

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

a longer passage is found that refers to the Philistine cities, of which Ashkelon, Gaza, Ekron and Gaza are mentioned in the text. The passage is part of a more general prophecy against various cities of Syria (Hadrech, Damascus, Hamath) and Palestine, or more particularly, Phoenicia (Tyre and Sidon) and Philistia. The prophecy is followed by a promise of peace for Jerusalem (Zc 9, 9-10) and of the deliverance of Ephraim and Judah (9, 11-17).

For several centuries arguments have been raised for an early dating of the passage. As early as the 18th century W. W. Newcome expressed the view that chapters 9-11 should be dated at the time of the prophet Hosea (750-730 B. C.), on the basis of internal evidence. That view or its more or less modified versions have survived till our own days, largely owing to L. Bertholdt, who provided a number of new supporting arguments in 1814. In his opinion, chapters 9 and 10 were written prior to the Syro-Ephraimite war (735-733 B. C.) by Zechariah ben Jeberekjāhū, who lived at the turn of the 8th century B. C. (cf. Is 8, 2)⁶.

B. Stade's work published in 1881-2⁷ constituted a breakthrough in the study of Deutero-Zechariah. The author did not examine the individual verses allegedly containing allusions, but the literary structure of the book in its entirety and its relation to the other prophetic books of the Old Testament, and concluded that the Book of Zechariah came from the Hellenistic Period. Soon after, J. Wellhausen supported J. Stade's view and dated the book more closely to the times of Maccabees⁸.

There have been attempts to reconcile the two conflicting views: S. R. Driver and some other students put forward the theory that Zc 9-11 came from the pre-exilic times but was revised after the exile⁹. The discussion is continuing. There are scholars who still believe in the earlier dating of Deutero-Zechariah and those who date it at a later time (roughly, the Hellenistic Period). The former group may be represented by F. Horst¹⁰,

the latter includes the most eminent modern students of Biblical literature such as O. Eissfeldt¹¹ and G. Fohrer¹².

Zc 9, 1-8 has aroused considerable interest for the last fifty years. This section of the text is certainly crucial for the dating of the whole prophecy. It contains many names and allusions, which are not at all easy to place in their right historical context. As is the case with all of Deutero-Zechariah, there have been many conflicting proposals for the dating of 9, 1-8. A very early date was postulated by H. Kraeling¹³, who regarded it as a prophetic catalogue of the Assyrian conquests from the fall of Hadrach to (738 B. C.) to the capture of Ashdod (712 B. C.). A. Jepsen¹⁴ put the date even further back, to the middle of the 8th century B. C., reading the passage as a reference to the Syrian conquests of Jeroboam II. F. Horst¹⁵ suggested Tiglath-pileser III's times, confining the substance of the prophecy to verses 1-6.

From among non-Biblicists, A. T. Olmstead supported Kraeling's proposal for an early dating. He saw half of the prophecy fulfilled with the fall of Hamath, the flight of Hanun from Gaza and the battle of Raphia (ab. 720 B. C.); after the fall of Hadrach, Damascus and Hamath the turn would come for the Phoenicians and the Philistines. It seems that A. T. Olmstead regarded Deutero-Zechariah as a genuine prophecy made at the beginning of Sargon II's reign¹⁶.

Among the post-war studies, those by A. Malamat and H. Tadmor merit special attention. A. Malamat attempts to establish the exact date of Zc 9, 1-6 by setting the individual elements of the prophecy against external data¹⁷. His primary assumption is that verses 5-7 referred to real historical events. As we remember, v. 5 says that "the king will vanish from Gaza", and v. 6, "the bastard will live in Ashdod" and I mean to destroy the arrogance of Philistia¹⁸. The two verses would thus refer to the banishment of Hanun from Gaza in 720 and the accession of Yamani (a foreigner) in Ashdod; let us add that for A. Ma-

lamat "Yamani" denotes a Greek (a Ionian). The latter event preceded and occasioned Sargon II's campaign against Ashdod in 711. Following these assumptions, which point to the beginning of Sargon II's reign as the time of the prophecy, A. Malamat next pursues the question whether the remaining parts of the prophecy are in agreement with the information about the fate of the towns listed that is found in the Assyrian sources.

