

ISSN: 2587-2532 | e-ISSN: 2587-1862

<http://filistin.org>

FAD- Filistin Arařtırmaları Dergisi Sayı: 6 (Kıř 2019)

BPS- Bulletin of Palestine Studies Issue: 6 (Winter 2019)

**Başlık/ Title: What of the Land with Bows? Archers of "Meshech" and the Allusion to Genesis in Isaiah 66:19**

**Yazarlar/ Authors**

Selim Ferruh ADALI

**ORCID ID**

0000-0002-3398-892X

**Bu makaleye atıf için:** Selim Ferruh Adalı, What of the Land with Bows? Archers of "Meshech" and the Allusion to Genesis in Isaiah 66:19, *Filistin Arařtırmaları Dergisi*, no.6 (2019): 78-87.

**To cite this article:** Selim Ferruh Adalı, What of the Land with Bows? Archers of "Meshech" and the Allusion to Genesis in Isaiah 66:19, *Filistin Arařtırmaları Dergisi*, no.6 (2019): 78-87.

**Makale Türü / Type of Article:** Arařtırma Makalesi / Research Article

**Yayın Geliř Tarihi / Submission Date:** 04.12.2019

**Yayına Kabul Tarihi / Acceptance Date:** 03.01.2020

**Yayın Tarihi / Date Published:** 03.01.2020

**FAD- Filistin Arařtırmaları Dergisi**

**BPS- Bulletin of Palestine Studies**

**Tarandıđı Uluslararası İndexler/ Abstracting & Indexing**

INDEX COPERNICUS | SCIENTIFIC INDEXING | CEEOL | DRJI | İSAM

INDEX COPERNICUS  
INTERNATIONAL



Yazar: Selim Ferruh ADALI\*

### Neden Yayların Ülkesi?

#### Yay Geren "Meřek" ve Yeřaya 66:29'da Tekvin'e Telmih

**Özet:** Çalışmada Yeřaya kitabındaki özgün bölge ve halk adı olarak geçen "yay geren Meřek" ifadesi incelenmektedir. Redaksiyon metodolojisine göre Üçüncü-Yeřaya olarak anılan kısımda Yeřaya 66:19'da bazı bölge ve toplum adları belirtilir: "Aralarına bir belirti koyacađım. Onlardan kaçıp kurtulanları uluslara, Tarřiř'e, Pül'a, Lud'a, yay geren Meřek'e, Tuval'a, Yâvan'a, ünümü duymamıř, yüceliđimi görmemiř uzak kıyı halklarına göndereceđim. Uluslar arasında yüceliđimi ilan edecekler." Mōřkê qeřet, "yay geren Meřek" olarak çevrilir. Meřek, Frigya'yı kast etmektedir ve Lidya ile Orta Anadolu'daki Tubal/Tabal arasına yerleřtirilir. "Yay geren Meřek" ifadesi, bilindik bir eski Yakındođu toplum adı deđildir. Yeřaya 66:19'da "yay" a yapılan atıf, Tekvin 9:13'e edebi bir telmih olarak anlařılabilir: "Yayımı bulutlara yerleřtireceđim ve bu, yeryüzüyle aramdaki antlařmanın belirtisi olacak". Masoretik metinde Yeřaya 66:19 ile Tekvin 9:13'de geçen "iřaret" (ôt) kelimesi de bu yorumu güçlendirir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Tanah, Yeřaya, Tekvin, Telmih, Meřek, Frigler

### What of the Land with Bows?

#### Archers of "Meshech" and the Allusion to Genesis in Isaiah 66:19<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** This paper seeks to interpret the term "Meshech of the bow", a unique gentilic in the Book of Isaiah. Placed within a part of the Book of Isaiah referred to in redactional methodology as Trito-Isaiah, Isaiah 66:19 lists several gentilic names: "I will set a "sign" among them and will send survivors from them to the nations: Tarshish, Put, Lud, Meshech of the bow, Tubal, and Yavan, to the distant coastlands that have neither heard my fame nor seen my glory. They will declare my glory among the nations." Among them is a certain Mōřkê qeřet, translated as "Meshech of the bow". Meshech is a reference to Phrygia between Lydia and Tubal/Tabal in Central Anatolia. The term "Meshech of the bow" is not a recognized ancient Near Eastern gentilic name. The reference to the "bow" in Isaiah 66:19 can be understood as a marker for a literary allusion to Genesis 9:13: "I have set My "bow" in the cloud, and it shall be for a "sign" of a covenant between Me and the earth". The use of another marker in the Masoretic text, the word "sign" (ôt) in both Isaiah 66:19 and Genesis 9:13 further strengthens this interpretation.

