

less repeating the description which he had heard in the city, when he attended the Council). Iconium was now no longer a part of Lycaonia in a political sense; and the connexion of blood, and in some degree perhaps of language, with Phrygia was felt more strongly.

W. M. RAMSAY.

### SENNACHERIB AND JERUSALEM.

705-681 B.C.

A PREVIOUS paper<sup>1</sup> brought the history of Isaiah's Jerusalem to the eve of its great crisis: the campaign, or, as we may find probable, the *two* campaigns of Sennacherib against Southern Palestine.

#### I.

Sargon died in 705, and, as usual, the transfer of the Assyrian throne became the occasion for a general revolt among its vassals. The most formidable was Merodach Baladan, of Bīt Jakīn, on the northern coast of the Persian Gulf, who in 709 had been driven from Babylon by Sargon, and now regained that great capital with all the commercial and religious influence which its possession conferred. He enjoyed besides the support of Elam. In 703 Sennacherib, on his first campaign, drove Merodach Baladan out of Babylon, and set up there, as "king of Sumer and Akkad," a vassal of his own, named Bel Ibni. Sennacherib's second campaign in 702 was northwards, towards Media; and in 701 he began his third—against Phoenicia and Palestine.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> EXPOSITOR for July.

<sup>2</sup> There are six Assyrian accounts of, or references to, this campaign (1) "The Rassam Cylinder" of 700 B.C., recording Sennacherib's first three campaigns. (2) "The Taylor Cylinder" of 691 (in the British Museum, reproduced at p. 188 of *Light from the East*, by Rev. C. S. Ball, London, 1899), recording eight campaigns, the account of the first three based on "The Rassam Cylinder." (3) "The Bull Inscription" (on slab I. of the Kuyunjik Bulls in the British Museum, translated in *Records of the Past*, vii. 57 ff., by Rodwell). (4) Cylinder C. (5) The Neby Yunus

His swift overthrow of the Phoenicians terrified a number of the southern states into submission, but Judah, Ashkelon, Ekron—where the Assyrian vassal, Padi, had been deposed,—and others continued to resist. The head of this coalition was Hezekiah, by virtue alike of the size of his territory, the strength of his capital, and the repute of his arms, which had recently overrun Philistia as far as Gaza.<sup>1</sup> Padi, upon his deposition—which, perhaps, occurred on this campaign—was delivered into the keeping of Hezekiah. As we have seen,<sup>2</sup> the league against Assyria did not rely solely upon its own forces. Sennacherib tells us that Hezekiah had increased the garrison of Jerusalem by a number of Arab mercenaries,<sup>3</sup> and among the forces he encountered at Eltēkeh, near Ekron, were “bowmen, chariots, and horses of the king of Melukhkha,” which used to be considered as Ethiopia, but is now by Assyriologists held to be a state or territory of Northern Arabia.<sup>4</sup>

Inscription of Sennacherib (now at Constantinople; translated in *Records of the Past*, xi. 45 ff., by Budge), with a very brief notice of the campaign of 701, lines 13–15. (6) The Bas-Relief from Sennacherib's Palace at Nineveh (now in the British Museum; reproduced in *Light from the East*, 190 ff.), with the inscription, “Sennacherib, king of the world, king of Assyria, sate on a throne and caused the spoil of Lachish to pass before him.” Of all these the most useful to the historian of Hezekiah's reign is “The Taylor Cylinder,” along with the additional information of the Bas-Relief of the Siege of Lachish. For the following pages I have used the various translations, or summaries, of “The Taylor Cylinder,” by Talbot, Schrader, Sayce, Ball, Winckler, Weber, Price, and Rogers.

<sup>1</sup> 2 Kings xviii. 8. Professor Cheyne (*E. B.* column 3059) seems to me rightly to date this campaign of Hezekiah *before* Sennacherib's arrival, as against Stade and Kittel, who date it later. <sup>2</sup> P. 14.

<sup>3</sup> “Taylor Cylinder,” col. iii., line 31. The Assyrian word is *urbi*. Schrader, Sayce, Ball (with a query), Price, Nagel, etc., render it “Arabians” Others leave it untranslated.

<sup>4</sup> “Taylor Cylinder,” col. ii., line 74. Schrader in the 2nd edition of the *K.A.T.*, English translation 289 f., still took Melukhkha as Ethiopia. In his map to the 3rd edition, Winckler places it south of the Gulf of Akabah on the Red Sea coast. Budge (preface to vol. vi., *History of Egypt*, p. xv.) thinks that Winckler's previous hypothesis of Melukhkha = Sinai and Midian has much probability. If Melukhkha be an Arabian state, it is surprising to find chariots mentioned among its forces.