The question of the Syrian towns proved to be the easiest to decide. As is known from several of Sargon II's inscriptions¹⁹, the king of Hamath, Yaubi'di, led a revolt fanned also by Damascus and Samaria. As a matter of fact, Deutero-Zechariah speaks of "all the tribes of Israel", but that, in A. Malamat's opinion, also includes Samaria²⁰. Sargon II's texts, then elucidate the prophet's allusions. As for Hadrach, the city's participation in the revolt of 720 B. C. is revealed by the stele of Ashurnasirpal II²¹. Thus, all the cities mentioned by Deutero-Zechariah did take part in the rebellion against Sargon II.

Next, A. Malamat deals with the reference to Tyre. The information that "And Tyrus did build herself a stronghold" (v. 3)²² seems to be confirmed by Menander's mention of the siege of town by Shalmaneser V (as quoted by Josephus Flavius, Ant. Jud. 9, 14, 2). The city, which for such a long time withstood attacks by the Assyrians, who were so expert at siegecraft, must have been well fortified (quite apart from the fact that it lay on an island). The prophecy about Tyre says that the Lord "...will smite her power in the sea; and she shall be devoured with fire" (v. 4)²³. Yet, Menander's account says nothing of the city's surrender to Shalmaneser. Therefore, A. Malamat looks for the explanation of the prophecy in an obscure fragment of an inscription on a Sargon II cylinder. The fragment says that Sargon caught the sea-dwelling Ionians like fish and captured Que and Tyre (Cylinder, 1.21). Am Malamat suspects a connection between the sea battle against the Cypriots (that is how he reads the first part of the record)

and the capture of Tyre. He even supposes that a sea battle may have been fought between the Tyrians and the Assyrians. This conjecture is based on the three facts (the battle with the Cypriots, the conquests of Tyre and of Que) being reported in the same brief fragment. A. Malamat also points out that according to Menander's account Tyre had links with Cyprus through its colony at Kition. He believes that the siege of Tyre went on contemporaneously with that of Samaria starting from 725/724 B. C. As according to Menander the siege lasted for five years, the fall of Tyre would have occurred in 720/719 B. C., under Sargon II²⁴.

A. Malamat sums up by saying that Zechariah's prophecy was written in the wake of "the military exploits of Sargon II", who about 720 B. C. served as "the rod of the Lord's anger" against Hadrach, Damascus, Israel and Hamath and conquered Gaza and Tyre. The coup d'état in Ashdod cannot be dated precisely, but it is very likely to have preceded the Assyrian campaign of 711 B. C. by a few years and to have briefly followed the events of 720 B. C.²⁵.

A. Malamat's dating of Zc 9, 1-6 met with a very sharp reply of H. Tadmor. The latter also believes that the prophecy is related to real events, but such as had occurred twenty years before, during the reign of Tiglath-pileser III. At that time king Azariah of Judah (Ass. Az-ri-a-u mat la-u-da-a-a, Heb. Uzziah) led a coalition against the Assyrian monarch. The background had been as follows. When in 743 B. C. Tiglath-pileser III marched against the Syrian coalition led by the ruler of Arpad, Sarduri and his followers were defeated and Arpad fell after a three-year-long siege (742-740). As a result, all the states of northern Syria and southern Anatolia had to recognize Assyrian supremacy. However, when Tiglath-pileser III set out on a campaign against Ulluba on the border of Urartu in 739 B. C., a new coalition arose, led by Azariah of Judah. Azariah, whose warlike spirit is so much dwelt upon in the Bible (cf. for instance 2 Ch 26, 1-23), led his army to battle near Hadrach.

Unfortunately, the battle was lost. Azariah and several other rulers paid tribute to Assyria²⁶. H. Tadmor believes that the countries listed in Zc 9, 1-6 are indeed those that took part in Azariah's revolt.