**Keywords:** Hebrew Bible, Isaiah, Genesis, Literary Allusion, Meshech, Phrygians

\* Assoc. Prof., Department of History, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Social Sciences University of Ankara, [selimferruh.adali@asbu.edu.tr](mailto:selimferruh.adali@asbu.edu.tr), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3398-892X>.

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to my friend and colleagues Alan Lenzi and Selim Tezcan for having read an earlier version of this article. The author alone is responsible for the content and possible errors.

## Introduction

Bernard Duhm's 1892 *Das Buch Jesaia* proposed a tripartite division of the Book of Isaiah into Proto-, Deutero-, and Trito-Isaiah. This has been the basis for redactional and text-critical inquiries into the Book of Isaiah ever since.<sup>2</sup> An original core has been argued for Proto-Isaiah (i.e. Isaiah 1-39) by an eighth century BC Hebrew scribe or prophet.<sup>3</sup> Determining the *Sitz im Leben* for the redactional processes of Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah, Isaiah 40-55 and 56-66 respectively, is more difficult. How to historicize the lexical and thematic associations in Isaiah 56-66 and its formation are still debated.<sup>4</sup> The text-critical and redactional methods have assumed different authors for terms deemed by contemporary scholars to be representative of editing in antiquity prior to the final form of Isaiah. A demonstrative example is from the concentration of the terms "nations"/"kings", the term "foreigner", and several verbs such as "righteousness", "rejoice", and "praise" in Isaiah 60-62 which has been assumed to mean that these chapters were a specific unit authored separately in history.<sup>5</sup> This is only one among several units proposed. According to some versions of historical scenario that may be assumed following the redactional method, such editing was then presumably established among Judahite scribes, continued by consequent scribes and keepers of written tradition among Jewish communities in the Iron Age, the exilic period and onwards. Modern scholarly assumptions about different authors and the presumed textual transmission have led to the idea of "layers" detected from within the Isaiah text and received in written tradition. The inevitable result of such a method has been multiple propositions. This has obscured the dating of parts of the Book of Isaiah. Several layers have been proposed for Isaiah 65-66, with the raised possibility that Isaiah 66:18-24 was later integrated into the Book with verses 18-22 originating in the mid-fifth century BC and verses 23-24 in the early Hellenistic period or again the mid-fifth century BC, whereas it cannot be excluded that Isaiah 66:18-24 was written to conclude Deutero- or Trito-Isaiah or even the entire Book.<sup>6</sup> There exists no consensus on the date of Isaiah 66:18-24. The gentilics in Isaiah 66:19 have not usually been used when trying to date the text. It is for this reason that the question of the passage's date and milieu and related issues raised are beyond the scope of the present study. My present aim is limited and specific. I will try to understand one of the more elusive gentilics in Isaiah 66:19, that is מִשֵּׁחַ הַקַּוּץ.<sup>7</sup> This would literally translate as "Meshech of the bow", with the biblical gentilic Meshech vocalized in the Masoretic Text (MT) in Isaiah 66:19 as *Môšĕkê* (מֹשֶׁכֶּה) in the construct plural noun form. *Môšĕkê qešet* may alternatively be rendered with a participle taking an object, as "who draw the bow", taken to be a description of the previous gentilic names such as Tarshish, Put ("Lybia") and Lud ("Lydia"). One can argue, however, that the gentilic Meshech is meant here with the form *Môšĕkê*. Such an argument will need to explain the MT vocalization. The consonantal base is that

---

<sup>2</sup> Ulrich F. Berges, *The Book of Isaiah: Its Composition and Final Form* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012), 2-4.

<sup>3</sup> Matthijs de Jong, *Isaiah among the Ancient Near Eastern Prophets. A Comparative Study of the Earliest Stages of the Isaiah Tradition and the Neo-Assyrian Prophecies* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007), 357-436.

<sup>4</sup> Berges, 401-405.

<sup>5</sup> Pierre E. Bonnard, *Le Second Isaïe, son disciple et leurs éditeurs, Isaïe 40-56* (Paris: Gabalda, 1972), 415, 425.