It may be to negotiations before 701 between the South Palestine States and such Arab princes that Isaiah's *Oracle of the Beasts of the South* refers with its description of the passage of an embassy bearing treasure through the terrible desert.<sup>1</sup>

Till recently Old Testament scholars and Assyriologists alike held that Hezekiah and his allies relied also upon help from Egypt, and that in response an Egyptian force appeared at the Battle of Eltekeh. Sennacherib includes among his foes there, along with the king of Melukhkha, "the king" or "kings of Muşuri"<sup>2</sup>; and this was taken to be the same as the Hebrew Mişraim or Egypt, divided at this time under several rulers. But since Dr. Winckler elaborated his arguments for the existence of an Arabian Muşri, Sennacherib's foes of that name at Eltekeh have been considered by a large number of scholars to have been as certainly Arabs as their allies of Melukhkha were. This opinion has been further supported by an appeal to the political condition of Egypt. In the second half of the 8th century and indeed till the appearance of Taharko in 691,<sup>3</sup> Egypt, it is argued, owing to its divisions, was not capable of interfering in the politics of Palestine. Dr. Winckler indeed holds that wherever the Assyrian inscriptions of that period mention Muşri it is the Arabian Muşri which they mean—that, for example, it was not Egypt, as we have supposed, but the independent Arab state of the same (or a very similar) name which Sargon met at Raphia in 720 and which conspired with Ashdod and other South Palestine states in the rising against him of 713-711. The present is not the connection in which to discuss the ques-

<sup>1</sup> Isaiah xxx. 6 f.

<sup>2</sup> Tayl. Cyl. ii., 23, "Kings"; but other readings give "King"; cf. the Bull Inscr. i. 23.

<sup>3</sup> According to W. Max Müller, *E. B.* col. 1245, this is the proper date for Taharko's achievement of the sovereignty of all Egypt. The formerly accepted date, 704, is "certainly improbable" (n. 2). See also the detailed argument for 691 in Prášek, *Sanherib's Feldzüge gegen Juda*, i, 34 ff., 1903.

tion between Dr. Winckler and those who deny that he has proved the existence of an Arabian Muşri.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Winckler has produced an amount of evidence for the Arabian Muşri which has convinced a number of leading scholars both in Germany and this country,<sup>2</sup> and even some who do not think him justified in all the assertions which he makes of the appearance of this state in the Assyrian and Jewish records.<sup>3</sup> At the same time there are great difficulties, one of which is the existence of two independent states, bordering with each other and having names which are practically the same: MŞR. We must keep in mind that (as in modern times) Egypt, i.e., Muşr or Mişr (Mişraim) was not confined to Africa but covered the fringe of Asia as far as the Gulf of Aqaba on the east, and Raphia near Gaza on the north—or just the territory which Dr. Winckler claims for his Arabian Muşri. It may have been thus that the name Muşr came to cover the latter and the Arab tribes which inhabited it; and, if the real Egypt between 745 and 691 was too weak to interfere with Assyrian operations in Palestine, it is quite possible that it is Arab tribes *only* whom the Assyrian inscriptions mean by Muşur or Muşuri. But though this is possible, to say that it is certain would be somewhat rash in our present fragmentary knowledge of Egypt at the time. Bakenrenef, the Bocchoris of the Greeks, who reigned at Sais in the last quarter of the century, evinced some power and left a great reputation. Either he or the vigorous Shabako who overcame him about 706<sup>4</sup> may have been strong enough to attract the hopes of

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Dr. Budge, in the preface to vol. vi. of his *History of Egypt*.

<sup>2</sup> The English reader will of course consult Dr. Cheyne's "Mizraim," § 2b and other articles in the *E. B.*; cf. Hommel, "Assyria" in *Hastings D. B.* i. 187 f.; in German, Guthe, *Gesch.* 219 f.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Nagel, *Der Zug des Sanherib gegen Jerusalem*, 1902, p. 98, who admits the existence of an Arabian Muşri and its appearance at Eltekeh in 701, but argues that the Muşri of Sargon's inscriptions is Egypt.

<sup>4</sup> "706 (?)" W. Max Müller, *E. B.* col. 1244 f. Shabako certainly corresponded with Assyria; two of his seals have been discovered in the royal library at Nineveh.

the South Palestine cities in their fear before Sennacherib's advance.

