

*ASSYRIAN AND BABYLONIAN INSCRIPTIONS IN
THEIR BEARING ON THE OLD TESTAMENT
SCRIPTURES.*

XI. SOLOMON AND THE KINGS OF THE HITTITES.

IT is not without a certain sense of disappointment that the student of Assyrian inscriptions finds that they make no mention of the reigns of the two kings who ruled over an undivided Israel. The conquests of David as "he went to recover his border at the river Euphrates" (2 Sam. viii. 3); his defeat of the king of Zobah and of the Syrians of Damascus; Solomon's alliance with Egypt and with Tyre (1 Kings iii. 1; v. 1), and his sovereignty "over all kingdoms from the river (*i.e.*, the Euphrates) unto the land of the Philistines and the border of Egypt" (1 Kings iv. 21); the tribute that came from Arabia, and the commerce carried on with the East by the ships of Tarshish (1 Kings x. 15, 22); the foundation of a great city like Tadmor in the wilderness (1 Kings ix. 18); these, we think, must have forced the new monarchy of Israel on the notice of the Assyrian kings. How is it that while the inscriptions of a later date make mention, as we shall see, of Omri and Jehu and Uzziah and Ahaz and Hezekiah, of kings of the Philistines and of Tyre, we have no record of this close contact with Israel under David and Solomon?

A partial answer is found in the comparative scantiness of Assyrian records at this period. Between Tiglath-Pileser I. (*circ.* B.C. 1130-1110), great as a conqueror and ruler, and Assur-nazir-pal (= Asshur protects his son) the builder of the great palace at Calah (*Nimroud*), who (*circ.* B.C. 884-859) "possessed the countries from the banks of the Tigris even to Lebanon," and "subjected to his power the great seas and all lands from the rising even to the going down of the sun" (*R. P.*, iii. 37), we have the names of eleven kings,

which include a change of dynasty, but no record of their achievements (Lenormant, *Anc. Hist.*, i. 375-377; Rawlinson, *Anc. Monarchies*, ii. 291). It may legitimately be inferred from this that the Assyrian power was, during this period, in a state of comparative decadence. One of these, Asshura-bamar (*circ.* B.C. 1080), is recorded to have been conquered in a decisive battle by the king of the Hittites, and this obviously may have prepared the way for the conquests of David and Solomon (*circ.* B.C. 1055-1000), especially if they appeared on the scene as the allies of the old enemies of Assyria, the Hittites, who inflicted this defeat.

Of such an alliance the records of the Old Testament present sufficient evidence. The most striking fact is, perhaps, the presence among the generals of David's army—one of the first "thirty" (2 Sam. xxiii. 39), high in honour and office—of the Hittite Uriah, whose name is familiar to us in its connexion with the dark tragedy of the king's crime. The high rank of the position which he occupied is shewn by the fact that his wife Bathsheba was the grand-daughter of Ahithophel, the king's chosen counsellor (2 Sam. xi. 3; xxiii. 34), the daughter of one who, as also of the "chief thirty," was Uriah's companion in arms (2 Sam. xxiii. 34). The way in which he speaks of the ark of God (2 Sam. xi. 11) indicates that he had become a proselyte to the religion of Israel, and shewed the reality of his faith by the nobleness and devotion of his character. Another Hittite, Ahimelech, appears as the companion of David and Abishai (1 Sam. xxvi. 6). Hittite women, probably princesses, were found in Solomon's harem (1 Kings xi. 1). In 1 Kings x. 28, 29; 2 Chron. i. 14-17, we have a distinct view of the commerce carried on between the two nations. The "merchants of Solomon," the king apparently making the trade a government monopoly, imported "horses and linen yarn" from Egypt, at a fixed price, and

in this way he "brought out *horses* for all the kings of the Hittites and all the kings of Aram (=Syria)." Geographically the rulers so named correspond with "all the kings on this side the river (Euphrates)" of 1 Kings iv. 24, who were in some sense subject to Solomon, and we are led to the conclusion that the Northern Hittites were a powerful confederacy of princes, owning at this time the suzerainty of the king of Israel, and probably favouring the establishments of outposts like Baalath and Tadmor as a defence against their more northern neighbours on the Tigris or Euphrates.