The sentence "Yahwe has passed through the land of Hadrach and Damascus is his dwelling place" (Zc 9, 1) acquires fuller sense when considered against the background of the events described, i. e., the Syrian campaign of Azariah's army. H. Tadmor does not attempt to date all the events of Zc 9, 3-6 precisely, but tends to associate the prophecies against Tyre and Philistia with the years 739/738 B. C. He makes the very valuable observation that also the epilogue of the prophecy, that is verses 9, 10-11, should be interpreted with Azariah's campaign in mind. The epilogue speaks of a future empire of Judah and Ephraim which "will rule from Sea to Sea, from the River to the ends of the Earth" (9, 10)²⁷. For a brief spell, in 739/738, Azariah's forces did stay near the Euphrates and the southern borders of his kingdom reached the Gulf of Aqaba and the Red Sea.

While H. Tadmor does not propose any positive explanation for Deutero-Zechariah's prophecy against Tyre and Philistia, he violently opposes A. Malamat's views in the matter. He believes that the hypothesis of a campaign of Sargon II against Tyre cannot be maintained: such a campaign certainly is not mentioned more than once in Sargon II's inscriptions, and even the interpretation of the crucial line 21 of Sargon's cylinder ought to be different from what D. D. Luckenbill suggested and A. Malamat followed; namely, the expression "ušapšihu KUR Que u URU Suri" should not be read as "subdued Que Tyre" (as was done by them) but as "Quieting (= bringing peace) to (the people of) Que and Tyre" H. Tadmor also precludes the possibility of the expression WYŠB MMZR B'ŠDWD in v. 6 of Deutero-Zechariah's prophecy being related to the usurpation of the Ashdod throne by Tamani, because the latter was not a foreigner, not an Ionian, but in all probability a local, perhaps even a Philistine²⁸.

Both these attempts to set Deutero-Zechariah's prophecy in framework of real historical events are very interesting and the arguments adduced so competently by the two authors are indeed weighty. Yet, neither hypothesis is logically faultless.

H. Tadmor's proposal is in fact confined to verses 1-2; as to the other verses, H. Tadmor merely criticises A. Malamat's views with no attempt at justifying his own conjectures. Let us, then, consider the arguments put forward by H. Tadmor. We can speak of the land of Hadrach and of northern Syria in general only under the assumption that Azriyau of Yaudi was identical with Azariah, king of Judah. That view, however, is still disputed²⁹. Some scholars believe that Azariah was the king of a small state in northern Syria³⁰, but this is not a very appealing hypothesis, for it is unlikely that at the same time two kings of the same name should have ruled two countries of Yaudi (Judah) situated in the same general area (Syria-Palestine). It is much more likely that the far-sighted king Azariah of Jerusalem saw the threat from the north and tried to meet it as far as possible from his own country, as Ahab had done a hundred years before³¹. Although the last word in the matter of the identity of the Azariah who appears in Tiglath-pileser III's Annals has not been said H. Tadmor's proposal is estimated favourably by F. W. Albright and his school of oriental research³². The only disputed point is the chronology. W. F. Albright, E. R. Thiele³³ and J. Bright³⁴ assume that Azariah's revolt took place not in 739/738 but in 743 B. C., that is, about five years earlier.

Let us next consider H. Tadmor's suggestion that also verses 3-6 of the prophecy, which speak about the fall of Tyre and the destruction of the Philistine cities, refer to events that occurred in the same year. It is true that Tyre was implicated in Azriyau's revolt and paid tribute to Assyria after the defeat. It was a few years after that, in 734 B. C., that Tiglath-pileser's army marched across Philistia to the very borders of Egypt. Tiglath-pileser captured Gaza and removed its king, Hanun, who

was later restored to the throne. The fates of the other Philistine cities during that campaign are unknown³⁵.