<sup>6</sup> Paul Allan Smith, *Rhetoric & Redaction in Trito-Isaiah: The Structure, Growth, and Authorship of Isaiah 56-66* (Leiden, New York and Köln: E. J. Brill, 1995), 128-132, 144-151, 188.

<sup>7</sup> Hebrew Bible quotations are from A. Alt, O. Eißfeldt, P. Kahle, R. Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997).

of Meshech. Meshech is known from other attestations in the Hebrew Bible as an independent gentilic name. The form *Môšêkê* in Isaiah 66:19 is closer to the Septuagint (LXX) vocalization *Μοσοχ* used throughout LXX for Meshech.<sup>8</sup> MT vocalizes Meshech as *Mešek* (מֶשֶׁךְ) in Genesis 10:2, 1 Chronicles 1:5, and Ezekiel (27:13; 32:26; 38:2,3; 39:1).<sup>9</sup> *Môšêkê* in the MT tradition in Isaiah 66:19 may have regarded it as verb qal participle masculine plural construct from *מִשַׁךְ*, a root which means “to seize, carry off” as well as “to pull, drag”. The latter sense is attested 1 Kings 22:34, according to which a man “drew a bow (*baqqešet*)” 1 Kings 22:34. The object of the verb takes in this case an inseparable *ב* (“in”) prefix. The LXX, however, though aware of such a verb root and the possibility for interpreting as a participle in Isaiah 66:19, avoided this rendering and instead wrote Meshech as *Μοσοχ*. It is clear LXX understood Meshech specifically as another gentilic and not a general description of previously mentioned gentilics in Isaiah 66:19. One could consider that the MT tradition may have added “bow” *qešet* for their own purposes, to interpret the gentilic differently. This, however, is unlikely since Meshech in itself would be obvious. It is very likely therefore that both LXX and MT received a Hebrew text with *מֶשֶׁךְ קֶשֶׁת*. LXX may have omitted the “bow” (*qešet*) whereas MT revocalized it as *Môšêkê qešet* even if the latter lacked the inseparable prefix *ב* (“in”) used in 1 Kings 22:34 when the verb “to pull” (root: *מִשַׁךְ*) took “bow” (*qešet*) as the object (*baqqešet* in 1 Kings 22:34). This is not to argue that *Mešek* was the original Hebrew vocalization. It may even be something closer to LXX *Μοσοχ* which in turn is closer to the ancient Near eastern term *Muška/i* than MT *Mešek*. This is only to argue that the MT tradition opted to diverge from its usual *Mešek* vocalization due to difficulties interpreting the “bow” and not wanting to omit it in the actual text transmission. LXX is a translation and so it is easier for them to omit the additional descriptive “bow” (*qešet*). LXX perhaps eliminated it because its meaning was unclear. This is not possible to discern. In any case, Meshech is the Hebrew rendering of an Anatolian gentilic *Muška/i* and refers to a region bordering Tabal in Central Anatolia as will be discussed below. The peculiar description of Meshech in a construct form as “Meshech of the bow (*qešet*, *מֶשֶׁךְ קֶשֶׁת*)”, apparently refers to them as archers. This peculiar construct noun is of interest. Other gentilic names do not have such an additional description or such a peculiar noun formation. Why is such a uniquely described gentilic used alongside other nations listed in Isaiah 66:19?

### The List of Nations in Isaiah 66:19

Isaiah 66:19 provides a list of “nations” (*goyim*) in the context of a prophetic passage in what is the last chapter of the Book of Isaiah:

וְשִׂמְתִי בָהֶם אֹת וְשִׁלְחֹתִי מֵהֶם אֶל־הַגּוֹיִם תַּרְשִׁישׁ פּוּט לֹד מֶשֶׁךְ קֶשֶׁת תּוּבַל וְיָוָן וְהַגִּידוּ אֶת־קְבוּרֵי בָנֵיהֶם

I will set a “sign” among them and will send survivors from them to the “nations” (*goyim*): Tarshish, Put, Lud, “Meshech of the bow (*מֶשֶׁךְ קֶשֶׁת*)”, Tubal, and Yavan, to the distant coastlands

<sup>8</sup> Septuagint quotations are from Sir Lancelot Charles Lee Brenton, *The Septuagint with Apogrypha* (London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1851. Tenth printing. United States of America: Hendrickson Publishers, 2003).