In such uncertainty we must leave the question. But it does not much affect our present purpose. What is clear is that on the approach of Sennacherib, Hezekiah and his allies sought and found support from Arab tribes and kingdoms; this is proved from the presence of Arab mercenaries in Jerusalem, and of the forces of the king of Melukkhka at the Battle of Eltekeh. What is not certain is whether Egyptian soldiers were also present at Eltekeh. The name Muşuri applied by Sennacherib to some of his foes there may mean Egyptians (as all scholars used to think) or Arab tribes from Asiatic Egypt (as the present writer thinks most probable), or, on Dr. Winckler's argument, the forces of an Arabian land, Muşur, which at the time was independent of Egypt.<sup>1</sup>

Sennacherib having settled affairs in Phoenicia, advanced upon Hezekiah and his allies. We need not suppose that his inscriptions give the exact chronological order of all his operations. For instance, they report the restoration of Padi to power in Ekron immediately after the capture of the city, while it is more probable that Hezekiah did not deliver up Padi till after his own submission and payment of tribute. But in the main the inscriptions follow the natural course of such a campaign.<sup>2</sup> Coming down the sea-coast Sennacherib took first Ashkelon and its subject cities: Beth-dagon, Joppa, Bene-berak and Azuru. Then he turned to meet the southern forces, whom the coalition had summoned to its help: the kings of Muşur

<sup>1</sup> If Dr. Winckler be right, that Egypt was too weak to interfere in S. Palestine before Tirhaqah's ascension, or to attract the hopes of Hezekiah and his allies, whose only reliance, when Sennacherib approached to attack them, was on an Arabian Muşri, then we may have to remove the oracles of Isaiah on Egypt in Chaps. xxx. ff. from 705-701 (to which they are generally assigned) to the next decade.

<sup>2</sup> See *Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land*, pp. 235 f.

and the warriors of the king of Melukkhka; and defeated them at Eltekeh (unknown but probably on the Philistine plain). Then he took Ekron and was now free to turn against the most secure and formidable of the allies, Hezekiah. Sennacherib appears not to have immediately advanced on Jerusalem. Whether because his victory at Eltekeh had not finally dispersed the danger of an attack by an army from the south, and he could not therefore afford to lead his main force against Jerusalem; or because, like the Seleucid generals and Vespasian, he appreciated the strength of Jerusalem and the waterlessness of her surroundings, so dangerous to all her besiegers, and knew that he must not hope to take her before making sure of the rest of the land, he began with the latter. 'But Hezekiah of Jerusalem, who had not submitted to me, forty-six of his walled towns, numberless forts and small places in their neighbourhood I invested and took by means of battering rams and the assault of scaling-ladders (? siege towers) the attack of foot-soldiers, mines, breaches and . . .<sup>1</sup> Two hundred thousand one hundred and fifty, great and small, men and women, horses, mules, asses, camels, oxen and sheep without number I carried off from them and counted as spoil.'<sup>2</sup> While these operations proceeded,<sup>3</sup> part of the Assyrian army blockaded Jerusalem. 'Himself I shut up like a bird in a cage in Jerusalem his royal city. I raised forts about him and the exits of (or whatever came forth from) the chief gate of his city I barred. His towns which I spoiled I severed from his territory and gave them to Mitinti, king of Ashdod, Padi, king of Ekron, and Šilbil, king of Gaza; so I diminished his territory.'<sup>4</sup> The blockade of Jerusalem

<sup>1</sup> So after Ball and Nagel, the former of whom renders the last three terms, 'mines, bills and axes': Taylor Cyl. iii. 11-17.      <sup>2</sup> Id. 17-20.

<sup>3</sup> Because later, when Hezekiah submitted, we find Sennacherib still investing Lachish, doubtless one of the Judæan towns, since Hezekiah had already overrun Philistia up to Gaza.

<sup>4</sup> Taylor Cyl. 20-26, after Schrader and Ball.

brought Hezekiah to terms. 'Himself the fear of my august Lordship overpowered. The Arabians and his faithful ones whom he had brought in for the defence of Jerusalem his royal city, fell away.<sup>1</sup> Along with 30 talents of gold and 800 of silver, precious stones, carbuncles, *kassû* stones, great pieces of lapis lazuli, ivory thrones, elephant hides (and) tusks, *ushu* wood, box-wood, all sorts of things, a huge treasure, and his own daughters, the women-folk of his palace, men and women singers he brought after me to Nineveh the city of my Lordship; and for the payment of the tribute and to do homage, 'he despatched his envoy.'<sup>2</sup>

This account asserts or implies the following: the conquest of all Judah, with the overthrow of the principal cities except Jerusalem, and the captivity of a large portion of the country population; the blockade of Jerusalem, but neither its siege<sup>3</sup> nor its capture; the payment by Hezekiah of a costly tribute; and the departure of Sennacherib, before even the tribute could be paid, to Nineveh. The Bas-Relief in the British Museum proves in addition that among the cities taken and spoiled by Sennacherib was Lachish. For the reason of Sennacherib's swift return to Nineveh we cannot be at a loss. It must have been news of the revolt of his vassal Bel-Ibni in Babylon. Against this rebel Sennacherib's next campaign in 700 was directed.