Of these Hittites, however, the records of the Old Testament tell us comparatively little. In Gen. xxiii. 10 they appear as settled at Mamre, afterwards Hebron, and conveying the cave and field of Machpelah to Abraham with all the formal precision of a people accustomed to such transactions.¹ Esau takes to himself two wives of the daughters of Heth (Gen. xxvi. 34). They are named in all the lists of the seven nations of Canaan in the book of Exodus, commonly standing second (Exod. iii. 8, 17; xxiii.

¹ It is interesting to compare the form of what we may call the earliest "deed of conveyance" extant,— "Abraham weighed to Ephron the silver, which he had named in the audience of the sons of Heth, four hundred shekels of silver, current money with the merchant. And the field of Ephron, which was in Machpelah, which was before Mamre, the field and the cave which was therein, and all the trees that were in the field, that were in all the borders round about, were made sure unto Abraham for a possession in the presence of the children of Heth, before all that went in at the gate of his city" (Gen. xxiii. 17, 18),—with the like forms of the Assyrian contract tables translated by Mr. Sayce (*R. P.*, i. 137-139), attested by nail marks in place of seals, *e.g.*, "The whole house, with its wood-work and its doors, situated in the city of Nineveh, adjoining the houses of Mannu-ci-akhi and Ilu-ciya, and the property of Sukaki, he has sold, and Tsillu-Assur, the astronomer, an Egyptian, for one *maneh* of silver, according to the royal standard, in the presence of Sarru-ludari, Atarsuru, and Amat-Suhala the wife of its owner, has received it. The full sum thou hast given. This house has been taken. The exchange and the contract are concluded. There is no withdrawal." Then follow penalties in the case of a breach of contract, and the names of witnesses, and the date. As most of these contracts refer to the *maneh* of Carchemish as a standard of value, it is probable that here too the formulæ were of Hittite origin, adopted by the Assyrians.

23), or third as in Josh. xi. 3, while in Josh. ix. 1; xii. 8, their name stands first in the list. It was probably a consequence of the Israelite conquest of Canaan that they retired northwards to the valley of the Orontes, and were drawn, both by race and trade affinities, to ally themselves with the Phoenicians, and possibly, as we have seen in the section on Balaam (EXPOSITOR for June), to take part, under the slightly varied name of Khittim, in the colonization of Cyprus.

The people of whom the annals of Israel tell us so little are, however, prominent enough in those of Assyria and Egypt. Thus, in Sir H. Rawlinson's translation of an inscription of Tiglath-Pileser I., shortly before the time of David, the king boasts that "the Lord Asshur had committed to his hand a powerful rebel-subduing army," with which he had conquered 4,000 of two rebellious tribes of the Kheti (= Hittites), who submitted without fighting, and from whom he took 120 of their chariots" (*R. P.*, v. 12). Elsewhere in the same inscription he relates his triumphs over them as far as Qarqamis (= Carchemish), which belonged to them and which he plundered of all its treasures and goods and chattels (*Ibid.*, p. 18), and that he subdued "from beyond the river Zab, plain, forest, and mountain, to beyond (*i.e.*, west of) the river Euphrates, the country of the *Khatte* (also = Hittites), and the upper ocean of the setting sun" (*Ibid.*, p. 20). The last phrase obviously points to the coasts of Phœnicia, and possibly to Cyprus, as occupied by, or at least in alliance with, the Hittites. He adds that he "brought them under one government, placed them under the Magian religion, and imposed on them tribute and offerings."

