## NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

Lecture I. Note 1, p. 4. — With all its defects, the Federal theology of Cocceius is the most important attempt, in the older Protestant theology, to do justice to the historical development of revelation. See Diestel's essay in Jahrb. f. d, Theol., vol. x. pp. 209-276, and the briefer discussion in his Geschichte des Alten Testamentes in der christlichen Kirche (Jena, 1869). The first conception, however, of the Bible record as the history of true religion, of the adoption and education of the Church from age to age in a scheme of gradual advance, appears pretty distinctly in Calvin; and the method of Calvinistic theology, in which all parts of the plan of grace are considered in dependence on the idea of the sovereign Divine Providence, made it natural for theologians of his school to busy themselves with the demonstration of the historical continuity of revelation. So long, however, as it was attempted to find the law of this continuity by speculative and dogmatic methods rather than by ordinary historical investigation, no result really satisfactory could be reached. In this connection a reference may be added to the History of Redemption of Jonathan Edwards.

Note 2, p. 5. — In illustration of the position taken up by the older Protestant divines, I may refer to Witsius's treatment of the Protevangelion, Gen. iii. 14 seq., in his OEconomia Foederum, lib. iv., cap. 1. After deducing from the words addressed to the serpent the principal theses of systematic theology, including the doctrines of Saving Faith, Sanctification, and the Resurrection of the body, he remarks (§ 26) that it was not unreasonable that so large a range of doctrines should be summed up in a, few enigmatic words. The splendour of midday was not appropriate to the first dawn of the day of grace; "and besides, God did not even then withdraw revelations of Himself from our first parents, but by frequent instruction and gracious illumination of their minds expounded to them the things that concern faith and piety. And it is fair to suppose that they treasured up this promise of salvation in particular, thought over it with care, and expounded it in frequent discourse to one another and their children." In other words, they received from the Revealer, and handed down to their posterity, a traditional exposition of the words of Scripture.

Note 3, p. 13. — The great empires of the East overran foreign countries, reducing them to subjection, or even transplanting their inhabitants to new seats, but made no attempt to break down differences of national custom between the several parts of their realm, or to assimilate the conquered peoples to a single cosmopolitan type. The motley character of the great Persian empire, for example, is strikingly illustrated in the picture drawn by Herodotus (vii. 61 seq.) of the various contingents that served in the army of Xerxes, each in its own national garb. In contrast with the earlier empires **the kingdom of the Greeks appears to the prophet Daniel, as "diverse from all kingdoms, devouring the whole earth, treading it down, and breaking it in pieces"** (Dan. vii.). And so King Antiochus, who sought to Hellenise his subjects, is spoken of as "changing times and laws " (Ibid. ver. 25). But the first thoroughgoing and successful attempt to create an empire possessing an organic unity, with a cosmopolitan civilisation and institutions displacing the old varieties of local custom and law, was the monarchy of Caesar. See Mommsen's History, bk. v. ch. 11.

Note 4, p. 19. — A large mass of translations from Assyrian and Babylonian texts is now accessible to the English reader, in numerous separate publications, such as those of the late G. Smith, in the Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, and in the somewhat unequal but very

convenient collection published by Messrs. Bagster under the title of Records of the Past. In this collection the volumes with odd numbers (i. to xi.) contain the Assyrian texts. **There can be no question that the sense of a great many texts, especially simple historical narratives, has been determined with sufficient certainty to afford the greatest assistance in the study of the Bible history**; and most fortunately the Assyrian chronology, as determined in particular by the Eponym Canon (supra, p. 150), is one of the most certain as it is one of the most important of the new discoveries. But, on the other hand, many details even of historical texts are too imperfectly understood to justify the large conclusions too often built on them, and, above all, **the reading and identification of proper names in certain ways of writing them — for in Assyrian character the same sounds may be written in different ways, and the same character may have different sounds — are often highly precarious.** The doubts that still attach to many things which have been accepted, often on the faith of a single Assyriologist who does not himself distinguish his facts from his conjectures, have been very forcibly set forth, though perhaps with an extreme of scepticism, by Prof. v. Gutschmid in his Neue Beitrage, Leipzig, 1876, and a more popular demonstration of the amount of uncertainty still attaching to the translations of historical texts will be found in the recent brochure of M. A. Delattre, Les inscriptions historiques de Ninive et de Babylone (Paris, 1879). **In truth, there are few Assyriologists in Europe whose tact, caution, and general knowledge of the Semitic dialects entitle them to speak with authority upon problems far more difficult than those, for example, of the Phoenician inscriptions, where our best orientalists are often not ashamed to confess themselves at a loss. The very nature of the material often compels the translator to guess at the general import of a mutilated text or at the true sense of a word.** It is fair, indeed, to remember that the vast extent of the material now available and the great sameness of style and expression which characterises Assyrian historical documents often counterbalance these difficulties. As regards the application of Assyrian results to the Old Testament, it is too often forgotten that **the fruits of Assyrian study can be of no substantial use to the Biblical student except in connection with a critical study of the Hebrew sources.**

As I am not able to make independent use of the cuneiform monuments, I do not venture to build upon them in the present volume except where the sense seems to be thoroughly made out by the consent of the best scholars.

Note 5, p. 23. — On the Hittites see Mr. Cheyne's article in the ninth edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. On the identification of Carchemish with the modern Jirbas (Yakut ii. 688) — that is, the Syriac Agropos, Greek Εὐρωπός, Ὡρωπός — see G. Hoffmann, Syrische Akten Persischer Martyrer (1880), p. 161 seq.; Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? (1881), p. 265 seq. The name Ierabolus given by some travellers is false. The town lay on the west side of the Euphrates opposite Der Kinnisre. The passage of Stephanas Byzantius, quoted by Hoffmann, which says that Oropus was formerly called Τελμησσός, presumably תל מוש, not only confirms the identification with Carchemish, but shows that the latter is a Semitic word, "castle of Mish."

Note 6, p. 26. — See Wellhausen, Jahrb. f.d. Theol., vol. xxi. p. 602; Meyer in Stade's Zeitschrift, vol. i. p. 122; Stade, Geschichte, p. 110. An essay by Steinthal, Z. f. Volkerpsychologie, vol. xii. p. 267, is referred to by the last two writers.

Note 7, p. 28. — See especially Wellhausen, De Gentibus et Familiis Judaeis, Gott., 1870, and Geschichte, vol. i. p. 225 seq., for the analysis of the genealogy of the originally nomad elements of Judah, the Hezronites. The great clan of the Kalibbites (Caleb) belonged to this branch of the population of Southern Judaea. For the Amalekites and their original connection with Mt. Ephraim, see Judges v. 14; xii. 15; Noldeke, Ueber die Amalekiter, u.s.w., Gott, 1864.

Note 8, p. 29. — As we shall hear of these routes again in connection with the history of Judah, I may here refer to Pliny's account of the great incense road from Thomna to Gaza (H. X. xii. 14), and the discussion in Sprenger's Alte Geographie Arabiens, Bern, 1875, p. 141 seq. On this inland route the Edomite capital of Petra was a station. **The incense trade, it must be remembered, was of enormous importance in ancient times from the use of frankincense in all temples.**

Note 9, p. 29. — The land of Goshen did not belong to the Delta proper, which never can have been given up to a shepherd tribe, and would not have suited their way of life. In all ages nomadic or half nomadic tribes, quite distinct from the Egyptians proper, have pastured their flocks on the verge of the rich lands of the Delta. The Eastern shepherd or herdsman does not base his conception of good pasture ground on anything like an English meadow, and it is not necessary to suppose that the south-eastern borders of the Delta were much more fertile in the days of Moses than they are now. That the Israelites at this time came under any considerable influence of Egyptian civilisation must appear highly improbable to any one who knows the life of the nomads of Egypt even in the present day, when there is a large Arab element in the settled population. **It is impossible here to enter into details on the supposed traces of Egyptian culture and religion in the institutions of Israel; but it may safely be affirmed that they are far fewer than is often stated, and that those which are beyond question cannot be traced back to the oldest times, and may with great probability be held to have come in for the most part, not from Egypt direct, but through the Phoenicians.**

Note 10, p. 29. — The important assistance rendered to Israel by the Kenites comes out clearly in the oldest parts of the Pentateuchal narrative. Compare Exod. xviii. and Num. x, 29 seq., with Judges i. 16; iv. 11; 1 Sam, xv. 6.

Note 11, p. 29. — The classical passage in this connection is Judges i.; comp. Josh, xviii. 14 seq.; Judges xvii. 1 seq. See especially Graf, Der Stamm Simeon, Meissen, 1866.

Note 12, p. 30. — On the stone of Dibon, which records the victories of King Mesha (2 Kings iii.) over the Israelites, we read that he slew the whole inhabitants of Nebo, seven thousand in number, for they were devoted by the ban to Ashtar-Kamosh — a deity related to the god Chemosh, who is repeatedly mentioned in the Bible.

Note 13, p. 34, — See The Old Testament in the Jewish Church (1881), especially Lectures xi. and xii. It may be convenient to repeat that the three main masses of legislation still distinguishable in the Pentateuch are — (1) The Book of the Covenant, as it is generally called, Exod. xxi.-xxiii., a primitive legislation designed for a very simple state of agricultural society, and corresponding in its precepts with the traces of the actual usage and law of Israel found in the history of the age of the Judges and the earlier monarchy. (2) The Deuteronomic Code, Deut. xii.-xxvi,, in which the laws of the Book of the Covenant are recast with special reference to the limitation of ritual

worship to a single sanctuary. This limitation is introduced as a new thing. It was unknown up to the time of Isaiah and Hezekiah, but was formally accepted as law when the Deuteronomic code was promulgated as binding in the great reformation of the reign of Josiah. The code must have been written between this date (B.C. 621 or 622) and the reforms which Hezekiah adopted after the retreat of Sennacherib in B.C. 701 (see Lect. viii.). (3) The Priestly or Levitical Legislation, composed after the book of Ezekiel and adopted as the law of the New Jerusalem (in conjunction with the rest of the Pentateuch) under Ezra, B.C. 445. See Neh. viii. seq.

Note 14, p. 35. — The main passage for the way in which Moses organised the administration of justice in Israel is Exod. xviii. Compare O. T. in Jewish Church, p. 334.

Note 15, p. 36. — **"Every Arab tribe," says Burckhardt, "has its chief sheikh, and every camp is headed by a sheikh, or at least by an Arab of some consideration; but the sheikh has no actual authority over the individuals of his tribe. . . Should a dispute happen between two individuals the sheikh will endeavour to settle the matter; but if either party be dissatisfied with his advice he cannot insist upon obedience. The Arab can only be persuaded by his own relations; and if they fail war commences between the two families and all their kindred respectively. . . , In fact the most powerful Aeneze chief dares not inflict a trifling punishment on the poorest man of his tribe without incurring the risk of mortal vengeance from the individual and his relations. The prerogative of the sheikhs consists in leading their tribe against the enemy; in conducting negotiations for peace or war; in fixing the spot for encampments; in entertaining strangers of note, etc., and even these privileges are much limited."** — Bedouins and Wahahys, 8vo ed., p. 11 5 seq.

Note 16, p. 39. — See O. T. in Jewish Church, p. 225 seq., p. 257 and note (Shechem in the time of Abimelech was a Canaanite town), p. 78 seq.; and infra, Lect ii. note 6.

**Lecture II.**

Note 1, p. 47. — On the one hand, the great Phoenician trading cities, with the usual jealousy of commercial monopolists, were little disposed to form a close and equal union with any outside their own circle. Nor were they disposed to warlike operations to extend their territory. Carthage, it will be remembered, neither made the natives Carthaginians nor even sought to make them subjects till a comparatively late date. See Mommsen's History of Rome, bk. iii. chap. 1. The jealousy and political inertness of the Phoenicians had two results. It long prevented the Hebrews from becoming a trading people, and so saved them from rapid social changes which would greatly have endangered their old life and religion; and, on the other hand, it left them free to deal as they could with the Canaanites of the interior. Even in the interior the Canaanites continued to be the trading class, and, as the Hebrews occupied the land, became more and more exclusively traders. Between traders and cultivators of the soil there was a natural class-antagonism, which no doubt helped to maintain the distinct character of Israel. On the other hand, the Israelites of the frontier, in Judah and beyond the Jordan in Gilead, evidently retained not a little of the ancient nomad habits, and in part were closely allied with other tribes of the wilderness. Thus we find from time to time expressions of that characteristic distaste for the ease and luxuries of settled life which belongs to the genuine Bedouin, The Nazarite vow against drinking wine and the laws of the Rechabites are

cases in point. And the Rechabites, like the Nazarites, were on the side of the old Jehovah worship, and against the Canaanite Baal.

Note 2, p. 47. — **That the institution of the kingship was a necessary step in the development of national unity, and therefore also in the progress of the religion of Jehovah, is often overlooked under the too exclusive influence of 1 Sam.** viii.; x. 17-27; xii. But it is always a mistake to estimate the real significance of events in ancient history by the speeches — never literally reported and often used as a convenient and, on ancient literary methods, legitimate vehicle for reflections of a later age influenced by changed circumstances — which are now interwoven with the context of the narrative, instead of allowing ourselves to be guided by the historical context of events; and as a matter of fact **no one can doubt that the institution of the kingship was a great blessing to Israel, putting an end to the state of anarchy which the book of Judges justly represents as most unfavourable to religious progress.** Nor is it less clear that Israel from the first recognised this blessing as a special gift of Jehovah, who sanctioned the kingship by bestowing His spirit on the king (1 Sam. X. 6; xvi. 13). **In the Blessing of Moses the kingship is represented as the crowning gift of Jehovah, by which the branches of the nation and the tribes of Jacob were united together** (Deut. xxxiii. 5). Modern criticism has made all this much more plain by pointing out that there are two distinct but parallel accounts of the choice of Saul, the older version being preserved in 1 Sam. ix.; x. 1-16; xi. (omitting v. 14). After his unction Saul returns to his father's house, awaiting the opportunity indicated in x. 7; after about a month (so the LXX. in xi. 1), this opportunity arises in the invasion of Nahash, and the sovereignty which Saul had assumed on this occasion in virtue of a divine impulse (xi. 6), is solemnly confirmed after the victory. The detailed proof of the separate character and greater antiquity of this form of the narrative may be found in Bleek's Einleitung, 4th ed., by Wellhausen, p. 210 seq., with which compare the corresponding discussion in Wellhausen's Text der Bucher Samuelis. It is to be noted that the attacks on Samuel so current in the older sceptical school (see, for example, Volney's Histoire de Samuel), derive their whole plausibility from the one-sidedness of the current uncritical treatment of the history.

Note 3, p. 50. — The English reader will find an account of this celebrated monument, now in the Louvre, and the translation of the inscription which it bears, in an article [by Professor W. Wright of Cambridge], printed in the North British Review, October 1870, or in Dr. Ginsburg's Moabite Stone (2d ed 1871), where an account is also given of the literature of the subject. Dr. Ginsburg's version is reprinted in Records of the Past, vol. xi. . p. 165. See also Dr. A. B. Davidson in the B. and F. Ev. Review, 1871.

Note 4, p. 51. — The history of this celebrated monument and a list of the literature connected with it are to be found in the Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, pars I., tom, i., p. 1 seq. (Paris 1881). The inscription dates from the Persian period.

Note 5, p. 53. — On tithes in antiquity outside Israel see the essays of Selden and Hottinger, Spemer, Leg, Rit. Heb., lib. iii. c. 10; "Winer, s.v. "Zehnten," Ewald, Alterthumer, p. 398 (Eng. tr., p. 300); Knobel on Lev. xxvii. 30 seq. **The practice of paying tithes to the gods was widely diffused, both in the form in which it appears in Gen. xiv. 20, where tithes are paid from booty (which in Greece was the commonest case), and in the shape of a regular tribute on the products of agriculture, trade, or the like.** It is sufficient for the present purpose to indicate the

prevalence and scope of tithes among Semitic nations or in regions of Semitic influence. **Here it is to be noted first that tithes were paid to the king** (as in 1 Sam. viii.) according to the ancient Babylonian law revived under Alexander (Aristot. (Econ., ii. p. 1352 b of the Berlin ed.; comp. p. 1345 seq.). Next, as regards tithes to the gods, it is attested by Diodorus, xx. 14, that **the Carthaginians as a Tyrian colony paid tithes to the Tyrian sun-god Melkarth or Herakles**, the divine king of the city; and in like manner **Hercules was the god to whom the Romans paid tithes**(Diodor., iv. 21; Plut., Mor. ii. 267 E; compare the authorities collected by "Wyttenbach in his index to Plut., Mor. s.v. Ἡρακλῆς). Among the Arabs of the frankincense country tithes of this product were paid to the priests of the sun-god Sabis (Plin. xii. 32). Among the Arabs, says the scholiast to Harith (Moal, ed, Arnold, p. 186), "men used to vow" — just as Jacob vowed at Bethel — "If God gives me a hundred sheep I will sacrifice one in every ten." The discharge of this vow was not enforced, and often "his soul grudged what he had vowed, and he would hunt a gazelle and substitute it for the sheep that were due" (cf. Mai. i. 14). The tax on the produce of their mines paid by the Siphnians at Delphi (Hdt. iii. 57; Pausan. x. 11.2) may be plausibly ascribed to Phoenician influence, and tithes are also an institution in various parts of Asia Minor, where we know the influence of Semitic religion to have been very great; e.g., in Lydia there was a tithe on cattle (Nic. Damasc. in Muller's Fragm. Hist. Gr., iii. 371). The mention of the Kabiri also speaks for a Semitic element in the sacrifice of tithes or first-fruits — note the connection of the two ideas — by the Pelasgi mentioned by Dion. Hal., A. R. i. 23.

