

and Symmachus. Granted the spelling שׁמנ, the history of the corruption is easy to follow. The final ן became attached to the following radicals, and the ך of חדש was, as so often, read as ר: אחר was thus produced, and the remaining ש was naturally interpreted as the common late Hebrew (or Aramaic) equivalent for the relative אשר. The stages in the textual history were thus:—

- (1) שׁמ חדש LXX
- (2) שׁמנ חדש
- (3) שׁמ אחר ש
- (4) שׁמ אחר אשר M.T.

The LXX phrase is that contained in both texts in the parallel passage, Isa. lxii 2.

H. ST. J. THACKERAY.

THE PROPHECY IN ISAIAH IX 1-7.

(A reply to Dr Burney)

DR BURNEY in his criticism¹ of my article in *J. T. S.* vol. vii pp. 321 ff, entitled 'The Prophecy in Isaiah ix 1-7', makes some assertions which call for a reply.

In the first place it may be pointed out that a statement made in accordance with the opinion of one of the first Assyriologists in England, deliberately pronounced with reference to a case in point, would not usually be described as made 'on hearsay'. Since, however, the source of a statement is of small importance compared with its intrinsic probability, I may pass on to consider Dr Burney's remarks on this point. With reference to the word שׁננ, Dr Burney writes, 'It is not improbable that the word was ordinarily unused in Hebrew, and that Isaiah intentionally used the native word applied by the Assyrians to their military boots'. He maintains that 'šunu and שׁננ have no philological connexion whatsoever. The real Assyrian equivalent to שׁננ is the familiar šēnu'. And in a later footnote he says, 'Here I assume that the operation of the law which governed the interchange of vowels was constant, and that Isaiah, hearing šēnu (or more probably šēn) pronounced, would reproduce it, not indeed by שׁננ as pronounced by the Massorettes, but by its original form sa'n, which appears to have been the nearest Hebrew equivalent'.

¹ *J. T. S.* April 1910 p. 438 ff.

Here Dr Burney makes some assumptions which appear, to say the least, extremely arbitrary. In the face of such passages as Deut. xxviii 49, 2 Kings xviii 26 (leaving out of account the difficult passage Isa. xxviii 11), he asks us to believe that Isaiah not only possessed a knowledge of the Assyrian language, but a knowledge so extensive and intimate, that he was able to change an Assyrian word into the form which it would have possessed in Hebrew, if it had come down into the latter language from the speech of the parent Semitic stock. It is an absolutely unwarrantable assumption that a *loan-word*, taken over from living speech, would be so modified in the mouths of those who borrowed it. There are in modern English a number of words taken over from the French in recent times. Would it ever occur to any one to alter such words into the form which they would have had, if they had been brought over by William the Conqueror? If Isaiah himself was numbered among 'the students of Semitic philology', were the inhabitants of Jerusalem and the men of Judah generally equally enlightened? How were those who knew no Assyrian, and ordinarily, as Dr Burney thinks, did not use the root נָד , to know that when Isaiah said *sa'n*, or some such word, he meant the boot which the Assyrian soldiers called šēn ? Dr Burney, indeed, maintains that 'certain other words exist in Hebrew in which ד and not ב is the equivalent of Assyrian š , and that these all appear to be *loan-words* from the Assyrian or Babylonian'. But even on the assumption that this is correct, it does not prove that a Hebrew, hearing an Assyrian š , would necessarily reproduce it as an *s*. Moreover, we know that in the dialects of Palestine itself š and *s* were interchanged (cf. Judges xii 6). But the supposition that Isaiah reproduced an Assyrian šēn by *sa'n* does not concern the pronunciation of the sibilants only. How, we may ask, did the prophet know that šēn was derived ultimately from a root middle *aleph* and not middle *wāw*? Even if he knew the Assyrian equivalents of שָׁנָה and נָדָה , why should he suppose that every Assyrian ē should have arisen out of an *aleph* preceded by a short *a*? The author of Isa. xlvi 1, who may be supposed to have had a much more extensive acquaintance with Assyrian or Babylonian than Isaiah had, writes לֵבַי not לֵבַי . If, however, we might suppose, for the sake of argument, that Isaiah knew that the Assyrian boot was called *sānu* or *sūn*, there would be little difficulty in supposing that he assumed the identity of this word with the more familiar Aramaic שָׁנָה , which he might know in a literary form, and which would be recognized by many other people (cf. 2 Kings xviii 26). The evidence of Semitic philology is not therefore so conclusive as Dr Burney represents it.¹