<sup>9</sup> There is also a homonymous Aramaean tribe, “son of Aram”, by the name Meshech in 1 Chronicle 1:17 and Psalms 120:5 (paired with Kedar) in Masoretic vocalization, whereas the Masoretic vocalization is *Maš* (מֶש) in Genesis 10:23. LXX vocalizes in all these *Μοσοχ* cases, except in 1 Chronicles 1:17 where there is no mention of *Μοσοχ*. In that case, *Μοσοχ* is used in 1 Chronicles 1:6 for Meshech which is paired with Tubal in Ezekiel as Anatolian gentilics. This homonymous Meshech/Mash “son of Aram” is not related to the present query.

that have neither heard my fame nor seen my glory. They will declare my glory among the nations.

Although "Meshech of the bow" could be its word-for-word translation for מִשְׁכַּח בִּיבִי, the word "bow" (תִּשְׁבָּע) is initially difficult to understand in this context. תִּשְׁבָּע "bow" is used to refer to the bow weapon in general. It can also represent the military might of any peoples, such as the "bow of Elam" (Jeremiah 49:35) or the "bow of Israel" (Hosea 1:5). Combined with Meshech, it would refer to the archers of Meshech. The precise connotation of Meshech may be inferred from the fact that Meshech is the Hebrew rendering of an Anatolian toponym bordering Central Anatolia and the historical region of Tabal. Meshech is also known from Assyrian, Babylonian, and Urartian cuneiform sources as well as Anatolian Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions as Muška/i (with variants Mušku, owing to an addition of the Akkadian nominative -u ending, and Muška, especially in Luwian).<sup>10</sup> In Ezekiel (27:13; 32:26; 38:2,3; 39:1), Meshech is paired with Tubal. This pairing is a Hebrew Bible convention and assumes two adjacent or near adjacent lands (cf. Cush and Put in Ezekiel 30:5). Tubal is the Hebrew rendering of Tabal, which denoted the eastern portion of the Cappadocian plain in Central Anatolia, mentioned in Neo-Assyrian texts dating from the 9<sup>th</sup> to the 7<sup>th</sup> centuries BC.<sup>11</sup> At least from the 8<sup>th</sup> century BC onwards, Muški referred to the Phrygian kingdom under Midas, the contemporary of Sargon II (722-705 BC) of the Neo-Assyrian Empire. Midas was based in Gordion, near the Sakarya River and near the region of Tabal.<sup>12</sup> Tabal is also the name for the same region in Neo-Babylonian documents.<sup>13</sup> One recalls also Herodotus's mention of the Moschi (Μόσχοι), alongside several other Anatolian Black Sea peoples, that is the Tibareni (Τιβάρηνοι), Macrones (Μάκρωνες), Mossynoeci (Μοσσυνοίκοι) and Mares (Μαρσες) as part of Achaemenid Persia's 19<sup>th</sup> province (Histories, 3.94).<sup>14</sup> Herodotus's Μόσχοι resembles MT Isaiah 66:19's *Môšškê* (מִשְׁכַּח) and LXX's Μοσσοχ. The reason for the resemblance is not entirely clear. Herodotus's Μόσχοι, although phonetically akin to Meshech and LXX's Μοσσοχ, apparently refers to a different people and not the Phrygians since the Hebrew Meshech, rendered specifically as *Môšškê* in Isaiah 66:19, phonetically resembles more the term Assyrio-

---

<sup>10</sup> References are collected in Anne-Maria Wittke, *Mušker und Phryger. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Anatoliens vom 12. bis zum 7. Jh. v. Chr.* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2004). New discoveries in Luwian inscriptions point to new attestations of Muška (Lorenzo d'Alfonso, "War in Anatolia in the Post-Hittite Period: The Anatolian Hieroglyphic Inscription of Topada Revised", *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 71 (2019): 133-152; Petra Goedegebuure, Theo van den Hout, James Osborne, Michele Massa, Christoph Bachhuber, and Fatma Şahin. "Türkmen-Karahöyük 1: a new Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription from Great King Hartapu, son of Mursili, conqueror of Phrygia", *Anatolian Studies* forthcoming).

<sup>11</sup> Sanna Aro. "Tabal". *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 13 (2012): 388-391.

<sup>12</sup> Susanne Berndt-Ersöz. "The Chronology and Historical Context of Midas", *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* 57 (2008): 17-19.

<sup>13</sup> Ran Zadok, *Geographical Names according to New- and Late-Babylonian Texts* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1985), 300.