In the light of known facts, H. Tadmor's view concerning verses 3-6 can hardly be maintained. In criticising A. Malamat, H. Tadmor questions the correctness of the interpretation of the reference to Tyre in Sargon II's inscription. He believes that the key word *uṣapšihu* should be taken not in the sense of "subdued" but of "bringing peace to". It is beyond question that the word is a causative form (described in the old grammars as *Shafel* formed from *Piel*)³⁶. But how ought it to be understood in this context? H. Tadmor follows closely H. Winckler's translation ("und Ruhe verschaffte Kui und Tyrus")³⁷ and W. Muss-Arnolt's dictionary ("brought peace to Que and Tyre")³⁸. On the other hand, already F. E. Peiser took the text in a different sense, rendering it as "zur Ruhe brachte"³⁹. D. D. Luckenbill's translation was similar ("subdued")⁴⁰. In W. von Soden's Assyrian dictionary yet another shade of meaning is found: "Feinde pazifizieren" (to pacify a foe)⁴¹. This last suggestion seems to fit in best with what is known of the history of Tyre in the times of Sargon II. There is no doubt that Sargon II besieged the city, thus continuing the efforts of his predecessor, Shalmaneser V. He did not capture the city, however, but pacified it and laid it under tribute. The absence of any mention of the capture of the town in the official annals is indeed striking. If Tyre had fallen, Sargon II's scribes would not have failed to publicize the fact on the walls and floors of Dur-Sharukkin and in other places. Moreover, let us bear in mind that Tyre was governed by the same ruler, Luli (Eloulaios) for thirty-six years⁴²; if Tyre had been conquered, it would certainly have received a more compliant ruler, as Eloulaios had made himself known to the Assyrians as a dangerous and dauntless enemy. When Sennacherib conquered all of Phoenicia in 701 B. C. (except for the island on which the stronghold of Tyre was situated), Eloulaios fled to Cyprus. He did not give up struggle against Assyria and that attitude

may well have been the cause of his violent death while on the island (Sennacherib's *Annals* 18-19).

In view of these facts, neither A. Malamat's belief that Tyre was conquered nor H. Tadmor's opinion that Sargon II's policy towards the city had a peaceful sequel are sufficiently justified. Tyre was humiliated after a five-year-long siege, as was long ago stated by B. Turaev⁴³ and recently repeated by M. J. Gel'cer⁴⁴. The event occurred probably in 720/719 B. C., contemporaneously with the suppression of the Syrian rebellion, the second conquest of Samaria, the fall of Gaza and Raphia, and before the campaign against the Mannaeans and to the borders of Urartu⁴⁵.

Let us finally take up the question of the "*mamzer* in Ashdod" (Zc 9, 6). Is it really Yamani's usurpation that is meant, as A. Malamat believed? H. Tadmor answers with a definite "no", pointing out that Yamani was not a foreigner but a native of the land, perhaps a Philistine⁴⁶. The problem of Yamani's origin have been discussed in a more detail study⁴⁷. Let us now examine more closely the meaning of the word *mamzer* and its possible alternative interpretation. The word is extremely rare and it occurs only twice in the Old Testament. It appears in Dt 23,3 in the sense of "bastard", which is confirmed by the Septuagint translation, ἐκ πόρνῃς⁴⁸, but for Zc 9, 6 the Septuagint has a different term: ἀλλογενεῖς (foreigner, stranger). It is this broader meaning that is adopted by A. Malamat⁴⁹. H. Tadmor rejects a reference to Yamani, but there is nothing to preclude the use of the term in connection with the Ashdod events. As H. Tadmor rightly notes, the whole of verse 6 ought to be taken into consideration, but in a different sense from that suggested by A. Malamat. First, it was suggested long ago by E. Sellin that the word *mamzer* is used here in the sense of "half-breed"⁵⁰. E. Sellin, who connected the text with a later period, supposed that "the influx of people of various nationalities would cause the native population (i. e., the people of Ashdod) to be outnumbered, so that one could not properly speak of the land of the Philistines but of the

