled probably by a disciple (cf. Is 8,16).

⁹ O. Eissfeldt, l. cit.

¹⁰ R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, New York 1965, vol. 1, p. 193.

¹¹ O. Kaiser, Isaiah 13-39, London 1974, p. 114.

¹² A. Ungnad, Eponymen [in:] Reallexikon der Assyriologie, Berlin-Leipzig 1933, p. 433.

¹³ H. Tadmor, The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological Study, Journal of Cuneiform Studies 12 1958, p. 79 (and note 208) and p. 95.

¹⁴ This is justly noted by M. Noth, The History of Israel, London 1965, p. 265 note 3.

¹⁵ H. Tadmor, op. cit., p. 95 (concerning the year 712 B. C.).

¹⁶ A. Dillmann, R. Kittel, Der Prophet Jesaja, Leipzig 1898, p. 181.

¹⁷ O. Procksch, Jesaja I, Leipzig 1930, p. 257.

¹⁸ J. A. Montgomery, Archival Data in the Book of Kings, Journal of Biblical Literature 53 1934, pp. 46-52.

¹⁹ H. Fischer, Das Buch Isaias. I. Teil: Kapitel 1-39, Bonn 1937, p. 147.

²⁰ B. S. Childs, Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis, London 1967, p. 71 and note 7.

²¹ S. Erlandsson, The Burden of Babylon. A study of Isaiah 13:2-14:23, Lund 1970, p. 80.

²² O. Kaiser, l. cit.

²³ P. Auvray, Isaïe 1-39, Paris 1972, p. 197.

²⁴ O. Kaiser, l. cit.

²⁵ P. Auvray, l. cit.

²⁶ Translation according to The Jerusalem Bible, London

1971, p. 1336. The garment ('aderet sē'ār) mentioned in the text was probably a kind of cloak similar פִּתּוּל.

²⁷ A. S. Herbert, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah 1-39, Cambridge 1973, pp. 127 f.

²⁸ Lusseau-Collomb, Manuel d'Études Bibliques. T. III (2^{me} Partie). Les Livres Prophetiques, Paris 1934, p. 170 note 100.

²⁹ E. Power, Isaias [in:] A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture, London 1953, p. 555.

³⁰ P. Auvray, l. cit.

³¹ O. Kaiser, l. cit.

³² P. Auvray, l. cit.

³³ Cf. O. Kaiser, op. cit., p. 115.

³⁴ P. Auvray, l. cit.

³⁵ P. Auvray, l. cit.

³⁶ O. Eissfeldt, op. cit., p. 321.

³⁷ Cf. the list in G. Fohrer, History of Israelite Religion, London 1973, p. 240. See also L. R. Stachowiak, Symboliczne czynności jako forma przekazu prorockiego [in:] Współczesna bibliotyka polska 1945-1970, Warszawa 1972, pp. 79-90.

³⁸ J. Köenig, op. cit., p. 65 note concerning vv. 3-4. The demonstration is compared with Ezr 4,1 ff and 5,1 ff.

³⁹ Cf. A. S. Herbert, op. cit., p. 127 and G. Fohrer, Religion..., p. 241.

⁴⁰ Cf. R. D. Barnett, Assyrische Palastreliefs, Prag (c. 1960), figs. 45-48.

⁴¹ The representation of prisoners of war on ivory objects found at Megiddo that O. Kaiser quotes on p. 114, note f come from the years 1350-1150 B. C., that is from the end of the Bronze Age. Thus, the example clearly is an anachronism. Cf. J. B. Pritchard, ed., Ancient Near Eastern Pictures Relating to the Old Testament, Princeton 1952, p. 124 and fig. 385 and J. B. Pritchard, ed., The Ancient Near East: Supplementary Texts and Pictures Relating to the Old Testament, Princeton 1969, fig. 90.

⁴² O. Kaiser, op. cit., pp. 116 f.

⁴³ Dealing with Isaiah's political activity one ought to become acquainted with E. J. Kissane's lucid views of the subject (The Book of Isaiah, Vol. I (I-XXXIX)), Dublin 1942, pp. XIX-XXI.