There is no doubt that the Biblical parallel to Sennacherib's record of his suddenly ended campaign in Southern Palestine is found in 2 Kings xviii 13-16: *In the fourteenth*

<sup>1</sup> So Ball and Nagel; cf. Delitzsch, *Assyr. Handwörterbuch*, 171a. Others translate differently.

<sup>2</sup> Taylor Cyl. iii 29-41: after Ball and Schrader.

<sup>3</sup> The inscription does not use the usual word for siege, but a word that probably means 'blockade': cf. Prásek, *Sanherib's Feldzüge gegen Juda*, p. 21; in the *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1903, 4. Cf. Winckler, *A. T. Untersuchungen*, p. 31.

year of king *Hizkiyah Sanherib*, king of *Ashshûr*, came up against all the fortified cities of Judah and took them; and *Hizkiyah*, king of Judah, sent to the king of *Ashshûr* to *Lachish* saying: I have sinned; turn from against me, what thou layest upon me I will bear; and the king of *Ashshûr* laid upon *Hizkiyah*, king of Judah, 300 talents of silver and 30 talents of gold. And *Hizkiyah* gave all the silver, found in the house of *Jahweh* and in the treasuries of the king. At that time *Hizkiyah* stripped the doors of the temple of *Jahweh* and the pillars which *Hizkiyah*, king of Judah, had overlaid and gave it to the king of *Ashshûr*. The first verse of this passage, verse 13, is found in *Isaiah xxxvi. 1*, the rest are wanting there. The independence of the passage from what follows it in *2 Kings xvii.*, and is also given in *Isaiah xxxvi. 2 ff.*, is shown by the fact that the name of the king of Judah is spelt *Hizkiyah*, while in the latter passages it is *Hizkiyahu*.

To the same campaign of *Sennacherib* in 701 we may confidently refer the long discourse by *Isaiah*, now placed as a preface to his prophecies, ch. i. 2-26. Take verses 7-9:—

*Your land is a desolation, your cities are burned with fire,  
To your face strangers are devouring your soil  
(And it is desolate, like the overturning of Sodom).<sup>1</sup>*

*The daughter of Sion is left like a hut in a vineyard,  
Like a lodge in a garden of cucumbers,  
Like a city besieged.<sup>2</sup>*

*Unless Jahweh of hosts had left us a remnant,  
Almost as Sodom had we become,  
To Gomorrah had been levelled.*

To the same year of 701 is usually assigned chap. xxii. 1-14.

<sup>1</sup> So *Ewald*, *Lagarde*, *Cheyne*, and others, reading  $\text{דָּרַם}$  for the unmeaning  $\text{זָרַם}$ . The clause, however, is taken by some as a later insertion, on the ground that it breaks into the couplets of the verse-form.

<sup>2</sup> This clause is strange after the previous comparisons, unless *Isaiah* spoke it before the actual blockade of *Jerusalem*.



It seems hardly possible to take this passage as a unity.<sup>1</sup> Owing to the corruption of the text it is difficult, if not impossible, to detect the seam between the two pieces: hence the diverse modern divisions of the passage. But not only are the opening verses (1-5 at least) in one rhythm, and the closing (11b-14) in another; they do not appear to describe the same phase of the fickle temper of the City. Verses 1-2a exhibit the people on the housetops in a joyous celebration, to which the prophet opposes, in 2b-5, his vision of an imminent disgraceful defeat—flight and captivity of the leaders without resistance—merging into a picture of *a day of the Lord*. On the other hand, verses 8-14<sup>2</sup> rebuke the people for trusting in their preparations for a siege instead of in God; and then, as if even that material confidence has given way, depicts them, while God calls them to repentance, losing their balance altogether and plunging into a desperate self-indulgence—*for to-morrow we die*. This is a very different mood from that pictured in the opening verses. Let us take verses 11-14 first. Professors Cheyne, Skinner, and Marti refer this oracle to the people's relief upon the sudden withdrawal of the

<sup>1</sup> Formerly the universal opinion (shared by the present writer, *Expositor's Bible, Isaiah i.-xxix.*), and still held by Prof. Skinner (*Camb. Bible*, 162 ff.); cf. Robertson Smith, *Prophecy*, 1st ed., 346 f. Duhm divides the passages into two oracles of Isaiah: (a) 1-7, on an unknown occasion which moved the city to mirth, which the prophet answers by a vision of destruction; (b) 8-14, the prophet's rebuke of the city's trust in its preparations against a siege and its subsequent desperate levity. Marti distinguishes three pieces: (a) 1-5, in the Kinah measure. To the city, in an exultant mood Isaiah announces his vision of the overthrow of its leaders without resistance; (b) 6-11, the work of a later writer, because of the mention of Elam, which cannot have been among the Assyrian forces in 701; (c) 12-14, Isaiah's, from the same occasion as 1-5, the thoughtless joy of the citizens at the withdrawal of the Assyrians in 701. Cheyne (*SBOT.*, p. 163: see further *Crit. Bibl.*) distinguishes 1-5 and 6-14, both on the Assyrian withdrawal, the latter describing the rebound of the citizens from despair to hope. He thinks something has fallen out from the beginning of the second piece. All three take *vv. 9b-11a* as a gloss.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps this passage begins earlier.