<sup>14</sup> Moschi and Tiberani may be connected with Musku and Tabal from ancient Near Eastern and Assyrian texts but this is disputed (Lorenzo d'Alfonso, "Tabal: An Out-Group Definition in the First Millennium BC", *Leggo! Studies Presented to Frederick Mario Fales on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Giovanni B. Lanfranchi, Daniele M. Bonacossi, Cinzia Pappi and Simonetta Ponchia (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012), 185-186; Zsolt Simon, "Tabal und die Tibarener", *Altorientalische Forschungen* 41 (2014): 125-134). Herodotus's *Histories* are quoted from Alfred Denis Godley, *Herodotus, with an English Translation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920).

Babylonian and native Anatolian term Muřki was used in the 8th century BC and later during the Neo- and Late-Babylonian periods.<sup>15</sup> This does not exclude a link with Muřku as a travelling ethnonym since it was probably used for other peoples in eastern Turkey before the 8th century BC.<sup>16</sup> For the Phrygians, Herodotus provides a Balkan origins (Histories, 7.73) different to that of the Μόσχοι,<sup>17</sup> which means he does not relate the latter with the the Phrygians who in earlier non-Greek sources were also known by Muřku and related terms. Furthermore, the association of the bow and Meshech in Isaiah 66:19 lacks in Herodotus. Herodotus (Histories, 7.72-73) states that Phrygian military equipment is similar to Paphlagonian weapons, with plaited helmets, and small shields and short spears, and javelins and daggers. The reference “Meshech of the bow” in Isaiah 66:19 probably does not refer specifically to the Phrygians or the Moschi but it does seem to point to an Anatolian provenance and may potentially include them both, although this is not evident aside from the considerations provided immediately above. Even if one assumed that the term Meshech acquired its own unique semantic range in the Hebrew Bible, it clearly retained an Anatolian provenance in Isaiah 66:19 since it appears between two Anatolian land names, after Lydia (MT: מל, LXX: Λουδ, Assyrian and Babylonian *Lūdu*) and before Tubal (MT: מל, LXX: Θοβελ, Assyrian and Babylonian *Tabal* discussed above). The Anatolian land between Lydia and Tabal is Phrygia and this agrees with the use of the term Muřku for Phrygia at least since the 8th century BC. The reference to archers in such a context may very well be to peoples, regardless of their ethnic background, to people populating the regions between Lydia and Tabal known as Muřku/Phrygia. Bows and arrowheads were effectively used in Central Anatolia since the 8th century and well into the Hellenistic and Roman periods, regardless of ethnicity. The formation of the Hebrew Bible can also be placed in Iron Age contexts and one finds therein pertinent historical names and episodes.<sup>18</sup> This may explain the use of Meshech in an Anatolian context given the ancient Near Eastern and Anatolian references mentioned above, and one may also assume its archers are mentioned. However, “Meshech of the bow” still sounds peculiar and is not used in the onomastic repertoire of Hebrew Bible tradition. One may look for other motives in including this unique description.

### The Literary Allusion to Genesis 9:13

There is another reason to believe that the use of the word “bow” is deliberate. Ben-Porat argues that literary allusions can be made in a text by particular words, markers, used to signaling the referent, that is the alluded text.<sup>19</sup> Such an allusion may be another reason for the use of “bow” (מִשְׁכֵּחַ) in Isaiah 66:19. Aside from its common use for archers’ bow or strength of a

<sup>15</sup> Zadok, 231.

<sup>16</sup> Wittke, 145-147.

<sup>17</sup> There is a Greek tradition associating Thracians and Phrygians, discussed in contributions in *Thracians and Phrygians. Problems of Parallelism*, ed. Numan Tuna, Zeynep Aktüre, and Maggie Lynch (Ankara: Centre for Research and Assessment of the Historic Environment, Middle Eastern Technical University, 1998). This proposed identification remains problematic because the original population movements and the precise identification of the people concerned are unclear.

<sup>18</sup> Finkelstein, Israel, and Neil Asher Silberman, *Bible Unearthed: Archaeology’s New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origin of its Sacred Texts* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001), 46-50; Şeyma Ay Arçın, “Demir Çağı Yazılı ve Arkeolojik Kaynaklarında İsrail ve Yahuda Krallıkları”, *Filistin Arařtırmaları Dergisi/Bulletin of Palestine Studies* 2 (2017): 1-31.