¹ It is to be noticed that Dr Burney's assumption that נָדָה originally as written by Isaiah was pronounced *sa'n* requires us to suppose that the later form נָדָה was still later modified into נָדָה on the analogy of נָדָה for נָדָה . This artificial

But the exact derivation of נִנְדָּב is of little importance, since Dr Burney agrees with me that, like the Syriac ܢܝܢܕܐ , ܢܝܢܕܐ , to which it bears such a suspicious resemblance, it means *boot*. I may therefore pass on to consider Dr Burney's further remarks. It is satisfactory to find that he agrees with me that שׁוּל here means *noise*. But in discussing the meaning of the participle נִנְדָּב he is scarcely consistent. If, as he states, 'there exists in Assyrian a verb *šēnu* (another point of connexion with Isa. ix 4); and the passages in which it occurs seem to demand the sense *to put on boots or sandals* (as in Syriac and Ethiopic),' and if 'upon this analogy נִנְדָּב should mean "one wearing boots"', why cannot נִנְדָּב שׁוּלֵךְ mean, as I translate it, 'one noisily booted', i. e. one whose boots make a noise? Why, if the word שׁוּל be translated 'noise', 'must we conjecture that the verb נִנְדָּב can mean "to march in boots"?' If, as Dr Burney maintains, we are to think 'not of the tramp of a single soldier, but of the measured march of a well-disciplined army', the use of the singular is inexplicable. It must not be forgotten that Hebrew possesses a word which means 'to march'.

I may point out that I have never denied that the Assyrians wore boots. My assertion is that we have no proof that heavily-nailed boots, if they existed, 'were the ordinary equipment of the Assyrians, who in the eighth century B. C. are frequently represented as shod merely with a sort of sandal turned up at the heel or even barefoot'. I am acquainted with the representations of the soldiers of Sennacherib wearing boots half-way up the leg, to which Dr Burney refers. I do not, indeed, know of any as early as the time of Tiglath Pileser, though I do not deny the possibility that they may have been worn at this time; but even if this should prove to have been the case, it would not destroy the force of my contention that the boots of the Assyrian soldiers *in general* were not, as far as we know, sufficiently remarkable to be singled out from all their other equipment, in order to denote a soldier. I may again call attention to the fact that in a passage of which there is no reason to doubt the Isaianic authorship (v 27) the boot (or shoe) of the Assyrian is called a נַעֲלָ .

But inasmuch as I have never based my main argument for the Maccabæan date of Isa. ix 1-7 on the translation of $\text{נִנְדָּבֵי שׁוּלֵךְ}$, regarding the rendering of this phrase which I have adopted only as a further confirmation of what, I have maintained, can be established on shifting of the vowel, however, appears to belong to the Masoretic age, i. e. the age of the introduction of the vowel points, whereas in this case the *consonantal* spelling implies the pronunciation š'ôn .

¹ By boots which make a noise we must surely understand what would usually be described as *heavy boots*, boots with heavy soles. *Creaking boots* are surely not to be thought of! The epithet *noisy* certainly is more applicable to nailed soles than to soles composed simply of leather.