land of half-breeds"⁵¹. Secondly, the word gā'ôn need not necessarily appear in verse 6 in its derived sense of "pride", as is commonly accepted by translators and exegetes⁵², but in its principal sense of "greatness, splendour". If so, why not read verse 6 as follows: "foreigners will settle in Ashdod and ruin the greatness (splendour) of the Philistines"? This interpretation seems to be corroborated by the Assyrian texts (cf. Display Inscription, 107-109). As J. Zabłocka has found, an indefinite number of people from Ashdod, Gintu and Ashdūdimmu were brought by Sargon II to live in Karalla and Itti after the fall of Yamani⁵³. The population was thus mixed. In addition, let us bear in mind the accounts in Sargon's inscriptions of the looting of the towns of the Ashdod kingdom, including the royal palace, of the overthrow of the native dynasty and of the imposing of a military governor. Philistia was thus stripped of political power and despoiled of her riches, and so the "greatness and splendour of the Philistines" were gone.

Despite H. Tadmor's objection, then, there is no doubt that Zc 9, 1-6 provides information on the period of Sargon II's reign. On the other hand, we cannot share A. Malamat's view that only the events of 720/719 B. C. can be meant. The attempt to date the events in Ashdod (or at least the accession of Yamani)⁵⁴ to those years fails although suggestions to that effect have been made⁵⁵. Zc 9, 1-5, then, concerns developments that took place during Sargon II's first campaign against Syria, Philistia and Phoenicia, while Zc 9, 6 refers to events ten years later. At any rate, Zc 9, 1-6 must be dated to a time earlier than 705-701, because Ashdod did not participate in the revolt against Sennacherib and the local dynasty (perhaps the old one) had been restored to the throne. The question remains whether Zc 9, 1-6 contains fragments of two prophecies⁵⁶, v. 6 having originally been part of a later prophecy against Philistia. In any case, the editor of chapter 9 must have been familiar with the fates of Philistia in the days of Deutero-Zechariah (that is probably Zechariah son of Jeberechiah), cf. Is 8, 2/.

NOTES

¹ Cf. Z. J. Kapera, Biblical Reflections of the Struggle for Philistia at the End of the Eight Century B. C., Part 1 [in:] Prace Historyczne 70 (= Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 613), Kraków 1981, pp. 11-28.

² The problem of Deutero-Zechariah was first raised at the beginning of the 17th century by Joseph Mede (d. 1638). Cf. J. Homerski, Księga Zachariasza. Wstęp - przekład - komentarz [in:] Księgi Proroków Mniejszych, Poznań 1968 (= Pismo Święte Starego Testamentu, vol. 12, part 2), p. 276.

³ O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament. An Introduction, Oxford 1965, p. 440.

⁴ J. Homerski, Nowe spojrzenie na kompozycję księgi Zachariasza, Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne 13, 1966, no. 1, pp. 71-80 citing studies P. Lamarche and B. Otzen.

⁵ J. Homerski, Księga Zachariasza, p. 366.

⁶ J. Homerski, Księga Zachariasza, pp. 277-279.

⁷ B. Stade, Deuterozacharia, Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 1, 1881, pp. 1-96 and 2, 1882, pp. 151-172, 275-309.

⁸ J. Wellhausen, Die kleinen Propheten, Berlin 1892, p. 182 and 1898², p. 190, 195 f, 198 - quoted after J. Homerski, Księga Zachariasza, p. 283, note 71.

⁹ G. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, Edinburgh 1905⁷, pp. 346-355.

¹⁰ T. H. Robinson, F. Horst, Die zwölf kleinen Propheten, Tübingen 1938, p. 238 (2nd ed. - 1954).

¹¹ O. Eissfeldt, op. cit., pp. 434-440.

¹² G. Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament, London 1970, pp. 466 f.

¹³ E. G. H. Kraeling, The Historical Situation in Zach 9, 1-10, American Journal of Semitic Languages 41, 1924, pp. 24-33.

¹⁴ A. Jepsen, Israel und Damascus, Archiv für Orientforschung 14, 1941-1942, p. 171 and ZAW 14, 1939, pp. 242 f (quoted after A. Malamat, cf. below, note 17; p. 150, n. 2).