⁴⁴ It is the common opinion of B. Duhm, A. Condamin, R. Kittel, O. Procksch, E. J. Kissane, E. Power, O. Kaiser and

others. Cf. O. Kaiser, op. cit., p. 116 and J. Steinmann, Le Prophete Isaie. Sa vie, son oeuvre et son temps, Paris 1955², p. 193.

⁴⁵ P. Auvray, op. cit., p. 198.

⁴⁶ O. Kaiser, l. cit.

⁴⁷ T. K. Cheyne, Einleitung in das Buch Jesaja, Gies-sen 1897, p. 127 and O. Procksch, op. cit., p. 259. Cf. also: G. A. Smith, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 199.

⁴⁸ Cf. H. Winckler, Keilinschriftliches Textbuch zum Alten Testament, 3rd. ed., Leipzig 1909, p. 42.

⁴⁹ F. Delitzsch, Biblischer Commentar über den Pro-pheten Jesaja, Leipzig 1879, p. 239.

⁵⁰ A. Dillmann, R. Kittel, op. cit., p. 184.

⁵¹ J. Fischer, op. cit., p. 148.

⁵² J. Steinmann, op. cit., p. 194.

⁵³ O. Kaiser, op. cit., p. 112.

⁵⁴ J. Paściak, Księga Izajasza [in:] Pismo Święte Sta-rego i Nowego Testamentu w przekładzie z języków oryginalnych (Biblia Tysiąclecia), Poznań-Warszawa 1971, 2nd. ed., p. 865.

⁵⁵ B. Wodecki, Księga Izajasza [in:] Pismo Święte Sta-rego i Nowego Testamentu w przekładzie z języków oryginalnych ze wstępami i komentarzami (Biblia Poznańska), Poznań 1975, Stary Testament, Vol. 2, p. 725.

⁵⁶ The Jerusalem Bible, p. 998.

⁵⁷ G. A. Smith, op. cit., pp. 199 f.

⁵⁸ O. Procksch, op. cit., p. 255.

⁵⁹ J. Köenig, op. cit., p. 65.

⁶⁰ P. Auvray, op. cit., p. 81. 198.

⁶² S. Erlandsson, op. cit., p. 81.

⁶² A. A. Herbert, op. cit., p. 126.

⁶³ J. F. Stenning, The Targum of Isaiah, Oxford 1949, pp. 64 f.

⁶⁴ l. cit.

⁶⁵ O. Procksch, op. cit., p. 259.

Zdzisław J. KAPERA

BIBLICAL REFLECTIONS OF THE STRUGGLE FOR PHILISTIA AT THE END OF THE EIGHT CENTURY B. C.

Part III

JUDGMENT ON THE NEIGHBOURING COUNTRIES (ZECHARIAH 9, 1-8)

Apart from the passages of Isaiah discussed¹, the only prophetic text that students have related (or attempted to relate) to the events of Yamani's rebellion in Ashdod is one of the prophecies of so-called Deutero-Zechariah. The book continues to appear under its traditional name of the Book of Zechariah, but no modern Biblicist entertains any doubts that chapters 9-14 (which include the passage in question) were written by a different author than chapters 1-8; the two parts differ widely in both form and content². This is not the place for detailed argument; let us merely point out that Zechariah 9-14 has further been split into two subparts, a special position being attributed to chapters 9-11; moreover, some scholars have even postulated a third author, so-called Trito-Zechariah³, for chapters 12-14, but that view has commonly been rejected⁴.

Starting from chapter 9 the Book of Zechariah is composed of a series of oracles and prophecies. Their interpretation is rendered very difficult by their general, eschatological and later even apocalyptic nature. As J. Homerski rightly observes, there are two major lines of interpreting Deutero-Zechariah, one "looking for some factual background or at least historical allusions" and trying to "date and interpret the prophecies accordingly", the other viewing the text as a set of "eschatological and Messianic prophecies not based on any particular historical data"⁵. It is the former direction that is interesting for us, since in Zc 9, 1-8