

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

ΜΑΤΤ. xiv. 15. ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης προσήλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες *Ἐρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος, καὶ ἡ ὥρα ἤδη παρήλθεν.	ΜΑΡΚ vi. 35. καὶ ἤδη ὥρας πολλῆς γενομένης προσελθόντες αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγουσι ὅτι *Ἐρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος, καὶ ἤδη ὥρα πολλή.	ΛΥΚΕ ix. 12. ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν· προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δώδεκα.
--	--	--

Here are surely abundant indications of free translation from a common source. On the first line, ὀψία = evening, stands abreast of ὥρα πολλή = a late hour; πολλή referring to the greatness of the number, drawing near to the twelfth hour. I would suggest that in the first line the original was שעת ערבית והויה = And it was the hour of evening, or, the hour of evening prayer. This Luke freely renders, "when the day began to wear away." In the last line we read in Matthew, "the hour (of prayer) has already gone by," וכדו שעתא עברת, the verb עברת being 3 s. f. pret. of עבר, which in Aramaic as in Hebrew means to go by, to go past; whereas the reading in Mark requires וכדו שעת ערבית = already it is the evening hour, a late hour.

J. T. MARSHALL.

UZZIAH AND THE PHILISTINES.

THERE is perhaps no graver case of literary and historic injustice in the records of biblical study than the treatment accorded to the book of Chronicles, as respects its statements about Uzziah and his time, by one of the dominant schools of Old Testament criticism. As is well known, the critics to be named presently, parting company with their great pioneer Reuss, whose strength lay chiefly in literary judgment, feel themselves obliged to reject every historical statement in Chronicles not otherwise attested. Thus, in the matter now under inquiry, Wellhausen (*Encycl. Brit.*,

xiii., p. 412, art. "Israel"; *Skissen und Vorarbeiten*, T, 58) followed by Meyer (*Geschichte des Alterthums*, § 355), ascribes to Uzziah nothing more than the possession of Edom and the use of its seaport, while he ridicules (*Proleg.*, p. 217) the statements of the Chronicles as to other enemies whom Uzziah is declared to have subdued. Stade, in his elaborate history, has nearly three pages devoted to Amaziah (*Gesch. des Volks Israel*, T, 567-569), while Uzziah is disposed of in half a dozen lines, because "the book of Kings has no warlike deeds to report of him." Dr. Robertson Smith, in his ingenious and instructive work, *The Prophets of Israel*, takes due care to credit Uzziah with a wide political influence (p. 203 f.), but he also excludes Chronicles from the sources of evidence (see also his article "Philistines," *Encycl. Brit.*, xviii., p. 755, note).

Wellhausen (*Proleg.* l.c.) makes the sweeping statement that "the triumphs with which Chronicles credits its favourites are, without exception, devoid of historical consequences (*Wirkung*), and have merely the momentary importance of raising the prestige of their respective reigns." Let us see how that applies to the case of Uzziah. According to Chronicles, he contended against the Philistines, razing the fortifications of Gath and Ashdod, and building up Jewish settlements in the territories of the latter city. This implies an extension of Jewish territory nearly as far as the Mediterranean. Such a state of things is altogether credible, and just what might have been expected from such a monarch as the traditional Uzziah. Do we find later traces of this alleged domination? Sennacherib implies in his report about Ekron, of 701 B.C., that Judah had held that city in vassalage; otherwise we cannot explain the surrender of its king to Hezekiah by his own subjects on account of his being a partisan of the Assyrians (Taylor, *Cylinder II.*, 69 ff.). Of course Sennacherib makes also an assertion of lawful suzerainty; but this was simply the

customary general title by which he made claim to all the conquests of his father Sargon, and it did not annul the specific rights of the kings of Judah. He also says that the cities which he had cut off from Judah he gave to the kings of Ashdod, Ekron, and Gaza. This naturally means the towns and villages that lay in the neighbourhood of each of these cities respectively; for other settlements, situated farther eastward, and within territory originally Jewish, could not possibly be administered by these petty principalities, which had long ceased in such affairs to act in common. No doubt some of them are included in the list of towns which, according to 2 Chronicles xxviii. 18, were taken from Ahaz by the Philistines, and as we may infer from 2 Kings xviii. 8, retaken by Hezekiah. The question now comes up, How and when did Judah get possession of these districts? Everything points to Uzziah and his time. Before him Judah, as is universally admitted, played a part entirely secondary to Israel, and beyond its hereditary feuds with Edom, and occasional service rendered to the Northern Kingdom in its wars with Syria or Moab, did nothing of Palestinian importance,¹ and in general was not recognised as a factor in the affairs of Western Asia. With Uzziah all this is changed; and although among biblical records his deeds of national aggrandisement are detailed only in Chronicles, other evidence of their reality and permanent influence is not wanting. Tiglath-pileser III., the real founder of the Assyrian world-empire, makes mention of him in a passage which, although obscure on account of the defacement of the inscription, plainly reveals that this king of Judah was in some sort of league with the states of middle Syria—a situation entirely impossible before his day. Then we have the picture of Judah's power and riches presented in Isaiah ii., and drawn shortly after the death

¹ The tribute of "some of the Philistines," sent to Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii. 11), was evidently a transaction of a local and temporary character.

of Uzziah, where the prophet describes a state of things not of sudden growth, but based on commercial traffic that had been carried on for a considerable period, and which could not have been conducted at all, unless the military influence of the nation had been widespread and well-established, securing, for example, the toll of the caravans that passed through the Philistian lowlands, and utilizing, with the Red Sea trade of Edom, the Philistian ports of Gaza and Joppa. Moreover, as far as the Philistines were concerned, they with the Moabites were normally within the sphere of Israelitish influence up to the time when, under Uzziah, Judah took its place as one among the nations.