Note 6, p. 56. — In the oldest legislation (Exod. xxiii. 14 seq.; xxxiv. 18 seq.) the three annual feasts are (1) the feast of unleavened bread, (2) the feast of harvest, (3) the feast of ingathering (of autumn fruits). The two first mark the beginning and end of the corn-harvest; compare Deut. xvi. 9; Lev. xxiii. 10. Thus the agricultural reference of all these feasts is clear, and they are to be compared with similar agricultural festivals and offerings of first-fruits among other ancient nations. **Pliny, for example, says of the ancient Romans that they would not even taste the new corn or wine till the priests had tasted the first-fruits** (H. N. xviii. 2) and — to take an instance from Semitic races — a feast of first-fruits in the month of May was celebrated according to En-Nedim by the heathen Harranians (Chwolson, Ssabier, ii. 25; Fihrist, ed. Flugel, p.322). See Spencer, Op. cit. lib. iii. cap. 8, 9. To trace correspondences in detail between the Hebrew feasts and those of the surrounding nations is not so easy. **The occasions of the Hebrew festivals are those naturally suggested by the course of the seasons of husbandry, while at an early date we find among their neighbours feasts determined rather by astronomical considerations, and having reference to the worship of the heavenly bodies; such, for example, as the Tyrian feast of the awakening of the sun** (Herakles), Jos. Ant., viii. 5, 3. This feast, however, is said to have been feast instituted by Hiram, and **it is probable that in general agricultural festivals were older than astronomical ones.** Thus, in Judges ix. 27 we find a Canaanite vintage feast corresponding to the Hebrew feast of ingathering, which in the early books appears as the principal yearly feast, or at least as the pilgrimage feast, when men had leisure to visit distant shrines (1 Kings xii. 32). Ewald (Ant, E. T. p. 351, comp. Z.f.d. Kunde des Morgenlandes, iii. 419), who conjectures that a spring and an autumn feast were known to the Hebrews before the time of Moses, points to the fact that according to the scholion cited in last note, the Arabs paid tithes in the month Rajab, and that the Arabs had of old two sacred months — Moharram, the first month from autumn, and Eajab, the seventh. See, however, Sprenger in Z. D. M. G., 1859, p. 134 seq.; Leben Mohammed's, iii. 516 seq.; Dozy, Israeliten te Mekka, p. 138, from which it will be seen that there is still considerable obscurity about the holy seasons of**the heathen Arabs**. The ancient holiness of

Rajab as a sacrificial season (see Lane s.v.) is the best established point, and as this month corresponds to the Hebrew Nisan, the sacrifices then offered may be taken as a probable parallel to the paschal sacrifices of the Hebrews.

**That there were great similarities in the method of celebration between the feasts of the Hebrews and their heathen neighbours is clear from the Bible, especially from the undoubted fact of the admixture of elements of Baal worship with the service of Jehovah.** The custom of holding feasts in tents or booths (Hosea xii. 9) reappears in the Babylonian Sacoea and elsewhere in the East; see Movers, Phoenizier, i. 483 seq. Again, the Hebrew technical term עצרה reappears in the worship of the Tyrian Baal, 2 Kings x. 20. The description of Syrian festivals given by Posidonius (Muller, Fragmenta, iii. 258), the copious eating and drinking, the portions carried home, the noisy music, recalls forcibly what we read of the Hebrew feasts (1 Sam. i. 14; 2 Sam. vi. 19; Lam. ii. 7, etc.).

**In addition to the great yearly feasts, Hosea ii. 13 specially designates the Sabbath and the New Moon as occasions of festal joy.** The latter of these was also a sacred season among the Phoenicians celebrated by special offerings, Corp. Inscr. Sem., pars i. cap. 2, No. 86. The Sabbath, on the other hand, as a day of joy, stands in marked contrast to the unlucky seventh day of the Babylonians, on which see Sayce in Records of the Past, i. 164; vii. 157 seq. The relation, of the Hebrew Sabbath to the planetary week of the Babylonians, in which the seventh day is connected with Saturn, is still far from clear. The week is perhaps originally nothing else than the fourth part of a lunation. Thus among the Harranians, if we may believe En-Nedim, four days in each month were suitable for sacrifices, and to these belonged the new moon, the first quarter, and the twenty-eighth day. (Chwolson, ii. 8; Fihrist, ed. Fl., 319.)

Note 7, p. 56. — The literature of the sacrificial tablet of Marseilles is cited, and the inscription itself published with a commentary in Schroder's Phoninische Sprache, p. 237 seq,. It contains an account of the dues in money or in parts of the victim to be paid to the priest for every kind of sacrifice. A fragment of a similar tablet from Carthage may be found in the same work, or in Davis, Carthage and her Remains, p. 296 seq.

Note 8, p. 57. — See in particular the inscription of Iehawmelek (C. I. S., p. i. cap. 1. Art. 1, where the king records the erection of a brazen altar, of golden chased work, and of a portico and columns. The aspect of a Phoenician temple, with its court and portico and a lofty obelisk or sun-pillar, is best seen on the coin of Byblus, figured ibid. p. 6, and in Renan's Miss, de Phenicie, p. 177. The brazen altar recurs in the Sardo trilinguis (Schroder, p. 249; Levy, Phon. Stud., iii. 40). **The palm-tree or palm-branch found among the temple ornaments is one of the commonest of Phoenician symbols.** See, for example, the woodcuts in Renan's Mission, p. 651 seq.; the woodcut from Yarun, Survey of Western Palestine, i. 259, and the coins figured by Schroder, Plate xviii. 10-14. Compare further Old Test, in J. Ch., p. 248 and note 2 there. For the classes of ministers in a Phoenician sanctuary, see 0. I. S., No. 86.

Note 9, p. 57. — See Old Test, in J. Ch, p. 285 and note 4 there.

Note 10, p. 62. — The ancient exegesis of Exod. iii. 14 flowed in two main channels. The Hellenistic tradition, attaching itself to the rendering of the

LXX., ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν . . . ὁ ὢν ἀπέσταλκέ με, finds the meaning of the ineffable name in the absolute being and aseity of God; the Palestinian tradition, on the other hand, understands the name of God's eternity and immutability. The former view is untenable on linguistic grounds, for the Hebrew substantive verb has not the sense of metaphysical entity, and the imperfect אהיה does not mean I am, but I will be [something]. This the Palestinian exegesis recognised (Aq., Theod.), and, taking the verb, not in the abstract metaphysical sense of the Hellenistic interpretation, but in the simpler sense of actuality (Daseyn), which it certainly has, at least in later Biblical Hebrew, they seem to have got the notion of eternity by rendering I will be in existence, I will not cease to be. In that case the whole clause must be rendered [My name is] I will be, [that is] I who will be. As A. ben Ezra puts it, אהיה אשר is an explanatory apposition to אהיה. This view of the grammatical structure of the clause has been recently supported by Mr. W. A. Wright (Jour. PhiL, iv. 70) and Wellhausen (Z.f.d. Th., xxi. 540), who, however, do not object to retain the present tense, which I think is impossible in such a connection and with the substantive verb. For my own part, I doubt if even the notion of actuality, as we find it in the Hebrew of Ecclesiastes, can be given to the substantive verb in such an early passage. The sense of אהיה is not so much I exist or I will exist as will be it — an incomplete predication. On this view the predication, incomplete in the simple יהוה or אהיה, is completed in the fuller אהיה אשר אהיה. This clause may certainly be grammatically rendered Be I what I may — a view adopted and grammatically justified with his usual wealth of illustration by Lagarde, Psalt. Hieron., p. 156 seq. To the passages from various languages which he cites — the Biblical ones are Gen. xliii. 14; 1 Sam. i. 24; xxiii. 13; 2 Sam. xv. 20; Zech. X. 8; Ezek. xii. 25 — I add in illustration of the idiom, Deut. ix. 25; Exod. iv. 13; xvi. 23; xxxiii. 19; Esther iv. 16; Mishna, Shab. xiv. 4 אם נתרפא נתרפא; Freytag, Prov. Ar., i. 339, No. 212, Ujlus heith tajlus; Tabary, iii. 93, 1. 3, qataltu man qataltu. The great difficulty in the view of Professor Lagarde, and indeed in almost every view except that of A. ben Ezra, is that the meaning of the full אהיה אישר אהיה disappears in the shorter form אהיה or יהוה, the whole clause being essential to the sense. In a paper in Brit, and For. Ev. Rev., Jan. 1876, I proposed to meet this difficulty by following out the hint given by R. Jehuda Hallevy (Kusari, ed. Cassel, p. 304), who explains אהיה to mean " I will be present to them when they seek me," and appeals to ver. 12, "I will be with thee," in support of this interpretation. In truth this divine I will be rings through the whole Bible in varying form (Gen. xxvi. 3; Josh. i. 6: Judges vi. 16; Jer. xxiv. 7; Zech. ii. 5 [9]; viii. 8, etc.) Is there not a presumption that this oft-repeated I will be is akin to the אהיה of ver. 14, and that the latter must also mean, not I will exist, but I will he — something which lies implicitly on the mind of him who uses the name? In this case it is possible with R. Jehuda and A. ben Ezra to take the אשר אהיה as an apposition, but it seems more reasonable to think that the added אשר אהיה, I will be what I will be, expresses more distinctly the fact that the predicate is vague. The construction, in fact, is in principle analogous to the well-known idiom שָׁמַע הַשְׁמֵע to express the indefinite subject. The relative clause is without emphasis — as appears from the parallels cited above, and the sense is not that God reserves for His own arbitrium to determine what He will be, but simply that what He will be to His people He will be, will approve Himself to

be, without fail. The vagueness is inevitable, for no words can sum up all that Jehovah will be to His people; it is enough for them to know that He will be it (comp. Isa. Ixiv. 3; Lam. iii. 23). On this view the clause is exactly parallel to Exod. xxxiii, 19, which does not mean that God will choose the objects of His grace arbitrarily, but that to those to whom He is gracious — who they are is left vague — He will be gracious. I am disposed to think that this exegesis of the passage is as old as Hosea iii. 9, where the words, "I will not be for you," seem to be chosen in direct contrast to the promise, "I will save Judah in the quality of Iahwe their God." It must of course be remembered that Exod. iii. 14 does not give the original sense of the name Iahwe, which is still obscure (O. T. in J. Ch., p. 423; compare Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? p. 158 seq., and the reply of Tiele, Theol.Tijd, 1882, p. 262 seq.), but an adaptation of the name, so that we need not be surprised to find a little awkwardness in the expression.

Note 11, p. 64. — This monument may now be seen in the Louvre. "Let them," says Eshmunazar, have no bed with the shades, and let them not be buried in a grave, nor let there be to them son or seed in their stead, and let the holy gods deliver them into the hand of a powerful kingdom . . let them have no root downward or fruit upward (comp. Isa. xxxvii. 31), nor any comeliness among the living under the sun." — C. I. S., ut supra, No. 3. **The Authorised Version of the Bible unfortunately obliterates the characteristic ideas of the "underworld" (Sheol) and the "shades" (Rephaim).** In Isa. xiv. 9, for example, the former word is rendered "hell," and the latter "dead."

Note 12, p. 72.— A reference may here he added to the latest discussion of the derivatives of the root CDK by Prof. Kantzsch of Tubingen (Festeinladung, 6 Marz 1881), who concludes that the fundamental idea of the root is conformity to a norm. Even this, perhaps, is too wide, and does not lay sufficient weight on the distinctly forensic element which the author recognises as preponderant in the earlier Hebrew writings. The roots צדק and ריטע are correlatives, and ought to be taken together. All the other uses of the derivatives of CDK may, I think, lie traced from the primitive forensic sense; but the more complex developments belong to a later period than that covered by the present volume. Prof. Kantzsch is certainly right in declining to start from the very doubtful considerations of etymology often put in the front, and especially from the obscure Arabic phrase rumh cadq.

Note 13, p. 7 5. — The Biblical narrative is here supplemented by the "Moabite Stone" erected by King Mesha.

Note 14, p. 79. — The sources for the history of Elijah are not all of one date, and do not all reproduce with equal immediacy the aspect in which his work presented itself to his contemporaries. See Wellhausen's edition of Bleek's Einleitung, and the article Kings, Books of, in the forthcoming volume of the Encyclopaedia Britannica.

Note 15, p. 81. — In Hosea vi. 5 for משפטיך אור read with LXX. כמשפטי באור.

Note 16, p. 84. — On wine and wine-drinking among the Arabs before Islam, see especially I. Guidi, Delia Sede primitiva dei popoli Semitici (Rome, 1879), p. 43 seq. **Like all barbarians, the Arabs were fond enough of getting drunk**, but wine was a foreign and costly luxury, and the opposition to its use found distinguished advocates before Mohammed. Among the Nabataeans of

the Syrian desert, according to Diodorus (xix. 94, 3), it was a law neither to sow nor to plant any fruit-bearing plant, nor to use wine, nor to construct a house, and death was the penalty of disobedience. See also Ammianus, xiv. 4.

Note 17, p. 85. — See G. Hoffman, Verhandlungen der Kirchenversammlung zu Ephesus, etc., Kiel, 1873, p. 89; **"bar naggare is not the son of a carpenter, but a carpenter as member of the incorporation." The current notion that the prophets were not a guild is derived from too exclusive attention to the prophets of the school that arose with Amos and expressly disclaimed connection with the established guilds. In Jerusalem, as we see from Jeremiah, the prophets were under a certain official control on the part of the priests.**

Note 18, p. 86. — The etymological sense of the Hebrew nabi is much disputed. It must be observed that there is nothing in extant Hebrew literature by which it can be determined, for Exod. iv. 16; vii. 1; Jer. xv. 19, cannot be taken as giving the meaning of the word, or as proving that it ever meant a speaker or interpreter in general, but only as evidence how the function of the prophet in relation to God was conceived among the Israelites. Nabi, in the Old Testament, always has the technical sense of a prophet, and the other derivatives of the root (nibba and hithnabbe, prophesy) are denominatives formed from nabi. The word, in short, has no root in Hebrew of the historical period, and we must suppose either that it has survived from very remote antiquity or that it is a loan word. It is not, however, like kohen, "priest," a common Semitic term; the other Semitic dialects have certainly borrowed it from the Hebrews (Noldeke, Gesch, d. Qorans, p. 1). Thus it belongs to an isolated sphere of Semitic religious life; and as the Nebi'im were common to Israel and the worshippers of Baal, while according to I Sam. ix. 9 nabi superseded the old Hebrew term ro'eh after the time of Samuel, it is hardly likely that the word is older than the settlement of the Hebrews in Canaan. This circumstance, taken with the fact that the root is not otherwise found in Hebrew, certainly favours the view of several recent inquirers that the name is of Canaanite origin. In this case the etymology becomes comparatively unimportant, and in any case the origin of the name lies too remote from the historical development of Hebrew prophecy to be of value in illustration of the conception of a prophet among the Israelites.

As regards the meaning of the root, it is hardly doubtful that the ultimate stem is NB with the notion of protrusion (Fleischer in Delitzsch's Genesis, 4th ed. p. 552), and so the Taj el 'Arus (i. 131) remarks that naba'a 'ala, in the sense of hajama watala'a, is interchangeable with nabaha and naba'a. But this fundamental idea not only divided itself under a variety of triliteral roots; the root naba'a itself, according to the Arabic lexicographers, has very various meanings, among which it is difficult to find one that can be regarded as central. **Thus, when Kuenen (Onderzoek, ii. 3; comp. Godsdienst, chap. iii. note, and Prophets, p. 42) selects the notion of bubbling up, and regards the prophet as one who bubbles up under inspiration, this hypothesis has no more value than that of a guess guided by the particular development of the root idea found in** נבך **and** נבע**. The most interesting etymological question is whether nabi may not originally mean simply a "speaker" or "herald" of God. This view is supported mainly from the Arabic by Ewald (Propheten, i. 7), Fleischer (ut supra), and many others, while Hupfeld (Z. f. d. K. des Morgenl, iii. 40) and Riehm (Mess. Weiss., p. 21), also starting from the Arabic, take the view, less accordant with the grammatical form of the word, that the nabi is one to whom God whispers His revelation.** Kuenen (Prohets, p. 42), in opposing the argument from the Arabic, goes so far as to say that the Arabic verb is probably derived from nabi, and so is a Hebrew loan word. I

presume that he does not mean to deny that there is a real Arabic root naba'a with the sense of prominence, impetus, etc., but only refers to the use of Conjugations II., IV., in the sense of "tell" (akhbara), and to the nom. act. of Conj. I. explained by khahar, news. And no doubt the usage of the Koran is to reserve these words for divine or supernatural communications, and Ragheb, cited at length in the Taj el 'Arus, explains that nab' is not to be used of any khabar, but is confined to announcements that are valuable and promote knowledge and are certain truth, like the word of God and His prophet. Yet it seems impossible to treat Conj. II. as a mere theological term derived from the Hebrew. Even in the Koran (lxvi. 3) it is used in a wider sense, and, what is more important, it is so found in old Arabic, e.g. in 'Antara (Moall., 1. 61 of Arnold's ed., or 1. 68 of Ahlwardt's Divans, p. 48). This circumstance adds importance to the fact that **in Assyrian naba means to "announce," Delitzsch, Ass. Lesestucke, 2d ed. (1878), p. 3. Nab'at, "a gentle sound" (Harith, Moall, 1. 11, and Taj el 'Arus i. 131, foot), is also an old word. It cannot, however, be said that the sense "speaker," or "newsbringer," is as yet established as the etymological meaning of nabi.**

Note 19, p. 86. — **From 1 Sam. x. 5, 10 seq.; xix. 20 seq., we see that the nebi'im at their first appearance in Israel formed bands or companies. Their "prophesying" was a joint act; Samuel, in xix, 20, stands presiding over them, precisely like the sheikh in a zikr of Dervishes**. Further, these exercises were sometimes gone through in sacred processions, sometimes at a fixed place, as at the Naioth at Ramah, which ought probably to be rendered "dwellings" — a sort of coenobiam. **They were accompanied by music of a somewhat noisy character, in which the hand-drum and pipe played a part, as was otherwise the case in festal processions to the sanctuary** (2 Sam. vi. 5; Isa. xxx. 29). Thus the religious exercises of the prophets seem to be a development in a peculiar direction of the ordinary forms of Hebrew worship at the time, and **the fact that the "prophesying" was contagious establishes its analogy to other contagious forms of religious excitement. That Saul under the influence of these exercises stripped off his clothes, and so joined in the prophesying, is precisely identical with what Ibn Khallikan (ed. Slane, p. 610; Eng. Tr. ii. 538) relates of Kukubury, that he used, under the influence of religious music, to become so excited as to pull off part of his clothes. It does not seem that at this early time the prophetic exercises necessarily involved any gift of prophecy in the ordinary sense of the word**, but it was recognised that "a divine spirit" (ru$^{a}$h elohim) came upon those who participated in them; Saul was, as an Arab would now say, malbus. The connection of music with the prophetic inspiration is still found in the time of Elisha (2 Kings iii. 15).