<sup>19</sup> Ziva Ben-Porat. “The Poetics of Literary Allusion”. *PTL: A Journal of Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 1 (1976): 108-109.

people, the word "bow" represents the warrior's bow and is thus also a metaphor for rainbow in Genesis 9:13.<sup>20</sup> I argue the word "bow" in Isaiah 66:19 signals the same word קֶשֶׁת in Genesis 9:13. This is evident also from the fact that the other specific term in Isaiah 66:19, "sign" (אוֹת), signals the same word אוֹת again in Genesis 9:13.

אֶת-קֶשֶׁתִי נָתַתִּי בְעָנָן וְהַיְתָה לְאוֹת בְּרִית בֵּינִי וּבֵין הָאָרֶץ

I have set My "bow" in the cloud, and it shall be for a "sign" of a covenant between Me and the earth.

The Septuagint does not use the term "bow" and only refers to Μοσοχ as a land name like the others next to it. Furthermore, LXX refers to "signs" (σημεία) in the accusative neuter plural whereas LXX's Genesis 9:13 renders the covenant after the Flood in the singular the word "sign" σημεῖον. This raises a question: Did the LXX translators drop the marker ("sign" in singular) to the Genesis allusion from their Hebrew text or did Masoretic transmission add the words singular "sign" and "bow" to allude to Genesis? This is difficult to answer. It could be either. Another way to try to explain the omission Hebrew MT's "bow" (קֶשֶׁת) in LXX has been to assume that קֶשֶׁת was an error in transmission wherein the initial qof was originally a resh and the final tav did not exist, thus rendering a presumed \*רש which may be interpreted as a gentilic vocalized as "Rosh" connecting with a proposed reading of the Rosh gentilic in MT Hebrew Ezekiel 38:1 and 39:1, according to which the eschatological figure Gog of Magog would be described as the "Leader of Rosh, Meshech, and Tubal".<sup>21</sup> The MT Hebrew Ezekiel text marks "Rosh" (רֹשׁ) with Meshech and Tubal in Ezekiel 38:1 and 39:1 and describes Gog as a "leader" (נֹשֵׂא) whereas the LXX Greek text translates a toponym "Rosh" (Ρωσ) in Ezekiel 38:2, 3 and 39:1. To elaborate this further: the MT tradition of the Hebrew text vocalizes נֹשֵׂא as a construct linked to the following word רֹשׁ, but the accent mark is the strongly disjunctive *zāqēp magnum*, whereas רֹשׁ has a conjunctive accent (a *mâjēlā*) tying it to the following Meshech.<sup>22</sup> The LXX and MT traditions therefore assume a toponym Rosh. It cannot be excluded that the transmission tradition misunderstood an earlier and archaic reference to a *nēšî rōš* "great leader" of Meshech and Tubal.<sup>23</sup> Another possibility could be raised here, if one were to allow assumptions for the type of transmission error that for a supposed Rosh in Isaiah 66:19 as mentioned above, is that the references to Rosh in Ezekiel could have been a transmission error for another Anatolian toponym such as Urartu known from Phoenician and Aramaic transmission,<sup>24</sup> probably having made its way into Hebrew Bible tradition as a vocalized Ararat

<sup>20</sup> Ellen van Wolde, "The Bow in the Clouds in Genesis 9.12-17: When Cognitive Linguistics Meets Visual Criticism", *A Critical Engagement: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of J. Cheryl Exum*, ed. David J.A. Clines and Ellen van Wolde (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011), 380-400.

<sup>21</sup> For more information on this interpretation, see Jon Mark Ruthven, and Ihab Griess, *The Prophecy That is Shaping History. New Research on Ezekiel's Vision of the End* (Longwood: Xulon Press, 2003), 58-59.

<sup>22</sup> Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel. Chapters 25-48* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 435n45.

<sup>23</sup> Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, *Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie des Ezechielbuches* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1977), 43.

<sup>24</sup> The rendering of Urartu in Phoenician as 'rrt is attested in the Phoenician of the late-8th century BC trilingual text (Phoenician, Luwian, Neo-Assyrian) of Incirli (Front Side, line 8 in Stephen A Kaufman, "The Phoenician Inscription of the Incirli Trilingual: A Tentative Reconstruction and Translation", *Maarav* 14 (2007): 12). It is later attested in the Aramaic translation of Darius the Great's Behistun inscription (Albert Ten Eyck Olmstead, "Darius and