From Tiglath-Pileser I. we pass to the next great monarch of Assyria, Assur-nazir-pal (B.C. 884-853), whose annals found at Calah (= *Nimroud*) have been translated by Mr. Sayce. He too conquered Carchemish, and dwells at

length on the tribute he received there from Sangara, king of Aram (=Syria), gold, silver, copper, "the extensive furniture of his palace . . . female slaves, vestments of wool and linen, beautiful black coverings, beautiful purple coverings, precious stones, horns of buffaloes, white chariots, images of gold . . . the chariots and warlike engines of the general of Carchemish" (*R. P.*, iii. 72). From other cities of the Khatti (=Hittites), Gaza, and Kanulua, he took spoil of like character (*Ibid.*, pp. 72-3), from another stores of wheat and barley, and thence passed on to subdue the cities of Phœnicia, "Tyre, Sidon, Gebal, and Arvad on the sea-coast" (*Ibid.*, p. 74).

Scarcely less conspicuous are the Hittites for their power and wealth in the annals of Egyptian conquerors. The great Rameses II., the Sesostris of the Greek historians (circ. B.C. 1388-1322), in the third Sallier papyrus (*R. P.*, ii. 67-78) dwells on his conquest of the "vile chief of Cheta" as the greatest of his triumphs. Mesopotamia and Carchemish were in alliance with the Hittites. They mustered 2500 chariots, but the Egyptians prevailed and the soldiers of Rameses sang his praises. "Thou guardest Egypt, chastisest lands of thy foes, bruise the head of Cheta for ever" (p. 75). "Thy spirit is mighty; thy strength weighs heavy on Cheta-land" (p. 77).¹

Both the Biblical and the extra-Biblical notices of the Khita or Hittites indicate, as we have seen, a people of commercial habits and corresponding wealth. One striking example of this is seen in the fact that the coinage of their chief city was recognized as of exceptionally high value,

¹ See also Brugsch, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, ii. 45-48. The victories of Rameses II. were recorded not only in the poem of Pentaur, but in a series of pictures on the walls of the Temple of Abydos, which represent the several stages of the campaign; the armies of the king distinguished by their complexion and equipment from the Khita and their allies; the chariots of the Khita thrown into the river Orontes; the capture of the great Hittite city, Kadesh, which stood upon its banks.

so that Assyrian contract notes provide specially for the payment of so many "*manehs* of silver according to the standard of Carchemish" (*R. P.*, i. 138; vii. 114).¹ The precision with which the purchase of the cave of Machpelah is recorded and the weighing of the four hundred shekels "current money with the merchant" (Gen. xxiii. 16) gives proof, as has been shewn above, of business habits of the same character.

XII. HOSEA, SHALMAN, AND KING JAREB.

In the later history of the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah we pass from the fragmentary notices and incidental points of contact with Assyria, which have hitherto come before us, to something like a continuous chronicle. The earliest record of Assyrian intervention is found not in the Jewish, but the Assyrian annals. Shalmaneser II. (Sayce) or IV. (Lenormant) in the Monolith and Black Obelisk inscriptions, found by Sir A. Layard at *Nimroud*, relates how it came to pass. There had probably been a conquest which involved the payment of tribute, as early as the reign of Ahab (*R. P.*, iii. 99), but a fuller subjugation took place in the reign of Jehu, when Hazael, king of Syria, "smote them in all the coasts of Israel, from Jordan eastward, all the land of Gilead, the Gadites, and the Reubenites, and the Manassites, from Aroer which is by the river Arnon, even Gilead and Bashan" (2 Kings x. 32, 33). Hazael, like his predecessor Benhadad, probably the RIMMON-IDRI of the inscriptions, was in alliance with a confederacy of twelve kings of the Kheta or Hittites.

¹ So, according to one etymology, our "sterling" as applied to money comes from "Easterling," the coin of the Hanse towns of Eastern Germany having become famous for its purity about the time of Richard I. Our Troy weight, in like manner, bears witness to the commercial importance of Troyes in the middle ages. Guinea, Florin, Mark, Thaler, present analogous instances. (Taylor, *Words and Places*, p. 455).