**The exercises of the prophets of Baal, as described in 1 Kings xviii., were much more violent and ecstatic. They correspond exactly with the later descriptions of the fantastic enthusiasm of the wandering priests of the Syrian goddess given by Apuleius, Metam. lib. viii., and Lucian, Asinus, c. 37. These priests correspond to the kelabim (literally "dogs") of the Phoenician sanctuaries** (C. I. S., No. 86), and of Deut, xxiii. 18, who again are the same with the kedeshim of 1 Kings xv. 12; 2 Kings xxiii. 7. **At the time of Josiah's reformation these wretched creatures had dwellings in the temple.**

**Lecture III.**

Note 1, p. 91. — The vagueness of 2 Kings xiii. 5 is not an isolated phenomenon. Amos never mentions the Assyrians by name, though he plainly alludes to them, as at vi. 14. So, too, Wellhausen (Bleek's Einl., 4th ed. p. 251 seq.) remarks that the cause of the sudden raising of the siege of Samaria (2 Kings vii. 6) can have been nothing else than an invasion of the Damascene territory by the Assyrians; but the Hebrew narrator plainly did not know this.

NOTE 2, p.91. — The "torrent of the 'Arabah," in Amos vi, 14, is identical with the brook of the 'Arablm, or willows (Arabic gharab; Celsius, Hierobot., i. 304: seq.; I can testify from personal observation that a tree of this name is still common in the Zor of the Jordan valley), the southern boundary between Moab and Ammon. The sea of the 'Arabah in 2 Kings xiv. 25 is, of course, the Dead Sea, the 'Arabah (A. V. "Wilderness") being the great depressed trough in which the Jordan flows and the Dead Sea lies.

Note 3, p. 92. — Isaiah closes his citation with the words: "This is the word that Jehovah spake concerning Moab long ago. And now within three short years [comp, xxi. 16] the glory of Moab shall be brought to contempt," etc. Isaiah presumably cited the old prophecy at some period of revolt against Assyria, most likely in the great rising against Sennacherib, when, however, Moab made voluntary submission after the fall of the Phoenician cities (supra, p. 322; G. Smith, Hist, of Sennacherib, p. 55). That the prophet quoted by Isaiah is Jonah is a conjecture of Hitzig (Des proph. Jonas Orakel uber Moab, u.s.w., 1831; Der Prophet Jesaia, 1833, p. 178 seq.). See also Cheyne's Prophecies of Isaiah.

Note 4, p. 94. — I transcribe, by way of illustration, a passage from Sprenger's Alte Geographie Arabiens, p. 213, referring to the Druses. "The government is a patriarchal aristocracy. The common people are distinguished by industry, the hereditary aristocracy by chivalry and disinterestedness, and both by a frugality bordering on asceticism. The individual is lost in the tribe, and within the community a rigid observance of the laws of morality is enforced. The people have the most absolute confidence in their leaders, who are not without education, and obey their smallest sign. . . . By such institutions the Druses have been able to effect brilliant military successes, and fill their neighbours with a sort of superstitious belief that they are invincible. . . . There have always been such tribes with military organisation in Arabia, and such are still the Dhu Mohammed and Dhu Hoseyn spoken of by Maltzan." See Maltzan, Reisen in Arabien, ii. 404 seq.

Note 5, p. 95. — Saul governed essentially as a Benjamite, and his court consisted, at least mainly, of men of his own tribe (1 Sam. xxii. 7). David's original policy was more enlarged. He chose a capital with no tribal connection, formed a foreign bodyguard, and showed no exceptional favour to his own tribe, as is clear from the fact that the men of Judah were the first to rebel under Absalom, and the last to return to obedience. In fact, David had to win them over by a promise that he would in future recognise their position as his brethren (2 Sam. xix. 12, 13). Under Solomon the Judueans continued to enjoy special favour. They did not share the discontent of Northern Israel, and the chief mark of their favoured position is that, in 1 Kings iv. 7 seq., Judah is exempted from the system of non-tribal government — essentially for purposes of taxation — applied in the other parts of Canaan. It is quite clear, too, from 1 Kings V. 13; xi. 28 (where for charge read harden, with reference to the forced labour employed in the repair of the city of David) that Solomon did not exempt Israelites from forced labour, as 2 Chron. viii. 9 supposes. The system of government by rulers of provinces — that is, the system of centralisation, destructive of old tribal organisation

— reappears in the time of Ahab (1 Kings XX. 14 seg.). The word "provinces" is rather Aramaic than Hebrew, which may point to an influence of foreign models on the organisation of the state.

Note 6, p. 98. — See on all these points Old Test, in J. Ch., Lect. viii., p. 223 seq.

Note 7, p. 110. — See O. T. in J. Ch., Lect. xi., p. 336 seq.

It is strange that a sound Hebraist like Prof. W. H. Green (Presb. Rev., iii. 123) should still maintain that Exod. xx. 24 refers, not to co-existing sanctuaries in Canaan, but to altars successively reared at different places in the wilderness, and even assert that the Authorised Version "in all places" does not accurately represent the Hebrew. The Authorised Version is perfectly accurate, and the idiom quite common, Exod. i. 22; Deut. iv. 3; 1 Sam. iii. 17; Jer. iv. 29; Ewald, Lehrb., 290 c. But the climax of absurdity is reached when Prof. Green regards this law, with its express provision that if an altar is built of stone it shall not be of hewn stone, as referring to the earth with which the frame of the brazen altar was filled. So, again, it is suggested that Exod. xxii. 30 may have been a law only for the wilderness journey, when all Israel was encamped in the vicinity of the tabernacle. But it is certain that there was no regular sacrificial observance in the wilderness (Amos v. 25; Jer. vii. 22), and the whole law to winch Exod. xxii. 30 belongs is on the face of it a law for Canaan; the offering of the firstlings on the eighth day is only part of an ordinance embracing also the first-fruits of cereals and liquors (ver. 29). How Prof. Green can possibly deny that the asylum in Exod. xxi, 12-14 is the altar, and that in Deuteronomy the idea of asylum-cities is separated from connection with the sanctuary, I do not understand.

Note 8, p. 119. — For the interpretation of this most important chapter see especially, in addition to the commentaries on Deuteronomy, Graf, Der Segen Mose's, Leipzig, 1857; Wellhausen, Geschichte, i. 266, 376. In verse 2 the text must be corrected as suggested by Ewald, Gesch., ii. 280, so as to read, "came to (from?) Meribath Kadesh."

Note 9, p. 120. — "With the exception of Vater's Amos (Halle, 1810) and the lengthy work of G. Baur (Giessen, 1847), the recent commentaries on Amos are incorporated in books on the prophets in general or on the minor prophets. Among modern English works Prof. Gandell's Amos in the Speaker's Commentary closely follows Dr. Pusey's Minor Prophets. The prophet is also included in the second volume of Heilprin's Historical Poetry of the Ancient Hebrews (New York, 1880). Of German commentaries those of Ewald, Keil, and Schmoller (in Lange's Bibelwerk) are translated. The most influential modern commentaries have been those of Ewald (Propheten, vol. i.), and Hitzig in his Kleine Propheten, of which the last edition by Steiner (1881) contains little new matter of consequence. Of the older commentaries that of Le Mercier (Mercerns) is the most valuable. There have been a good many recent discussions of individual questions, especially of the difficult passage, v. 26, which will he alluded to below. See also the section on Amos in Duhm's Theologie der Propheten (Bonn, 1875); an essay, containing a great deal that is arbitrary, by Oort, Theol. Tijdsch., 1880, p. 114 seq.; Noldeke's valuable article in Schenkel's Bibellexikon; and the excellent remarks of Wellhausen, Encyc. Brit., xiii. 410. I have not seen Juynboll, Disp. de Amoso, 1828.

Note 10, p. 120. — If we could venture to suppose that 1 Chron. ii. 24, iv. 5 refer to the settlement of Judah before the Exile, we should gather that the ancient inhabitants of Tekoa were not pure Hebrews, but belonged to the Hezronites, nomads from the desert who had settled down in the

southern part of the land of Judah. In this case we should have an interesting line of connection between the kinship of Amos and the Kenite family of the Rechabites, who gave their support to Jehu in the interests of ancient nomadic simplicity. The analysis of Wellhausen, however, De Gentibus et Familiis Judaeis, 1870, makes it probable that the connection of the Hezronites with the district of Bethlehem began after the Exile, when their older seats in. the south had been occupied by the Edomites. On Tekoa and the surrounding district see especially the preface to Jerome's Gomm. in Amos; Reland, Paloestina, vol. ii. p. 1028; Tobler, Denkblatter aus Jerusalem, 682 seq.; Robinson, Biblical Researches, 2d ed. p. 486; Stickel, Das Buch Hiob, p. 269 seq., whose remarks on the active movements of commerce in this district serve, as Kuenen has pointed out [Onderzoek, ii. 335), to throw light on the range of the prophet's historical and geographical knowledge. The idea that Amos belonged to the Northern Kingdom and to some other and unknown Tekoa (Gratz, Oort, ut supra) is quite arbitrary. That Amos has a thorough knowledge of the Northern Kingdom proves nothing. Oort's most striking argument is derived from the mention of sycamore culture as the prophet's occupation. The chief home of this tree was certainly in the plains, especially in the low country on the Mediterranean coast (1 Kings x. 27; compare the notice of a great sycamore grove between Rafah and Gaza in Yakut, ii. 796); and Jerome (on Amos vii.) already remarks that it did not exist in the wilderness of Tekoa, and conjectures that the bramble is meant. According to Tristram (Land of Israel, p. 34), it seems only to be found "on the sea-coast, where frost is unknown, or in the still warmer Jordan valley." It is, however, rather daring to affirm that the sycamore can never have grown in the vicinity of Tekoa or between Tekoa and the Dead Sea, as it was certainly widely distributed in Palestine. Compare on the whole subject Celsius, Hierob., i. 310; Gesenius, Thes., s.v.; Winer, s.v. "Maulbeerfeigenbaum"; and especially "Warnekros in Eichhorn's Repertorium, xi. 224 seq. That Amos was a Judaean is clear from the way in which he alludes to the sanctuary of Zion, i. 2.

Note 11, p. 124. — The phrase "eat bread" for "earn one's bread" is common to Hebrew and Arabic. See De Goeje's glossary to the Bib. Geog. Arab. (vol. iv. p. 180). Mokaddasy says, "I am not one of those who eat their loaf by their knowledge." Thus Amaziah distinctly treats prophecy as a trade by which men live.

Note 12, p. 125. — That the text in both these passages is corrupt hardly admits of doubt. With regard to iv. 3 this is generally admitted; for ix. 1 see Lagarde, Anm. zur Gr. Ueb. d. Proverbien, p. v. In some other places there are irregular spellings (vi. 8; viii. 8; v. 11; comp. Wellh. in Bleek, p. 633), which must rather be put to the account of transcribers than taken as indications of dialectic peculiarities of the prophet, and probably there may be one or two other passages where LXX. has preserved better readings, but Oort (ut supra) goes too far in the numerous corrections he introduces. The text is on the whole in an unusually good state, nor can I see that there is evidence of such extensive interpolations as Duhm, Oort, and even Wellhausen assume (infra, note 18).

Note 13, p. 126. — An interesting example of this will he found in Ibn Khallikan's article on Ibn al-Kirriya (p. 121, or i. 236 seq. of the English translation).

Note 14, p. 128. — On the origin and date of the several parts of this tableau of the geography (not the ethnography) of the Hebrews see, in addition to the comnientaries, De Goeje in the Theol. Tijdsclirift, 1870, p. 233 seq., and Wellhausen in Jahrb. f. D. Theol, 1876, p. 395 seq. The problems of the chapter are still far from being conclusively solved, and De Goeje, for example, is disposed

to regard the parts of the chapter which are not from the hand of the main author as later additions. But it is more probable that Wellhausen is right in assigning them to the earlier history JE. The verses which he regards as most ancient are 8-19, 21, 25-30. The distant northern nations of Japhet mentioned in the later part of Gen. A. are not known to Amos.

Note 15, p. 13-2. — The current idea that the day of Jehovah is primarily a day of judgment, or assize-day, is connected with the opinion that the earliest prophecy in which the idea occurs is that of Joel. See, for example, Ewald, Propheten, i. 90 seq. But if the book of Joel, as there is reason to believe (see Encyc. Brit, s.v.), is really one of the latest prophetical books, Amos V. 18 is the fundamental passage, and here the idea appears, not as peculiar to the prophet, but as a current popular notion, which Amos criticises and, so to speak, turns upside down. The popular idea in question cannot have been that of a day of judicial retribution; the day which the men of Ephraim expected must have been a day of national deliverance, and, from the whole traditions of the warlike religion of old Israel, presumably a day of victory like the "day of Midian " (Isa. ix. 4). The last cited passage shows that among the Hebrews, as among the Arabs, the word "day" is used in the definite sense of "day of battle." Illustrations of the Arabic idiom have been collected by Gesenius on Isa. ix. and Schultens on Job, p. 54, to which may be added a reference to the section on the "Days of the Arabs" in the "Ikd of Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, Egyptian ed., iii. 60 seq. The "days" of the Arabs often derive their name from a place, but may equally be named from the combatants, e.g., "the days of Tamim against Bekr" ('Ikd, p. 80). By taking the day of Jehovah to mean His day of battle and victory we gain for the conception a natural basis in Hebrew idiom. The same idea seems still to preponderate in Isa. ii., and is quite clearly seen in many later prophecies. That the day of Jehovah's might is not necessarily a day of victory to Israel over foreign powers, but a day in which His righteousness is vindicated against the sinners of Israel as well as of the nations, is the characteristic prophetic idea due to Amos, and from this thought the notion of the day of judgment was gradually developed.

Note 16, p. 135. — Offences against the dead appear to antiquity as among the gravest breaches of natural piety, as is well known from the story of Antigone. The same feeling finds frequent expression in the Old Testament (Deut. xxi. 23; Josh. X. 27; Ps. lxxix. 2, 3; Jer. xxxvi. 30). The feeling is connected with the doctrine of the Underworld — "All the kings of the nations lie in glory, every one in his own house; but thou art cast out of thy grave like a worthless sapling — the slain are thy covering, pierced through with the sword, who go down to the stones of the pit — like a carcase trodden under feet" (Isa. xiv. 19). The curse of Eshmunazar on those who disturb his grave (supra, p. 387) is a pertinent illustration. Compare also the account in Jos. Ant, xvi. 7, of the portents which deterred Herod from his attempt to violate the grave of David, and of the costly monument that he erected by way of expiation. The attempt was deemed so unseemly that the eulogist of Herod, Nicolaus of Damascus, omitted to record it in his history.

Note 17, p. 135. — The tablet of Marseilles seems to show that among the Phoenicians the "whole burnt-offering was used especially in supplicating the favour of the deity, or as an exceptional thankoffering (Schroeder, o'p. cit). So it appears also in old Israel (Judges xi. 31; 1 Sam. vii. 9; 2 Sam. xxiv. 25). Thus Amos means that Jehovah will not pay regard even to those offerings which were regarded as of special importance and delicacy.