¹⁵ Cf. note 10.

¹⁶ A. T. Olmstead, History of Palestine and Syria to the Macedonian Conquest, New York-London 1931, pp. 457 f.

¹⁷ A. Malamat, The Historical Setting of Two Biblical Prophecies on the Nations, Israel Exploration Journal 1, 1950-1951, pp. 149-154.

¹⁸ After A. Malamat's translation, op. cit., pp. 150 and 151.

¹⁹ Cf. Annals, vv. 23 ff, Display Inscription, vv. 33 ff and other inscriptions.

²⁰ A. Malamat, op. cit., pp. 152 and 153 note 12.

²¹ F. Thureau-Dangin, La Stele d'Asharne, Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale 30, 1933, pp. 53-56.

²² After A. Malamat's translation (op. cit., 151).

²³ As above.

²⁴ A. Malamat, op. cit., pp. 151 f.

²⁵ A. Malamat, op. cit., pp. 154 f.

²⁶ Cf. H. Tadmor, Azriyau of Yaudi [in:] Ch. Rabin, ed., Studies in the Bible, Jerusalem 1961 (= Studia Hierosolymitana 8), pp. 232-271, especially 266-271.

²⁷ Translation of Biblical texts after H. Tadmor, op. cit., p. 269.

²⁸ For discussion of the question, cf. H. Tadmor, op. cit., pp. 235 ff.

²⁹ H. Tadmor, op. cit., p. 235, note 1.

³⁰ For instance, J. Zabłocka locates it on the Issos Bay. Cf. her: Historia i rozwój państw starożytnej Mezopotamii [in:] Mezopotamia, Praca zbiorowa pod red. J. Brauna, Warszawa 1971, p. 127.

³¹ Cf. J. Bright, A History of Israel, 2nd ed., London 1972, p. 268 and D. J. Wiseman, Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia in: Documents from Old Testament Times, ed. by D. Winton Thomas, New York 1961, p. 56, note 1.

³² W. F. Albright, The Biblical Period, from Abraham to Ezra, New York 1965², pp. 72 f and p. 107 note 142.

³³ E. R. Thiele, The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings, Grand Rapids 1965, pp. 90-115 and A Chronology of the Hebrew Kings, Grand Rapids 1979, p. 49.

³⁴ J. Bright, l. cit. Cf. also F. F. Bruce, Israel and the Nations, Exeter 1973 (= 1963), p. 61.

³⁵ H. Tadmor, Philistia under Assyrian Rule, Biblical Archaeologist 29, 1966, p. 88.

³⁶ Cf. F. Delitzsch, Assyrian Grammar, Berlin 1889, pp. 232 and 236. Cf. Also, G. Ryckmans, Grammaire Accadienne, Louvain 1960, pp. 72 f.

³⁷ H. Winckler, Griechen und Assyrier [in:] H. Winckler, Altorientalische Forschungen, vol. I/4, Leipzig 1896, p. 364.

³⁸ W. Muss-Arnolt, Assyrisch - englisch - deutsches Handwörterbuch, Berlin 1905, p. 842, s. v. pašaxu (§ Š).

³⁹ Cf. F. E. Peiser, Inschriften Sargon's, Berlin 1896 (= Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek II), p. 43.

⁴⁰ D. D. Luckenbill, Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia, New York 1975 (= Chicago 1926), vol. II, § 118.

⁴¹ W. von Soden, Akkadisches Handwörterbuch, Lief. 9, Wiesbaden 1969, p. 841, s. v. pašahu(m), § 1 c.

⁴² Cf. the following mention in Menander: "Eloulaios ruled for thirty - six years" (cf. Josephus Flavius, Ant. IX, 14, 2). Menander's entire account is analysed in detail by C. F. Lehmann, Menander und Josephus über Salmanasser IV, Klio 2, 1902, pp. 125-140 and 466-472.