Assyrians: "in the rebound from despair to hope the citizens of Jerusalem give expression to the wildest joy."<sup>1</sup> But this does not suit the cry, *for to-morrow we die*. These words compel us to refer the passage to a panic, when the people saw, or imagined, that their end was near, and instead of penitence, gave way, as other cities in similar conditions have done, to wild excesses. Now the occasion of this panic may have been that alluded to in Sennacherib's statement: that, during the blockade of the City, Hezekiah's "Arab mercenaries and his faithful ones" deserted from him. At an earlier moment, when no fear of their end possessed the citizens, but they had gone up to the housetops in great joy, Isaiah appears to have anticipated some such desertion of their cause, even by the rulers themselves: verses 1-3:—

*Thy slain are not slain with the sword,  
Nor dead in battle.  
All thy rulers are fled together.*

. . . . .<sup>2</sup>

An alternative would be to take the exultation of the people on the housetops as happening on the departure of the Assyrians, while the prophet predicts the certain return of the latter. But this is less probable, for verses 8-9a go on to describe hasty preparations *before* a siege, *when he had removed the screen of Judah*: that is probably when the frontier fortresses strengthened by Hezekiah and previous kings as screens to the capital had already been taken by Sennacherib. It is therefore more reasonable to take the exultation upon the housetops as happening upon the arrival of some addition to the strength of Jerusalem—possibly the entry of the Arabian mercenaries; while, as we have seen, the different mood of the people described in verses 11-14 emerged before rather than after the blockade

<sup>1</sup> Cheyne, *SBOT.*, *Isaiah*, p. 163.

<sup>2</sup> The text of this line is uncertain.

was lifted, and possibly on the desertion of the same hirelings along with some of the native Jews.

## II.

So much at least, then, happened in 701, and is covered by Isaiah xxxvi. 1 and the parallel 2 Kings xviii. 13-16, Isaiah i. and (probably) xxii. 1-14. The blockade was lifted, and Hezekiah sent tribute to Sennacherib at Lachish, or, according to Sennacherib's own account, to Nineveh, whither the Assyrian king implies he suddenly returned.

But there immediately follow on Isaiah xxxvi. 1 and 2 Kings xviii. 13-16 the accounts of two Assyrian expeditions to Jerusalem. *First*, the Rabshakeh is sent with an army to Jerusalem, and demands her surrender, but Isaiah emboldens Hezekiah to defiance by predicting that the king of Assyria shall hear a rumour, return to his own land, and fall there by the sword (2 Kings xviii. 17-xix. 8, parallel with Isaiah xxxvi. 2-xxxvii. 8). *Second*, on the return of the Rabshakeh Sennacherib hearing that Tirhakah, king of Egypt, is advancing, sends a letter to Hezekiah once more demanding the surrender of Jerusalem. Hezekiah spreads the letter with prayer before God; Isaiah tells him the Assyrian is overruled by God and will return without coming near Jerusalem; an angel smites of the Assyrians 185,000 men in a single night; Sennacherib returns to Nineveh and is murdered by his sons in the Temple of Nisroch (2 Kings xix. 9-37, parallel with Isaiah xxxvii. 9-38<sup>1</sup>).

<sup>1</sup> The verses describing the visitation on the Assyrian army, the return of Sennacherib and his murder, are assigned by many to the first account. The line between the two accounts is very sharp. 2 Kings xix. 8 tells of the return of the Rabshakeh from Jerusalem to the king of Assyria at Libnah. But the subject of the verb, *and he heard*, in verse 9 is not the Rabshakeh but the king of Assyria. With this verse, then, a new narrative obviously begins.

The questions which arise upon these two narratives are as follows: (1) What are their date, character and value? (2) Are they the accounts of two separate expeditions to demand the surrender of Jerusalem, or parallel versions of one and the same expedition? (3) In either case, do they refer to 701 or to a later campaign of Sennacherib in Palestine? These are questions to all of which diametrically opposite answers have been given with equal confidence. I do not think such confidence is justified in either direction: our evidence is incomplete, and as it stands conflicting. We can but state the questions and give the probable answers—probable, but even when most probable not always compatible with each other.