(from a 'rrṭ consonantal base in transmission) in Genesis 8:4, 2 Kings 19:37, Isaiah 37:38, Jeremiah 51:27,<sup>25</sup> again assuming transmission changes in some of the letters. The difficulty with this scenario, similar to the one mentioned above, is that it is hypothetical. In any case, translations for Ezekiel 38:2 and 39:1 may be disputed despite difficulties in identifying a Rosh, since efforts to this end refer to varying unconnected sources in history with different contexts and the identifications that are, leaving aside other difficulties, too far away from the Anatolian context of Meshech and Tubal.<sup>26</sup> Whatever may be the final verdict on these, the most immediate and relevant fact for the present query is that the MT and LXX traditions do *not* assume the toponym Rosh for Isaiah 66:19 but only assume it for texts in Ezekiel. LXX only translates Μοσοχ as mentioned above while at the same time assuming a land Ρως in Ezekiel. The LXX Greek translation and the MT tradition indicate that the land name Rosh, or another name, is not apparent from the Hebrew text. One needs therefore to address in another way why LXX translators omitted the description of "bow" for the Meshech. The hypothetical explanation of omission due to a less understood toponym remains shrouded in mystery whereas the wording in Isaiah 66:19 can be more directly explained, with the lexeme "bow" meant as a marker for an allusion to Genesis. And while it may be argued that the themes of Genesis 9:13 interconnect with those in Isaiah 66:19 even without the markers, it is apparent that the markers merely make it much more obvious. The Book of Isaiah concludes with a series of eschatological descriptions that have been described in the field of biblical studies as part of a wider field, as a form of "covenant theology", and this concerns the use of the word "covenant" (בְּרִית) throughout the Hebrew Bible as well as the Hebrew Prophetic tradition's royal ideology.<sup>27</sup> The description in Isaiah 66:19 is worded with phraseology to cover the entire world listed as nations/*goyim* whereas the covenant and its "rainbow" sign (that is, a "bow") in Genesis 9:13 concern the entire earth and the promise to never inflict the Flood. This idea of covering the entire world could be defined as being 'universal'. Hence, one may argue that the phraseology in the Book of Isaiah aimed to express this universal aspect of the prophecy in Hebrew tradition. It is part of this same universalizing phraseology by which one may understand the use of two unique lexemes in the same verse Isaiah 66:19 in the Masoretic text. They are lexemes meant as a specific and deliberate allusion to the earlier Genesis tradition known to the author of Isaiah 66:19, using the word "bow" uniquely with Meshech in its own context of a list of nations used in an eschatological prophecy, picking up from the list of nations who descended from the children of Noah in Genesis 10, with Meshech mentioned alongside Tubal in Genesis 10:2. The purpose of the allusion to Genesis in Isaiah 66:19 was to further express the universal aspect of the prophecy in Isaiah 56-66. The precise connotations and social context of Isaiah 55-

---

His Behistun Inscription", *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 55 (1938): 407n87). The Neo-Babylonian variant of Urartu was rendered Uraštu in the Neo-Babylonian version of the Behistun inscription (line 6 in W. C. Benedict, and Elizabeth von Voigtlander. "Darius' Bisitun Inscription, Babylonian Version, Lines 1-29". *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 10 (1956): 3). The Hebrew tradition more likely interacted with Phoenician and Aramaic 'rrṭ which the MT and LXX traditions reflect.

<sup>25</sup> For a discussion of the toponym Urartu and its transmission as Ararat according to these references, see Peter Marinković, "Urartu und die Bibel", *Biainili – Urartu. The Proceedings of the Symposium held in Munich 12-14 October 2007*, ed. S. Kroll, C. Gruber, U. Hellwag, M. Roaf, P. Zimansky (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 217-225.

<sup>26</sup> For references to such efforts, see Ruthven and Griess, 59-67.

<sup>27</sup> Antti Laato, *History and Ideology in the Old Testament Prophetic Literature. A Semiotic Approach to the Reconstruction of the Proclamation of the Historical Prophets* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1996), 271-280.



66 will be addressed in future research discussing other components of phraseology in the Book of Isaiah and the Hebrew Prophetic tradition.