After Uzziah, there seems to be little place for the occasions of that Judæan expansion which is a matter of history. It will not be claimed that the reign of Ahaz was favourable to the extension of territory, and the successes attributed to Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii. 7 f.) were necessarily of but short duration and limited scope. During the administration of both these kings, the operations of the Assyrian invaders in Palestine, and the pressure of the Assyrian claims, intermittent perhaps, but of certain recurrence, rendered impossible such radical changes of international relations as those ascribed to the agency of Uzziah in Chronicles, and apparently implied in the cuneiform inscriptions. What Hezekiah achieved against the Philistines amounted evidently to a successful campaign, in which, as above indicated, the authority of Judah was, in part at least, re-established, and the country ravaged as far as Gaza. Stade (*op. cit.*, p. 624) and W. R. Smith (*Encycl. Brit.*, xviii., p. 756) refer this action of Hezekiah which, being recorded in Kings and not in Chronicles, they regard as historical, to a time after his deliverance from Sennacherib; but they fail to explain the relations between Judah and the Philistines at the time of the great Assyrian invasion.

I may mention, in passing, a circumstance which may

possibly afford a corroboration of Chronicles in another statement relating to Uzziah. It is recorded (2 Chron. xxvi. 7) that he also subdued certain of the Arabian tribes. Now, curiously enough, the inscription of Sennacherib already cited makes reference (III. 31 ff.) to Arabs who served (of course as vassals) along with the native Jewish soldiers in the defence of Jerusalem. These peoples may conceivably have been brought under Jewish control by Ahaz or Hezekiah; but in view of the conditions just indicated, it is not very probable.

But the evidence of the credibility of the statements in Chronicles is not exhausted by these arguments. Many proper names of Philistian rulers are met with in the inscriptions of Sargon and Sennacherib; and it is a remarkable phenomenon that the most of them show marks of having the name *Yahu*, or its contraction *Ya*, as one of their constituents. Thus the king of Askalon is *Šidkā*, contracted from עֲדִיקָה, Zedekiah; that of Ekron is *Pādī-Pādīyāh*; that of Ashdod is *Mitintī*, with great probability considered as Mattithiah (Schrader K and T² 162 f.). How are we to account for the occurrence of these and similar cases? The Philistines, as far as we know, did not voluntarily adopt the worship of Israel, either in whole or in part, and a perpetuation of the feelings which prompted the offerings mentioned in 1 Samuel vi. 3, 17 f. is not to be thought of. Schrader (cp. *op. cit.*, p. 24) thinks of a simple borrowing of the cultus of Jehovah along with the name, and asserts that this was in conformity with a custom common among ancient nations. But this is a mistake so far as such a custom is supposed to hold good of Semitic peoples. Conquered nations, or those for any reason entering into servitude to other states, adopted, as a matter of compulsion and principle, the religion of their over-lords, or at least acknowledged it in addition to their own. The reason of this procedure was that a certain form of religious

worship, or the cult of a particular deity, was bound up with the very idea of national existence; and when the political life of any community was modified by the influence of another community, a religious syncretism was regularly the result. This is, in fact, the key to the history of the ancient Orient. Or when an alliance was made between two states, particularly when cemented by a marriage between members of the reigning families, an addition to the authorized worship might be made. This last case was however exceptional in the history of Western Asia. It may be illustrated by the introduction into Israel of the worship of the Phœnician Baal, when Ahab married Jezebel, a princess of the latter country; or by the adoption of the god Nebo by the Assyrians when Rammaunirari III., the conqueror of Damascus, married the Babylonian princess Semiramis. It is, moreover, capable of explanation on the general principle above enunciated. As between Philistia and Judah, we can only think of a transfer of deities as being due to a state of vassalage entered into by the former.