Note 18, p. 136. — Duhm, Theologie der Propheten, p. 119, followed by Oort, ut supra, p. 116, proposes to reject Amos ii. 4, 5, as a Deuteronomistic interpolation. But it is plain that Amos could not have excepted Judah from the universal ruin which he saw to threaten the whole land, or at all events such exception would have required to he expressly made on special grounds. Such grounds did not exist; for in vi. 1 the nobles of Judah and Samaria are classed together, and both kingdoms are mentioned in vi. 2. Comp. iii. 1, where all who came up from Egypt are included. Nor is there anything suspicious in the language used about Judah. " To reject the Torah of Jehovah" is a pre-Deuteronomic phrase, Isa. v. 24, comp. Hosea ii. 4, "thou hast rejected knowledge;" and "the statutes of God and His Torah " appear together just as in our passage in the undoubtedly ancient narrative, Exod. xviii. 16. See also Dent. XXX. 10. In all these parallel passages the reference is to ordinances of civil righteousness, and such, probably, are meant by Amos. It is therefore a second, though not unconnected, offence that the men of Judah have been led astray by the deceitful superstitions practised by their ancestors. This again is quite a natural accusation, for in Josh. xxiv. ancestral superstition appears as one of the two great temptations leading the people away from Jehovah. The worship of the brazen serpent is an instance in point, and Ezek. viii. 10, 11 is a clear proof of the survival of primitive totemism in the last days of the king- dom. The connection makes it probable that Amos views these superstitions as producing moral obliquity. That, however, is in the highest degree natural. Observations in all parts of the world show that totemism is directly connected with peculiar systems of social ethic, and particularly with such practices as are condemned in Lev. xviii., and were still common in the time of Ezekiel (xxii. 10, 11). Comp. Journ. of Philology, vol. ix. pp. 94, 97. Duhm further proposes to reject as later additions iv. 13; V. 8 seq.; ix. 5, 6, and in this he is followed not only by Oort, but by Wellhausen, Geschichte, i. 349 seq., who compares these passages to the lyrical intermezzi celebrating Jehovah as Lord of the Universe, which characterise Isa. xl.-lxvi., and argues that Jehovah's all-creating power acquires a sudden prominence in the Exilic literature; Jehovah becomes Lord of the World when the realm of Israel falls to pieces. It may be conceded that these verses are not closely connected with the movement of the prophet's argument in detail; but they are thoroughly appropriate to its general purport. To Amos Jehovah is not merely the God of Israel, and Wellhausen has himself observed that the prophet studiously avoids the use of this familiar title. It is true that the universal Godhead of Jehovah appears to Amos rather as a sovereignty over all mankind than as a sovereignty over the mere powers of nature. He uses nature as a factor in history as a means of dealing with man; and this agrees with the older account of creation in Gen. ii. But undoubtedly Amos teaches that all nature is at Jehovah's command for the execution of His moral purpose (vii. 4; ix. 2 seq., etc.), and thus it is natural that the prophet should make occasional direct appeal to that lordship over nature which is the clearest proof that Jehovah's purpose is wider and higher than the mass of Israel supposed. That such appeal takes an ejaculatory form is not surprising under the general conditions of prophetic oratory, and in each case the appeal comes in to relieve the strain of intense feeling at a critical point in the argument. It is certainly possible that v. 8, 9 originally stood in direct connection with iv. 13; but even this transposition rests too much on merely subjective arguments to claim general acceptance.

Note 19, p. 140. — In this verse there are two disputed points. The first is with reference to the tense of  See, besides the commentaries, Merx in the Bibel-lex. s. v. "Chiun "; Graf in Merx's Archiv, ii. 93 seq.; Kleinert, Das Deuteronomium (1872), p. 111; Smend, Moses apud Prophetas, p. 23 seq.; Driver, Hebrew Tenses, 2d ed. p. 167; and references to discussions of the point in Holland in Oort, ut supra, p. 145. The question is whether (a) Amos in this verse describes

the idolatry of the wilderness (so Hitzig, De Goeje, Kuenen, Merx, Keil, and others), or (b) describes the present services of the Israelites as consisting of a carrying about of certain idolatrous objects in sacred procession (so Kamphausen, Schnltz, etc.), or (c) predicts that they shall have to carry these things away into captivity (so Rashi, Ewald, etc.). The question of the consecution of tenses is complicated by the fact that the preceding verb is an interrogative, and thus De Goeje in support of his view appeals to Job xxviii. 21, ונעלמה, which, however, is no exact parallel. An allusion to the sins of Israel in the wilderness would be singularly out of place in this connection. Amos, like the other older prophets, regards the wilderness journey as a time when Jehovah's favour was specially manifested (ii. 1 0), and his argument is that this favour was enjoyed without sacrifice. Compare the argument of the Clementine Homilies (iii. 45), that " God did not desire sacrifices, for He slew those who lusted after the taste of flesh in the wilderness." (Lightfoot, Colossians, p. 373.) In point of fact there is no close syntactical connection between v. 26 and v. 25, and the force of the consecutive Waw is rather to be determined by והגליתי following, which is a true future. Thus the captivity of the idols seems to be alluded to, as in Isa. xlvi. 1, 2. It was a known practice of the Assyrians to carry off the palladia of vanquished cities, and the captives are here represented as compelled to bear them.

If, now, the allusion is to religious institutions of the prophet's own time, it is still a difficult question what these were. What is plain is that the allusion is to astral worship, and to idols, the work of man's hands. The verse contains two unique words סכות (A.V. tabernacle), and כיון (A. V. Chiun). Are these common or proper names? As regards the first the whole weight of the early versions supports the English version, and, as the form in ות from סכך may be an abstract used as a concrete, there is no difficulty in supposing a reference to the well-known portable chapels or tabernacles of Phoenician worship (Diod. XX. 14, 65; comp. 2 Kings xxiii. 7, where we read of women who wove tents for the Ashera), and it is not necessary with Ewald to compare the Syriac sekkitha, " post." With regard to the second word, however, where the Septuagint introduces a problematic Raiphan, or Rephan, there is an early variation of the tradition. Whether the Raiphan of the oldest version is a synonym of Saturn, borrowed from the Egyptians, is highly doubtful; it may be a mere error, and Theodotion does not take the word as a proper name. But the Syriac and perhaps the Tgm. do take it so, and both Jewish and Syriac expositors identify it with Keiwan, Saturn. According to Abulwalid, most Jewish interpreters took this view, though he himself prefers the opinion, essentially that of most recent commentators, that the word is like כמונה, a pedestal. The great difficulty is that the name Keiwan is not Semitic (see Fleischer in Levy, Chald. Wort., i. 428), but probably Persian. So too, when Schrader (Stud, und Krit., 1874, p. 324 seq.; Riehm's Handw., i. 234 seq.) will have it that סכות is Sakkuth, an epithet of the god Adar, we are met by the difficulty that this also is no Semitic name, but so-called Accadian (Delitzsch in the German transl. of Smith's Genesis, p. 274). It is hardly credible that elements of Eastern religion not common to all Semites could have been established in Israel at the time of Amos, or that the Adrammelech (Adar), the introduction of whose worship is re- corded in 2 Kings xvii. 31, was known before that time under a non-Semitic name; while, on the other hand, the identification of כִּיּוּן with Keiwan naturally suggested itself when that name of Saturn became current; but this interpretation can hardly have existed when the pronunciation expressed by the Massorets was

adopted. That our word may be the source of the Greek κίων is suggested by Hitz. in loc. and Lagarde, Abhandlungen, p. 13.

Note 20, p. 140. — See O.T. in J. Ch.., Lect. xi. p. 341, and note 7.

**Lecture IV.**

Note 1, p. 145. — The chronological discussions which I have felt it necessary to introduce in one or two places in these Lectures start chiefly from the results obtained by Noldeke, Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments: " 4, Die Chronologie der Richterzeit," and Wellhausen, Jahrbb. f. Deutsche Theologie, 1875, p. 607 seq. (compare Bleek's Einleitung, 4th edition, p. 264 seq.; Geschichte, i. 287; and Krey, Zeitsch. f. Wiss. Theol, 1877, p. 404 seq.). The observation of the trisection of the 480 and 240 periods of Judah and Ephraim, by which I confirm the systematic character of the chronology already pointed out by these scholars, was first published in the Journal of Philology, x. 209 seq., to which I refer for various details. In several notes to the present volume I have endeavoured to carry further the argument there opened. The material for the Assyrian synchronisms is excellently brought together by G. Smith, The Assyrian Eponym Canon, where also an account will be found of various proposals for harmonising the dates. Another attempt is that of Oppert, Salomon et ses successeurs, 1877. I do not accumulate references to other works, because it appears certain that the first basis of a sound treatment of the problem is the recognition of the fact long ago pointed out by Ewald, that the synchronisms of Judah and Israel are not independent chronological data [infra, note 2). The first chronologer who has used the Assyrian data in a thoroughly critical spirit is therefore Ewald's scholar Wellhausen. The ordinary schemes of harmonists are mere guesswork. For students who desire to look into the subject for themselves, and are not yet familiar with the literature, I may add a reference to Scaliger's Thesaurus Temporum; Ussher's Annals of the World, 1658 (preceded by the Latin Annales, 1650-54); and G. Syncellus, Bonn ed., i. 388 seq., where the famous Canon of Ptolemy is preserved.

Note 2, p. 146. — In fixing on this particular means of harmonising the two lines chronologers were guided by the so-called synchronisms or cross references which in the present text of the books of Kings occur as the beginning of each reign, to the effect that A, king of Judah, came to the throne in such a year of B, king of Israel, or vice versa. Jeroboam II. is said to have begun his reign in the 15th year of Amaziah, and his son Zachariah succeeded in the 38th year of Azariah. Thus the interval between the two accessions is 523 years, instead of 41, which is explained by assuming an interregnum of 1 1 years. On the other hand, we are told that Amaziah lived 15 years after the death of Jehoash ort he accession of Jeroboam, and yet the accession of Amaziah's son Azariah is placed in the 27th year of Jeroboam (2 Kings XV. 1). In other words, the synchronisms themselves are not exact, and the right to use them as a key to the chronology becomes doubtful. In fact, when we go over the whole series of synchronisms, as has been done at length by Wellhausen (Jahrb. f. D. Theol., 1875, pp. 607 seq.), we are forced to the conclusion that they are not independent data, furnishing additional material for the chronological scheme, but have simply been added by a later hand, who calculated them out so as to harmonise as he best could the already discrepant lines of the Judaean and Northern chronology. This view was expressed by Ewald (Geschichte, iii. 464), and subsequent inquiry has fully confirmed its correctness; for not only are the synchronisms full of such inconsistencies as were inseparable from the task of harmonising two sets of data that do not agree, but an exact examination of the text shows that they are inserted in such a way as to disturb

the natural construction of the sentences in which they occur. See Wellhausen, ut supra, p. 611. For chronological purposes, therefore, it is not only legitimate, but imperative, to ignore these synchronisms, and for simplicity's sate I have passed them by in the text of my Lecture. There are only two synchronisms of which account must he taken, viz. the contemporaneous accession of Jehu and Athaliah, and the siege of Samaria from the fourth to the sixth year of Hezekiah.

Note, 3, p. 148. — On forty as a round number see Gesenius, Thesaurus, p. 1258 seq.; Lepsius, Chr. der Aegypt, i.

Note 4, p. 151. — The precise year of the fall of Samaria is still open to dispute. The siege began under Shalmaneser, while the conquest is claimed by Sargon. The data which determine Sargon's first year have given rise to considerable discussion, and are difficult to harmonise. See Schrader, K. A. T., p. 158 seq.; Oppert in Records of the Past, vii. 22, 28, Smith; Assyrian Eponym Canon, pp. 125, 129, 174; the criticism of v. Gutschmid, Neue Beitrage, 101 seq.; and Schrader again in K. G. F., p. 313 seq. It seems pretty certain, however, that Sargon came to the throne in 722, and reckoned 721 as his first year. He records the siege and capture of Samaria together, as happening in the beginning of his reign, apparently distinguishing this from his first year, when he was occupied with a revolt in Babylonia, This leaves it uncertain whether he records the capture in the first year of the siege or the siege in the year of capture, but the extreme limits for the commencement of the siege are 724 and 722, assuming always that the latter year is that of Shalmaneser's death. Now, it is noteworthy that in 720 Sargon was in Syria and Palestine meeting a revolt supported by the Egyptians, in which Samaria is mentioned as taking part, and, on the other hand, that 2 Kings xvii. 4 seq. seems to place the defeat and capture of Hoshea before the three years' siege. This would fit very well with the hypothesis that the fall of Samaria took place in two acts, the first falling in 722 and the second in 720. If we do not accept this solution we must suppose that a revolt broke out in Samaria immediately after its capture, of which the Bible tells us nothing. Were it possible to go by a tablet in the Louvre, aided by a conjecture of v. Gutschmid (ut supra), based on the variations which Assyriologists themselves have given in the rendering of an obscure word, we might even place Shalmaneser's death and the commencement of the siege in 721; but this seems hardly possible in view of the line, indicating a change of rule, placed in the Eponym Canon before 722. The year 721 would lend itself to the theory of Sayce and others, that 2 Kings xviii. 9, 13 are to be harmonised by making the latter verse refer to an expedition in 711; but that theory has so many other difficulties that it cannot be allowed to influence the dates with which we are now concerned.

Note 5, p. 153. — See Schrader in Jahrbb. f. prot. Theol, 1875, p. 329 seq., and in particular A. V. Gutschmidt, Neue Beitrage, p. 143 seq.

Note 6, p. 154. — The literature upon the book of Hosea is in large part the same with that upon Amos, but there are several special German commentaries of recent date, by Simson (1851), Wunsche (1868), and Nowack (1880). The last-named gives a very complete view of recent discussions. There is also a very excellent old commentary by Pococke (1685). Further references to books are given in Encyc. Brit., xii. 298, where also some notices of the traditions about the prophet may be found. Many parts of the book of Hosea are very imperfectly understood, and this not merely from the intrinsic difficulties of the prophet's style, but from the fact that the text is often manifestly corrupt.

Note 7, p. 156. — In the title to Hosea's prophecy i. 1, his date is given by the reigning kings of Judah and Israel. He prophesied, we are told, (1) in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah; (2) in the days of Jeroboam, the son of Joash, king of Israel. As Jeroboam died probably in the lifetime of Uzziah, and certainly long before the accession of Ahaz, these two periods do not coincide, and it can hardly be thought that they are both from the same hand or of equal authority. As the first part of the book was certainly written under Jeroboam II., and Hosea himself would not date by the kings of a foreign realm it seems natural to suppose with EAvald and other scholars that the date by Jeroboam is original, but stood at first as a special title to chaps, i. ii., or to these chapters along with chap. iii. and that the special title was generalised by a later hand, which inserted the words, "Uzziah, etc., kings of Judah and in the days of." The later editor or scribe cannot have been a man of Ephraim, and perhaps was the same who penned the identical date prefixed to the book of Isaiah. In this case he must have lived a considerable time after Hosea, for the title of Isa. i. 1 can hardly be older than the collection of Isaiah's prophecies in their present form (see p. 215 seq.), and we are hardly entitled to accept his statement as proving more than that he knew Hosea to have been a contemporary of Isaiah. If the title were correct, Hosea, on the common chronology, must he held to have continued to prophesy for a period of some sixty years. This difficulty, indeed, is now removed by the shortening of the last period of the history of Ephraim, which we have seen to be demanded by the Assyrian synchronisms. But the fact still remains that there is nothing in the book of Hosea that points to the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah, or justifies the later title. Some writers indeed, including Dr. Pusey, suppose that the Shalman of x. 14 is Shalmaneser IV., the successor of Tiglath Pileser. But of this there is no proof. Dr. Pusey's theory is that Beth Arbel is the Arbela in the plain of Jezreel known to Eusebius, and that it was sacked by Shalmaneser when he first received Hoshea's submission at the beginning of his reign. But a town in this quarter, important enough to be used to supply a figure for the fall of Samaria, could hardly have remained without mention in the historical books, and it does not appear that Hoshea ventured to resist Shalmaneser at the time referred to, Hosea is fond of historical allusions, and does not confine himself to such as lie near at hand. There was another Arbela known to Eusebius (Onom., ed. Lagarde, p. 214), east of the Jordan near Pella, which might conceivably have been reached by Shalmaneser III, This combination has been suggested by Schrader (K. A. T., p. 283), who, however, himself admits its very problematic character, and offers the more plausible alternative that Shalman may have been a Moabite king, a sovereign of Moab of that name (Salamanu), actually appearing on the monuments (comp. Smith, Eponym Canon, p. 124). An episode in the ferocious wars of Gilead, spoken of by Amos, may indeed very well be referred to, and in any case the allusion is too obscure to be used to fix the date of any part of Hosea's prophecies.

Note 8, p. 156. — The general sense of this passage has been best illustrated by "Wellhausen, Geschichte, i. 141, who is certainly right in saying that the direct address to the priests does not begin with verse 6, but must include verse 5. In spite of the objection taken by Nowack, there is no difficulty in understanding  (A. V. mother) of the stock or race of the priests, 2 Sam. XX. 19; Ezek. xix. 2; Arabic, ummah. But to gain a proper connection between ver. 5 and ver. 4 is more difficult, and seems to require a slight readjustment of the text. The lines on which this must proceed have been clearly laid down by Wellhausen. Hosea in ver. 4 suddenly breaks off in his rebuke of the nation at large, " Yet let no man accuse and no man rebuke for . . . " What follows must be to the effect that the real blame in the matter lies with the priests, whose destruction is then announced in ver. 5 following. It is they who, by rejecting the knowledge of Jehovah which they

were set to teach, have banished that knowledge from the laud. But the reading which Wellhausen accepts, ועמי כבמריו, "for my people is like its priests," is not satisfactory; כהנים and כמרים are not synonyms, and the conjectured reading not only leaves an unexplained יכהן at the end, but does not do justice to the circumstance that, in order to get a natural transition to ver. 5, the clause must be addressed to the priests and the concluding word a vocative. This requisite of a plausible conjecture is in so far met by Heilprin's ועמך כמריביו, " thy people are like its accusers, priest." But the priests were judges, not accusers, and the people at large could hardly be called the priest's people. Rather the people of the priest must be the priestly caste or clan, and this points to the very slight correction במריבי for מרו בי, "thy people have rebelled against me, priest." The corruption might easily arise, especially with scriptio defectiva, under the influence of the preceding ירב. Perhaps, indeed, it would be enough to change the pointing and simply read, "Thy people are as mine enemies, priest" (1 Sam. ii. 10).

Note 9, p. 160. — The etymological relations of חסד are obscure. In Syriac we find two words hesda: the first, written according to Bar Hebraeus with hard d, means " reproach," the latter with rukkakha, hesdha, is the Hebrew חסד. The aspiration is exactly the opposite of what we should expect, especially as the hard form seems to correspond with Arabic hasad, envy. The sense "reproach" or "shame" in Hebrew (Lev. xx. 17; Prov. xiv. 34) may safely be regarded as an Aramaism; and in all probability the two like-sounding words are etymologically distinct; the one corresponds to the Arabic root HSD, the other to HSHD, in which the idea of friendly combination appears to lie, in correspondence with the fact that in Hebrew חסד is the virtue that knits together society. It is noteworthy that hashada has ii special application, in the phrase hasadu lahu, to the joint exercise of hospitality to a guest.