Shalmaneser put forth all his strength to crush a power that was becoming dangerous.

“In my eighteenth year for the sixteenth time the Euphrates I crossed. Hazael of Damascus to battle came. 1,221 of his chariots, 470 of his war-carriages with his camp I took from him. . . .”

“In my twenty-first campaign for the twenty-first time the Euphrates I crossed; to the cities of Hazael of Damascus I went. Four of his fortresses I took. The tribute of the Tyrians, the Zidonians, and the Gebalites I received. . . .” (*R. P.*, v. 34, 35).

We are left so far to conjecture what line of action was taken by the king of Israel. We may infer from the fact that no victory over him is recorded, that he offered no resistance to the progress of the Assyrian arms. He might well watch with satisfaction the overthrow of the Syrian king. It seems probable enough that he had invited the assistance of Shalmaneser. The probability passes almost to a certainty when we turn from the annals of the Black Obelisk to the sculptures on its base. In one of these we have the figure of a king doing homage, prostrate at the feet of the Assyrian monarch, and the epigraph that accompanies it gives the name of the suppliant.

“The tribute of Yahua son of Khumri (= Jehu, son of Omri), silver, gold, bowls of gold, pitchers of gold, lead, sceptres for the king’s hand and staves” (*R. P.*, v. 41).

It is singular enough to find Jehu, whose special work it was to overthrow and extirpate the whole house of Ahab, the actual son of Omri, described officially as if he were of the same dynasty. We may infer from the fact that, little as is recorded of him in the Bible narrative, the name of Omri had become famous, and carried with it a prestige which Jehu was unwilling to forfeit. Succession in the East was constantly identified with a figurative filiation, and it was doubtless part of the policy of Jehu to represent

himself as continuing rather than interrupting the line of the great hero-king.

The history thus brought to light explains some otherwise obscure passages in the earliest prophet who makes distinct mention of Assyria, the earliest also in the chronological arrangement of the prophetic writings. We find in Hosea x. 14, a text which has almost to the present day been the stumbling-block of interpreters. The prophet predicts the sore judgment that shall fall upon Ephraim, *e.g.*, the northern kingdom of Israel. "All thy fortresses shall be spoiled, as Shalman spoiled Beth-Arbel in the day of battle; the mother was dashed to pieces upon her children." All the ancient versions go wildly astray in their interpretation. The LXX. gives, scarcely intelligibly, "As the ruler Salaman from the house of Jerubbaal in the days of war dashed on the ground the mother upon the children;" the Vulgate, "As Salmana was laid waste by the house of him who judged Baal in the day of battle, when the mother was dashed upon the children." It is clear that both versions rest on a confused identification of Shalman with the Zalmunna, king of the Midianites, of Judges viii. 5—that they followed a conjectural reading which turned "Arbel" into "Jerubbaal" (= "Let Baal plead;" or "Baal is the pleader or avenger"), the name which attached to Gideon after his throwing down the Baal-altar in his father's house (Judges vi. 32; viii. 29). Every element of historical probability is, however, against this identification. There is no record of any deeds of cruelty, of any capture of a city, by the Zalmunna of the Gideon history. The English Version follows Luther, and in so doing at least avoids what is a blunder at once of translation and of history. Who Shalman was remained, however, an unsolved problem. Most commentators assumed that it was a shortened form of Shalmaneser; but then there was the difficulty, that the only Assyrian king of that name