other grounds, I may pass on to Dr Burney's remarks about the history. In his opinion 'the most obvious explanation of the phrase, "the district of the nations"', is 'that this northern district was so named *from the time of Israel's earliest occupation of Canaan*, because the foreign element, from the first, largely predominated over the Israelite. Judges i 30-33 (J) claims no conquests for Zebulon, Asher, and Naphtali, but tells us, on the contrary, that they failed to expel the inhabitants of certain specified cities, and settled down among them. The same reference to this foreign element is found in חַרְשֵׁת הַגּוֹיִם, "Harosheth of the nations", mentioned as the home of Sisera in Judges iv 2, 13, 16; a locality which, whether it corresponds to the modern el-Haritiye, on the right bank of the lower Kishon, or is to be looked for further north, would in any case fall within the district denoted by הַגְּלִיל'. But unless Dr Burney maintains that Judges iv is older than 722 B.C., in which few modern students of the Old Testament will agree with him, this latter part of his argument is of no force. I am not aware that any one nowadays affirms that Galilee was ever Israelite to the same extent as, for example, Ephraim; but it is surely an unwarrantable assumption that all through the period of the Israelite monarchy the inhabitants of Galilee remained so distinct from those accounted Israelites that the region was known as 'the district of the nations'.

Dr Burney's explanation of the fact that Isaiah ignored the crushing blow which came upon Samaria in 722 is 'the relatively simple one that this had not occurred when he wrote'!

But if, as he maintains, this passage was composed by Isaiah *before* 722, what, we may well ask, was the great deliverance which the land had experienced? It will be generally admitted that an Imperfect with *Wāw* Consecutive is not the natural sequence after a Prophetic Perfect, but after an historic tense. The use of the Imperfect with *Wāw* Consecutive in וַיִּקְרָא and וַיִּתְּרֵי is an indication, as I have maintained (p. 336), that the Perfects which these words follow are *real* Perfects, that is, *they relate to events already accomplished*. The natural inference from the use of the tenses is that the writer *looks back at those actions expressed by the Perfects*, and forward to their effects still future. To what great light given to the inhabitants of Galilee did Isaiah *look back* at some date before 722? What had then happened which could be described as the breaking of the yoke of the oppressor, and which led to the hope that the equipment of the foreign soldiers would be burnt? Who, we may well ask, is the 'son' that *had already been given* to the nation? If, on Dr Burney's hypothesis of the date of this passage, Isaiah had Hezekiah in view, and if Hezekiah had already succeeded to the throne, which is doubtful, there is yet no evidence that the Assyrian empire was shaken by his succession, nor is there the faintest

hint in the Old Testament or elsewhere that between 734 and 722 anything happened which would have led Isaiah to imagine that his country *had actually recovered independence*.

R. H. KENNETT.

FOUR AND SEVEN AS DIVINE TITLES.

THE following conclusions were reached after an investigation of the meaning of the name *Ḳiriath-Arba'*, which is stated (Gen. xxiii 2, xxxv 27; Joshua xiv 15, xv 13, 54, xx 7, xxi 11 all P; Judges i 10 R^p) to have been the ancient name of Hebron. In the main they have already been anticipated by Prof. Winckler¹; but since I fail to find even a bare allusion to such an explanation in recent works which deal with the interpretation of *Ḳiriath-Arba'*, it seems worth while to state the arguments which appear to me to offer a practical demonstration of the meaning of this name, as also of others.

Ignoring, as we may do, the conjecture of the priestly writer that *Arba'* was 'the greatest man among the *'Anākim*' (Joshua xiv 15), or 'the father of *'Anāḳ*' (Joshua xv 13, xxi 11),² we naturally interpret *Ḳiriath Arba'* as 'City of Four'. Modern commentators exhibit a unanimity in explaining this enigmatic title as Tetrapolis, fourfold city, or city of four kindred or confederate tribes. Dr Skinner, in his recent commentary on Genesis, even goes so far as to say that 'the name means "four cities"'. Such an explanation is purely conjectural, and lacks the support of a particle of evidence. I cannot help thinking that, in adopting it, scholars have been influenced consciously or unconsciously, by the possibility that the name Hebron may denote 'league' or 'association'. Yet the fact that the city formerly called *Ḳiriath Arba'* was afterwards renamed Hebron should tell in favour of diversity, rather than similarity, of meaning in the two names.

In thinking over the problem, the first idea that occurred to me was a comparison of the Assyrian Arbela between the Upper and the Lower

¹ *Geschichte Israels* ii pp. 39 ff.

² Prof. Moore has shewn that the original text in each of these passages was probably 'the metropolis (𐤀𐤍) of *'Anāḳ*', which was altered owing to later misunderstanding: *Judges* p. 25.