## Bibliography

- d'Alfonso, Lorenzo. "Tabal: An Out-Group Definition in the First Millennium BC". *Leggo! Studies Presented to Frederick Mario Fales on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Giovanni B. Lanfranchi, Daniele M. Bonacossi, Cinzia Pappi and Simonetta Ponchia, 173–194. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012.
- d'Alfonso, Lorenzo. "War in Anatolia in the Post-Hittite Period: The Anatolian Hieroglyphic Inscription of Topada Revised". *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 71 (2019): 133-152.
- Alt, A., O. Eißfeldt, P. Kahle, R. Kittel, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.
- Aro, Sanna. "Tabal". *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 13 (2012): 388-391.
- Ay Arçın, Şeyma. "Demir Çağı Yazılı ve Arkeolojik Kaynaklarında İsrail ve Yahuda Krallıkları". *Filistin Araştırmaları Dergisi / Bulletin of Palestine Studies* 2 (2017): 1-31.
- Ben-Porat, Ziva. "The Poetics of Literary Allusion". *PTL: A Journal of Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 1 (1976): 105-128.
- Benedict, W. C., and Elizabeth von Voigtlander. "Darius' Bisitun Inscription, Babylonian Version, Lines 1-29". *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 10 (1956): 1-10.
- Berges, Ulrich F. *The Book of Isaiah: Its Composition and Final Form*. Translated by Millard C. Lind. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012.
- Berndt-Ersöz, Susanne. "The Chronology and Historical Context of Midas". *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* 57 (2008): 1-37.
- Block, Daniel I. *The Book of Ezekiel. Chapters 25-48*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Bonnard, Pierre E. *Le Second Isaïe, son disciple et leurs éditeurs, Isaïe 40-56*. Paris: Gabalda, 1972.
- Brenton, Sir Lancelot Charles Lee Brenton. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1851. Tenth printing. United States of America: Hendrickson Publishers, 2003.
- Duhm, Bernard. *Das Buch Jesaja*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892. Second edition, 1902.
- Finkelstein, Israel, and Neil Asher Silberman. *Bible Unearthed: Archaeology's New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origin of its Sacred Texts*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001.
- Godley, Alfred Denis. *Herodotus, with an English Translation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.
- Goedegebuure Petra, Theo van den Hout, James Osborne, Michele Massa, Christoph Bachhuber, and Fatma Şahin. "Türkmen-Karahöyük 1: a new Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription from Great King Hartapu, son of Mursili, conqueror of Phrygia". *Anatolian Studies*, forthcoming.
- Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar. *Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie des Ezechielbuches*. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1977.
- de Jong, Matthijs J. *Isaiah among the Ancient Near Eastern Prophets. A Comparative Study of the Earliest Stages of the Isaiah Tradition and the Neo-Assyrian Prophecies*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Kaufman, Stephen A. "The Phoenician Inscription of the Incirli Trilingual: A Tentative Reconstruction and Translation". *Maarav* 14 (2007): 7-26.
- Laato, Antti. *History and Ideology in the Old Testament Prophetic Literature. A Semiotic Approach to the Reconstruction of the Proclamation of the Historical Prophets*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1996.
- Marinković, Peter. "Urartu und die Bibel". *Biainili – Urartu. The Proceedings of the Symposium held in Munich 12-14 October 2007*, ed. S. Kroll, C. Gruber, U. Hellwag, M. Roaf, P. Zimansky, 217-225. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.
- Olmstead, Albert Ten Eyck. "Darius and His Behistun Inscription". *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 55 (1938): 392-416.

- Ruthven, J. M, and I. Griess. *The Prophecy That is Shaping History. New Research on Ezekiel's Vision of the End*. Longwood: Xulon Press, 2003.
- Simon, Zsolt. "Tabal und die Tibarener". *Altorientalische Forschungen* 41 (2014): 125-134.
- Smith, Paul Allan. *Rhetoric & Redaction in Trito-Isaiah: The Structure, Growth, and Authorship of Isaiah 56-66*. Leiden, New York and Köln: E. J. Brill, 1995.
- Tuna, Numan, Zeynep Aktüre, and Maggie Lynch. *Thracians and Phrygians. Problems of Parallelism*. Ankara: Centre for Research and Assessment of the Historic Environment, Middle Eastern Technical University, 1998.
- van Wolde, Ellen "The Bow in the Clouds in Genesis 9.12-17: When Cognitive Linguistics Meets Visual Criticism". *A Critical Engagement: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of J. Cheryl Exum*, ed. David J.A. Clines and Ellen van Wolde, 380-400. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011.
- Wittke, Anne-Maria. *Mušker und Phryger. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Anatoliens vom 12. bis zum 7. Jh. v. Chr.* Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2004.
- Zadok, Ran. *Geographical Names according to New- and Late-Babylonian Texts*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1985.