(1) I have space only for a summary treatment of the first question. 2 Kings xviii. 13-16, which (as we have seen) is the Hebrew parallel to Sennacherib's account of his invasion of 701, is generally recognized as an extract from the official annals of Judah. But the two accounts which follow it and which, besides differently spelling the name of Hezekiah, are couched not in an annalistic but a narrative style, are usually taken to be of that class of prophetic biographies upon which the compiler of the Book of Kings has so largely drawn.<sup>1</sup> The two accounts contain obvious editorial additions.<sup>2</sup> The compiler certainly did not finish his work before the Exile, roughly speaking the middle of the sixth century, and to him may be assigned the possibly late linguistic traces which the text of the two accounts contain.<sup>3</sup> The foreshortening of the period

<sup>1</sup> As, for example, in the cases of Elijah and Elisha.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. xviii. 17: *The Tartan and the Rabsaris* for verses 17-19 imply the presence only of the Rabshakeh, cf. xix. 8; *son of Amos*, cf. Kautzsch *in loco*; xix. 10: *Thus shall ye speak to H. king of Judah, saying* (Kautzsch).

<sup>3</sup> For example, the name *Jewish* (instead of Hebrew) for the language of the people of Jerusalem (2 Kings xviii. 26, 28), not elsewhere used in the O.T. except in the post-exilic Neh. xiii. 24, and objected to on the ground that it could not have come into use so soon after the fall of Samaria and the sole survival of Judah as the end of the 8th or begin-

between Sennacherib's return from Palestine and his murder in 681 may also be due to the distance of the compiler from these events.<sup>1</sup> More precarious evidence of the compiler's alteration of his material is found in the religious temper of the two accounts; their monotheism, especially in Hezekiah's prayer, is alleged to be too pure for a date before the Deuteronomic influence and the prophecies of the Second Isaiah<sup>2</sup>; while the representation of Isaiah as a mediator between God and men, to convey the Divine answer to prayer or to give omens for the future, is held to be a conception of the prophetic office formed by an age later than Isaiah's.<sup>3</sup> To the present writer this line of argument is very uncertain. Isaiah during his long career, and by the vindication of several of his predictions, may well have achieved a religious authority of a degree sufficient to create among his countrymen the sacred conception of him prevailing in these narratives. Again, the mention by the first narrative of Hezekiah's expectation of help from Egypt and the assertion that he will be disappointed are not impossible (as some have alleged) before Tirhakah's conquest of all Egypt in 691; but are quite consistent with Isaiah's own oracles, so generally assigned to 705-701, upon the futility of Jewish reliance upon Egyptian aid. On the other hand a great many of the details in the two accounts can hardly be the invention of the late compiler. Nagel may have overstated the case for

ning of the 7th century. Nagel argues that its use was quite possible after 681, subsequent to which year he places the two accounts in consequence of their mention of Sennacherib's death. Other expressions alleged to be late are the Deuteronomic phrases in Hezekiah's prayer, 2 Kings xix. 15 ff.; the words *שְׂאִרִיָּה* and *פְּלִטָּה* in xix. 31, which Cheyne calls post-Isaian, but this is very doubtful (see Nagel's answer); and the expressions for *my sake*, and *for the sake of my servant David* (so Kuenen and others).

<sup>1</sup> So Kuenen, and since him many others.

<sup>2</sup> So Meinhold and others.

<sup>3</sup> So Marti.

the credibility of the narratives<sup>1</sup>; but there can be no doubt that much of the graphic and detailed description in these is most naturally explained as the work of a contemporary, if not an eyewitness, of the events recorded. The two narratives, then, owe their present form, including perhaps some re-arrangement and overlapping and probably some errors, not now always possible to distinguish, to their late compilation, but the attempt to prove them substantially unsound cannot be maintained.<sup>2</sup>

(2) Since Stade's analysis of the two narratives,<sup>3</sup> the prevailing tendency of criticism has been to refer both to 701 as parallel versions of the same course of events in that year.<sup>4</sup> This theory lays stress upon the elements common to both narratives: the dispatch of a mission by Sennacherib to demand the surrender of Jerusalem; the similarity of the terms of the speech of the Rabshakeh in the first narrative with those of the letter given in the second; Hezekiah's reference of both speech and letter to his God; the intervention in both cases of Isaiah and his encouragement of Hezekiah to defy Sennacherib; while the discrepancies between the two narratives are held upon this theory to be "perhaps not greater than between parallel accounts in the four gospels."<sup>5</sup> This is by no means conclusive. Alternative explanations of the simi-

<sup>1</sup> In his sections on the Credibility of the Hebrew account in *Der Zug des Sanherib gegen Jerusalem*.