who was then known, invaded and took Samaria at a later date than that of Hosea's prophecy, and it was further asked why, if the name was written in its full form in 2 Kings xvii. 3, it should appear clipped and curtailed as it is supposed to do here.¹ Some scholars, accordingly, (*e.g.*, Fürst, *Lex.*, *s.v.* Shalman) assumed an early king of Assyria bearing the name of Shalman. Ewald, with his characteristic genius for divination, ventured, before the discoveries of Assyrian scholars, on the conjecture that there must have been an earlier monarch of the name of Shalmaneser, one of whose acts of vindictive cruelty is here recorded. That conjecture is confirmed, as we have seen, by the inscription of the Black Obelisk of the British Museum. There *was* an earlier Shalmaneser, the contemporary of Hazael and of Jehu, conspicuous for his victories and his cruelties. "The cities to a countless number I threw down, dug up, and burnt with fire . . . With the chief of his young warriors his broad fields I filled . . . The rebels whom I had taken I fixed on stakes. Two hundred and fifty of their cities I threw down, dug up, and burned with fire . . . Pyramids of the heads of the people over against his great gate I built up . . . heaps on stakes I impaled." These are samples taken almost at random from the king's records of his victories (*R. P.*, v. 36-41, iii. 95). Like cruelties, it will be remembered, were perpetrated by Hazael, against whom he made war (2 Kings viii. 12).

The question where Beth-Arbel was presents another

¹ The answer to that question, however, is probably not far to seek. Nothing is more common in the intercourse between nations who speak different languages, than this popular abbreviation of long and unfamiliar names. Another probable instance of it will meet us in the case of Pul, the successor of Shalmaneser. Even within our own memory the Shalmaneser of France was known to a large portion of the working class of England not as Napoleon or Buonaparte, but as "Boney." It is significant in its bearing on this question, that the name of this earlier Shalmaneser is the only name of an Assyrian king that is divided in the inscriptions—"Shalman" in one line and "eser" in the next. (Smith, *Assyrian Discoveries*, p. 247.)

difficulty. There is an Arbela of world-wide fame as the scene of one of Alexander the Great's battles, within the Assyrian kingdom, east of the Tigris. There is another named in 1 Macc. ix. 2, and by Josephus (*Ant.*, xii. 11, 1; xiv. 15, 4), which the latter places in Galilee. Each of these has found advocates (Fürst, *e.g.*, supposing that the former city had sustained a siege from the Assyrians, the horrors of which had become proverbial), but as yet there are no adequate *data* for a decision. The way in which Hosea speaks of it as a place well known, and the combination *Beth-Arbel* is, perhaps, in favour of the Galilean rather than the Assyrian city. On the other hand, Mr. Sayce (*R. P.*, iii. 96, and Schrader, *Keilinsch.*, p. 139) find in the Monolith inscription of Shalmaneser the record of an eastern expedition which included Arbela. "In the lowlands of the country of Kirruri, at the entrance of the city of Arbail (= Arbela) came I forth." In any case the horrors of its capture had made an impression on the minds of men, like that made on the mind of Europe in the sixteenth century by the sack of Rome by the Constable Bourbon (A.D. 1527), or that of Magdeburgh by Tilly in the Thirty Years War (A.D. 1661).

Another theory, also connected with the inscriptions, has, however, to be noticed. In one of the records of Tiglath-Pileser there has been found the name "Salamanu" as a king of Moab, from whom he received tribute about B.C. 732, and it has been conjectured that this was the king who attacked a Galilean or Trans-jordanic Beth-Arbel, and whose capture was signalled by the atrocities of which Hosea speaks (Menant, *Annales*, p. 144, quoted in *Speaker's Commentary*, vi. 473). Leaving this as a question more or less unsettled, we gain from Hosea a vivid picture of the state of feeling produced in Israel, as afterwards in Judah, by the intervention of Assyria in their political relations. Placed as they were between the two