It ought never to be forgotten that in Hebrew thought there is no contrast such as is drawn in certain schools of theology between justice, equity, and kindness. Kindness and truth are the basis of society, and righteousness — even forensic righteousness — involves these, for it is the part of good government not to administer a hard-and-fast rule, but to insist on considerate and brotherly conduct. If we forget this we shall not do justice to the emphasis laid by the prophets on civil righteousness. Compare, for example, 2 Sam. xiv.

Note 10, p. 166. — The difficulties which surround the literal interpretation of Gen. xxxiv. are in part so obvious that they were felt even by the old interpreters. The latest stage of inquiry into the meaning of the chapter may be studied in "Wellhausen's Composition des Hexateuchs (Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol., vol. xxi. p. 435 seq.), Dillmann's Genesis, and Kuenen's essay in Theol. Tijdschrift, 1880, p. 257 seq., and leads to the result that the narrative, as it now stands, has passed through a complicated history which need not occupy us here. It is plain that the two individuals Simeon and Levi could not take and destroy a city; that in verse 30 Jacob speaks of himself, not as an individual, but as a community, " I am a few men;" and that in Gen. xlix. 6 he speaks of his sons as tribes, for two men do not form an "assembly" (קהל). As regards what is said of Reuben in Gen. xxxv. 22; xlix. 4, it is to be observed that the Hebrew undoubtedly were accustomed to state facts as to the relationships and fusion of clans or communities under the figures of paternity and

marriage; and this plan inevitably led in certain cases to the figurative supposition of very strange connections. A clear instance of such figurative use of marriage with a father's wife is found in 1 Chron. ii. 24, as the text has been restored by Wellhausen after the LXX. (e Gentibus, etc., p. 14); and the story of the birth of Moab and Ammon, as well as of the elements of the tribe of Judah spoken of in Gen. xxxviii. (see Encyc. Brit, 9th ed., article Judah), may be probably explained in a similar way. The form of the figure was probably not repulsive when first adopted, as marriage with a stepmother is a, Semitic practice of great antiquity, and at one time was known to the Israelites (Journ. of Phil., vol. is. pp. 86, 94; O. T. in J. Church, p. 438). The precise meaning of the deed of Reuben is, however, obscure. The tribes of Bilhah were subordinate branches of the house of Joseph, and perhaps some combination against the unity of Israel and the hegemony of Joseph may be alluded to. That these historical allegories turn largely on marriage and fathership is not unworthy of note in connection with Hosea.

Note 11, p. 167. — That אהי in Hosea xiii. 10 either stands for or must be corrected into איה is the almost unanimous opinion of ancient and modern interpreters, from the LXX. downwards. The prophet, therefore, does not say, "I will be thy king,"" but "Where now is thy king?"

Note 12, p. 171.— Compare Noldeke in Z.D.M.G., xv. 809, Wellhausen, Text der Bucecr Samuelis, p. 30 seq. Beeliada of 1 Chron. xiv. 7 is the same as Eliada of 2 Sam, x. 16 or as Jehoiada.

Note 13, p. 171, -- For the meaning of the word mohar, dowry, and the corresponding verb, see Hoffmann's Bar Ali, 5504, where the corresponding Syriac word denotes "what the son-in- law gives to the parents of the bride." In the same sense the Syrians say מכר מנה ברתה, he espoused his daughter, lit. bought her from him (Bernstein, Chrest., p. 37). The Hebrew word eres, "betroth" (Exod. xxii. 15, Hosea ii. 16), properly means to barter or hire, so that eris in Palestinian Syriac is it farmer (Lagarde, Semitica, i. 50). In Exod. xxii. the primitive sense is still felt, as also in 2 Sam. iii. 14, where eres is construed as a verb of buying with the preposition 2. Note also the law of Exod. xxi. referring to a secondary wife, where the provision that the marriage is not dissolved at the close of seven years may be directed against the principle of temporary marriages as practised among the Arabs (nikahu 'l mut'ati: Mowatta, iii. 24; Bokhari, Bulak ed., vi. 124; Ibn Khallikan, Slane's transl. iv. 36). For our present purpose it is important to note that this view of marriage explains how Hosea had to buy back his wife (iii. 2). This would constitute a new betrothal, and so Jehovah betroths Israel to Himself anew (ii. 19).

Note 14, p. 171. — The variation of the form of the metaphor, in which the spouse of Jehovah is now the land (Hosea i. 2), now the stock of the nation (ii. 2 seq.), belongs to the region of natural symbolism, in which land and nation form a natural unity. The nation, as it were, grows out of the land on which it is planted (Hosea ii. 23; Amos ix. 15); the living stock of the race has its roots in the land, and is figured as a tree (Isa. vi. 13; xvi. 8; Hosea xiv. 5, 6; Num. xxiv. 6, etc.). From this point of view the multiplication of the nation is just one aspect of the productivity of the land, and it is indifferent whether we say that the deity marries the land and so makes it productive, or marries the stock of the nation. In Semitic heathenism, in fact, 'Ashtoreth the spouse of Baal is not so much connected with the earth as with the stock of the earth's vegetation. Her symbol is the sacred tree, the Arabic 'athary is the palm tree planted on the ba'l land, and the same conception of the sacred

tree was found in the popular worship of Israel (Hosea iv. 13). The heathenish element in these conceptions is the constant reference to natural productivity, the identification of the godhead with a natural fertilising principle. Hosea entirely strips off this conception. The heaven-watered land of Israel and its goodly growth are Jehovah's gift (Hos. ii. 8, 22, 23), not his offspring. But all analogy leads us to believe that the physical use of the symbolism of marriage was the earlier, and without this supposition the details of the allegory can hardly be explained. Even in Isaiah (iv. 2) the spring of Jehovah is analogous to the Arabic ba'l (Lagarde, Semitica, i. 8), and must be interpreted, not in a moral sense, but of the natural products of Jehovah's land.

Note 15, p. 172. — In Euting, Punische Steine (1871) p. 15, we find a woman's name אֹרשתבעל "the espoused of Baal." For Babylon and parallel examples from other nations see Herodot. i. 181 seq. See also Jos., Ant., xviii. 3 § 4.

Note 16, p. 172. — On the Arabic ba'l see Wetzstein in Z. D. M. G., xi. 489; Sprenger, ibid, xviii. 300 seq.; Lagarde, Semitica, i. p. 8. The glossaries to De Goeje's Beladsori and to the Bib. Geog. Ar. supply examples. The term is also Talmudic. But for the illustration of the conception of the marriage of the deity with his land, it is more important to look at the term "athary or 'aththary, for which see Lane s. v.; Prof. W. Wright in Trans. Bib. Arch., vi. 439; Lagarde in Nachr. K.G.W. Gott. 1881, p. 396 seq.; and in particular the glossary to Beladsori s. v. ba'l. The connection of "athary with 'Ashtoreth seems to have been first observed by G. Hoffmann. The land of Baal, or the growth springing from such land, fertilised by the rains of Baal, bears a name derived from 'Ashtoreth, and this appears to be a clear enough indication of the ancient prevalence of the ideas touched on in the text.

Note 17, p. 179. — One or two corrections are necessary in the English version of Hosea iii. in order to bring out the full sense. In verse 1, read "Go and love once more a woman beloved of a paramour, and an adulteress." It is the same faithless wife to whom Hosea is still invited to show his affection. The עוד qualifies the main verb, not the לך; comp. for this construction Cant. iv. 8. The grape cakes in the end of the verse (not " flagons of wine ") are a feature of Dionysiac Baal-worship (O. T. in J. Ch., p. 434). In ver. 3 the sense seems to be that for many days she must sit still, not finding a husband (Jer. iii, 1) — not merely as A. V., not marrying another, but not enjoying the rights of a lawful wife at all — while at the same time Hosea is "towards her," watching over and waiting for her (the phrase is as 2 Kings vi. 11; Jer. xv. 1; comp. Hosea i. 9).

Note 18, p. 181. — The true sense of this narrative was, I believe, first explained by Ewald. The older literal interpretation, in the form still maintained by Dr. Pusey, was offensive to every sound moral sense. The idea that a divine command could justify a marriage otherwise highly improper, and that the offensive circumstances magnify the obedience of the prophet, substitutes the nominalistic notion of God for that of Scripture. In addition to Ewald's exposition, the remarks of Wellhausen in Bleek, Einl, p. 406 seq., well deserve perusal. See also Encyc. Brit., xii. 297, for an indication of the various interpretations that have been offered, and Nowack, op. cit., p. xxxvi., for a catalogue of recent Continental literature on the question.

Note 19, p. 185. — A remark may here be offered on the difficult passage, vii. 5 seq. The prophet is describing the wickedness of the king, princes, and people as a hot fever, an eager and consuming passion, which bums up the leaders of the nation, and makes Ephraim like a cake not turned, and so

spoiled by the fire. In v. 5 this figure is mingled with that of the heat of intoxication. " In the day of our king the princes were sick with the heat of wine, they stretched out their hands with scorners" or reckless despisers of right. The figure here is quite similar to Isa. xxviii. 1 .seq. In the following verse we must plainly read קִרְבּוֹ, " For their inward parts are as a furnace," with the same enallage numeri as in כמו for כמו in ver. 5; or, as is suggested by Schorr (in Heilprin, ii. 145), we may read קרבם (many supposed enallages are probably corruptions of text, and כמו in old writing can as well be plural as singular). The following words לבם בארבם may be defended from Jer ix. 8 [Heb. ix. 7] בקרבו ישים ארבו, to which the construction stands related as שים לב על דבר to שים דבר על לב. It will then be a circumstantial clause. The prophet is speaking of a wicked project of king and princes in which they join hands with impious men in the intoxication of their evil passions, and proceeds, " for their inward part is as a furnace, when their heart is in their guiles." [There is, however, a good deal that is attractive in Schorr's proposal to read בער בם, "their heart burns within them."] In what follows, Houbigant long ago thought of עשן (perfect) for יִשֵּׁן, but neither he, nor Wunsche, who follows him, saw that ישן is simply an obsolete orthography for the imperfect יְעַשֵּׁן, like למו for לעמו, Psalm, xxviii. 8, so that the passage is to be explained by Deut. xxix. 20 [Heb. 19]. Thus the verse goes on, "their anger (אַפָּם as Tgm. Syr.) smokes all the night, in the morning it flames forth like blazing fire."

Note 20, p. 189. — I adhere, though not without some hesitation, to the לי of the Massoretic text of Hosea xiv. 8 and the traditional view that the prefixed אפרים indicates Ephraim as the speaker, as against the לוֹ of the LXX., which has found favour with many recent writers. The elliptical indication of the change of speaker, though unique, is not incredible, for it causes no insuperable obscurity. But in this view I think it is quite necessary to regard the whole verse as spoken by Ephraim. The first אני, indeed, on this view, marks an emphasis which we would not express in English; but precisely in the pronominal expression or suppression of emphasis Hebrew and English differ greatly. The main difficulty in the LXX. reading seems to me to be much greater than any that attaches to the other view. The comparison of Jehovah to a fir-tree is not only without parallel, but in strange contrast to all prophetic thought. The evergreen tree is in Semitic symbolism the image of receptivity, of divinely nourished life, not of quickening power. Ephraim bears fruit to Jehovah, not Jehovah to Ephraim. Moreover, the "answering" in our verse corresponds to that of ii. 15.

Although the rendering " cypress" for "fir-tree" has of late become so common, I hesitate to adopt it for two reasons. (1) Ebusus, the modern Iviza, is according to the coins אי בשם = אי ברושים, and what this means appears from the Greek Πιτυοῦσαι (see Schroder, Phon. Spr., p. 99). (2) The Berosh is according to Scripture the characteristic tree of Lebanon along with the cedar. Now it is true that the cypress occurs on Lebanon in association with the cedar, but a species of Abies is equally characteristic of these mountains, at a lower altitude, and to judge from its present frequency must have always been a prominent feature in the forests.

Note 21, p. 190. — According to most recent critics, the prophecy in Ztechariah ix.-xi. ought to come in here to close the prophetic record of the Northern Kingdom; but Slade, in his essay on "Deuterozecharia," in the Zeitschrift fur alttestamentliche Wissenschaft (not yet completely published), and in the Gaessner Ludwigstag Programm, 1880, following Vatke and a few others, has put this question in a new light, and assigns Zech. ix.-xiv. to a very late date. That Ewald's view of Zech. xii.-xiv. is untenable, and that these chapters at least are post-Exilic, has been my conviction for many years. Stade seems to have shown that the same thing holds good for ix.-xi.

Lecture V.

Note 1, p. 191. — The literature of the book of Isaiah, with which we shall be mainly occupied in the next four Lectures, is enormous; for an account and estimate of the commentators it is enough to refer to Mr. Cheyne's tenth essay appended to his Prophecies of Isaiah, 1881. This exceedingly useful book gives the English reader so complete a view of the present state of the exegetical questions connected with Isaiah that a general reference to it may take the place of many notes on individual points which would otherwise have called for remark. The book is indispensable to every one who has not access to a full library of Continental exegesis, while, on the other hand, those who have themselves worked in the same field will best appreciate the exhaustive studies witnessed to on every page. In addition to other help which these Lectures derive from it, I ought here to acknowledge repeated obligations to the translation for felicitous phrases. On the other hand, it will appear by and by that I am in very many cases at variance with Mr. Cheyne as regards the order and date of the several prophecies, a point on which he seems to have been misled by the Assyriologists. Of modern foreign commentaries, those of Gesenius, Ewald, Hitzig, and Delitzsch may be chiefly recommended to the student. The learned commentary of Dr. Kay offers little assistance in the mainly historical objects contemplated in the present Lectures. For the historical exegesis of the Prophet, the labours of Ewald are the necessary starting-point of every student, though in part now antiquated by Assyrian researches. The student should not overlook the contributions of Lagarde in his Prophetoe Chaldaice, p. il., and in his Semitica, I.

Note 2, p. 193. — This is the natural inference from the fact that for a time Jeroboam retired from Shechem to Penuel beyond the Jordan (1 Kings xii. 25).

Note 3, p. 194. — For the chronology of Ahaz's predecessors we must take as our point of departure the campaign of Tiglath Pileser against Pekah and Rezin B.C. 734. At this time Ahaz was king of Judah. Further we know that Menahem was still alive B.C. 738 (supra, p. 160), while 2 Kings xv. 37 shows that Pekah was king and had begun to attack Judah before the death of Ahaz's father Jotham, Ahaz, therefore, must have come to the throne between 738 and 734; and, as it is hardly to be supposed that the Syro-Ephraitic war was prolonged more than one or two years before the Assyrians interfered, the date of Jotham's death may be taken approximately as B.C. 735, so that 734 would count as the first year of Ahaz. Now reckoning backwards we find that the Judsean chronology assigns to the reigns from Athaliah to Jotham inclusive, 6 + 40 + 29 + 52+16 = 143. The northern chronology gives for the same period 102 years of the dynasty of Jehu, 10 of Menahem, and some 3 years more up to the expedition of Tiglath Pileser — in all about 115 years. The Assyrian monuments (supra, p. 150) show that this reckoning is right within a few years, but if anything is rather too long than too short, so that the Judaean chronology of the period is out by about 30 years. The discrepancy may be so far reduced by assuming that part of Jotham's reign fell

in his father's lifetime, as we know that he acted as vizier while Uzziah was a leper (2 Kings xv. 5). But even this does not put all right, and is at best a mere hypothesis, which finds a very uncertain stay in the supposed Assyrian reference to Azariah or Uzziah B.C. 740. In reality it seems probable that the necessary shortening of Judaean reigns must be sought at more than one part of the period with which we are dealing, and that the error is distributed between the 69 years of Joash and Amaziah and the 68 of Uzziah and Jotham. For Amaziah, Uzziah's father, was contemporary with King Joash of Israel, and his defeat by that monarch seems to have fallen near the close of Amaziah's reign. At least it is a highly plausible conjecture of Wellhausen (Z.f. d. Theol., 1875, p. 634) that Amaziah's murder in a popular rising was due to the discontent produced by his absurd challenge to Joash and the misfortunes that followed. In this case the first year of Uzziah cannot have fallen anything like so late as the 15th year of Jeroboam II., to which the present Judaean chronology appears to assign it (6 + 40 + 29 = 75 = 28 + 17 + 16 + 14). But, on the other hand, the campaign of Joash against Jerusalem must have fallen in his later prosperous years. [The three campaigns of Joash against Syria must be at the end of his reign, since it was left to his son to improve his victories.] Thus we are led to conclude that Uzziah came to the throne about the same time with Jeroboam II. The rest of the error belongs to the prosperous days of Uzziah and Jotham, Avhich may very well be reduced by 15 or 16 years, and yet leave time for the great internal changes alluded to in the early chapters of Isaiah.