<sup>2</sup> Prašek (*op. cit.* 25 ff.) divides the first narrative into a short summary from the annals of Judah, 2 Kings xviii. 17, 18 and xix. 8, of good historical value, and a prophetic narrative of the time of the Exile. So definite a division cannot be pronounced successful.—The oracles attributed to Isaiah in 2 Kings xix. 21-34 have been doubted. They vary in rhythm and some of the verses contain some of the late features already noted. But even if parts, or all, of them be omitted, a substantial narrative remains.

<sup>3</sup> *ZATW*, vi. 1886.

<sup>4</sup> This view has been adopted by Prof. Skinner in so recent a volume as the "Century Bible," *Kings* (p. 388), and maintained against the new hypothesis of Winckler.

<sup>5</sup> Skinner, *Isaiah i.-xxxix.*, p. 262.

larities are, to say the least, equally probable. For in part they may be due to the borrowing by one account of some of the exact terms of the other<sup>1</sup>; and, still more, they may have arisen from the natural analogies between two very similar historical situations in which the chief actors were the same. If Sennacherib sent two different missions to demand the surrender of Jerusalem—a fact not in itself improbable—he would naturally repeat himself, nor is it less likely that Hezekiah and Isaiah would render him on both occasions similar replies. On the other hand, the discrepancies between the two narratives are greater than the adherents of the theory of their parallelism allow; and the existence of these discrepancies is, on the whole, more consistent with the explanation of the narratives as continuous of each other. In the second, there is no allusion to the Fall of Samaria, which is very explicable if this second refers to events later than the first. In the second, Sennacherib no longer taunts Hezekiah with the futility of a reliance upon Egypt: again a natural omission if, as the compilation of the two narratives states, Tirhakah of Egypt had at last become able to advance into Palestine. There is also an apparent difference in the positions assigned to Sennacherib by the two narratives respectively. In the first he is in Judah, not far from Jerusalem, to which he is able to send an army detached from his great host. In the second, he is not near, and Isaiah asserts he will not come near.<sup>2</sup> There is also a difference between the temper ascribed to Hezekiah in the first narrative and that in which he is shown to us in the second; in the latter he is no longer seized by panic, but is calm. This change is very naturally explained, both if we assume that Hezekiah had already passed through the discipline described in the

<sup>1</sup> For example, the list of towns already conquered by Assyria.

<sup>2</sup> Prášek's contention (*op. cit.* 32, 37) that the letter of Sennacherib in the second narrative implies that Jerusalem was besieged by the Assyrians and hard pressed at the time the letter was sent, is quite unfounded.

first narrative, and if we suppose (as we have just seen reason to do) that on the second occasion Sennacherib was at a greater distance from the capital. Again, in the first narrative Hezekiah sends a solemn embassy to Isaiah; but in the second Isaiah sends of his own accord to Hezekiah. And finally, while in the first narrative Isaiah announces that Sennacherib's departure from Palestine will be due to a rumour that he shall hear, in the second this is not implied, and the cause of his departure is stated to be a pestilence.<sup>1</sup>

While, then, the similarities in the two narratives are explicable on other grounds than that they are parallel versions of the same events, their differences are less consistent with such a theory than they are with the interpretation of the two narratives as the accounts of successive events. And even some of the adherents of the theory of parallelism admit that the two narratives let themselves be read as a continuous whole.

(3) This leads us to our third question: If the two narratives imply two successive Assyrian missions to Jerusalem to demand the surrender of the City, did both of these missions take place in 701, or was the first in that year and the second some years later?

The hypothesis that Isaiah xxxvi.—xxxvii. records the results of two Assyrian invasions of Palestine separated by an interval of some years was advanced by British Biblical critics from a comparatively early date. Apart from the idea of Dr. Hincks<sup>2</sup> that the first of these was Sargon's campaign of 711, and the second that of Sennacherib in 701, Sir Henry Rawlinson distinguished between a first successful campaign of Sennacherib and a second and later unsuccessful expedition by the same monarch.<sup>3</sup> This theory met

<sup>1</sup> There is really no sufficient reason for assigning the story of the pestilence to the first narrative.

<sup>2</sup> Followed for a time by Professors Cheyne and Schrader.

<sup>3</sup> See G. Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 1862.



with opposition from Professor Schrader, and was supposed by critics generally to have been disproved, on the grounds that there is no space in the Biblical records for the second campaign, and that there was no word about it in the Assyrian annals.<sup>1</sup> Recently, however, some Assyrian evidence has appeared, which, though unfortunately not conclusive, points towards the fact of a second Palestine campaign by Sennacherib some years later than that of 701. This consists, *first*, of an allusion in the annals of Esarhaddon to a campaign by Sennacherib in northern Arabia.<sup>2</sup> As Esarhaddon repeated this, and continued its probable purpose by the invasion of Egypt, it was argued that Sennacherib himself had advanced from his Arabian conquests at least as far as the frontier of Egypt, and in support of this appeal was made to the Egyptian tradition of the Assyrian overthrow and retreat reported in Herodotus ii. 141, which calls Sennacherib "king of the Arabians and Assyrians," a title that implies his Arabian conquest. On those grounds Winckler has argued for a campaign in Palestine by Sennacherib after 690, of which the Biblical account is found in the record of the two narratives we have been discussing (2 Kings xix. 8-37)<sup>3</sup>; and has been supported by Hommel,<sup>4</sup> Benzinger,<sup>5</sup> Guthe,<sup>6</sup> and others.<sup>7</sup> *Second*: Last year Father Scheil<sup>8</sup> announced