rival monarchies of the Tigris and the Nile, and conscious of their weakness in comparison with either, their position offers a striking parallel to that of Afghanistan in our own times between England and Russia. They felt, to use the homely similitude of Lord Lytton's despatch to the unhappy Shere Ali,—a similitude which might almost have come from the lips of Rabshakeh,—that they were as the earthen vessel between two vessels of iron, all but certain to be crushed in any case, vainly trying to wriggle out of their difficulties by attempts, like those of the Afghan king, to play off one power against the other as opportunity might offer. "Ephraim is like a silly dove without heart; they call to Egypt, they go to Assyria" (Hos. vii. 11). The prophet saw nothing but evil as the result of that policy. Shame, disaster, exile would be its certain outcome. "They shall not dwell in the Lord's land; but Ephraim shall return to Egypt, and they shall eat unclean things in Assyria" (Hos. ix. 3). "Egypt shall gather them up, Memphis shall bury them" (Hos. ix. 6). "When Ephraim saw his sickness, and Judah saw his wound, then went Ephraim to the Assyrian, and sent to king Jareb; yet could he not heal you, nor cure you of your wound" (Hos. v. 13). In relying on the protection of Assyria they were courting their own destruction. "It" (the glory of Bethel; the treasures and idols of the sanctuary of Israel, including, probably, the golden calf) "shall be also carried unto Assyria for a present to king Jareb: Ephraim shall receive shame, and Israel shall be ashamed of his own counsel" (Hos. x. 6). The Egyptian alliance, on which men rested their hopes, should be without result except for evil. "He (Ephraim) shall not return into the land of Egypt, but the Assyrian shall be his king" (Hos. xi. 5). "They shall tremble as a bird out of Egypt, and as a dove out of the land of Assyria" (Hos. xi. 11). Their one hope was in returning to the Lord, to Jehovah

whom they had forsaken, with the cry of penitents, "Take away all our iniquity, and receive us graciously" (Hos. xiv. 2). The prophet's last words of warning were, "Asshur shall not save us," neither Assyria, nor the god whom the Assyrians worshipped, and from whom they took their name (Hos. xiv. 3).

It will have been noticed that twice in the course of his collected prophecies Hosea speaks of an Assyrian "king Jareb." No name in the slightest degree approaching to this in sound is found in the inscriptions, and we are left to the conclusion that it must have been like the Rahab (= the proud, or haughty one) which appears in Ps. lxxxvii. 4; lxxxix. 10; and Isa. li. 9, as a synonym for Egypt, a word, used not without a touch of irony, as descriptive of what seemed to the prophet the characteristic feature of the Assyrian monarch. Looking to its etymology, the name might be rendered, like the prefix in the name of Jerubbaal (= let Baal plead) assumed by Gideon (Judges vi. 32), "he who pleads," the "advocate," or the "avenger." Jerome, so wildly astray in the matter of Shalman, is here on the right track, and translates it in both passages by "*ultor*" (= "the avenger"). The significance of the name lies almost on the surface. The Assyrian king, to whom Israel was turning for help, would prove no helper, rather would prove to be the "pleader" for his own cause, the "advocate" of his country's gods, the "avenger" at once of the wrongs which, from his point of view, had been done to those gods by all who rebelled against him, and of the sins which had in reality drawn down the chastisement with which the God of Israel was visiting his people. We cannot read the inscriptions of Assyrian kings, like Shalmaneser, Tiglath-Pileser and others, without seeing that, from their point of view, their wars were, like those of Mahomet and his successors, religious wars, wars of propagandism. They begin the record of their victories by boasting of the favour

of Asshur or of Bel. They claim that favour by subduing those who have rebelled against the great gods of Assyria; they are, as it were, "defenders of the faith."

So, *e.g.*, Assur-nazir-pal (*R. P.*, iii. 40, 41) describes himself as—

"A warrior who in the service of Asshur his lord hath proceeded . . . trampling on all foes, crushing assemblages of rebels; who in the service of the great gods, his lords, marched vigorously . . . a Prince who in the service of Asshur and the Sun-god, the gods in whom he trusted, loyally marched to turbulent lands:" His boast is, "the enemies of Asshur in all their country the upper and lower I chastised." He is "the restorer of the worship of the goddesses and that of the great gods."