The chronology from B.C. 734 downwards offers a much more complicated problem, for here we have to deal with a multitude of discordant data. According to the present chronology of the book of Kings, Manasseh's accession opens the last third of the second 480 years of Israel's history, and so falls 160 years before the return or 110 before the destruction of the temple in the 11th year of Zedekiah (B.C. 586). For the last part of these 110 years we have a sure guide in the chronology of the book of Jeremiah, in which the reckoning by years of kings of Judah is adopted, and checked by another reckoning by years of Jeremiah's ministry, and by a third by years of Nebuchadnezzar, whose dates are known by the Canon of Ptolemy (Syncellus, p. 388). Now, the book of Kings divides the 110 years as follows: --

| | |
|---|---|
| Manasseh | 55 |
| Amon | 2 |
| Josiah | 31 |
| Jehoiakim | 11 |
| Zedekiah | 11 |

The 11 years of Zedekiah are certain from Jer. xxxii. 1; 2 Kings XXV. 8. Further,

4 Jehoiakim = 23 Jeremiah (Jer. xxv. 1), 13 Josiah = 1 Jeremiah (Jer, xxv. 3).

Therefore 1 Jehoiakim = 20 Jeremiah = 32 Josiah; that is, Josiah reigned 31 years as stated in Kings. But now, if Jehoiakim really reigned 11 years, 21 Jehoiakim =10 Zedekiah =18 Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xxxii. 1), and so 4 Jehoiakim = 1 Nebuchadnezzar, an equation actually given in the Hebrew text of Jer. xxv. 1, but rightly wanting in the Septuagint. For in reality 4 Jehoiakim is, according to Jer. xlvi. 2, the year of the battle of Carchemish, when Nabopolassar was still on the throne, but in his last year (Berosus ap. Jos., c. 'Apion. i. 1 9). Hence we must conclude that the

first year of Nebuchadnezzar — that is, the first year which began in his reign — was really the fifth of Jehoiakim, and that the latter reigned not 11 but 12 years. [1] The 12 years of Jehoiakim seem also to be confirmed by Ezek. i. 1 seq., which Wellhausen uses to support the current chronology. According to Ezekiel, the fifth year of Jehoiachin's captivity (i. 2) is the 30th year of another unnamed era. It appears from xxiv, 1 , where the ninth year is the ninth of Zedekiah, that Ezekiel counts as the first year of captivity the first year of Zedekiah — that is, the first year that began in exile. Thus the first year of the anonymous era will be the 18th of Josiah if Jehoiakim reigned 11 years, but the 19th if he reigned 12. As the 18th year of Josiah is that of his great reformation, it would appear that Ezekiel reckons from that event. His era is the era of reformed worship. But in that case it seems a mistake to assume, as Wellhausen does (ut supra, p. 623), that the 18th year would be the first of the reformed era. If the first year of captivity is the first that began in captivity, the first year of reformation must be that which began after the reformation, or the 19th of Josiah. It is indeed probable, since Ezekiel reckons by Babylonian months, and so begins the year in the spring, that his first year begins with Josiah's reformed passover. But if so, the spring era was already in use in Josiah's time in priestly circles (comp. 2 Kings xxii. 3, LXX.), and so, in spite of 2 Kings xxiii. 23, which belongs to the editor, not to the sources, and therefore has no chronological authority, that passover must have fallen in the 19th year of the king. For it is to be noted that it is always in priestly circles or in connection with events of the temple that a reckoning by years of the king is found. The assignation of 11 years to Jehoiakim instead of 12 may be a mere oversight, the Hebrew chronicler supposing that Nebuchadnezzar commanded at Carchemish as king. It may, however, be systematic, as the number 11 is the key to the last 110 years of the kingdom (Manasseh, 55; Amon + Josiah = 33). In any case it would have the effect of disordering by one year any calculations as to earlier dates.

Let us now go back to the time of Hezekiah. Taking the reigns from Manasseh to Zedekiah inclusive at 110 years, and that of Hezekiah at 29, we get 1 Hezekiah == B.C. 724; but allowing one more year for Jehoiakim the date is 725. But for the reign of Hezekiah we have the following synchronisms: —

(1) 2 Kings xviii. 9; 4 Hezekiah = the year of the commencement of the siege of Samaria = B.C. 724-722 by the Assyrian monuments.

(2) 2 Kings xviii. 13; 14 Hezekiah = the year of Sennacherib's invasion = B.C. 701 by the monuments.

These dates are quite inconsistent with one another, and the question arises which we shall take as our guide. Let us begin with (1). It is plain that, according to the received chronology, this date is at least one year out; but if we introduce the correction already found requisite for Jehoiakim it is probably exact (supra, p. 403). In other words, if this date is original and accurate, the book of Kings is probably right — certainly not more than two years wrong — in assigning 29 + 55 + 2 = 86 Years to Hezekiah, Manasseh, and Anion taken together. There is therefore high probability that (1) is an independent and valuable datum, and that the sum of the years of Hezekiah, Manasseh, and Anion is also accurately known. And in general this result is borne out by the statement of Jer. xxvi. 18, that Micah, who predicts the fall of Samaria, prophesied under Hezekiah, a statement inconsistent with synchronism (2), which makes Ahaz be still on the throne when Samaria was captured.

When we pass now to (2) we are encountered by a very complex problem; for the statement that Sennacherib attacked Samaria in Hezekiah's fourteenth year is closely connected with the assignation to that prince of a total reign of 29 years. The connection is as follows: — At 2 Kings xx. 1 we learn that Hezekiah's sickness took place about the time of the Assyrian invasion, and at verse 6 we find that after this sickness Hezekiah lived 15 years. Now 29= 14 + 15, which at first sight seems to bear out (2). A closer examination, however, shows that there is something wrong. Merodach Baladan, whose embassy is placed after Hezekiah's sickness, was no longer king in B.C. 701, and the history contains internal evidence (ver. 6) that Hezekiah's sickness fell before the expedition of Sennacherib. One, therefore, of the numbers 14, 15, 29 is certainly false, and has been calculated from the other two. In that case we have three possibilities, (a) 14 and 29 are right and the 15 is wrong. If so, Manasseh came to the throne in 686, and not in 695 as the received chronology states. In this there is no intrinsic improbability, for to make that king begin the third section of the 480 years from Solomon's temple seems to be certainly a part of the artificial chronology. But in that case it is very singular that the artificial chronology should have found its end served by a date for Manasseh which is indeed false, but combined with 29 and with 2 Kings xviii. 9 gives a date almost, if not quite, exact for the fall of Samaria. Such a coincidence could only be the result of design, and the design is an incredible one, for it implies knowledge of the true Assyrian chronology and a determination to fix the fall of Samaria (a non-Judaean date) correctly, at the expense of the date 701, which directly affected Judah. (6) 14 is right and 29 is wrong, and derived from a combination of the 14 with 15. In this case a similar argument applies. The false 29, and the artificial (but independent) date for Manasseh combine to give the true date for the fall of Samaria. And neither (a) nor (6) gives the least clue to the reason of the discordant data (1) and (2). (c) There remains a third hypothesis, viz. that 15 and 29 are the dates from which the 14 has been derived, and this view, I think, enables us to give a tenable hypothesis for the whole system of numbers.

To develop it, I return to the assumptions already found probable, that the fourth year of Hezekiah coincides with the first year of the siege of Samaria, and that Hezekiah, Manasseh, and Amon together reigned 86 years. I do not assume that the years of each king are truly known, for the accession of Manasseh seems to be an artificial date. But it is highly probable that the true reign of each of these kings was once known. For in the time of Uzziah dates were not yet popularly reckoned by years of kings (Amos i. 1), while this reckoning appears under Hezekiah. This does not seem to be accident. The sundial of Ahaz, as well as his interest in star worship, point to the fact that astronomy (combined, of course, with superstition) was one of his foreign tastes, and it is impossible that he could have dealt with astronomy without feeling the need for a more exact calendar on the Assyrian model. It seems also that the reckoning by years of kings really went by the Assyrian Calendar from the time of Josiah downwards, If so, the time of Ahaz or Hezekiah is almost the only one at which it could have been introduced. I apprehend, then, that from the time of Ahaz downwards there was an exact record of years reigned, such as there is no trace of at an earlier date, except in concerns of the temple (the latter probably reckoned by the Phoenician Calendar; see Dillmann's essay in Monatb. Berl. Ac., 27 Oct. 1881). Again, though the book of Kings in its present form dates from the Exile, or indeed, as regards the schematised chronology, from after the restoration, the main stock of it is certainly earlier even in its redaction, and so might well contain the true years for Hezekiah and his successors. If so, the schematiser of the chronology would not change more than was necessary, and if he lengthened Manasseh's reign would correspondingly shorten Hezekiah's. Thus it is intelligible that the fourth year of Hezekiah comes in

at the true date, or, at least, within a year or two. We may assume, therefore, that the choice of the number 29 was not arbitrary. But now again it is the independent judgment of critics that, in its present form, 2 Kings xviii. 13-xx. 19, with the exception of the remarkable versos xviii. 14-16 (not found in the parallel passage in Isaiah), belongs to a pretty late date (Wellhausen, in Bleek, § 131), or at least was retouched after the fall of the kingdom. In that case it is easy to understand how the fourteenth year of Hezekiah may be an insertion or correction made on the presupposition that Hezekiah's sickness corresponded with the year of Sennacherib's invasion. It is not quite certain that this even requires us to hold the 15 to be part of the original tradition, for Jerome gives an interpretation of Isa. xxxviii. 10 which makes the sickness fall at the bisection of Hezekiah's clays, and it is probable that this explanation was traditional.

The foregoing argument is undoubtedly of a very hypothetical character, but it seems to show that at all events it is possible to explain (2) from (1), but not vice versa; and this, combined with the argument from the date of Micah, and the fact that (1) gives a date for the siege of Samaria as accordant with the monuments as we can possibly expect, seems to entitle us to give it the preference. Hezekiah's first year is thus fixed for 725 (724). It does not follow that Manasseh's first year was 695, for that is a schematised date, and there is force in Wellhausen's argument that the strength of the prophetic party in Judah at the time of the reaction under Manasseh makes it probable that Hezekiah reigned some considerable time after the defeat of Sennacherib.

If the first year of Hezekiah was 725, Ahaz's reign is shortened to some ten years. But his 16 years will not fit with either (1) or (2); and, though the ages given to him and Hezekiah at their accessions rather demand a lengthening than a shortening of his reign, it is difficult to assign much value to these, when numbers so much more essential to be remembered are indubitably most corrupt.

Note 4, p. 202. — The nature of this divination by means of familiar spirits, as the wizard or Ba'al Ob pretended, is seen from the narrative of the witch of Endor. In reality, the performance was a form of ventriloquism, and the Ob or familiar spirit seemed to speak from beneath the ground or out of the stomach of the diviner. The Greeks called such diviners ἐγγαστρίμυθοι, ἐγγαστρῖται, στερνομάντεις, Εὐρυκλεῖς or Εὐρυκλεΐδαι, and their father Eurycles was said to prophesy truly "by the daemon that was within him," Schol. on Arist., Vespae, 984 (1019); Iamblichus cited by Lagarde, Abhandlungen, p. 189. In Syriac these subterranean spirits are called Zakkure, and the conception is well illustrated in the second Syriac romance of Julian the Apostate, published by Hoffmann (Julianos der abtrunnige, Leyden, 1880, p. 247), translated by Noldeke, Z. V. M. G., xxviii. 666 seq. See also Noldeke's note.

Note 5, p. 211. — Compare O. T. in J. Ch., Lect. iv. p. 109 seq.; Lect. vi. p. 159 seq.

Note 6, p. 217. — Mr. Cheyne, mainly following Kleinert in Theol. Stud. u. Krit., 1877, p. 174 seq., defends the authorship of Isa. xxi. 1-10 by Isaiah, arguing that the ideas and phraseology are Isaiah's, that the second part of the prophecy seems to have been written at a distance from Babylon, with the fate of which the prophet expresses a certain sympathy, and that the reference may therefore be to the siege of Babylon by Sargon in 709, to which date Mr. Cheyne assigns the expedition of Merodach Baladan to Hezekiah. I do not think that these arguments have all the weight claimed for them. There is good reason for holding that the embassy of Merodach Baladan fell in the reign of Sennacherib (infra, Lect. VIII), and it seems impossible to question that the

destruction of Babylon, spoken of in ver. 2 as effected by Elam and Media, must be the capture of the city by Cyrus. The prophecy, therefore, belongs to the Chaldaean cycle.

Note 7, p. 217. — It may here be convenient to give in connected form the chronological order of the chief prophecies, according to the results of the following Lectures. Of course, there is necessarily a large element of hypothesis in the details.

First Period. — From the year of Uzziah's death to the outbreak of the Syro-Ephraitic war. Chaps. ii.-v., and probably (as Ewald conjectures), ix. 8 — x. 4, the latest part of this collection dating apparently from the first epoch of the war, circa 735 B.C.

Second Period. — Prophecies at the time of Ahaz's resolution to do homage to Assyria, and during the ensuing campaign of Tiglath Pileser (734 B.C.). Chaps, vii. 1 — ix. 7 (chap, vi., recording Isaiah's first vision, seems to have been published as a preface to this collection). Chap, xvii. 1-11 seems also to date from the same period.

Third Period. — The time of Assyrian domination.

(a) Prophecies apparently occasioned by the impending fall of Samaria, 722-720 B.C., or restating the prophet's position after that event. Chap, xxviii. (before the fall of Samaria); chap. x. 5— xi. (after that event).

(b) At the time of the revolt of Ashdod, 711 B.C. Chap. XX.

(c) Under Sennacherib: — (1) During the first movements of revolt in Philistia, 704 B.C. Chap. xiv. 29-32.

(c) Prophecies addressed to Judah while the plan of revolt was ripening, 704-701 B.C. Chaps, xxix.- xxxii. (3) Against the other nations in revolt against Assyria. Chap. xxi. 11-17, Duma and the nomads of the Syro- Arabian desert; chap, xxiii., Tyre; chap, xviii., Ethiopia; chap, xix., Egypt, The re- issue of the old prophecy against Moab, chaps, xv. xvi., may belong to the same period. (4) During the campaign in Judaea, 701 B.C. Chaps, i., xxii. (5) In the last stage of the campaign, after the fall of the party opposed to Isaiah. Chaps, xxxvii. 6, 7; xxxvii. 21-35; xxxiii. (6) Chaps, xiv, 24-27; xvii. 12-14, seem to belong to this period, but their exact position in it is uncertain.

Irregular as the arrangement of these prophecies seems to be, it is not without a principle. Chap. i. seems to have been prefixed as a general introduction to the whole book, for which its contents well ht it. With this exception, the part of the book that precedes the large Babylonian prophecy of chaps, xiii. xiv. is well arranged, apart at least from the trans- position of ix. 8 — x. 4. It contains two sections which Isaiah himself may have published very much as they stand, followed by a great and self-contained prophecy against Assyria, which might well be chosen as the close of a first attempt at a collected edition of some of Isaiah's principal pieces. Again, from chap, xiii. to chap, xxiii. we have a collection of prophecies which, with the exception of chap, xxii., are all directed against foreign nations. As it now stands, this collection contains also Babylonian prophecies, and so must be of Exilic or post-Exilic date. But the main part of it may well be of earlier collection, and chaps, xiii., xiv. 1-23, perhaps do not properly belong to it at all. Finally, from chap. xxix. onward we have prophecies of the time of Sennacherib addressed to Judah. That xxviii., which

dates from an earlier period, is associated with these is explicable from the subject, and it is not unlikely that Isaiah himself may have published it as a preface to the later prophecies with which it is now associated. The chief breaches of chronological order are entirely due to the plan adopted of putting the prophecies against foreign nations together, as was also done in the collection of the oracles of Jeremiah. A study of the varying order of the several parts of the last-named book in the Hebrew and LXX. respectively is the best exercise by which one can convince oneself that the order in which a. collection now stands cannot be held to afford any sure clue to the chronological order.

Note 8, p. 218. — See Cheyne on the passage, and, as regards the Cherubim, his article in Encyc. Brit., s.v., where references to the relevant literature are collected. If the Seraphim are a personification of the lightning flash they have some analogy to the Phoenician רשף (C. I. S., p. 38).

Note 9, p. 224. — On the idea of holiness a great deal has been written. I need only refer to two of the most recent discussions. Duhm (Theologie der Propheten, p. 169 seq.) lays particular emphasis on the relation of the idea to the worship of God. The idea is aesthetic; Jehovah's majesty presents itself as holiness to the worshipper in the act of worship. It would be more correct to say that the idea of consecration to God is a religious or aesthetic and not strictly an ethical idea; it becomes ethical in the prophets because religion becomes ethical. In the elaborate article on the notion of holiness in the Old Testament in Baudissin's Studien, part ii. (1878), there is a useful collection of material. The most important thing in it, as Noldeke observes in his review of the book (Lit. Centralbl., 1879, No. 12), is the part devoted to show that the notion of holiness has not the primary sense of purity. It may be now held as agreed among scholars that the Arabic words on which this idea was based are taken from the Greek κάδος. That the word is old Arabic in the sense of holy seems clear from Kuds as the name of two mountains in Arabia (Yakut iv. 38, seq.; see also Noldeke, l. c.); but its use in the Koran is influenced by Judaism; the word seems almost to have disappeared from the ordinary Arabic vocabulary, and the explanation of the commentators on Sur, ii. 28 that kadasa fi'l ard, like sabaha fi'l ard, means "to go far off" (Ibn Sa'ud, Egn. ed., i. 59), does not go for much. So Noldeke judges that the arguments from Arabic for the sense of "depart" require confirmation. The Aramaic Kdasha, an earring, literally a "holy thing," that is, no doubt, an amulet (comp. the lehashim or amulets as articles of finery, Isa. iii. 20), is noteworthy. The remarks on the idea of holiness in the text of this Lecture are exclusively based on the earlier parts of the Old Testament down to the time of Isaiah.

Lecture VI.

Note 1, p. 236. — In viii. 1 for roll read tablet. That a tablet inscribed in large letters to catch the eye of every one is meant is the plausible explanation of Ewald, Propheten, i. 8. A facsimile of the Siloam inscription, with commentary, etc., will appear in the forthcoming part of the Oriental series of the Palaeographical Society.

Note 2, p. 239. — The explanation of ix. 14 given in the following verse is regarded as a later and inaccurate gloss by most recent critics.

Note 3, p. 246. — On this topic, and in general on Isaiah's theocratic ideal, see Wellhausen, Geschichte, i. 431 seq.