<sup>1</sup> See also the arguments of Prof. Cheyne in *Introd. to the Bk. of Isaiah*, pp. 234 f.; and Prof. Rogers' *Hist.*, vol. ii., 203, n. 4. Cf. Meinhold, *Jesaja und seine Zeit*, ii. ff.

<sup>2</sup> In which he took the fortress of Adumu variously identified with Petra, and with Dumat in the Jöf (the Dumata of Pliny): cf. Duma of Isaiah xxi. 11.

<sup>3</sup> *Alt. Or. Untersuchungen*, 1889, esp. p. 259; *A. T. Untersuchungen*, 41 f.; *KAT*, 3rd ed., 1902, 272 f.

<sup>4</sup> Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, i., 1886.

<sup>5</sup> *Commentary on Kings*.

<sup>6</sup> *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*.

<sup>7</sup> Budge (*Hist. of Egypt*, vi. 149) says that the compiler of the Book of Kings has confused two sieges of Jerusalem: one when Shabataka was king of Egypt, and a second when Tirhaka was king.

<sup>8</sup> In the *Orient. Literaturzeitung*, 1904, 2. Cp. Weber's *Sanherib* in Heft 3 of "Der Alte Orient" for 1905.

the discovery of a fragment of Sennacherib's own annals, which imply that between 691 and 689 Sennacherib undertook, in consequence of a revolt of his western vassals encouraged by the activity of Tirhakah, a campaign westwards, but the fragment does not carry the progress of the campaign farther than N. Arabia. In this uncertain state the question must now be left pending the discovery of further evidence.

But meantime it may be pointed out how far the hypothesis of a second campaign by Sennacherib in Palestine suits the Biblical record. In the first place, before Father Scheil's discovery this second campaign was supposed to have taken place late in the eighties of the seventh century. But we now know that, whether or not the campaign extended to Palestine, it took place between 691 and 689, which would bring it within the possible extent of Hezekiah's reign and Isaiah's career. By that time, too, Tirhakah had certainly become lord of all Egypt—the most probable date for this event being, according to Egyptologists, 691. With all this are consistent the introduction of his name at the beginning of the second Biblical narrative, and the abstention of Sennacherib, in the letter which this narrative records, from all such emphasis as the Rabshakeh's speech lays upon the futility of Judah's hope of help from Egypt. Such hope was not futile now that Tirhakah was advancing. And, finally, if the second Biblical narrative refers to a campaign of Sennacherib in 690 or 689, it is more easy to understand why there was included in it a notice of Sennacherib's murder in 681, than if it refers to the campaign of 701, which was distant twenty years from that murder.

On the evidence then at present at our disposal, imperfect though it may be, the theory seems (on the whole) most probable that the first narrative refers to 701, the second

to a later campaign of Sennacherib about 690, and the late compilation of the two narratives would be sufficient explanation of their apparent reference to events following immediately upon one another during the same Assyrian campaign. But we must keep in mind that this is still only a hypothesis, and that it is not unattended by objections. I have space here only to speak of one of these. It is the first narrative which tells of Hezekiah's removal of the rural sanctuaries and centralization of the worship of Jahweh in Jerusalem. But the difficulty is to find a place or a sufficient motive for these before 701. They would most naturally fall after the devastation of the rural sanctuaries by Sennacherib's army in that year, and the unique inviolableness of the sanctuary in Jerusalem. The verse in the Rabshakeh's speech describing the reforms (2 Kings xviii. 22) has been very generally regarded as an interpolation. It is certainly out of place where it stands, and would be more in order after verse 24. But it may have belonged originally to the second narrative.

In any case, the causes of that addition of a great sacredness to Jerusalem, which becomes evident in the seventh century, are apparent. Isaiah had idealized the City and Temple; for some years he had insisted on the inviolableness of Zion. The Assyrian invasion of 701 had overrun the rest of Judah, more or less discrediting the influence, if not actually destroying the fabric, of the rural sanctuaries; and carrying off a very large number of their worshippers into captivity. And at least once in 701, and probably again eleven years later, Jerusalem had been wonderfully delivered from the investment and the further threatenings of Assyria.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.