So Shalmaneser II., the king whom we identify with Shalman (*R. P.*, iii. 83-100), is "the purified of the gods, the servant of the eyes of Bel, the high-priest of Asshur." And again (*R. P.*, v. 32),—

"The city of Tel-Abni . . . I captured . . . The weapons of Asshur in the midst of it I rested. Sacrifices for my gods I took. . . An image of my royalty I constructed. The laws of Asshur my lord, the records of my victories . . . in the midst of it I wrote."

So, to take one more instance, Tiglath-Pileser I. (*R. P.*, v. 7) puts himself under the protection of Abnil, an Assyrian deity identified by Sir H. Rawlinson with Hercules (?) "the champion who subdues *heretics* and enemies." He himself "subdues the enemies of Asshur"—is "the subjugator of the rebellious, . . . who has overrun the whole Magian world" (p. 12). . . . "The countries of Tsaravas and Ammavas, which from the olden time had never submitted, I swept like heaps of stubble. . . . I bore away their gods. The heavy yoke of my empire I imposed on them. I attached them to the worship of Asshur" (p. 14). . . . Tseni, the king of Dayáni . . .

I had mercy on him. I left him in life to learn the worship of the great gods from my city of Asshur" (p. 17).

It is surely no cause for wonder that a ruler who embodied this policy should be designated by a name which marked him out as the *Jareb*, the *champion king*. The fact that the surname given to Gideon was probably emphasized in its irony by its being the title of a Phœnician and Palmyrene deity (Movers, *Phöniz.*, i. 432) of the Heracles type, meaning probably, as so used, "Baal pleads," *i.e.*, "prevails," makes it not unlikely that we have an allusive reference, in its use by Hosea, to the old Gideon history.

It is, I venture to add, a not improbable supposition that the name of Shalmaneser in its popular abbreviated form, had something to do with reviving the memories of that history. If the LXX. and Vulgate were led to confound that name with Zalmunna, it was at least likely that the prophet and people of Israel should associate the two in their thoughts, and see in the similarity of sounds an omen that the fate of the new invader would be like that of the old. Traces of the fresh prominence given about this time to the ancient victory over the Midianites appear in two other passages of the Old Testament, on which accordingly the Shalmaneser inscriptions throw some light. (1) In Ps. lxxxiii. 6, 7, we have the records of a confederacy against Israel, formed with a view to its utter extirpation. It included nearly all the old hereditary enemies of the people, —Edomites, Ishmaelites, Moabites, Ammonites, Gebal, Amalek, Philistines, and Tyrians. Last, but not least, in this list, reserved as it were for the sake of emphasis, Assyria comes in. "Assur also is joined with them; they have holpen the children of Lot." The occasion of the Psalm has been found by most commentators in the attack on Judah, made in the reign of Jehoshaphat by "the children of Moab, and the children of Ammon, and others

besides the Ammonites" (2 Chron. xx. 1); and these "others" are identified in verse 10 with the Edomites of Mount Seir. Here, however, there is no mention of Assyria, and at that time it was indeed scarcely within the political horizon of Judah and Israel. In a later reign, that of Uzziah, and therefore nearer the time of Hosea, whose prophetic work began under that king, we find the king at war with the Philistines, Arabians, and Ammonites (2 Chron. xxvi. 6-8). Assyria, it is true, does not appear in the Old Testament narrative here any more than it had done in the history of Jehoshaphat. Traces of a war, unrecorded by the Jewish historians, in which Assyria was victorious, are, however, found in an inscription of Tiglath-Pileser II. (*R. P.*, v. 45, 46). The first part of the tablet is so mutilated, that I quote only the few lines in which the translator finds the name of the Jewish king:—

"Azariah, of the land of Judah . . .
 Of Assyria the great, they heard and their heart feared. . . .
 . . . I pulled down. I raged . . .
 To Azariah went over and strengthened him. . . ."