Note 4, p. 248,— The צמח (A. V. Branch) of Isa. iv. 2 is not, as in Jer. xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15, a sprout from the stock of David, but, more generally, that which Jehovah causes to spring forth, viz. from the land, as appears from the parallel "the fruit of the land." This, I think, excludes all reference to the king of chap, xi., such as is still thought of by Lagarde, Semitica, i. 8 seq., in spite of his apt illustration from Semitic heathenism, where Baal's land is, like the land of Canaan, such as derives fertility from the rains of heaven, not from irrigation (comp. Hosea ii. 21). The word צמח is best rendered, I think, by "spring" in the old English sense of young, fresh growth (as in Shakspeare's poems). This enables us to keep up the connection with the cognate verb, as in Zech. vi. 12 (" the man whose name is Spring and from under him it shall spring up," that is, wherever he treads fresh life and growth follow), as well as to feel the identity of the word in such a passage as Psalm lxv. 10, "Thou blessest the springing thereof."

Note 5, p. 250. — In justification of the Authorised Version in this rendering see Lagarde, Semitica, i. 13.

Note 6, p, 251. — Compare Ewald, Geschichte, iii. 664; and on 2 Kings xvi. 18, to which allusion is made a few lines down the page, see ibid., p. 667.

Note 7, p. 267. — This verse, certainly mistranslated in the Authorised Version, may run, "In that day shall his strong cities be like the deserted places of forest and hill-top, which were left desert before the children of Israel." Possibly, however, we should correct by the aid of the Septuagint (Lagarde, Semitica, i. 31) "the deserted places of the Hivite and the Amorite."

Note 8, p. 267. — Flesh is never a common article of food with the peasantry of Syria. Bread and other cereal preparations with milk, generally eaten sour, and dibs, or grape honey, are the ordinary diet, as Seetzen, for example, found in the Hauran (Reisen, i. 48; comp. Prov. xxvii. 27; Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, 1822, p. 293). Where there is much cultivation of cereals the supply of milk is of course correspondingly limited. According to Isaiah vii. 22, the whole land of Judah shall become free pasture ground, with the result that the kine and ewes shall yield abundance of milk, and the man who has a young cow and two sheep shall have abundance of milk for his family, but no bread or wine, As the vineyards are the first thing to be destroyed, requiring as they do the most sedulous cultivation, the honey mentioned by Isaiah is doubtless natural honey, such as John the Baptist found in the desert, or Jonathan in the woods. As the wild bee frequents desert places, swarming in the woody or in the rocky sides of deep watercourses, the abundance of honey is another indication of the desolation of the land. At vii. 15 the true rendering is that the child whose infancy falls at the time of the destruction of Damascus shall eat butter and honey when he is of age to distinguish the good from the bad. That is, when his infancy begins to pass into rational childhood the land shall be already reduced to the state of depopulation described in verses 21 seq.

Note 9, p. 272. — The view that the sign given by Isaiah refers in its original sense to the birth of our Lord is still upheld by Dr. Kay, and some remarks on the subject, with reference to his argument, may not be out of place. The first point is the meaning of the word עַלְמָה 'almah,

rendered παρθενος the oldest version, and "virgin" in the A. V. The word is not a very common one, though rather commoner than the masculine "elem, a young man or lad, of which it is the regular feminine. This fact is alone sufficient to show that virginity is not the radical idea, and a comparison with the Arabic and Aramaic leaves no doubt that both in the masculine and the feminine the meaning is a young person of marriageable age. There is in fact another and common word for a virgin (bethulah). Even the latter word can be used of a young bride (Joel i. 8), and when the idea of virginity is to be made prominent it is not out of place to express it more directly (Gen. xxiv. 16; Judges xxi. 12). But is it then at least the ease that usage limits the word 'almah to a virgin? The word only occurs six times apart from our passage; twice it is used of a grown-up girl still unmarried (Gen. xxiv. 43; Exod. ii. 8), twice it seems to be used of the slave girls of Solomon's harem (Cant. i. 3; vi. 8). In Prov. XXX. 19 Dr. Kay feels the force of the argument against his view so much that he backs up his appeal to Hengstenberg by the suggestion that the passage is allegorical; Ps. lviii. 25 may be fairly taken with the two passages first quoted. On the whole the evidence does not bear out the supposition that virginity is an essential in the notion; though a marriageable girl naturally stands distinguished from a married woman, and thus Isaiah probably means a young woman who has not yet been a mother. But this suits the acceptation of the passage which we have adopted. The prophet's point is that before a woman presently to be married can have a child emerging from babyhood certain things will occur. That this is at all events the correct determination of the date which he has in view (viz. the following year) is absolutely clear. For the same date is given again in the parallel prophecy viii. 3, 4, by a similar and quite unambiguous sign.

The objection to all this is mainly that the sign offered by Jehovah must be of a grander and miraculous character. But what is the nature of a prophetic "sign"? Another "sign" given by Isaiah is his walking naked and barefoot for three years (xx. 3); he and his children are living signs to Israel (viii. 18). So, too, in Ezek. iv. 3; xii. 6, 11; xxiv. 24, 27, the signs are mere symbolic actions or God-given pledges for the fulfilment of His word. They are, as it were, seals set to prophecy, by which its truth can he put to the test in the future. What Dr. Kay further urges for the Messianic references from combination with Isa. ix. 7, Micah v. 3, is plainly not demonstrative, for the combination is not indicated in the Bible itself.

Note 10, p. 273. — See Ewald on the passage, and Lagarde, Semitica, i. 31 seq., where the identity of Na'aman with Adonis in ably maintained. Note further that the river now called the Nahr Na'man is the ancient Belus, which seems to confirm the view that Na'man is a divine name.

Note 11, p. 276. — I here follow what I may call the certain correction made independently by Selwyn and Studer.

Lecture VII

Note 1, p. 279. — At this point the Assyrian records begin to be of the highest service for the history of Israel and of Isaiah's work. I shall not refer to them at each point, but it will be convenient to indicate where English translations of them may be found. The Annals of Sargon, translated by M. Oppert, are given in Rec. of the Past, vol. vii., the inscription on his palace at Khorsabad, ibid., vol. ix., and other inscriptions of the same reign in vol. xi. The Koyunjik cylinder, chiefly relied upon by those who refer several prophecies of Isaiah to a supposed invasion and siege

of Jerusalem by Sargon, is translated by George Smith, Eponym Canons p. 129 (Assyrian Discoveries, p. 289). It is, unhappily, in a very fragmentary condition. For the whole question of the relations of Judah with Sargon, as reflected in the prophecies of Isaiah, it is enough to refer to Mr. Cheyne's Prophecies of Isaiah, under chaps, i., X, XX,, but especially in his introduction to chaps, xxxvi.-xxxix., where the literature of the subject is fully cited. It will be seen in the text of this Lecture that I am unable to follow the conclusion which has recommended itself to Mr. Cheyne on the basis of suggestions by Dr. Hincks, Prof. Sayce, and other Assyriologists. Mr. Cheyne's commentary should he taken along with his article Isaiah, in the Encyc. Brit., ninth ed., vol. xiii. In regard to the bearing of the narrative of Kings on this question, the most satisfactory discussion is that of Wellhausen in his edition of Bleek's Einleitung (1878), p. 254 seq., and again in Encyc. Brit., vol. xiii. p. 414.

Note 2, p. 280. — Rafia is called Kafeh by Mr. Chester (Palestine Survey; Special Papers, p. 11), and Bir Refa in Baedeker's Handbook to Palestine, Route 11. The true Arabic name, however, is Rafah (Yukut, ii. 796; Istakhry and Mokaddasy soepius; Makrizy, Hitat wa-Athar, i. 189). Yakut places it eighteen miles from Gaza, at the termination of the sandy desert, with a great sycamore grove three miles on the Gaza side of it. It was, and still is, regarded as the frontier between Egypt and Syria (Istakhry, p. 45). The latest notice of the place is in the Archduke Ludwig Salvator's Caravan Route (Eng. Tr. 1881, p. 54), with a view of the columns that mark the site of an ancient temple.

Note 3, p. 287. — The difficulties of interpretation that encompass the book of Micah, and the very corrupt state of some parts of the text, are well known, and have received special attention from various critics since the publication of the Commentarius in Vaticinium Michae of Taco Roorda (1869). Notwithstanding the discussion by Stade in his Zeitschrift for 1881, I still think that chaps. i.-v. form a single well-connected book. The question of chaps, vi.-vii. does not belong to the subject of the present Lecture. At the same time, it will be seen in Note 5 that the text of Micah i.-v. has suffered from interpolation, and it is an open question whether, besides the passages there spoken of, ii. 12, 13 does not break the connection and at least require to be transposed. There is, however, nothing in the thought of these verses which is not perfectly congruous with chap, v., and Ewald's suggestion that they are inserted as a specimen of false prophecy is therefore untenable. The false prophets of Micah's time flattered the rulers and supported the status quo, while the verses in question give precisely Micah's idea of a rejuvenescence of the mass of the nation under Jehovah and Jehovah's king — a popular, not an aristocratic conception.

Note 4, p. 289. — In Micah ii. 8, and similarly in Isa. xxx. 33, the punctuation אתמול is not meant to be a variation of אתמול, but expresses a different exegetical tradition, in which the phrase is explained from מול, " over against." In Isaiah both traditions (and so both pronunciations) are ancient, but that with δ probably more ancient (LXX., Aq., Sym., Theod., Syr.). The conflate rendering of the Targum expresses both. In Micah the weight of tradition is for α (Aq., Hieron., Tgm., as against Sym. and perhaps LXX. j Syr. thinking of the root מלא) The variation can be traced down into the time of the pointed text; see Cod. Petrop., edited by Strack, where in each place a later hand has put δ for α. The passage, then, is one in which there was an early

divergence of tradition, and in which therefore we are thrown back on the consonantal text, which probably had originally no ו. But the opposition of vers. 7, 8 is that of sharp contrast, which suggests that we should begin with a pronoun וְאַתֶּם. Combining this conjecture with Roorda's שִׁלְמוֹ for שְׁלֹמֵי the latter of which gives no good sense, and omitting one of the four consecutive mems (יָקוּם for יְקוֹמֵם) or reading יְקוֹמֵם for יִתְקוֹמֵם (which, though less likely, is certainly possible, Ols. §68, h), we get the sense, "But ye are to My people as a foe rising up against one that is at peace with him; ye strip off the cloak from them that pass by securely, averse from [not thinking of] war." For אדר we probably should read אדרת, the final ת having disappeared in "that following, and the garment meant is probably the hairy mantle which, as worn by the prophets, was doubtless the garment of the simpler classes. Of interpretations retaining the present text the most ingenious is certainly that of Abulwalid (col. 764), who anticipates Roorda in taking אֶתְמוֹל as " against." The almost total neglect of this greatest of mediaeval Hebraists by expositors subsequent to Gesenius is much to be deplored.

Note 5, p. 290. — The words ובאת עד בבל are rejected as a gloss by Noldeke in Schenkel's Bibel-Lexikon, iv. 214 (1872), and by Kuenen, Theol. Tijdsch., 1872, p. 291. Kuenen forcibly points out that a precisely similar gloss has been introduced by the LXX. in ver. 8. That the words are no part of the original context appears, I think, very clearly from the sense. To say that the daughter of Zion shall be delivered in Babylon from the hand of all her enemies gives no good sense. We can speak of deliverance from captivity, but not of deliverance in it. On the other hand, to say that the population of Zion shall be delivered in the field, i.e. in the open country, agrees, as is shown in the text of the Lecture, with the context and the general tenor of Micah's thought. The words "And thou shalt come unto Babylon " cannot, however, be the only interpolation in chap. iv., for the impossibility of reconciling vers. 11-13 with ver. 10 is plain. According to ver. 10 Zion shall be captured by the enemy, and this agrees with iii. 12. But in the following verses the besieging hosts of many nations are broken beneath the Avails of Jerusalem. The force of this difficulty has been recognised by most recent writers on the question, by Oort (Theol. Tijdsch., 1872, p. 507); Kuenen (ibid., 1872, p. 62 — in the later paper already cited he endeavours to meet the difficulty); Wellhausen (Bleek's Einl., 4th ed., p. 426); Stade (Z.f. AT. W., 1881, p. 167); and Steiner (ad k). The solutions proposed are various, but the simplest seems to be that of Oort, who treats vers. 11-13 as an interpolation. In accepting Oort's view thus far, I by no means agree with his general treatment of the passage, which, as Kuenen has remarked (l. c), has no necessary connection with the genuineness of the verses in question. Stade, who separates out the whole pericope, iv. 11- V. 4 (Heb., V. 3) as a separate propjecy, seems to me to miss the point of the prophet's thought.

Note 6, p. 291. — The sinfulness of these things is elsewhere emphasised by the prophets, inasmuch as they are earthly things which come between man and Jehovah (Isa. ii.). But the thought of Micah goes further than this. Hosea had taught that Judah shall not be delivered by horses and horsemen, but also not by weapons of human war (i. 7; ii. 1 8). Micah, though he looks forward to a reign of peace among the nations, thinks of Judah as delivered by the sword (v. 6). His objection to fortresses and horses is not an objection to war. Nor is it a mere objection to the misuse of these things. They are themselves out of place in restored Israel. This is parallel to Deut. xvii. 16, where the multiplication of horses is spoken of as a fault in the king. Horses and chariots were in

fact in ancient times the counterpart of the standing armies and artillery of which free peoples in modern times have been naturally jealous as dangerous to liberty. And the maintenance of the royal establishment of horses was accompanied by oppressive exactions, as we see from 1 Kings xviii, 5, and the mention of the first grass crop as the "king's mowings " in Amos vii. 7.

Note 7, p. 297. — A few words may here be added on the special points in the prophecies assigned by Mr. Cheyne to the invasion of Sargon, which he lays stress on as hardly consistent with a reference to the wars of 701. On chap. i. the argument that there are no points of contact between this prophecy and those composed -with reference to Sennacherib's invasion is not valid if we distinguish in that campaign two periods, one before Hezekiah's submission, and another after the shameless breach of faith of which Sennacherib was guilty, in demanding the surrender of the fortress of Zion, after he had come to terms with Hezekiah. That the sketch of the moral and religious condition of Judah will not apply to Hezekiah's time is also an assumption based on the view that the reforms of that king preceded the repulse of Sennacherib, which is, at all events, very doubtful (see Lect. VIII.). In chap. xxii. "the severe tone of the prophecy" is again to be explained by referring it to the siege in the first part of the campaign, when Hezekiah made submission to Sennacherib, in chaps, xxix.-xxxii. Mr. Cheyne himself does not seem to reject the reference to Sennacherib, in spite of his remark at p. 155, that they "were evidently delivered at various stages of the Assyrian intervention under Sargon." See his notes on xxx. 29, 33.

Note 8, p. 298. — Several points of contact between Isa. x. xi. and Isa. xxviii. (x. 12: xxviii. 21; x. 23: xxviii. 22; x. 26: xxviii. 15, 18) have been pointed out by Ewald and Cheyne, and to these may be added x. 20: xxviii 15; xi. 2: xxviii. 6. In their whole conception, indeed, the two chapters are most closely allied, the essential points of difference being (a) that in the one Samaria has fallen, in the other is only about to fall; (b) that chap, xxviii. is mainly addressed to the godless rulers, while chaps. X. xi., in which very little reference is made to the sin of Judah, seem rather to be a word of comfort to the true remnant — primarily we may suppose to Isaiah's own circle. The thought that Judah and Assyria cannot long remain on terms appears already in xxviii. 20, and, taken with the lesson of the fall of Samaria, would easily lead to the thought of the decisive contest of chap. X., without the intervention of any actual war between Judah and Israel. Further, that chap. xi. was written at a considerably earlier date than the prophecies of the reign of Sennacherib seems probable from the prominence given in the former chapter to the new Davidic kingship, in that contrast to the old monarchy which disappears in later prophecies. The chief reason why many commentators feel themselves obliged to refer x. xi. to a time of actual war is the extraordinary vividness and detail of the description of the approach of the Assyrian through the pass of Michmash. We know, however, that Sennacherib's advance was not made by this road, which disposes at all events of the still not quite abandoned theory of a vaticinium ex eventu. Moreover, if Isaiah wrote this prophecy, as has also been supposed by some, when the Assyrian was already close at hand, he could not have chosen this route for his description, for it must have been plain from the beginning of the campaign that Sennacherib's plan was to advance by the sea-coast. In any case, therefore, the picture is an ideal one, and Isaiah gives it the most impressive form possible by depicting an advance from the North by way of Scopus. His thought is that from the conquered land of Samaria the Assyrian will move on against Jerusalem; his progress is southwards in steady course, and this determines the details.

Note 9, p. 307. — The first and last of the four names bestowed on the child of Isa. ix. 6 certainly do not imply anything that involves a transcendental personality. The king who is equipped as is described. in chap. xi. may well be called "Wonderful Counsellor" (these words are to be united in a single idea as in פרא אדם, Gen. xvi. 12), and "Prince of Peace." The interpretation of the third name is disputed. It is sometimes taken to mean "Father of booty," but at all events the phrase "everlasting mountains" (Hab. iii. 6) shows that it has not the transcendental idea of eternity. The words in Hebrew which we render by eternity mean only a duration the commencement or completion of which lies in the mist of extreme remoteness, or is not contemplated by the speaker. "God the mighty one," construed as an apposition, is a quite unique name, such appositional forms not occurring in pure Hebrew names of persons (Olshausen, Sprachlehrbuch, p. 613). If we rendered it "God is the mighty one," it would be parallel to such names as Elnaam, "God is graciousness;" Eliphelet or Elphelet, "God is deliverance;" Joah, "Jehovah is a brother." But, according to Hebrew idiom, a being in whom is God's name is one through which God manifests Himself to men, and so the prophet probably means this wondrous name to describe the manifestation of Jehovah's kingship through His human representative. It is through the New Testament that we learn that a complete and adequate manifestation of God to man can only be made through a God-man.