Schrader supposes that such changes of name were made especially in connexion with the accession of a new ruler. This may perhaps explain such a case as that of Uzziah himself with his alternate name Azariah, by which he was known to foreign nations. In those cases however of which we know the history, this was not the occasion of the change. Jehoiakim, when made king, had his name changed from Eliakim (2 Kings xxiii. 34), and Zedekiah was bidden to drop his old name Mattaniah (2 Kings xxiv. 17); but the motive of this significant step was not their accession to the throne, but their coming into bonds to their respective suzerains. A fine parallel to the Philistian examples referred to above is afforded by another prince of the Philistines called Sarludari. He was imposed as king by Sennacherib upon the people of Askalon (Taylor, Cylinder

ii. 63), and accordingly took this Assyrian name, by which he is known in the inscriptions. A further parallel may perhaps be found in the case of Ahaz. It has never been made clear why the name of this king of Judah appears as *Ya'uhazi* in the annals of Tiglath-pileser III. The explanation preferred by Schrader, that the later Jews dropped the supposed original prefix on account of the idolatrous practices of the bearer of the name raises the question why he was treated so invidiously as compared with others, Aholiah for example, and also why there are no traces of the fuller form in any of the ancient versions. Not every king of Israel or Judah had a name compounded with Yahu, and Ahaz was a name otherwise occurring in the simple form (1 Chron. viii. 35; ix. 42). May not the explanation be afforded by 2 Kings xvi. 7, where Ahaz sends a message to Tiglath-pileser: "I am thy servant and thy son; come up and save me"? Here Ahaz formally contracts to become the vassal of Assyria, and by virtue of that new relation to one who was to stand to him as master and father, he may very well have received a change of or addition to his name. It may be mentioned, by the way, that the idolatries introduced by Ahaz were doubtless Assyrian in their origin, and that the religious rites which he saw practised in Damascus (2 Kings xvi. 10 ff), as Duncker perceived, were also Assyrian. They could not have been Syrian, as is generally supposed; for Israel and Judah had been familiar with their rites for centuries, nor would the religion of a prostrate people like that of Damascus have had any claim upon the Jews, their fellow subjects. The consideration of the claims of the gods of the sovereign nation upon the religious homage of the conquered peoples throws a flood of light upon the attitude assumed by the prophets of Israel and Judah towards all questions of international relations. To return to the main subject of discussion, it seems almost superfluous to add a reference to the many passages of the

Bible in which the conferring of a name is, in phraseology based upon immemorial Semitic usage, connected with ownership and proprietorship (*e.g.* Exod. xxxiii. 12, 17; Ps. xlix. 11, cxlvii. 4; Isa. xl. 26, xliii. 1, xlv. 5, xlv. 3, xlix. 1). So also Abram, Jacob, and Saul of Tarsus received new names on entering upon a new service; that is, on undergoing a change of religious relations.

There is, then, evidence of a powerful and deep-rooted Jewish influence in Philistia at the close of the eighth century B.C. which cannot be accounted for as the work merely of Ahaz, or of Hezekiah, or of both.

Reference might perhaps be made to Isaiah xiv. 28 ff., where Delitzsch, Orelli, and Reuss (*Geschichte des Alten Testaments*, p. 518), with other authorities of the first name, find an allusion to Uzziah's conquests in ver. 29, "The rod that smiteth thee." But as there is great difference of opinion as to the historical application of the figures employed in this passage, it is not expedient to press it into service in the present contention. With more confidence perhaps might Amos i. 6-8 be cited, since it is clear that, unless we are to look for the fulfilment of these detailed threats against the Philistines in the time of the Assyrian invasion, which is alluded to only as a great general fact by that prophet, we have to find it in the alleged conquests of Uzziah.

A glance at the map of southern Palestine, with a moderate knowledge of the ancient history and civilization of the peoples inhabiting that and the neighbouring regions, is sufficient to convince any one that Judah could never have attained to that degree of prosperity and power which we know it to have reached in the early days of Isaiah's ministry, without having had a prolonged control over the Philistian plain and the borderlands. The facts adduced in the present brief inquiry may go to show that not only had a large part of the Philistine country been under

Jewish political influence, but that it had been to a considerable extent actually Judaized. However this may be, it may be safely set down as established that events just such as those ascribed in Chronicles to Uzziah must necessarily have occurred, else Jewish history would have been quite different from what we know it to have been. The failure to recognise this outstanding fact serves to illustrate the principle that historical investigation must not be made an occupation secondary and ancillary to the criticism of the documents which constitute its basis. Theoretical reconstructions of history are always to be suspected which lose sight of historic cause and effect under an engrossing anxiety lest current data should prove untrustworthy.

J. F. McCURDY.

THE ROMAN RECKONING OF THE DAY.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE EXPOSITOR."

DEAR SIR,—

In Dr. Sanday's notice of my volume on the Gospel of St. John, he finds fault with the statement that St. John probably adopted the Roman reckoning of the hours of the day and counted noon the sixth hour. "This method of counting," says Professor Sanday, "was not at all peculiarly 'Roman,' but was, in fact, almost universal. It was rather the other method of counting—the evidence perhaps does not permit us to say the *hours*, but the *day*—from midnight which more properly deserves to be called 'Roman.'" I should be glad to believe that this is the grossest inaccuracy in my volume. The fact is, I was at some pains to ascertain the Roman method; and besides the evidence adduced in Mr. Cross' paper, to which Professor Sanday refers, two other witnesses convinced me that the Romans did reckon from sunrise. The one witness is that of the ancient Roman sun-dials, on which noon is denoted by VI. This is decisive. The other witness is the epigram (iv. 8) of Martial on the routine of the Roman day.