* * * * *

Another tablet, less fragmentary, records a victory over "the city of Hammatti" (Hamath), "together with the cities which were around them, which are beside the sea of the setting sun, who, in seditious rebellion, to Azariah had gone over, to the boundaries of Assyria, I added . . ." (p. 46). It seems clear from this that there was an invasion of Judah by Tiglath-Pileser II. in the days of Uzziah (=Azariah), and that this king was treated as a rebel. Rebellion in such a case implies a previous subjection, and this may well have been connected with Shalmaneser II.'s victory over Hazael, and the capture (if we adopt that identification) of the Galilean Beth-Arbel, which lay on the border of the two kingdoms of Syria and Israel, and

must have passed often, like other cities in the same region, from the hands of one to those of the other (2 Kings xiii. 3, 22, 25). If so, the association of which I have spoken may well have carried the thoughts of the Psalmist, when Assyria joined in alliance with the other enemies of his people, to the victory once gained over an invader whose name, in the shorter form of Shalman, seemed almost reproduced in that of the Assyrian king, and prompted the prayer, "Do unto them as unto the Midianites . . . Make their nobles like Oreb and like Zeeb; yea, all their princes as Zebah and as *Zalmunna*" (Ps. lxxxiii. 11).

(2) The words of the Psalmist find an echo in those of a prophet who carried on his work, starting, indeed, somewhat later, in the same reign as Hosea, and who also had present to his thoughts the perils of an Assyrian invasion, and he too recalls the victory of Jerubbaal, "Thou hast broken the yoke of his burden, and the staff of his shoulder, the rod of his oppressor, as in the day of Midian" (Isa. ix. 4). It is, I think, scarcely possible to resist the conclusion that Hosea and Isaiah and the Psalmist were all under the influence of the same train of associations, and that those associations had their starting point in the revival of all the glorious memories of the "day of Midian," consequent on the chance resemblance of the names Shalman and *Zalmunna*. The fact that Ps. lxxxiii. is ascribed to Asaph in its heading proves, I need hardly say, nothing as to its date. The facts to which it refers, are incompatible with any hypothesis that would make it the personal composition of the Levite minstrel who was contemporary with David (1 Chron. vi. 39; xv. 17-19; 2 Chron. v. 12), and the psalms of Asaph must be regarded, like the poems of the Greek Homeridæ, as the works of a school of hymn-writers who looked on him as their head and founder. It is characteristic of their section of the Psalter, that it consists, for the most part, of national hymns, the prayers or praises of the

people in a time of calamity and war, and that they fit in with hardly an exception, like the Psalms of the "sons of Korah," with the period of the Assyrian invasions.

E. H. PLUMPTRE.

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF
Ἀπόλλυμι.

It is one of the palmary arguments of those who advocate the doctrine of "Conditional Immortality," that *ἀπόλλυμι* and its correlates, verbal and substantival, when applied to human beings, "bear, in Greek *prose*, only one signification—that which is self-evident;"¹ and this signification is further defined to be "in Plato, and all other known classical writers, *literal destruction* or *abolition of life*." It is admitted, of course, in passing that *ἀπόλλυμι* has the "secondary idiomatic sense of *to lose*;" and that "there are examples in the tragedians, in the 'hyperbole of passion and poetry,' in which the idea of *misery* and *pain* might seem to be more prominent than the *destruction* they were bringing on; but these are exceedingly rare, and in no cases occur, so far as [Mr. White] can ascertain, except when the misery is likely to *end* in destruction." Moreover, it is unreasonable, we are told, to urge "'figurative' senses on the strength of quotations supposed to contain similar figures, *taken from the Greek poets*;" for "in a grave *philosophical* or *religious* treatise these ['strong'] words must be taken in their proper and obvious meaning." Were it otherwise, we are reminded, "the Greek world" would have had "*to learn a new Greek language before it could understand the apostles*."

¹ For this and the succeeding quotations, see Mr. E. White's *Life in Christ* (3rd edition), pp. 403, 366, 367, 365. The italics are Mr. White's.