Note 10, p. 309. — The relation of these two passages has been so often and fully discussed that it is needless to go into it again. It seems to be quite clearly made out that Micah does not quote from Isaiah, but also there are no indications in the context that he quotes from any one at all, while the idea that the passage stands in Isaiah as the text for the remarks that follow is somewhat arbitrary and hardly borne out by the context. The opening words at Isa. ii. 2 show that the passage as it stands in Isaiah is divorced from its original connection, and it has just enough of apparent bearing on ii. 5 to make it possible that a copyist inserted it at that place.

Lecture VIII.

Note 1, p. 317. — The Assyrian inscriptions bearing on this revolt are given in G. Smith's posthumous History of Sennacherib, 1878; Eponym Canon, p. 131. See also Alexander Polyhistor, ap. Euseb., Chron., ed. Schoene, vol. i. p. 27; G. Syncellus (Bonn ed.), vol. i. p. 391. The Assyrians ruled Babylon by means of a vassal king, and so the two years "without a king" in the Canon given by Syncellus are those of Merodacha Baladan's revolt. His embassy to Judah can hardly fall later than 704.

Note 2, p. 319. — The title prefixed to this prophecy (xiv. 28) refers it to the year of Ahaz's death. In that case Ahaz must be the fallen oppressor of the Philistines, and Hezekiah the new and more terrible conqueror, and this view is supported by those who accept the title (e.g., Delitzsch, ad loc.) by reference to the victories of Hezekiah over the Philistines, 2 Kings xviii. 8. But in ver. 31 the destroying force is unquestionably the Assyrian, as Delitzsch himself admits, and thus the title breaks the unity of the oracle. If Hezekiah continued a dominion over the Philistines commenced in the reign of his father, both must have done so as agents of the Assyrian. There is no trace of this, and in any case such a supremacy could hardly have afforded the motive for our prophecy. It is possible that Hezekiah's operations in Philistia were connected with the rising against Sennacherib, when he seems to have been accepted as head of the Philistine revolt, and held Padi the Assyrian vassal-king of Ekron as n captive. Or more probably the reference in Kings is to operations

undertaken after the defeat of Sennacherib to recover the districts which, as Ave learn from the monuments, Sennacherib in the first prosperous part of his expedition detached from Judah and handed over to the sovereigns of Ashdod, Ekron, and Gaza. Before the war with Sennacherib, at all events, it was with Assyria, not with Hezekiah, that the Philistines had to reckon, and it is to Assyria that the prophecy clearly points. The titles of prophecies have by no means the same authority as the text; they are often demonstrably incorrect and mere late conjectures. In the present case the conjecture may have been founded on the Rabbinical exegesis expressed, as Bochart has noticed, in the Targum, which makes the root of the serpent (Nahash) mean the stock of Jesse, according to the well-known identification of Jesse with the Nahash of 2 Sam. xvii. 25. If the prophecy refers to the death of an Assyrian monarch, it is Sargon, not Shalmaneser, who must naturally be thought of.

Note 3, p. 322. — The Altaku of the monuments (in the neighbourhood of Tamna or Timnath) is generally and plausibly identified with the Eltekeh of Josh. xix. 44; xxi. 23, of which nothing further is known, except that it lay like Timnath in Danite territory.

Note 4, p. 335.— It was, I think, a saying of Napoleon, that under a good government the Delta encroaches on the desert, while under a, bad government the desert encroaches on the Delta. Not only are the public works, the great canals, apt to fall into ruin under a bad government, but the peasantry, having no security for the enjoyment of the fruit of their labour, will not do their part. Thus every traveller by the overland route to India must have been struck with the small amount of cultivation along the banks of the great freshwater canal. The water was there, provided at the cost of many thousand lives, but there was not such confidence in the equity of Ismail Pasha as to encourage cultivators to risk their capital in improvements which might be rendered worthless in a moment by a rise in the water-rate or by the water being cut off. The real cure for the miseries of Egypt is still a government in which the people can have sufficient confidence to venture to help themselves, and to utilise the vast number of small hoards now lying buried in the earth or in holes in the walls of houses. It is not free institutions, but a just and firm administration that is beneficial to the East.

Note 5, p. 336. — On the discussion as to the authorship of Isa. xix. 16-25 see Cheyne's introduction to the chapter; Kuenen, Onderzoek, ii. 74. The passage may have been retouched, and at least the variants on the name of the city in ver. 18 (city of destruction, city of the sun, city of righteousness) may have something to do with the Onias temple at Leontopolis; but that an interpolation in favour of this sanctuary could have entered the Hebrew text, as Hitzig and Geiger suppose, is hardly possible. And the allusion to the consecrated macceba, ver. 19, is quite inconsistent with a date subsequent to the reformation of Josiah and the acceptance of the Deuteronomic law of worship.

Note 6, p, 345. — The variety of opinion as to the history of the relations of Assyria to Judah, to which reference has been made in the notes on last Lecture, is nowhere more remarkable than in the accounts given by different historians and expositors of Sennacherib's campaign in Judah. The opinion which distinguishes two invasions under Sargon and Sennacherib respectively has been already discussed and rejected. On the other hand, the theory of Professor Rawlinson that Sennacherib was twice in Judaea (e.g. 701, and again B.C. 699), that Hezekiah's surrender and tribute belong to the first occasion and the great deliverance to the second (Ancient Monarchies, ii.

165), has no basis whatever except pure conjecture. Sennacherib seems to have been in quite a different quarter in the latter year (Smith, History of Sennacherib, p. 87). It is therefore necessary to place both the surrender and the deliverance of Jerusalem, as recorded in Kings, in the campaign of 701. The first part of the campaign, in which the Assyrians were victorious, is described in Kings exactly as on the monuments (see Encyc. Brit., xiii. 414). That .Sennacherib does not relate the calamity which subsequently befell his host and compelled him to retire is quite what we should expect from the exclusively boastful style of the Assyrian monuments, and his record is manifestly imperfect, for it does not tell how Sennacherib settled matters with Tirhakah or mention the conclusion of peace with him. Further, the immediate outbreak of a fresh rebellion in Babylon and the fact that Sennacherib did not again appear to make war on Egypt are clear proofs that his retreat was inglorious, in spite of the spoil he carried home from Judah. But it is arbitrary in Schrader and Duncker to suppose that the battle of Eltekeh was really the last event in the campaign, and was a virtual defeat. That battle was merely due to an attempt to raise the siege of Ekron, and the operations farther south at Libnah and Lachish must have occurred subsequently. It is plain, too, from the Egyptian tradition given in Herodotus that the Egyptians had a knowledge of the campaign and defeat of the Assyrians, but did not ascribe it to their own prowess. It is very probable that the mice which figure in the legend in Herodotus are a symbol of pestilence (Hitzig, Gesch. d. V. Israel, p. 125, 222; Urgeschichte der Philistaer, p. 201; Wellhausen on 1 Sam. vi. 4), in which case the Egyptian mythus points to the true account as given in the Bible.

Note 7, p. 345. — The first chapter of Isaiah must have been written at this time. It cannot well belong to the Syro-Ephraitic war, which, when the theory of invasion under Sargon is rejected, is the only other date that comes into consideration; for then the distress had not reached such a pitch as Isaiah describes. The points of contact with the contemporary chap. xxii. are manifest. The wicked rulers of chap. i. are the associates of Shebna in chap. xxii. Even the many sacrifices of i. 11 seq. reappear at xxii. 13, for at that time feast and sacrifice were identical; and the comparison of the two texts throws an instructive light on the popular worship as it displayed itself among Isaiah's opponents. The reading which I have adopted in i. 7 is that of Ewald, Lagarde, Cheyne, and others.

Note 8, p. 350. — Rabshakeh's attempt to gain the populace to his side was perhaps suggested by the course of the previous siege when, as Sennacherib relates, the garrison of Jerusalem "inclined to submission" (Smith, Sennacherib, p. 63; Duncker, ii. 365).

Note 9, p, 351. — I here follow the brilliant correction of Wellhausen (Bleek's Einleitung, p. 257), which has found general acceptance.

Note 10, p. 352. — I cannot see that the Bible narrative, as Mr. Cheyne supposes, implies that the calamity attacked a part of Sennacherib's army lying before Jerusalem, It seems to have been the main body of the host that suffered, presumably on the borders of Egypt, as we learn from the monuments that Sennacherib took Lachish, from the siege of which he sent his last summons to Hezekiah.

Note 11, p. 363. — The idea of the one sanctuary, the place chosen by Jehovah out of all the tribes of Israel to put His name there, and at which alone Israel's homage can be acceptably offered, is formulated in the book of Deuteronomy — especially in chap. xii. — and is presupposed in the Priestly Legislation. In the latter it appears as a, fixed idea, traditionally established, and no longer

requiring explanation or justification. Indeed, it is hardly too much to say that the fundamental idea of the Priestly Legislation is not the unity of the sanctuary but the prerogative of the Aaronic priesthood and ritual. The sanctuary at which these are found is the only true sanctuary, because only at it can Jehovah be approached through the mediators, and under the ceremonial forms, apart from which He, is either altogether inaccessible, or manifests Himself only in wrath. Of this point of view there is absolutely no trace in the history before the Exile; it appears exclusively in the priestly parts of the Hexateuch and in the Chronicles, and this is one of the most notable general facts which combine with a multitude of special arguments to establish the post- Exile date of the Priestly Legislation. For nothing is historically more certain than that the doctrine of the exclusive privilege of the priesthood of Aaron, in the sense of the Priestly Legislation, did not yet exist at the time when Josiah brought up the priests of the high places to Jerusalem and nourished them on the unleavened bread of the sanctuary along with their "brethren" of the house of Zadok, or even at the time of Ezekiel, to whom the privilege of the Zadokites is still a law for the future, not a fixed religious principle of the past. In the book of Deuteronomy, on the other hand, the unity of the sanctuary stands by itself, and rests on argument derived from the prophets of the eighth century. To the Deuteronomist, as to the prophets, it appears as an essential of true religion to maintain the separation between the worship of Israel and the worship of the Canaanite holy places. Jehovah is to be worshipped in a single sanctuary of His own choosing, in order that His service may be kept free from heathenish elements. In this argument the question of the hierarchy has no place: the law of Deuteronomy is a solution of the problem, which became practical after the victory of Isaiah, how the national worship can be reorganised so as to answer the conditions of sacrificial cultus, while yet excluding all danger of Canaanite influence. The lines in which the solution is sought are not, however, explicitly suggested either by Isaiah or Micah, neither of whom draws an express contrast between the legitimate altar and the provincial holy places. Between the prophetic condemnation of the popular worship and the Deuteronomic plan of worship centralised in one sanctuary a link is wanting, and that link is found in the shape assumed by Hezekiah's reforms under the special conditions of the land at the time when the provincial sanctuaries i had been destroyed by Sennacherib. Hezekiah's reforms were not permanent because they were largely guided by temporary circumstances. The Deuteronomic code endeavours to develop an adequate and permanent scheme for the whole worship of Israel, in which the principle of centralisation is carried out in all its consequences, and adapted to every requirement of social life. See the argument for this in detail, O. T. in J. Ch., Lect. xii.

Here, however, the question arises, how far the religious pre-eminence which was thus accorded to Zion corresponded with tendencies already at work before the catastrophe of Sennacherib, and which might have ultimately produced the same result even in other circumstances. We have first to consider the attitude taken up towards Zion by the prophets. According to Amos i. 2, Jehovah roars from Zion and sends forth His voice from Jerusalem. Zion, therefore, to this Judaean prophet is already the centre of Jehovah's self-manifestation. But the prophetic doctrine of Jehovah's manifestation in judgment has nothing to do with His appearance to His people in their acts of worship. To Amos the organs of Jehovah's intercourse with His people are not the priests, but the prophets and Nazarites (ii. 12). Jehovah's relation to "His people Israel" is that of the supreme judge: not the temple but the tent of David occupies the central place in his picture of restoration; the future glory of Jerusalem consists in its restoration to the position of a great capital, the centre of a dominion embracing the vassal nations, "over whom Jehovah's name was called" in the days of David. The last expression shows most clearly how little the idea of worship at the sanctuary of

Jerusalem has to do with Amos's notion of the religious importance of Zion; the subjects of the house of David are, as such, subjects of Jehovah. We shall not err, then, if we say that to Amos Zion is the seat of divine manifestation because it is the seat of the Davidic king- dom. Precisely in the same way the tent of David appears in a position of central importance in the old prophecy, Isa. xvi. It is in this relation also that Zion holds a central place in the ideal of Isaiah and Micah. Jehovah manifests Himself on Zion, not at the altar but on the throne of judgment. And so in Isa. xix. the conversion of Egypt is followed by the worship of Jehovah, not at the altar of Jerusalem, but within the land of Egypt itself. The tributary homage of Tyre and Ethiopia (Isa. xviii. 7; xxiii. 1 8) is paid to the capital of Jehovah's kingdom, and enriches the inhabitants of Jerusalem, not the priests. Had the priests been meant in Isa. xxiii. 18, the prophet would have said, "them that stand before Jehovah." At the same time it is obvious that the temple had necessarily a great preeminence over all other holy places because it was the royal, and so in a sense the national, sanctuary. This comes out most clearly in the old war-hymn for a king of Judah, Ps. xx. Another point which doubtless had great weight with the masses was the presence of the ark in Zion. That the ark was the token of Jehovah's presence was the ancient belief of Israel, and appears in a striking way in 2 Sam. xv. 25. On the old view the ark was the sanctuary of the armies of Israel, which led them to battle, and the words of David in the passage just cited are noteworthy as forming in a certain sense the transition from this view to that embodied in Solomon's temple, that Jehovah has now taken up His permanent dwelling-place in the seat of kingship. In this there lies a real step towards religious centralisation — only, we know that no inference was practically drawn from it for the abolition or limitation of local worship. All that is historically certain is that the autumn feast at Jerusalem, and perhaps the passover there, became great pilgrimage feasts. In this sense Isaiah himself seems to recognise Jerusalem as the religious centre of the land (xxx. 29; xxxiii. 20), and here we must, no doubt, seek another practical facilitation of the centralisation of worship. But the prophets lay no weight on the ark as the central point of Jerusalem's holiness. To Isaiah the whole mountain land of Israel, but especially the whole plateau of Zion, is holy (xi. 9; iv. 5). The code, as distinguished from the framework, of Deuteronomy never mentions the ark; according to Jeremiah the ark of the covenant of Jehovah is a thing of no consequence. In the days of Israel's repentance it shall not be sought for or repaired, but "Jerusalem shall be called Jehovah's throne" (iii. 1 7). Thus it is still as the scat of Jehovah's kingship that Jerusalem has central religious importance; the political not the priestly ideal is that which prevails among all the prophets before Ezekiel.

Note 12, p. 364. — Ashtoreth, Moloch or Milcom, and Chemosh, in whose worship similar elements prevailed with those of Moloch worship (2 Kings iii. 27), and who was also associated with Ashtoreth, as we learn from the compound Ashtar-Kemosh of the stone of Mesha, are the deities mentioned in connection with these sanctuaries in 1 Kings xi., 2 Kings xxiii. 13. And in the time from Manasseh onwards, Moloch-worship and worship of the "queen of heaven" appear as prominent new features of Judah's idolatry. It is also probable that the local high places took on their restoration a more markedly heathenish character than before. Isaiah and Micah do not speak in detail of Canaanite abominations in Judah, such as are mentioned for Ephraim in Amos and Hosea, while the book of Deuteronomy regards the high places as purely Canaanitish. This is very natural, for Sennacherib's invasion must have led captive a larger proportion of the higher than of the lower classes, and the latter, no doubt, were more mixed with Canaanite elements, the Israelites having long been a sort of aristocracy in the land (Horim, or freemen). Compare Jer. v. 4. Note 13, p. 365. — Ewald is doubtless right in assigning these chapters to the reign of Manasseh. The times are worse than those of Micah i.-v., but the religion of Judah has lost its old naive, joyful character.

Without any true sense of sin, there is a strong sense of Jehovah's displeasure, a, readiness to make any sacrifice — even that of the firstborn son — to appease His wrath. Then, too, the statutes of the house of Omri are kept (vi. 16). These are precisely the notes of the reign of Manasseh as described in Kings. One correction, however, must be made on Ewald's view. Wellhausen's argument that the prophecy breaks off abruptly at vii. 6, and that the following verses are "written from the standpoint of Babylonian exile (Bleek's Einl., p. 425 seq.) will, I think, when carefully weighed, be found to be conclusive. The enemy of vii. 10 cannot be the heathenish party in Judah; the restoration looked forward to is not a turn of affairs in a still existing kingdom of Judah, but the recall of the nation from banishment in Egypt and Assyria. The situation is no longer, as in the previous prophecy, one of prevailing national sin, the judgment on which cannot long be delayed, but a situation of present calamity and darkness, the punishment of past sins which are acknowledged by a penitent nation.

_____

**Notes:**

1. It will not do to get over this argument by supposing that the fourth year of Jehoiakim was reckoned from autumn, and that thus, if the battle of Carchemish fell in late autumn, part of that year on the Judaean reckoning might still coincide with Nebuchadnezzar's first year reckoned from the following Easter. For the ninth month of Jeremiah's calendar is a winter month, Jer. xxxvi. 9, 22, showing that he reckons by Babylonian years, beginning in spring. To suppose that Jeremiah habitually mixed up two calendars is altogether out of the question. Besides, it is highly improbable that the encounter of Necho and Nebuchadnezzar on the Euphrates took place in late autumn, as the river can be forded in summer.