⁴³ B. A. Turaev, Ostatki finikijskoj literatury, S. Petersburg 1903, p. 107 (quoted after M. Ja. Gel'cer, as below, p. 65, note 7).

⁴⁴ M. Ja. Gel'cer, Zametki po istorii Finikii VIII v. do n.e., Palestinskij Sbornik 3, Moskva-Leningrad 1958, p. 66.

⁴⁵ H. Tadmor, The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological - Historical Study, Journal of Cuneiform Studies 12, 1958, p. 94.

⁴⁶ H. Tadmor, op. cit., p. 90 and note 217.

⁴⁷ Cf. Z. J. Kapera, The Rebellion of Yamani in Ashdod: A Study in the History of Philistia c. 713 and 709 B. C., Kraków 1978 (unpublished dissertation), pp. 248-267 (Cf. summary: Folia Orientalia 20, 1979, pp. 313 f) and his, Was Ya-ma-ni a Cypriot?, Folia Orientalia 14, 1972-3, pp. 207-218.

⁴⁸ Cf. J. Homerski, Księga Zachariasza, p. 372 and F. Zorell, Lexicon Hebraicum et Aramaicum Veteris Testamenti, Roma 1968, p. 444, s. v.

⁴⁹ A. Malamat, op. cit., pp. 150 f (translation of v 6).

⁵⁰ E. Sellin, Das Zwölfprophetenbuch, Leipzig 1923 (non vidi).

⁵¹ J. Homerski, Księga Zachariasza, p. 372.

⁵² As above.

⁵³ J. Zabłocka, Stosunki Agrarne w Państwie Sargonidów (Agrarverhältnisse im Reich der Sargoniden), Poznań 1971, p. 74.

⁵⁴ A. Malamat, op. cit., p. 154.

⁵⁵ A. Alt, Neue assyrische Nachrichten über Palästina und Syrien, Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins 67, 1945, pp. 138 f.

⁵⁶ Cf. O. Eissfeldt's (op. cit., p. 436) observations on the conception of the Book of Deuterozechariah.

COMPTE-RENDUS

Zdzisław J. KAPERA

SOME RECENT BIBLICAL PUBLICATIONS IN POLAND

Les sciences bibliques en Pologne après la guerre (1945-1970). Travail collectif sous la rédaction de l'abbé Marian Wolniewicz, Varsovie 1974, Académie de Théologie Catholique, 8°, pp. 300, Price: 50 zł.

The book reviewed is a French translation of the second part of the Polish publication "Modern Polish Biblical Studies 1945-1970", ed. by J. Łach and M. Wolniewicz, Warsaw 1972, (original title: Współczesna biblistyka polska 1945-1970. I. Ośmy Kongres Biblistów Polskich, Praca zbiorowa pod red. ks. J. Łacha. II. Powojenna Biblistyka Polska, Praca zbiorowa pod red. ks. M. Wolniewicza, Warszawa 1972, ATK, pp. 502. Part II on pp. 233-488). The main aim of the book is to present Polish Biblical research after the 2nd World War. It consists of nine chapters. At the beginning M. Wolniewicz informs us about changes in Polish centers of Biblical research after the last war. (Centres de recherches et d'études bibliques dans le quart de siècle qui suivit la guerre, pp. 7-18). After a few years Biblical Departments were removed from the state universities, but increased in Lublin (The Catholic University), Warsaw (Academy of Catholic Theology and Academy of Christian Theology) and in Cracow, where there are numerous seminaries and where the only Polish Biblical bimonthly, the "Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny", appears. The second chapter (Traduction de la Bible en langue polonaise après la guerre, pp. 19-41), also by M. Wolniewicz, refers to the history of Polish translations of the Holy Bible from the original languages: 1. the so-called "Millennium or Tynieć Bible", 1st ed. 1965, and 2. the Protestant New Testament, 1966. It is worth adding that in the meantime there appeared 3. the 2nd ed. of the "Millennium Bible" 1971 (the 3rd ed. is in preparation) and 4. the Warsaw (Protestant) Bible, 1975 and 5. The Poznań Bible,